

**Unclassified**

**DCD/DAC/EV/M(2010)2**

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

**15-Dec-2010**

**English - Or. English**

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

## **DAC Network on Development Evaluation**

### **DAC Network on Development Evaluation**

#### **Summary Record of the Eleventh Meeting of the DAC Evaluation Network**

**16-17 November 2010**

Hans Lundgren, <a href="mailto:hans.lundgren@oecd.org">hans.lundgren@oecd.org</a> , Tel: +33 (0) 1 45 24 90 59 Emma Beer, <a href="mailto:emma.beer@oecd.org">emma.beer@oecd.org</a> , Tel: +33 (0) 1 45 24 96 68
--

**JT03294462**

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



**DCD/DAC/EV/M(2010)2  
Unclassified**

**English - Or. English**

## **SUMMARY RECORD OF THE ELEVENTH MEETING OF THE DAC NETWORK ON DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION**

### **I. OPENING SESSION**

The Chair, Nick York, opened the meeting and welcomed new members to the network. The draft agenda [DCD/DAC/EV/A(2010)2] was adopted. The summary record of the tenth meeting [DCD/DAC/EV/M(2010)1] was approved.

The DAC Facilitator, Frode Neergaard welcomed the strategic reflections within the EVALNET, which resonated well with the DAC's own reflection exercise and ongoing discussions on how the "new DAC" can stay relevant and meet member needs in an environment of new challenges, new global actors and new approaches. He drew attention to the forthcoming DAC discussion on global relations and the opportunities around the 50 year anniversary of the DAC next year. He outlined the OECD-wide development priorities, which focus on: infrastructure, tax policy, green growth, and food security.

### **II. REVIEW OF THE STRATEGY DISCUSSION**

Vice-chair Dominique de Crombrughe (Belgium) presented an overview of the network strategy discussions begun earlier this year. He called for increased member involvement in the work of the network using a selective approach. The discussion emphasised a need for prioritisation and for engagement both internally with other subsidiary bodies and with external actors.

Ongoing collaboration with a number of other subsidiary bodies and DAC work was noted (e.g. with INCAF, WP-EFF, aid for trade, GOVNET). Further collaboration was encouraged through selective engagement with other subsidiaries that have demonstrated a clear interest in collaborating, and where such collaboration would be mutually beneficial. Providing synthesis or meta-evaluations in important policy fields would provide an opportunity for the network to demonstrate policy relevance of its own and members' evaluation work. The need to go beyond aid and beyond traditional actors was also mentioned.

It was noted that DAC members in their discussion on the draft budget of the DCD had restored the share of evaluation to a similar share as in the previous two year period. It remained to be seen however what the final envelope would be as the budget process was not yet fully finalised.

**Action points:** Bureau, Secretariat and Members should deepen engagement with the work areas and subsidiary bodies where collaboration was already ongoing. The network seeks to engage in selective areas where a clear mutual interest and benefit can be established and will engage with new actors and partners more pro-actively. The Bureau with the Secretariat will take the lead on this and inform members of ongoing or new processes regularly. EVALNET will develop synthesis/evaluation briefs with policy relevant messages. (See also work programme discussion under item IX.)

### **III. CURRENT WORK: BRIEF UPDATES**

Written updates were provided on a number of areas of ongoing work from the current work programme (PWB 2009/2010). Oral presentations were kept brief to allow more time for discussion on other items in the agenda.

**a. Conflict prevention and peacebuilding:** EVALNET, in collaboration with the DAC International Network on Conflict and Fragility (INCAF), has developed methodological guidance for evaluating conflict prevention and peacebuilding interventions. Written updates were provided on the status of field tests in South Sudan and the Democratic Republic of Congo. Hans Peter Melby (Norway) invited members to participate in a workshop in Oslo to discuss emerging findings and experiences with the draft guidance.

*Action:* The joint task team (co-chaired by Norway EVALNET and Switzerland INCAF) will circulate a draft agenda and interested members are invited to attend the Oslo workshop 16 – 17 February 2011, and to share any relevant evaluations applying the guidance with the Secretariat.

**b. Haiti evaluation task force:** Following the devastating earthquake in Haiti earlier this year, the DAC EVALNET joined forces with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and ALNAP to support effective evaluation and learning on the international response. The chair provided an update on the work of the joint task force, including a recent mission to Haiti to explore the creation of an evaluation support function there.

*Action:* Interested members are invited to join the task force to help drive this work forward.

**c. Peer reviews of the evaluation function of multilaterals:** Ted Kliet (IOB, the Netherlands) provided an update on the joint UNEG-DAC task team on peer reviews and noted the strong demand for further reviews. Fredrik Korfker (ECG) highlighted the need to advocate for support for peer review processes within multilateral boards, to avoid individual ad hoc review processes which lack credibility. Belgium also shared its positive learning experience with a bilateral peer review and the Chair highlighted that the network can continue to learn from and build on the experiences of the UNEG/DAC task team.

*Action:* Members will continue to learn from these experiences and encourage other organisations to volunteer for the peer review processes.

**d. Managing aid seminar:** The Secretariat shared ideas for a seminar on: How Can Evaluation Be Used Better to Respond to Accountability and Policy-Making Needs in Development Agencies?

*Action:* Interested members are invited to contribute their ideas to the Secretariat to help further develop the concept note. The Secretariat will explore links with other DAC events on results.

**e. Progress on Paris Declaration Evaluation Phase II:** Niels Dabelstein (Secretariat for Paris Declaration Evaluation) provided an update on the status of the second phase of the evaluation of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. Emerging findings from country and agency studies are being compiled. Members were urged to use caution when looking at these emerging findings as conclusions have not yet been finalised. Conclusions will be discussed at the International Reference Group (IRG) meeting to be held 7-10 December 2010 in Indonesia.

**f. Aid-for-trade:** The Secretariat updated members on joint DAC-WTO work to strengthen approaches to results management, monitoring and evaluation in aid-for-trade, including findings of a recent meta-evaluation.

*Action:* The Secretariat will share the meta-evaluation when it is completed and members will be asked to provide feedback.

**g. Impact Evaluation:** Members were invited by Jean David Naudet (AfD, France) to attend the next meeting of Network of Networks on Impact Evaluation (NONIE), to be held in Paris 28-29 March 2011. Karen Jorgensen (Secretariat) updated members on recent developments in 3IE, including a new

funding window to help governments develop stronger proposals for evaluating the impacts of development programmes.

#### **IV. CURRENT WORK: ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND DECISION**

In-depth plenary discussions took place on three areas of ongoing work (continuing into the afternoon session under item VI.):

##### **a. Assessing multilateral effectiveness**

On the basis of the draft document “Pilot test on improving development effectiveness information on multilateral organisations,” and a presentation by task team leader Cida, members discussed current progress and next steps. The report was developed by the Management Group, composed of representatives from the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), the Department for International Development (DFID, the UK), France, the Swedish Agency for Development Evaluation (SADEV), the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the World Bank Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), on behalf of the larger task team.

A number of members underlined the strong demands in their organisations for more information on development effectiveness of multilateral organisations noting that available information differed between various organisations. The pilot effort was generally welcomed and it was emphasised that the pilot effort needs to be finalised taking into account the links with ongoing MOPAN work, the strengthening of the methodology, and that the dialogue with multilaterals needed to be strengthened, including in the discussion of criteria to be used in the assessment framework.

It would also be important to clarify, including for outside stakeholders, what this work was expected to lead to and how it would complement other ongoing efforts.

*Action:* The task team was encouraged to finalise the pilot test, build stronger links with MOPAN and engage in their next meetings, and compare complementarities of findings in light of MOPAN’s ongoing assessments. Further engagement with multilaterals was also recommended to engage all stakeholders including in the further development of criteria and the assessment framework. A management/steering group meeting should be held in the early spring to take stock and provide a report back to the network on lessons and suggested future steps taking into account the future plans for MOPAN.

##### **b. Evaluation capacity development**

Joakim Molander (Sida) gave an update on the Regional Centres for Learning on Evaluation and Results (CLEAR) initiative, which has selected regional host organisations in Africa, and is undergoing selection for centres in other regions. The African centre will be hosted in South Africa, with secondary centres in Ghana and Kenya. He noted the very high demand coming from partner countries, particularly in Africa. The OECD Secretariat from the MENA-OECD governance programme presented their work on regional capacity building and upcoming evaluation training centre in Morocco, and asked for support.

The Secretariat shared a draft network framework for strategic support for evaluation capacity development. The paper was welcomed by members and there was wide support for further strategic work on capacity support. The Chair asked for volunteers to engage on a task team to further develop ideas for a strategic partnership with two or three partner countries and links to other capacity initiatives and partner

networks. During the discussion, members reiterated their support for this work and emphasised the importance of country ownership and demand-driven approaches, highlighting that demand is high in many countries. It was agreed that the network should look for entry points where country leadership is high.

*Action:* A task team composed of Finland, Sida, DFID, the African Development Bank, the IEG World Bank Group, and the Secretariat will further develop ideas for action before the next meeting.

### **c. Budget support evaluation methodology**

Jean-Louis Chomel (European Commission) updated members on pilot tests in Tunisia, Zambia and Mali of the methodology for evaluating budget support. He indicated that the methodology appears to be working and that the initial findings from Tunisia and Zambia had positive results in terms of assessing the effectiveness of budget support as an aid instrument. A draft proposal for further joint work on improving the methodology and institutional arrangements for evaluating budget support activities in a number of countries was discussed.

*Action:* The draft proposal for institutional arrangements will be further discussed by members of the steering group once findings from the three pilots are available. Based on the experience with these three pilots, further work on the methodology and joint evaluations will be decided by the steering group early next year and reported back to the network.

## **V. CURRENT ISSUES IN EVALUATION – SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS**

As part of the network strategic reflection, the bureau agreed to create time in the agenda for small group discussions of substantive issues of interest that are not currently in the work programme. Topics were selected and led by members. Over a working lunch, small groups of members discussed the following four topics and reported highlights back to the plenary. Written reports on each group will be uploaded to the network website as they become available.

**a. Evaluability** – Led by Dr. Ruerd Ruben, Director of Policy & Operations Evaluation Department (IOB) the Netherlands. Presentations by the IOB, the Inter-American Development Bank and Finland highlighted common concerns around evaluability and poor programme design. The IADB has implemented ex-ante evaluability assessments, and undertaken three extensive reviews. The group expressed interest in further work on this topic, specifically looking together at the role of evaluation departments in using evaluability as a lens for understanding and improving management of development programmes. The group also identified tensions around assessing the cost/benefit of evaluations and the need to respond to political demands for evidence, even when evaluability is low.

**b. Evaluation Policy** – Led by Gerry Britan, Senior Evaluation Advisor, USAID. A draft was shared by USAID which contained fundamental principles, roles and evaluation procedures. Any programme activity over USD 10 million will undergo at least one performance evaluation during its life span. Members shared views on their experience in developing or updating policy. The discussion centred on issues around independence vs. lack of bias and decentralisation of evaluations and the drivers for change. The group agreed that even when publishing reports it is often difficult to get management to respond directly to them. The group suggested that it would be useful to develop better ways to communicate findings with the wider public as a means to stimulating management engagement with evaluation.

**c. Beneficiary Perspectives** – Led by Joakim Molander, Director, Department for Evaluation, Sida, Sweden. The group agreed that the perspectives of end beneficiaries were often lacking in development

evaluation and discussed the reasons for this as well as possible solutions. It was agreed that the views of beneficiaries would enrich many evaluations, and that evaluations need to be designed with more field time to allow for more primary data collection. This should be clearly spelled out in tenders. Local consultants and research institutions could also be more involved in data collection. It was suggested that a “showcase” study could be undertaken by interested members and that good examples of evaluations involving beneficiary perspectives could be gathered.

**d. Civil Society** – Led by Mr. William Carlos, Head of Evaluation and Audit, Irish Aid. There was a great deal of interest in the theme of Civil Society from a number of perspectives, including project work, programmes, and themes within Civil Society, as well as standards and accountability. Members shared insights and views from their evaluation activities in the area. The group also identified great diversity in civil society actors in development from NGOs, faith-based organisations, trade unions, universities etc. The corollary of this observation is that a diverse approach is needed. The group suggested that core criteria be developed, building from relevance, sustainability and so on. For the larger organisations, these core criteria could be built upon to develop a broader range of questions about their work.

## **VI. FURTHER DISCUSSION IN PLENARY SESSION**

**a. Continued discussion on Item IV** (see Item IV)

**b. How do we handle budget pressures?** (See Informal Discussion)

**c. Skills and competencies for evaluators and training needs** – Peter Davis, Office of Director of Foreign Assistance, US State Department, presented a distance learning course that the United States provides to train staff and country partners in evaluation methodology. This is the second course of its kind. It focuses on methodology, building on a first course (available on the DAC EVALNET website), which provided a basic introduction to evaluation issues.

DFID shared an evaluator accreditation process that they are implementing for staff, with the aim of having 80 accredited staff both in the Evaluation Department and in programme units as part of a wider push to strengthen decentralised evaluation across DFID. Interested members can contact DFID for more information.

## **WEDNESDAY 17 NOVEMBER**

### **OPENING SESSION**

The Director of the Development Co-operation Directorate (DCD), Jon Lomøy greeted the group and shared some observations on how the Network can continue to support the DAC and the wider development community through its role as the “collective memory of development co-operation”. He challenged the network to continue to reflect on how to use our position as the keepers of knowledge on what we have learned, what works and what doesn’t to influence policy. He encouraged members to look at making evaluations more appetising for policy makers and to begin by communicating about what can and cannot be said in terms of results.

It was agreed to change the order of the first two agenda items of the day.

### VIII. WHAT ARE MEMBERS EVALUATING?

The Secretariat presented an overview of trends in member evaluation plans. The presentation highlighted areas for potential collaboration and raised a number of issues on the distribution of evaluation reports, including low correlation between ODA levels and evaluation, a seeming gap in evaluation in Franco- and Lusophone African countries and conflict affected and fragile states. Members welcomed the analysis and proposed ideas for what might explain the observed distribution and gaps. A number of suggestions were made on areas for further investigation of evaluation distribution, including looking at donor fragmentation and aid architecture in different countries, the need to differentiate between different types of evaluation and to look at evaluation quality (not just at quantities), the inclusion of decentralised evaluations, analysis by ODA per capita or measures of aid dependency, and the impact of rolling multi-year evaluation planning at the country level.

*Action:* The Secretariat will make the evaluation plans tool available to a broader audience on the public website. The Secretariat will explore options for further research on the division of labour and programming of evaluation, drawing on the areas of further analysis suggested by members.

### VII. PANEL DEBATE ON JOINT EVALUATIONS

Margrethe Andersen (Denmark), Dominique de Crombrugghe (Belgium) and Gerhard Siegfried (SDC, Switzerland) debated: How can a more strategic approach be applied to joint evaluations? How can they be carried out in ways that reduce costs and maximise benefits?

The purpose of this session was to contribute to a better understanding of how joint donor evaluations are being implemented in practice and to initiate a discussion on how to apply a more strategic approach in the use of these evaluations.

Panel members debated incentives and disincentives and the political economy of joint evaluations. Incentives stem from the need to harmonise, reduce transaction costs for partners, for addressing broader issues of common interest and for evaluating joint programmes. Disincentives included issues around complexity, timing, transaction costs for donors, and different accountability needs. Some members identified a weak demand from partner countries for joint evaluations. Other members emphasised the benefits of joint evaluations in terms of accountability, quality assurance, more effective use of resources, and more comprehensive results that are given more weight in agencies. It is important that clear objectives are set out, alongside a clear division of tasks and agreement on ownership.

A number of members welcomed the notion of the political economy of joint evaluations and the need for a more strategic approach. It was noted that there were limits to harmonising evaluation agendas when programmes were not planned and implemented jointly. It is important to promote joint programming as this provides a better basis for partnership, and subsequently, alignment (where many members had noted a disjuncture in terms of joint evaluations).

While some argued that we need to build greater donor capacity in this area, others argued that we should be adapting to the systems already in place in partner countries.

A view that was widely supported was that while the overall results are shared, recommendations need to be made specific to the individual donor. Some members proposed a hybrid model, where policy analysis can be done jointly, while other aspects are pursued individually.

Several members suggested that criteria should be developed for considering when to engage in joint, hybrid or individual evaluations, building on the already existing Guidance for Managing Joint Evaluation. At the same time, several members argued for the need for further experimenting and learning from the application of different models. Tri-lateral partnerships were mentioned as a field where new approaches may be tested.

**Action:** Explore the feasibility to further develop criteria for when to do joint, hybrid, and individual evaluations drawing on existing guidance (lead member not identified). Encourage further experimentation in approaches for continued lesson sharing.

## **IX. STRATEGY AND PREPARATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING FUTURE WORK (Programme of Work and Budget 2011/2012)**

For this session, members were divided into small groups to discuss how to implement the new work programme (2011/2012), focusing on three planned outputs: joint evaluations, good practice tools, and key evaluation findings in priority policy areas. The discussion did not include the ongoing work of current task teams on Evaluation Capacity Development, Budget Support, Multilateral Effectiveness, UNEG/DAC peer reviews, Evaluating Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activities, which were covered elsewhere in the agenda. After half an hour of discussion in five groups, members reported back in the plenary session, the following main suggestions:

- Members were supportive of the overall strategic discussions and welcomed the new meeting format but suggested to focus the breakout groups on areas related to the programme of work. Interaction with other bodies (DAC and beyond) should be prioritised based on areas of priority interest and mutual benefit.
- The network should continue working on improving coordination and work towards a more strategic approach to undertaking joint evaluation work. Members suggested a more active marketing of ideas for topics for joint evaluations. Further thinking on “trilateral” evaluations and possible partnerships with emerging donors is also needed.
- Members welcomed the note on communication and interest was strong for developing good practice tools for communication. The communication issue will be on the agenda for the next network meeting. The network should collaborate with DEVCOM on this topic and also explore links with other relevant subsidiary bodies working on results, including Cluster E of the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF).
- The network will undertake syntheses of key evaluation findings and produce meta-evaluations or evaluation lessons briefs on relevant topics to inform policy discussions. Topics should focus on policy priorities identified through collaboration with other DAC subsidiary bodies or other policy channels, such as the horizontal priorities of the OECD (infrastructure, tax, green growth, food security). Members suggested adopting a common approach for this work. The Netherlands is willing to take the lead on synthesizing key findings on Food Security, DFID will take the lead on one synthesis (theme to be decided) and Germany will take the lead on synthesizing key findings on water in the area of infrastructure. Members agreed that topic choices should be demand driven and meet current policy needs.
- Members highlighted the need to further explore linkages between the network and decentralised evaluations and to learn more about what is going on outside of main evaluation units.

**Action:** The Secretariat and the Bureau will draw on these propositions to develop a prioritised action plan ahead of the next Network meeting.

## X. SUMMING UP AND ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Chair thanked departing Vice Chairs Benoit Chervalier and Penny Hawkins and long-time member Fredrik Korfker for their contributions to joint work and the network. He noted that before the next meeting, two of the vice chairs of the network will have left and that elections will need to be held. The Secretariat was requested to organise an open election process early next year in accordance with OECD policy on elections to subsidiary bodies.

The Secretariat drew members' attention to the next African Evaluation Association (Afrea) conference which will be held in Ghana towards the end of 2011. Preparations have begun and collaboration with the network is sought by the Afrea board.

**Action:** Secretariat to launch election process for Vice Chair in early 2011. Bureau and Secretariat to explore possible areas for engagement with the upcoming Afrea conference as an opportunity to reach out to partners, and to explore links with other actors which have indicated interest in closer collaboration with the network (Gates Foundation, IOCE, Council of Europe).

### *Informal Afternoon Session*

The informal session (without interpretation) allowed time for members to discuss recent and forthcoming changes in agency evaluation architectures. Contributions from Germany, DIFD and others experiencing major structural changes highlighted the growing push towards external and independent evaluation and encouraging signs that investment in high quality evaluation (including in decentralised units) is increasing.

The discussion on “**How do we handle the budget pressure on evaluation?**” (originally under item VI.b.) was merged into the discussion on recent and forthcoming changes in agency evaluation architectures for the informal session. Following ongoing fiscal consolidation processes in many OECD member countries, development agency budgets are under pressure. At the same time, there are increasing demands to be able to demonstrate results and to ensure value for money in development assistance. Several members shared concerns around staff and budget cuts, coupled with expanding ODA spending to reach 0.7% spending targets.

The informal session also allowed time for further clarification and summing up on the issue of multilateral effectiveness (See Item IVa).

### **EVALNET Working Groups and Task Teams 2010**

**Evaluation Capacity Development:** Task Team led by DFID, the United Kingdom

**Budget Support:** Steering Group led by the European Commission

**Multilateral Effectiveness:** Management Group led by CIDA, Canada

**Evaluating Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activities:** Co-chaired by Norway (EVALNET) and Switzerland (INCAF)

**Haiti Evaluation Joint Task Force:** ALNAP, EVALNET, and UNEG, chaired by DFID

**Joint Task Team of United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and the DAC Evaluation**

**Network on Peer Reviews of Evaluation Systems in Multilateral Organisations:** Co-chaired by IOB Netherlands and the Evaluation Department of the FAO

**International Reference Group for Phase II of the Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration:** Led by the Secretariat of the PDE

**Participants List for 11th Meeting of the DAC Network on Development Evaluation**  
**Liste des Participants pour 11ème Réunion du Réseau du CAD sur l'évaluation du développement**

16/11/2010 - 17/11/2010

**CHAIR**

**Mr. Nick YORK**

**Australia/Australie**

**Ms. Lyndal MANSON**

*Adviser (Development Cooperation)  
Permanent Delegation [Tues. morning]*

**Austria/Autriche**

**Ms. Karin-Christine KOHLWEG**

*Head of the Evaluation Unit  
Austrian Development Agency - ADA*

**Ms. Laurence HENGL**

*Evaluation Unit  
Austrian Development Agency - ADA*

**Belgium/Belgique**

**Mr. Dominique DE CROMBRUGGHE  
DE LOORINGHE**

*Évaluateur Spécial  
Service de l'Évaluation Spéciale de la Coopération au  
Développement  
SPF Affaires Etrangères, Commerce Extérieur et Coopération au  
Développement*

**Ms. Isabelle WITTOEK**

*Attaché de la Coopération Internationale  
Délégation Permanente*

**Canada**

**Mr. Goberdhan SINGH**

*Director General, Evaluation Directorate  
Strategic Policy and Performance Branch (SPPB)  
Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)*

**Czech Republic/République Tchèque**

**Mr. Petr JANOUSEK**

*Second Secretary  
Permanent Delegation*

**Denmark/Danemark**

**Ms. Margrethe HOLM ANDERSEN**

*Deputy Head  
Evaluation Department  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

**Mr. Frode NEERGAARD**

*Deputy Permanent Representative  
Permanent Delegation*

**Ms. Sine Brink SOBERG**

*Intern-Stagiaire  
DAC  
Permanent Delegation of Denmark to the OECD*

**Finland/Finlande**

**Ms. Kirsti AARNIO**

*Ambassador, Department for Development Policy  
Department for Development Policy  
MOPAN*

**Ms. Riitta OKSANEN**

*Senior Advisor  
Development Evaluation  
Ministry for Foreign Affairs*

**Ms. Sari LEHTIRANTA**

*Counsellor  
Permanent Delegation*

**France**

**Mr. Benoit CHERVALIER**

*Chargé de mission  
Direction générale du Trésor  
Ministère de l'Économie, de l'Industrie et de l'Emploi*

- Ms. Christiane ZEPTER** *Chef du Pôle de l'évaluation  
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères et Européennes*
- Mr. Frédéric BOBAY** *Adjoint au Chef de Bureau - Evaluation de la dépense publique  
Ministère de l'Économie, de l'Industrie et de l'Emploi*
- Mr. Jean-Christophe DONNELLIER** *Ministre-Conseiller, chef du service Economique  
Direction générale du Trésor  
Délégation Permanente*
- Ms. Michelle MARLARD** *Adjointe au chef de bureau  
Direction Générale du Trésor  
Ministère de l'Économie, de l'Industrie et de l'Emploi*
- M. Jean-David NAUDET** *Responsable de la Mission Evaluation & Capitalisation  
Département Evaluation  
Agence Française de Développement*
- Ms. Linda ZANFINI-MAGNE** *Rédacteur efficacité de l'aide et suivi de CAD à l'OCDE  
Direction de l'Economie Globale et des Stratégies  
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères et Européennes*

**Germany/Allemagne**

- Ms. Michaela ZINTL** *Head of Evaluation and Audit Division  
Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development  
(BMZ)*
- Ms. Martina VAHLHAUS** *Head of Evaluation, Dt. Gesellschaft für Technische  
Zusammenarbeit (GTZ)*
- Ms. Heike POERKSEN** *Desk Officer, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and  
Development (BMZ)*

**Ireland/Irlande**

- Mr. William CARLOS** *Head of Evaluation and Audit Unit  
Department of Foreign Affairs*
- Ms. Aine HEARNS** *Deputy Director  
Evaluation and Audit Unit  
Department of Foreign Affairs*

**Italy/Italie**

**Mr. Gioacchino CARABBA**

*Expert in Rural Development & Agriculture, Directorate-General  
for Development Co-operation  
Evaluation Unit, General Directorate for Development Co-  
operation  
Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

**Ms. Samanta VERGATI**

*Trainee  
Permanent Delegation of Italy to the O.E.C.D.*

**Japan/Japon**

**Ms. Akiko HAYASHIDA**

*Official, ODA Evaluation and Public Relation Division  
International Cooperation Bureau  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

**Ms. Yoko KAMADA**

*Policy Analyst  
JICA France*

**Ms. Ai IMAI**

*Researcher  
Permanent Delegation*

**Korea/Corée**

**Ms. EUNJU CHA**

*Manager, Evaluation Office  
Korea International Cooperation Agency*

**Luxembourg**

**Mr. Robert KREMER**

*Consultant  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

**The Netherlands/Pays-Bas**

**Dr. Ruerd RUBEN**

*Director  
IOB - Policy and Operations Evaluation Department  
Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

**Mr. Ted KLIEST**

*Policy & Operations Evaluation Department  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

**Norway/Norvège**

**Mr. Hans Peter MELBY**

*Senior Advisor, Evaluation Department  
Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation*

**Ms. Vibecke DIXON**

*Senior Advisor, Evaluation Department  
Norad – Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation*

**Poland/Pologne**

**Ms. Iwona KRZESZEWSKA**

*First Counsellor  
Permanent Delegation*

**Portugal**

**Ms. Ana Paula FERNANDES**

*Counsellor  
Permanent Delegation*

**Spain/Espagne**

**Ms. Cecilia ROCHA DE LA FUENTE**

*Head of the Evaluation Division, DG POLDE, MoFAC*

**Mr. Carlos RODRIGUEZ-ARIZA**

*Policy Advisor, Evaluation Division  
Directorate General of Development Policy Planning and  
Evaluation  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation of Spain*

**Sweden/Suède**

**Mr. Joakim MOLANDER**

*Director  
Department for Evaluation  
Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA)*

**Ms. Sofia OSTMARK**

*Department for Multilateral Development Cooperation  
Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Sweden*

**Ms. Marit VARMO**

*Swedish Agency for Development Evaluation (SADEV)*

**Switzerland/Suisse**

**Mr. Gerhard SIEGFRIED**

*Head Evaluation and Controlling SDC  
Direction du Développement et de la Coopération, Département  
fédéral des affaires étrangères*

**United Kingdom/Royaume-Uni**

**Mr. Tom MCDONALD**

*Head of Secretariat, Independent Commission for Aid Impact*

**Mr. Jonathan PATRICK**

*Evaluation Advisor, DFID*

**Ms. Elizabeth ROBIN**

*Capacity and Quality Group, Evaluation Department  
DFID*

**United States/États-Unis**

**Mr. Gerald BRITAN**

*Senior Evaluation Advisor  
US AID*

**Mr. Peter DAVIS**

*Coordinator  
Planning and Performance Management  
Office of Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance*

**Mr. Jack MOLYNEAUX**

*Director  
Independent Evaluations, Department of Policy and Evaluation  
Millennium Challenge Corporation*

**Delegation of the EU/UE**

**Mr. Jean-Louis CHOMEL**

*Head, Evaluation Unit  
(AIDCO/03)  
European Commission*

**Mr. Alfonso MARTINEZ SAENZ**

*Stagiaire  
Permanent Delegation of the European Union to the OECD and  
UNESCO*

**African Development Bank (AfDB)/Banque africaine de développement (BAfD)**

**Ms. Odile Renée KELLER** *Chef de Division chargée des évaluations de haut niveau (High Level Evaluations)  
Operations Evaluation Department  
Groupe de la Banque africaine de développement (GBAD)*

**Mr. Mohamed MANAI** *Division Manager, Project & Programme Division  
Operations Evaluation Department  
Groupe de la Banque africaine de développement (GBAD)*

**European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)/Banque européenne de reconstruction et de développement (BERD)**

**Mr. Fredrik KORFKER** *Chief Evaluator  
Project Evaluation Department*

**Mr. Wolfgang GRUBER** *Senior Evaluation Manager, Evaluation Department*

**Ms. Amelie GRAFIN ZU EULENBURG** *Senior Economist  
Evaluation Department*

**Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)/Banque interaméricaine de développement (BID)**

**Mr. Sixto Aquino** *Advisor*

**Mr. Yuri SOARES** *Economics Lead Specialist*

**UN Development Programme (UNDP)/Programme des Nations Unies pour le développement (PNUD)**

**Ms. Saraswathi MENON** *Director, Evaluation Office*

**World Bank/Banque mondiale**

**Ms. Daniela GRESSANI** *Senior Advisor and Deputy to Director General  
Independant Evaluation Group of The World Bank*

**OECD/OCDE**

**Ms. Karen JORGENSEN**

*Head of Division  
DCD/PEER*

**Mr. Hans LUNDGREN**

*Head of Section  
DCD/PEER*

**Mr. Andrew ROGERSON**

*Special Counsellor - Aid Architecture and Financing Division  
DCD/AAF*

**Ms. Emma BEER**

*Assistant  
DCD/PEER*

**Ms. Nathalie BIENVENU**

*Assistant to Division  
DCD/PEER*

**Ms. Emily BOSCH**

*Policy Analyst, Multilateral Aid  
DCD/AAF*

**Ms. Juana DE CATHEU**

*Project Manager  
DCD/POL*

**Ms. Penny JACKSON**

*Policy Analyst  
DCD/PEER*

**Ms. Megan Grace KENNEDY-CHOUANE**

*Policy Analyst - Evaluation Network  
DCD/PEER*

**Mr. John SIMPSON**

*Executive Assistant  
DEV*

**Other/Autre**

**Mr. Niels DABELSTEIN**

*Secretariat for the Evaluation of the Paris Declaration DIIS  
Paris Declaration Evaluation*

**Mr. Michael RULETA**

*Consultant*