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Agenda Item 2: Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

1. Members are invited to elect a Chair and Vice-Chair of the Task Force. For the post of Chair, the UK has indicated the availability of Mr. Richard Manning, Director-General (Resources), Department for International Development (DFID). France is expected to propose a candidate for the post of Vice-Chair. Members wishing to propose additional candidates are advised to inform the Secretariat before 24 January 2001.

Agenda Item 3: Draft Terms of Reference for the Task Force

2. The draft Terms of Reference for the Task Force [DCD/DAC(2000)28/REV1] were discussed at the Senior Level Meeting last December. Only Japan stated that it would submit suggestions for amendment of the terms of reference. They are attached as Annex 1 for consideration by the Task Force.

Questions: Do Members agree with the suggested amendments? Can the draft terms of reference now be considered as final?

Agenda Item 4: Tour de Table on Priorities

3. Paragraph 6 of the Terms of Reference for the Task Force sets forth three sets of activities to be undertaken by the Task Force. At this first meeting, Members of the Task Force are requested to discuss what they see as the priorities among and within these sets of activities:

- **Drawing** together the analysis and progress from relevant work underway, most notably the Multilateral Development Banks, the United Nations and the Strategic Partnership with Africa (SPA) programme.

  *Questions:* Do we think that we have a good picture of what is going on? If not, will this picture emerge in the course of our work or do we need a special activity to draw this picture right at the start of our work (e.g. a consultant could be hired to make an inventory of ongoing harmonisation work)?

- **Identifying** areas where donor practices could most usefully be improved.

  *Questions:* What are the areas where Members consider that good practice reference papers would add most value? Some suggestions include: Sector-Wide Approaches (proposed by...

---

1. In setting priorities, Members should take into account the role of information technology as a tool in support of simplifying practices and procedures; in this connection see DCD/DAC(2000)35 for a summary of the discussions at the joint World Bank/OECD-DAC Workshop on Using Information Technology to Promote Aid Effectiveness, which took place in Paris on 2-3 November 2000, in particular conclusion 4, which suggested that the Task Force on Donor Practices could provide an umbrella under which to pursue follow-up.

Denmark at the last Senior Level Meeting and the harmonisation of Technical Assistance under sector programme support (emerging from an international workshop hosted by the Netherlands in May 2000).

- Discussing, as necessary, conceptual issues and definitions.

Questions: Are there any conceptual issues or definitions which Members consider to be important to discuss before we start our work? E.g. Do Members share the definition of “harmonisation” which has emerged from the Round Table of Multilateral Development Banks?

### Agenda Item 5: Programme of Work

**a) Method of work of the Task Force**

4. Since the Task Force has an initial mandate of only two years, ways and means should be found to work as efficiently as possible. In particular a programme should be defined that leads to useful results in the right timeframe.

Questions: What should be the frequency of Task Force Meetings? Is there a need to establish any more specialist discussions?

**b) Interaction with Partner Countries**

5. In the discussions leading to the establishment of the Task Force, many Members have stressed the importance of interacting with partner countries, in order to make sure that this is not a donor driven process and the work programme of the Task Force reflects the main problems, including related capacity building issues, faced by partner countries when it comes to managing aid. Paragraph 9 of the agreed terms of Reference states that the Task Force will interact with partner countries throughout all the stages of its work in various ways as deemed efficient and effective. These could include regional consultations, establishing ad hoc or permanent panels of partner country representatives, and inviting partner country representatives to participate in Task Force meetings.

Question: What might be effective ways to organise such interaction?

**c) Interaction with MDBs and the Development Committee**

---

3. See Annex 3.

4. The original draft Terms of Reference for the study are attached as annex 4; should Task Force Members agree that this study be included in the programme of work, they may wish to discuss the terms of reference and adjust them where necessary.

5. The Roundtable is debating a framework for “harmonization” that envisages three distinct but related aspects: (a) consultation, which involves sharing information and learning from each other’s experiences; (b) convergence, which emphasizes moving toward similar requirements in agreed areas to reduce transaction costs to borrowers and development agencies and/or increase development impact (thereby avoiding convergence merely for convergence sake); and (c) complementarity/“competitive pluralism,” where institutions operate differently but in ways that are consistent with agreed development objectives, and with each institution’s mandate and comparative advantage.
6. Paragraph 8 of the Terms of Reference states: "The Task Force will interact with similar bodies established by multilateral organisations, notably the Roundtable of Multilateral Development Banks. It could be envisaged that a representative of the Task Force participates in meetings of the Roundtable and vice versa. In addition, representatives from DAC observers on the Task Force would be asked to assure close co-ordination with work of their agencies in the Roundtable". The Roundtable of Multilateral Development Banks intend to organise a meeting in the first week of February together with the members of their thematic working groups (see Annex 2 for more details) in which they also would like the Task Force to be represented. A related issue is the request from the Development Committee last September that the World Bank prepare a report for the Committee’s next meeting on progress with harmonisation.

Questions: Do Members agree that the Task Force be represented in the meetings of the Roundtable of Multilateral Development Banks by the Chair or Vice-Chair and a representative of the DAC Secretariat? How do Members wish to see the bilateral efforts on harmonisation reflected in the report to the Development Committee?

Agenda Item 6: Support and Finance

7. The work of the Task Force is close to the core activities of the DAC and will of course receive support from the Secretariat. At the same time it is clear that without voluntary contributions the work cannot be launched. At the Senior Level Meeting, the Secretariat presented a note [DCD/DIR(2000)32] on the estimated costs for making the Task Force operational. It is proposed to set up a Donor Practices Fund and all Members are invited to make general contributions to it. Members not able to make a general contribution might be in a position to provide funding for special activities (e.g. studies to be commissioned to consultants).

Questions: Do Members have any observations on the estimate presented by the Secretariat? Are Members willing to make a general contribution to the Donor Practices Fund and/or willing to fund specific activities?

6. It would be appreciated if Members who are willing to make a contribution would contact the Secretariat (Mr. Fritz Meijndert) before the meeting of the Task Force.
ANNEX 1

Japan’s Comments on “DAC Task Force on Donor Procedures Draft Terms of Reference” DCD/DAC(2000)28/REV1

1. Scope of the Task Force

Japan understands that the Task Force aims at collecting and analyzing good practices and ultimately to produce a reference book which donors may utilize in assisting partner countries. In making a good practice reference book (see 6 b), criteria for choosing ’good practices’ must be established through our further discussion.

2. Comments on Individual Paragraphs

(1) Paragraph 1 (second sentence, p. 3)
While aid programmes naturally require procedural rules and regulations in order to ensure transparency and accountability to stakeholders, differing and complex procedures of donor agencies put a serious burden on partner country public management,…

Reason:
Advancing harmonisation and simplification without sufficient consideration may have a risk of undermining (a) the transparency of public administration and financial system in developing countries, (b) accountability of ODA in donor countries, which might in turn lead to a reduction in aid volume. Thus, it should clearly be stated in the Terms of Reference that in advancing harmonisation and simplification, it is important to ensure both accountability in donor countries, and transparency in developing countries.

(2) Paragraph 6.
Discussion on this issue should not advance without grasping the current state of affairs and specifying the real needs of developing countries in Africa, Asia and Latin-America. Given this assumption, we would like to propose adding “Cross-regional analysis of current situation and real needs of partner countries” to paragraph 6.
ANNEX 2

ONGOING OR PLANNED WORK IN THE AREA OF HARMONISATION OF DONOR PRACTICES

Multilateral Development Banks

1. The 1996 Task Force Report on Multilateral Development Bank (MDBs) (“Serving a Changing World”) urged MDBs to co-ordinate across a broad front, including operational policies and procedures. Partly in response, MDBs formed *inter alia* six thematic working groups - covering procurement, evaluation, environment, governance/corruption/capacity building, the financial sector, and private infrastructure - to explore the scope for harmonisation.

2. The objectives and outcomes among the various groups differ. The Procurement Group has reached agreement on a Master Bidding Document for goods for use by all MDBs. This document will cover about 70 per cent of all contracts that use MDB financing. The Evaluation Group has made progress in exchanging information and establishing good practices. It has also produced a good practice standard document for evaluating private sector investments. However, standardisation of evaluation methodology is proving to be more difficult. The Environment Group has mapped and analysed the social and environmental requirements for all 35 participating institutions while the Private Sector Financing Group has established a data base which collects the experiences of members in the 'enabling environment' for private sector intervention. The recently established Financial Analysis and Management Group explicitly seeks 'harmonisation' among its participating institutions but the precise focus and working approach has yet to be determined.

3. In June 1999 several MDBs, UNDG and OECD/DAC began a parallel Roundtable that complements the work of the thematic working groups. While the participants in the thematic groups are subject matter specialists, participants in this exercise are officials with corporate responsibility for designing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating their institution’s overall policy and strategy framework. The intent is to encourage upstream dialogue on these overall frameworks in their broader corporate contexts; identify ways in which policies, practices and strategies facilitate or impede donor collaboration in supporting country level and regional development; and explore options (including harmonisation) for eliminating such impediments.

4. The ongoing work of the Roundtable includes the following items:

   - *Compiling an Inventory.* A comprehensive draft inventory of the differences and similarities in MDB operating requirements has been prepared. It suggests that several procedural requirements are complex and divergent.

   - *Revisiting Objectives.* As the working groups evolve, some are finding that they need to redefine their objectives to better reflect their internal dynamic and facilitate constructive engagement by all members. The Roundtable is compiling a list of these objectives and is discussing ways of supporting them. The objectives under discussion include reducing the administrative cost for borrowers and donors associated with the complexity of donor procedural requirements; improving the clarity of operational communications between donors and borrowers, and among donors themselves; enhancing MDB credibility; and preserving borrower choice among institutions which can play different but complementary roles.
• **Defining “Harmonisation”**. The experiences of the working groups have shown that “Harmonisation” does not have a uniform interpretation. The Roundtable is debating a framework for “Harmonisation” that envisages three distinct but related aspects: a) consultation, which involves sharing information and learning from each other’s experiences; b) convergence, which emphasises moving toward similar requirements in agreed areas to reduce transaction costs to borrowers and development agencies and/or increase development impact (thereby avoiding convergence merely for the sake of convergence); and c) complementarity/“competitive pluralism,” where institutions operate differently but in ways that are consistent with agreed development objectives, and with each institution’s mandate and comparative advantage.

• **Discussing Modalities**. Participants are discussing possible concrete and voluntary modalities for reducing administrative costs (related to procedural requirements) in the short and longer term. These modalities include arrangements under which staff could recommend for Management endorsement and Executive Directors approval (as necessary) exceptions to operating policies and procedures in specific instances where such exceptions would facilitate better donor collaboration (including cofinancing arrangements) and improve development impact. Other possible modalities include instituting voluntary upstream consultation and “global peer review” among MDBs during the development or revision of policies and procedures; hiring experts, where necessary and acceptable to the MDBs, to support the working groups, whose members typically juggle other work responsibilities; and voluntarily “contracting” one or more MDBs to assist in developing policies and procedures for another MDB or MDBs.

• **Exploring Priorities**. Possible priorities for information sharing include operational policy and strategy work programs. Possible priority areas in which procedural differences could be reduced are procurement, financial management, project processing and reporting, and social and environment safeguards. There is also scope for much better co-ordination in formulating country and sector strategies.

**United Nations**

5. One of the focus areas for the substantive session of the ECOSOC for the year 2000 will be the issue of simplification and harmonisation of procedures adopted by the UN system in its operational activities for development. The UN Secretary-General will submit a progress report to the ECOSOC with recommendations on how to pursue this matter. This report (E/2000/46 - 23 May 2000) is available on the UN web-site (http://www.un.org/documents/ecosoc/docs/2000/).

6. The Report concludes that progress by the UN system to simplify and harmonise programming and administrative procedures is still inadequate, but that new steps are being taken by UNDG. For example, UNDG has recently stressed the relation between harmonisation of programme cycles and CCA and UNDAF as instruments to harmonise programming at the country level. The report also mentions that budgetary, accounting, auditing and general financial practices represent an area where further steps might be explored to achieve cost reduction and higher productivity. Other areas of ongoing or planned work include reporting requirements; decentralisation and delegation of authority to the field; common formats for project design; procurement; personnel management practices.

**Strategic Partnership with Africa (SPA)**

7. The former Special Programme of Assistance to Sub-Saharan Africa -- renamed in 1999 the Strategic Partnership for Africa -- has always worked at improving donor instruments and procedures. In
the document outlining the objectives and work programme for SPA-5, it is recognised that certain changes
in donor practices and aid procedures could facilitate the use of a fiscal framework and add value to it and
therefore to aid effectiveness. Good progress in this area would entail that the timing of aid announcements
and disbursement is aligned with the national budget cycle. Timely reporting of aid flows in a transparent
manner would help improve the upstream reporting of public expenditures and ensure that aid flows are
adequately reflected in the budget (on an ex ante basis as well as on an ex post basis). Donor aid-reporting
systems which help provide information on aid commitments, aid disbursements, and aid composition (by
sector and instrument), would facilitate incorporation of the most accurate projections on aid flows in the
budget.

8. SPA is now working with seven Task Teams, two of which are explicitly addressing the issue of
harmonising procedures. The Task Team on Financial Management and Accountability is set to suggest
ways of harmonising donor procedures related to financial management. The Task Team on Sector
Programmes will look more generally at the issue: procurement, remuneration and per diems, fund
mobilisation; use of national procedures for aid implementation and common baskets.

**Club du Sahel**

9. A group of ministers from the Sahel region have decided to draft a code of good development co-
operation practice from a developing country perspective. The code aims to transfer the management of
development and the responsibility for executing programmes and projects to the developing country
partner. To facilitate this process, the Club du Sahel has set as one of its objectives to identify concrete
reforms that improve aid effectiveness. It has set up a network of financial managers and comptrollers
which will need to identify the worst obstacles in existing procedures; work to remove them; define a
framework for a new approach based on more delegation to the South, and harmonised management and
accountability principles; and promote the principle of pooling resources in common funds. In support of
this Network, the Club du Sahel intends to make an assessment of the magnitude of the problem of
multiple donor procedures and of the transaction costs involved. In addition it will map local capacities.

**Special initiatives**

10. In a number of CDF pilots efforts are being undertaken by the donor community to identify areas
of possible simplification and harmonisation of procedures, for example in Vietnam and Ghana. The latest
progress report on the CDF pilots notes that donors are increasingly seen to be aligning their strategies with
those of the Government. However, this is not an easy process. Conditionality is very much a factor for
some donors who prefer to negotiate this separately with the government involved. Voices from the field
raise concerns about the lack of donor co-ordination and the transaction costs this imposes on clients.
Encouragingly, some donors are ready to modify the use of their own procedures as a result of the CDF
process.

11. At the initiative of their Ministers for Development Co-operation - on a recent visit to Tanzania -
Norway, the Netherlands, the UK and Germany decided to co-operate on harmonising their aid procedures
in the health sector. They invited other donors to join their endeavours.

12. At a workshop organised in the Netherlands last May, with participation from a selected number
of organisations, on harmonisation and adjustment of financial management and control procedures it was
decided to conduct a study on harmonisation possibilities at the field level focusing on issues of reporting,
disbursements and auditing. It was also decided to commission a study on pooling technical assistance.
The sector wide programme approach (SWAP) is increasingly applied by DAC members. Those countries that do apply the approach would have an interest in learning about the experience of others and of how they have tackled problems. Those not applying the approach might have an interest in learning about experience and problems in order better to be able to decide on the appropriateness of applying the approach. There may also be instances, where it would be expedient for countries generally not extending sector programme assistance to join in the efforts of those that do.

Exchange of view and experience already take place in a number of contexts, e.g. SPA, and the Nordic countries, UK, Netherlands and Ireland also have consultations at relatively long intervals.

It seems natural for DAC to discuss this quite important innovation, e.g. by discussing it in the task force on donor practices, and/or by having a workshop/seminar on the issue.

Among aspects that may usefully be discussed by DAC are

- analysis of efforts already made in regard to exchange of views and experience and of what may be an appropriate role of DAC in ensuring maximum effect of these efforts;
- different concepts of sector programmes. DAC countries extending such aid may have different definitions, and the same donor country may apply the concept in different ways, depending i.a. on the circumstances of the recipient country and the weight, the donor country concerned carries in a given sector;
- problems encountered regarding co-ordination with other donors and with the recipient;
- problems of accountability;
- problems arising in the donor country due to difficulties in identifying the exact use of aid funds;
- how to ensure poverty orientation of sector programmes.
ANNEX 4
DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE

STUDY REGARDING THE HARMONISATION OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE UNDER SECTOR PROGRAMME SUPPORT

Background

1. It is increasingly acknowledged that Sector Wide Approaches (SWAp) provide a more effective channel for delivering aid to partner developing countries. This approach is intended to reduce fragmentation of aid, to improve co-ordination and to strengthen institutional capacity. A central feature of SWAps is the principle of strong recipient ownership and political commitment. The role of donors is that of legitimate stakeholders and partners in dialogue. As stakeholders in a joint sector programme, it is expected that donors harmonise their own support modalities and procedures in order to increase efficiency of sector programmes.

2. On 25/26 May 2000, a workshop hosted by the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs was devoted to the issue of harmonisation of donor procedures under sector programmes. It was attended by representatives of like minded donors — Denmark, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom. World Bank and Club du Sahel were also present. In the course of the workshop, a number of fields were identified as providing scope for short-term harmonisation of procedures. One of these fields was technical assistance (TA)1.

3. A central tenant and objective of Sector Wide Approach is that the planning and financing of all activities within the sector, including technical assistance, be part of an integrated and sustainable planning process. In actuality, however, use of technical assistance often falls short of this objective: it is frequently excluded from sector planning framework and budget, and is subject to different donor practices and procedures. The workshop recognised that technical assistance commonly falls within four types of arrangements: TA is provided as tied (isolated or co-ordinated) or untied (donor or government managed). In order to achieve greater integration of technical assistance within sector planning framework it is incumbent that donors harmonise their requirements and accept common implementation procedures. The workshop, however, acknowledged the fact that the actual degree of integration immediately achievable in each country will ultimately depend on local conditions (donor policy and commitment, recipient government human and institutional capacity etc.).

4. It was therefore agreed to examine the scope for donor harmonisation under sector programmes. The results of this study will feed into the SPA workshops on donor harmonisation.

Principles and definitions

Technical assistance

5. Technical assistance for the purpose of this paper is understood as the total effort to create local capacity and address the underlying causes that resulted in a ‘capacity gap’. It may be defined as the

1. In this paper the terms ‘technical assistance’ and ‘technical co-operation’ are used as synonyms.
transfer, adaptation, mobilisation, and utilisation of services, skills, knowledge, technology, and engineering to build national capacity on a sustainable basis.

**Underlying principles**

6. It is generally accepted, as an underlying principle, that implementation of technical assistance will use recipient government procedures and management structures, where these are acceptable to donors. In cases where the systems are not acceptable or where the systems are constrained by weak institutional capacity, donors are willing to work with the recipient government to correct the problem. Until recipient government effectively administers TA, third party management support under the authority of a lead donor may be envisaged as a transitory expedient. The attainment of common implementation procedures should be looked upon as a process, and should not be forced. Should the use of government procedures prove successful, all donors would be encouraged to use them.

**Pooling technical assistance**

7. The term ‘pooling TA’ refers to the integration of all technical assistance within a single management and financing framework under recipient country ownership or third party management support. This requires acceptance and usage, by all stakeholders, of common implementation procedures with regard to:

- Assistance to the recipient country in order to assess the yet installed capacity and capacity needed to implement development policies and strategies;
- Assistance to the recipient country in the identification and planning of TA needs;
- Elaboration and development of Terms of Reference for consultants, needs for training, coaching, networking and other relevant instruments aimed at capacity improvement;
- Identification and recruitment of consultants, services / investments to realise capacity building;
- Financing of services and investments;
- Management of monitoring and reporting, output and impact of the purchased services and investments made.

**Overall purpose**

8. The main purpose of the study is to draw the lessons from case studies in order to identify the criteria where pooling is appropriate and how it can be made more effective.

**Tasks:**

1. To examine the case studies and identify best practices involved in the pooling of TA in a number of areas including notably:

1.1. *Procedures and management structures:* describe both donor and local Government procedures with regard to the purchasing of TA services in case studies. Analyse processes involved in bringing about acceptance of common procedures and implementation of TA. Are Government procedures and management structures with regard to TA acceptable to most donors?
1.2. **Ownership** (to define as operational and financial management, supervision, monitoring and evaluation) and co-ordination: How- and by whom, was the need for TA identified? Are the goals and objectives of the TA services clear? what should, generally speaking, be achieved by the means of TA? How and by whom is the outcome and impact of the rendered TA services evaluated? What are the conditions that ensure adequate ownership of technical assistance by governments?

1.3. **Implementation capacity**: what capacity is required of Government at point of entry to appropriately manage technical pooled assistance programmes? include description of instruments used: i.e. handbooks, procurement guides, supervision guidelines etc.

2. **To identify and analyse constraints and reasons that have hindered pooling of technical assistance in the case studies:**

2.1. **Conceptual planning**: has the recipient country planned their need for TA independently? e.g. based on an (self) analyses of strength/weakness and an institutional development plan?

2.2. **Procedures and management structures**: have donor procedure requirements and practices hampered the realisation of pooled technical assistance? To what extent is technical assistance still tied?

2.3. **Ownership**: what factors have constrained Government ownership of technical assistance?

3. **Identify factors that make pooling TA more effective:**

3.1. **Procedures and management arrangements**: by what process can acceptance of common procedures and management structures be promoted?

3.2. **Ownership**: what is the position of donors on pooling and untying TA and how can they improve ownership? How should donors assist Government to achieve pooling of TA without substituting for it?

3.3. **Implementation capacity**: how can donors contribute to improving Government implementation capacity? Which are the most effective means to improve capacity?

**Scope of this study**

**Donors**

9. The study will focus on the scope for harmonisation of technical assistance of the following donors:

- Danida, Denmark;
- DFID, United-Kingdom.
- Germany;
- Ireland Aid;
- Netherlands;
- Norad, Norway;
- Sida, Sweden;
- World Bank.
Case studies

10. Three case studies will be examined in the course of this study. While the final choice of these countries and sector programmes will be decided in conjunction with the consultants, it has been tentatively suggested that the case studies be in the following countries:

- Tanzania;
- Ethiopia;
- Mali

Approach and Methodology

11. The study should be geared to providing pragmatic solutions to improving donor harmonisation of technical assistance with the ultimate goal of integrating technical assistance within a comprehensive planning and budgeting sector framework.

First Phase: Issues related to donor policy and requirements (21 days)

12. In the course of the first phase, the consultants will examine issues related to donor policies and requirements with regard to technical assistance. The consultants will focus work on the group of like minded donors. The methodology of the first phase will include the following:

- Review of existing literature by independent resources (to be provided by co-ordinators — see paragraph 18 of this Annex);
- Desk review of relevant legal and operational documents which specify donor requirements and procedures with regard to technical assistance;
- Visit to relevant personnel of each bilateral donor (to be identified by co-ordinators);
- Review existing donor policies for technical assistance in the context of sector programmes;
- Draft of inception note and first debriefing (1 day).

Second Phase: Field visit of case studies (18 days including travel)

13. This phase of the study will be carried out in situ by the consultants. The methodology of the second phase will include the following:

- Interviews with relevant personnel of each donor (to be identified by co-ordinators);
- Interviews with relevant government officials and stakeholders (to be identified by co-ordinators);
- Review existing procedures, management arrangements and practices for technical assistance.

Third Phase: Drafting (9 days)

- Second debriefing (1 day);
- Drafting preliminary and final report (8 days).
Reporting and outputs

14. Consultant will provide an inception note at the end of the first phase.

15. The final report will develop the following points:
   
   − Describe and analyse policy and management arrangement of technical assistance under sector support programmes both in general terms and in the context of the case studies;
   
   − Consider the acceptable guidelines / factors that should be required from recipient countries in order that they effectively manage technical assistance within the context of sector support programmes;
   
   − Identify the critical factors that are impeding pooling of technical assistance under sector programmes;
   
   − Recommend required actions towards making pooling of technical assistance more effective.

16. The report should be presented in MS Word format (hard copy and electronic). An oral debriefing may be required.

Time Frame

17. The time frame for this study is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bidding process (short list)</td>
<td>October 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment of consultants:</td>
<td>November –December 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First phase:</td>
<td>January 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second phase:</td>
<td>February 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary draft:</td>
<td>March 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from donors:</td>
<td>End of March 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report:</td>
<td>April 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Co-ordination

18. The study is being co-ordinated on behalf of the donor group by The Netherlands, DFID and the Club du Sahel.

Competencies and Skills required by consultants

19. The following profile will be required from consultants:

   − More than 10 years experience as a consultant;
   
   − Experience in Public Administration;
   
   − Track-record of research;
   
   − Back-up of a recognised institution;
   
   − Capacity to work independently;
   
   − Diplomatic skills required.