

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

21-Mar-2012

English - Or. English

## DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE Development Assistance Committee

**Working Party on Aid Effectiveness** 

### REVISED DRAFT SUMMARY RECORD

First meeting of the Post-Busan Interim Group, 13-14 February 2012

This document presents a revised summary of the first meeting of the Post-Busan Interim Group (PBIG). It reflects comments received from PBIG members in writing.

This summary is presented to the PBIG for APPROVAL under agenda item 1 of its second meeting (4-5 April 2012).

#### Contact

Ms. Hanna-Mari Kilpeläinen, tel: +33 (0) 1 45 24 90 36, email: hanna-mari.kilpelainen@oecd.org Mr. Robin Ogilvy, tel: +33 (0) 1 45 24 94 48, email: robin.ogilvy@oecd.org

### JT03318386

Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

This document and any map included herein are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

## I. Introduction

- 1. The first meeting of the Post-Busan Interim Group took place in Paris on 13 and 14 February 2012. The meeting was chaired by WP-EFF Chair Mr. Talaat Abdel-Malek. The list of participants for the meeting is available as annex to this document.
- 2. Following a round of introductions and the adoption of the agenda, the chair outlined the objectives of the meeting: i) to agree on an interim WP-EFF work process that will deliver agreement on the post-Busan governance and monitoring framework by June 2012; ii) to identify key characteristics of the future Global Partnership that will guide further work to define the functions, nature and support needs of the Partnership; and iii) to provide guidance on the key questions related to developing indicators and targets to monitor implementation of Busan commitments.

# II. Interim work process of the WP-EFF January-June 2012

- 3. The first substantive agenda item focused on the process through which working arrangements for the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation and the post-Busan monitoring framework will be finalised by June 2012. The Chair referred to the related meeting document [DCD/DAC/EFF(2012)1], which proposed a framework for the interim work process.
- 4. The Chair emphasised the importance of continuity in the work of the PBIG. The Chair asked that participants should aim to attend all PBIG meetings in person, but that at the same time some flexibility may be necessary. It was agreed that for future meetings, **personal attendance by PBIG members is the first preference** but, recognising possible limitations and constraints, members may designate a representative to speak on their behalf. However, to ensure continuity of the process, each **member shall have one designated observer** who will participate in meetings and who may represent the member in case of absence. In the case that both are present in meetings, this accompanying colleague will have observer status.
- 5. **Brazil, India and China** informed the group that they were attending the meeting as observers. In response, the Chair emphasised the inclusive nature of the Global Partnership initiated in Busan and invited these countries to participate in discussions to the extent that they desired, suggesting a **'participant observer' status**.
- 6. Moving on to the WP-EFF interim work process in broader terms, the Chair pointed out that while the PBIG represents directly or indirectly various stakeholders, there remain actors that are not represented in the group but that could have potential multiplier effects in the interim work process. In this context, the Chair proposed setting up a **reference group** that would include (but not be limited to) **regional actors** and would be actively solicited throughout the process. Some participants highlighted that various regional and other actors are already represented in the PBIG, and that duplication in structures should be avoided. The importance of including the **private sector** in such a group was emphasised. It was **agreed that a reference group be set up** and that relevant actors be invited to join. The group will be kept informed of the WP-EFF interim work process and offered opportunities to feed inputs to the PBIG work process.
- 7. In terms of the broad WP-EFF interim work process, the Chair emphasised that the final agreement on the working arrangements and monitoring framework will be taken by the WP-EFF. While some members proposed organising a WP-EFF plenary meeting earlier than June, the majority supported organising only one WP-EFF plenary meeting to deliver the final agreement. It was emphasised that consultations within the WP-EFF will play an important role throughout the coming months. To this end, the WP-EFF Community Site [link], which is accessible to all participants of the WP-EFF, will provide a

practical tool for seeking inputs and for sharing views. Alongside this, the official HLF4 website continues to provide a source of general information to all interested stakeholders.

- 8. As to structuring the interim work process, the group had a first round of exchanges related to the timing, sequencing and venues of forthcoming meetings. Initial reactions emphasised the need to take account of travel time and costs in setting up meetings. There was broad support for utilising opportunities to link meetings back-to-back with other key events and for keeping the process lean and practical. At the same time, several participants felt that more information on the substantive objectives and desired deliverables of the interim work process were needed before making decisions on the structure of the work process. Therefore, it was agreed that the **meetings schedule would be revisited** the following day in connection to discussions on next steps.
- 9. In relation to future meetings, the group acknowledged the importance of engaging a broad range of stakeholders in the WP-EFF interim work process, as mandated by the Busan Partnership document. The Chair concluded that all stakeholders that are committed to strengthening the effectiveness of development cooperation and to implementing the commitments of the Busan Partnership document are welcome to actively engage in the process.

# III. Working arrangements for the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation

Core functions of the Global Partnership

- 10. To structure the discussions, the Chair invited participants to focus first on what the core functions of the Global Partnership should be [DCD/DAC/EFF(2012)2 paragraphs 12-14]. The group identified four core functions for the Global Partnership:
  - i. Maintain and strengthen **political momentum** for more effective development cooperation;
  - ii. Ensure accountability for implementing Busan commitments;
  - iii. Facilitate **knowledge exchange** and sharing of lessons learnt; and
  - iv. Support **implementation** of Busan commitments at the **country level**.
- 11. Regarding the **scope** of the Global Partnership, particularly whether it should take on a broader development effectiveness role beyond solely reviewing progress in implementing HLF4 commitments, the majority advocated for a **focused approach**, whereby the Partnership should primarily focus on enhancing the effectiveness of development cooperation as foreseen by the Busan Partnership document.
- 12. At the same time, a certain degree of flexibility was called for to ensure that there is sufficient **space for policy dialogue**. Ministers should be able to address key issues arising from country level evidence and provide the political guidance needed to resolve arising challenges for development cooperation. The group did not foresee that the Global Partnership would assume the role of setting global standards; rather, it should facilitate the political level exchanges and dialogue necessary to ensure implementation of commitments and actions agreed in Busan.
- 13. There were diverging views within the group on the extent to which **policy coherence for development** should feature in the Global Partnership. The Chair raised the question of whether taking this issue on board might overstretch the capacity of the Partnership.

How the Global Partnership will deliver its core functions

- 14. Having discussed core functions of the Global Partnership, the group moved on to consider *how* the Partnership would deliver these functions [DCD/DAC/EFF(2012)2 paragraphs 15-19]. Regarding the membership of the Partnership, there was broad consensus that it should be **inclusive and open to all interested stakeholders**, with the sole criterion that they endorse the Busan Partnership document and are committed to implementing the actions agreed to therein. **Ministerial level meetings** including heads of agencies and of non-governmental organisations were identified as the key working structure of the Partnership.
- To support this ministerial level platform, there was broad support for the idea of a **Steering Committee**, which would convene below ministerial level and would guide the substantive agenda of the Partnership. Several participants envision this body to be limited in size and membership. Balanced representation arose as one important criterion for the composition, with some participants proposing a rotating membership to the Committee.
- 16. While the general framework of ministerial level political engagement and a Steering Committee operating at a lower level received strong support, participants agreed that there is a **need for more detailed elaboration** on how this governance set-up would operate in practice. Particularly, concrete suggestions would be needed on i) how to maintain political momentum and provide incentives for ministers to engage; ii) what frequency and organisational aspects of ministerial meetings would best support political momentum; iii) what would be the tasks and membership of the Steering Committee to ensure a functional and efficient structure. The **United Kingdom** expressed its willingness to develop a proposal to this end. It was agreed that the United Kingdom would work together with interested parties to submit a proposal by 29 February.
- 17. As set out in the Busan Partnership document, the group was unanimous that **Secretariat services provided jointly by the OECD and UNDP** will support the functioning of the Partnership. The OECD and UNDP informed participants that they are discussing their respective comparative advantages and beginning to consider how they can together respond to the call from Busan to provide support to the Global Partnership. This concept will need to be articulated in parallel to the development of the Global Partnership concept, and the organisations will share this with the WP-EFF once it is developed further.
- 18. **Regional organisations** were identified by some participants as important actors in supporting implementation of Busan commitments. Potential roles for regional organisations included collecting country level experiences and lessons (including possible engagement in country level monitoring efforts), facilitating intra- and inter-regional learning and building links between country and global level efforts to implement Busan commitments. The group identified the need for further elaboration on what different kinds of regional organisations are relevant in this context, what are their competences and mandates to engage in this agenda, and based on this what could be their specific role to support the Global Partnership. The **NEPAD Agency** representing the African Union expressed its willingness to develop a proposal to this end. It was agreed that the NEPAD Agency would work together with interested parties to submit a proposal by 29 February.
- 19. In the context of operationalising the Global Partnership, the group discussed the role of **Building Blocks and other voluntary alliances** that arose from HLF4. While the group considered that these can play a potentially significant role in implementing Busan commitments, there was consensus that these should continue to exist as self standing alliances and that there is no need to formally institutionalise them or envision any accountability relationship between them and the Global Partnership. At the same time several participants pointed to the fact that these alliances include champions around various substantive themes and could therefore offer important inputs to the work of the Global Partnership. It was

agreed that the **Chair will send out a letter**, providing actors associated with various Building Blocks information on the current interim work process and welcoming inputs to the work process at hand.

- 20. In structuring the work of the Partnership, there was widespread support for building on **existing knowledge and structures**. Comparative advantages and potential **value added** of existing actors and fora should be carefully analysed and tapped into. Working arrangements should ensure that **strategic links** are made to other political fora that are relevant for enhancing the effectiveness of development cooperation.
- 21. There was agreement on the need to resist creating new layers and heavy bureaucracies. The paradigm of 'global light' was conceptualised mainly as arranging meetings back-to-back with other international high level meetings, focusing on issues at the political level rather than working level and creating synergies and ensuring cost-effectiveness wherever possible. Ministerial level meetings were not envisioned to necessarily take place on a yearly basis, with several participants advocating a less frequent meeting cycle of every two or three years.
- 22. As regards to institutional anchoring of the partnership, several participants envisioned organising the ministerial meetings of the Global Partnership back-to-back with the **UNDCF and DAC High Level meetings**, alternating between the two. The Chair invited partner countries to consider, whether they would be interested to take on a role in hosting and organising events of the Global Partnership, with a view to strengthening ownership and country level linkages of the Partnership.

## IV. Monitoring Framework post Busan

- 23. The group's discussions on the post-Busan monitoring framework included an exchange of initial views on the "what", "who" and "how" of future monitoring [see DCD/DAC/EFF(2012)3]. In considering general criteria for the scope of global monitoring efforts, the following issues arose as key elements to guide further work:
  - i. **Country-level monitoring** provides the foundation for reviewing progress. Building capacity and strengthening systems for monitoring is essentially linked to developing country level monitoring frameworks.
  - ii. Country level monitoring must include **flexibility** to reflect specific country contexts and development co-operation priorities and could benefit from a **menu of options** provided at global level.
  - iii. Monitoring progress in implementing Busan commitments requires both qualitative and quantitative analysis. Existing information and analysis should be used to the maximum extent possible, combining quantitative and qualitative inputs from various sources.
  - iv. A distinction should be made between assessing **behavioural change** and assessing outcomes. While efforts to monitor the results of development co-operation are important, the commitment contained in paragraph 35 of the **Busan Partnership document focuses on monitoring effectiveness of development cooperation**.
  - v. In keeping with the nature of the BPd, participation in monitoring efforts is **voluntary**. At the same time, exchange of knowledge between all actors in development cooperation is strongly encouraged to facilitate sharing of lessons and mutual learning.
- 24. While country level monitoring was agreed to provide the basis for reviewing implementation of Busan commitments, the question of how to **link country level to global level monitoring** requires further elaboration. Particularly the question of whether country level information should be directly **aggregated**

to global level will need to be addressed. Some participants envisioned a role for **regional organisations** in gathering country level evidence and feeding it to the global level. The Chair invited AUC to include this aspect into its forthcoming proposal (*see above para 18*).

- 25. Regarding indicators at the **global level**, several participants advocated for a certain degree of **continuity** and **comparability** to enhance coherence in reviewing progress. It was noted that certain themes and commitments may be more appropriate to monitor at global level than others and that careful consideration should be given to the **global or country specific nature** of different commitments.
- 26. While there was broad consensus that future monitoring should build maximally on existing information, there were **varying views** in the group of the extent to which the **post-Busan monitoring framework should introduce new indicators** and methodology in the run-up to 2015. There was general consensus that not all Paris Declaration Survey indictors merit continuation, but that some indicators would nonetheless maintain their relevance post Busan. Several participants brought up the need for a certain degree of **flexibility** in the indicators to allow for possible revisions post-2015.
- 27. The group emphasised the difference between monitoring **behavioural change** and monitoring **development outcomes**. Some participants pointed out that there already exist monitoring mechanisms for development results (*e.g.* MDG monitoring) and that **duplication in approaches should be avoided**. While the majority supported a general shift of focus from input-output-analysis to examining results and outcomes, participants emphasised the importance of behavioural change to support strengthened results. Several partner countries underlined the value of monitoring behavioural change for informing dialogue between government and development partners.
- 28. Brazil and Mexico indicated that, as providers of **south-south cooperation**, they are not at this stage in a position to be associated with the future monitoring framework. They emphasised the need to take into account the differential and voluntary nature of commitments as stated in the Busan Partnership document and the longer time frame necessary for providers of south-south cooperation to adapt to the post-Busan framework. At the same time, several participants emphasised that increased information on all forms of development cooperation would be desirable to facilitate knowledge exchange and mutual learning, and to this end voluntary reporting by providers of south-south cooperation was seen as a viable means to make relevant information available.
- 29. Regarding the **process for agreeing on a monitoring framework**, there was broad recognition of the urgent need for more detailed elaboration on key questions. The option of setting up task teams was explored, but did not receive broad support. To structure the consultation and ensure coherence of inputs, it was agreed that the Secretariat will issue a simple questionnaire that sets out a uniform set of questions. Inputs are invited from PBIG members by the end of February.

## Agenda item II revisited: Meetings schedule and key deliverables of the interim work process

30. Based on the discussions of previous agenda items, the group revisited the work plan for the interim period leading to June 2012. The Chair emphasised the importance of avoiding clashes with other major meetings while at the same time utilising possibilities for back-to-back arrangements and expressed the willingness to organise meetings outside of Paris. Participants voiced varying preferences regarding meeting dates and venues, but overall there was broad support for prioritising **practicality and feasibility** in meeting arrangements. It was agreed that, based on the discussions, the Secretariat would produce an **updated proposal** for the work process, including meeting **dates** as well as key **deliverables and decision points**.

31. To make progress on developing the working arrangements of the Global Partnership and the monitoring framework, the Chair invited inputs by 29 February 2012. (See *Key decisions and follow-up* below).

# Key decisions and follow-up

- Working arrangements of the PBIG: Personal participation of each PBIG member in subsequent meetings is the first preference. In the event that this is not possible, the member may designate a representative to speak on their behalf. Each member shall have only one designated observer, who may represent him/her.
- Ensuring consultation with relevant actors: The Chair plans to consult a reference group representing key regional and functional entities that are not included in the PBIG but that can provide an important reference for the interim work process.
- Broad engagement of stakeholders in the WP-EFF interim work process: All stakeholders committed to implementing the Busan Partnership document are welcome to engage in this interim process to agree the post-Busan governance and monitoring framework. Such stakeholders are encouraged to contact the Secretariat for any additional information on participation in WP-EFF consultation.
- Further elaboration on working arrangements for the Global Partnership: The general framework of ministerial level political engagement and a steering committee operating at a lower level received strong support. At the same time participants agreed on the need for more detailed elaboration on how to put this into practice. The Chair invited the United Kingdom and the NEPAD Agency to develop, in collaboration with interested stakeholders, proposals on the governance structure and on the role of regional organisations respectively. PBIG members are invited to contribute inputs to these themes either i) through the United Kingdom and/or the African Union Commission; or ii) directly to the Secretariat by 29 February.
- Further elaboration on the post-Busan monitoring framework: Inputs are invited through a simple questionnaire, which should be submitted to the Secretariat by 29 February.
- Finalising agreement on the WP-EFF interim work process: Based on the PBIG discussions, the Secretariat has produced an updated and revised version of the document Interim Work Process of the WP-EFF January-June 2012 [DCD/DAC/EFF(2012)1/REV1] to propose a more detailed plan of work, including dates for future meetings of the Post-Busan Interim Group and their expected deliverables as well as timing of opportunities for consultation and inputs from the broad membership of the WP-EFF and other interested stakeholders. Further comments and feedback on the proposed timing of PBIG meetings are welcome.

### **ANNEX**

## Participants List for Post-Busan Interim Group Meeting

13-14 February 2012

### **Chair**

Mr. Talaat ABDEL-MALEK +20 2 27 927 158 Economic Advisor to the Minister and +20 2 27 923 944 Co-chair of the Working Party on Aid malek01@pema.gov.eg

Effectiveness

Ministry of International Co-operation 9, Mohamed Fahmy El-Said Str. Garden City, Cairo, Egypt

#### **Bureau**

Korea Ms. Enna PARK +02 2100 0170

Director General +02 2100 0110 **Development Cooperation Burea** epark@mofat.go.kr Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Seoul, Korea

OECD Mr. Brian ATWOOD +(33-1) 44 30 61 41

DAC Chair, DCD Brian.ATWOOD@oecd.org

World Bank Ms. Barbara LEE +1 202 473 7084

+1 202 522 0897 Manager, Aid Effectiveness Unit Operations Policy and Country Services blee@worldbank.org

Network The World Bank 1818 H Street, NW

DC 20433 Washington, United States

**UN** Development Ms. Sigrid KAAG

Programme (UNDP) Assistant Secretary-General 1-212-906-5307 Bureau for External Relations and Sigrid.kaag@undp.org

> Advocacy **UNDP**

One United Nations Plaza

First Avenue, 10017 New York, United

States

### **Participants**

Parliamentarians with

Africa

Association of European Mr. Clement BOUTILLIER Association of European

Parliamentarians for Africa (AWEPA)

Bangladesh Mr. Iqbal MAHMOOD +880 293 599 77

Senior Secretary, Economic Relations +880 2 8113088

Division

Ministry of Finance Government of Bangladesh iqbalm404@hotmail.com secretary@erd.gov.bd

c.boutillier@awepa.org

1-212-906-5512

M. Monowar AHMED

Joint Secretary, JCS Coordination

Officer

Aid Effectiveness Unit, Economic

**Relations Division** Ministry of Finance

Sher-e-Bangla Nagar, 1207 Dhaka

+8801711522543 +8802 8113088

ahmedmonowar@hotmail.com

BetterAid Mr. Antonio TUJAN

International Director IBON; Co-chair,

Better Aid (IBON Foundation)

3rd Floor IBON Center 114 Timog Avenue

1103 Quezon City, Philippines

Ms. Mayra MORO-COCO

Policy and Advocacy Manager, AWID

Mr. Matt SIMONDS

Liaison Officer Trade Union Advisory Committee

(TUAC)

15, rue Lapérouse, 75016 Paris, France

Canada Ms. Caroline LECLERC

Director General

Strategic Planning and Performance

Reporting

Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), Strategic policy and

performance Branch (SPPB) 200 Promenade du Portage,

Place du Centre, Floor 12, Room 1237

K1A 0G4 Gatineau

FU Mr. Vincent GRIMAUD

Germany

Head of Unit, Aid and Development

Effectiveness and Financing

**European Commission** 

Ms. Kristiina KUVAJA

National Seconded Expert in the EU

Commission

Aid Effectiveness Team **European Commission** Brussels, Belgium

Head of Division - Effectiveness of bilateral cooperation; policies and

quality assurance regarding

cooperation with countries and regions

Cooperation and Development Dahlmannstrasse 4, 53113 Bonn,

Germany

+63 2 927 6974 +63 2 927 6981

atujan@iboninternational.org

+34 646 974 431

mmoro-coco@awid.org

+33 1 55 3737 34 simonds@tuac.org

+1 (819) 994 6742

+1 (819) 997 9049

caroline.leclerc@acdi-cida.gc.ca

+322 296 33 20

Vincent.GRIMAUD@ec.europa.eu

kristiina.kuvaja@ec.europa.eu

Mr. Ronald MEYER

Federal Ministry for Economic

+49 2 28 99 535 35 40 +49 (228) 99 10 535 3540

ronald.meyer@bmz.bund.de

## DCD/DAC/EFF/M(2012)1/PROV/REV1

+49 228 5353290 Ms. Bettina HORSTMANN Senior Programme Officer bettina.horstmann@bmz.bund.de

Division Aid Effectiveness Federal Ministry for Economic

Cooperation and Development (BMZ) Dahlmannstrasse 4, D 53113 Bonn,

Germany

Honduras Ms. Lidia FROMM CEA +504 2230 7000 Director General for Co-operation +504 2230 5268 lfromm@seplan.gob.hn

Secretaría Técnica de Planificación y Cooperación Externa

Ministry of Planning and Co-operation Centro Cívico Gubernamental-Contiguo

a Chiminike, Boulevard Fuerzas

Armadas, Tegucigalpa

Mr. Martin CHUNGONG

Inter-Parliamentary

Union Director of Division of Program Division +41 22 919 4160

and Co-Chair of Aid and Accountability mch@mail.ipu.org

Management Group Inter-Parliamentary Union Chemin du Pommier 5

1218 Grand Saconnex, Geneva,

Switzerland

Aleksandra BLAGOJEVIC +41 22 919 41 83 Program Officer, International ab@mail.ipu.org

+41 22 919 4130

Development

Inter-Parliamentary Union Geneva, Switzerland

Ms. Yukiko OKANO +33 1 53 76 61 60 Japan

> Counsellor, Permanent Delegation +33 1 53 76 61 54

11, avenue Hoche, 75008 Paris, France yukiko.okano@mofa.go.jp

Korea Mr. Chul LEE +82 2 2100 0173

**Deputy Director** clee97@mofat.go.kr

Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade

M. Modibo M. MAKALOU Mali +223 763 747 00 Coordinateur/Mission de +223 2023 0009

Développement et Coopération mmakalou@mdc.pr.ml

**Development and Cooperation Initiative** 

(DACI)

Présidence de la République B.P.10, Koulouba, Mali

Mr. Gerardo BRACHO +52 (55) 36 86 51 00 Mexico gbracho@sre.gob.mx

Deputy Director General of Mexican Agency for Development Cooperation

Ministry of Foreign Affairs Plaza Juárez 20, Piso 7

Colonia Centro

Delegación Cuauhtémoc 06010 Mexico City, Mexico Mr. Aldo ALDAMA +33 1 56 59 29 21 Mexican Delegate to the DAC +33 1 45 63 03 63

Development, Employment, Health and aaldama@delegamexocde.org

Social Affairs Permanent Delegation

8, RUE BERRI, 75008 Paris, France

New Partnership for Africa's Development

(NEPAD)

Ms. Florence NAZARE +27 11 256 3632 Head, Capacity Development florenceN@nepad.org

**NEPAD Secretariat** Block B, Gateway Park, Midridge Office Park

P.O. Box 1234, Halfway House, 1685

Midrand, South Africa

Pacific Islands Forum

Secretariat

Mr. Alfred SCHUSTER +679 331 2600 ext 295 **Development Cooperation Advisor** Fax +679 322 0279 Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat alfreds@forumsec.org.fj

Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji

Ronald NKUSI Rwanda +250.252596130 ronald.nkusi@minecofin.gov.rw

Director

External Finance Unit Ministry of Finance and Economic

**Planning** 

Ms. Yuko SUZUKI NAAB +250782220008

Aid Effectiveness Specialist Ministry of Finance and Economic

Planning

Kigali, Rwanda

Mrs. Mmakgoshi PHETLA LEKHETHE South Africa

**Deputy Director General** 

International and Regional Economic

Policy

**National Treasury** 

Private Bagx115, 0001 Pretoria, South

Africa

Mr. Peter MAHAFHA +33 1 53 59 23 46 Third Secretary MahafhaP@dirco.gov.za

Multilateral

Embassy of South Africa

59 quai d'Orsay, 75007 Paris, France

Sweden Mr. Johan BORGSTAM +46 8 405 51 15

> Director General for International **Development Co-operation** Ministry for Foreign Affairs Gustav Adolfs torg 1

S-103 39 Stockholm, Sweden

Ms. Johanna TEAGUE +46 70 618 84 83

Department for Management and Methods in Development Cooperation

Ministry for Foreign Affairs S-103 39 Stockholm, Sweden johanna.teague@foreign.ministry.se

johan.borgstam@foreign.ministry.se

yuko.suzuki@minecofin.gov.rw

+27123956692

mmakgoshi.phetla-

lekhethe@treasury.gov.za

# DCD/DAC/EFF/M(2012)1/PROV/REV1

Timor Leste Mr. Helder DA COSTA + 670 331 0128 National Co-ordinator, International hdacosta@mof.gov.tl Secretariat of q7+ Aid Effectiveness Directorate Ministry of Finance Kobe House Palacio do Governo, Dili, East Timor Lisa DENNEY Overseas Development Institute (ODI) +1 212 906 5329 **UN** Development Ms. Dasa SILOVIC +1 212 906 5896 Programme (UNDP) Senior Policy Advisor Bureau for Development Policy/CDG dasa.silovic@undp.org UNDP, 304 East 45th Street, Room 622 NY 10017 New York, United States Harald FRIEDL + 1 212 906 6752 Special Assistant to the Assistant harald.friedl@undp.org Secretary General Bureau for External Relations and Advocacy United Kingdom Mr. Richard CALVERT +44 207 023 0417 Director General r-calvert@dfid.gov.uk Finance and Corporate Performance Division, Department for International Development 1 Palace Street SW1E 5HE London, United Kingdom Mr. Kevin GARDNER K-Gardner@dfid.gov.uk DFID, United Kingdom **United States** Mr. Steven PIERCE + 202-712-1097 Senior Advisor, PPL/DE + 301-646-6157 Office of Donor Engagement, USAID spierce@usaid.gov 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW 20523-4801 Washington, United States World Bank Ms. Julia NIELSON +33140693281 Advisor, External Affairs +331 40693064 The World Bank jnielson@worldbank.org 66 avenue D'Iena, 75116 Paris, France **Participant observers** Brazil Mr. Ricardo GUERRA DE ARAÚJO +33 1 45 61 63 54 Minister Counsellor +33 1 42 89 03 45 Head of OECD Liaison Office ocde@bresil.org Embassy of Brazil in France 34, Cours Albert 1er, 75008 Paris, France Mr. Marcus ROUANET MACHADO DE +33 1 45 61 63 09 **MELLO** ocde@bresil.org Counsellor, OECD Liaison office

**Embassy of Brazil** 

34, Cours Albert 1er, 75008 Paris

+33 1 53 57 70 18

ss.proj@orange.fr

People's Republic of China

Ms. Ruhua CHEN First Secretary

First Secretary chrh@mofcom.gov.cn Economic and Commercial Affairs Embassy of the People's Republic of

China

21 rue de l'Amiral d'Estaing

75016 Paris, France

Mr. Yong LI +33 (1) 53 57 70 12
Third Secretary +33 (1) 47 23 48 31
Economic and Commercial Affairs liyong@mofcom.gov.cn

Embassy of the People's Republic of

China

21, rue de l'Amiral d'Estaing

75116 Paris, France

India Mr. Rakesh SHARMA ss.paris@india.com

Second Secretary Embassy of India – Paris

Mr. Vijay KHANDUJA +(33) 140 50 50 29 Second Secretary (Economic & +(33) 1 40 50 09 96

Commercial)

Embassy of India in France 15 Rue Alfred Déhodencq 75016 Paris, France

Mr. Shashi Mohan JOSHI attachecom@wanadoo.fr Attaché, Embassy of India in France

**OECD Secretariat** 

Mr. Jon LOMOY +(33-1) 45 24 90 00 Director, DCD Jon.LOMOY@oecd.org

Ms. Brenda KILLEN +(33-1) 45 24 83 72 Head of Division, DCD/AQuA Brenda.KILLEN@oecd.org

Mr. Robin OGILVY +(33-1) 45 24 94 48
Policy Analyst, DCD/AQuA Robin.OGILVY@oecd.org

Ms. Hanna-Mari KILPELAINEN +(33-1) 45 24 90 36

Policy Analyst, DCD/AQuA Hanna-Mari.KILPELAINEN@oecd.org