

Unclassified

DCD/DAC/EV/M(2010)1

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

12-Apr-2010

English - Or. English

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

Cancels & replaces the same document of 02 April 2010

DAC Network on Development Evaluation

Summary Record of the Tenth Meeting of the DAC Evaluation Network

10-11 February 2010

Hans Lundgren, Em: hans.lundgren@oecd.org, Tel: +33(0)1 45 24 90 59
Nathalie Bienvenu, Em: nathalie.bienvenu@oecd.org, Tel: +33(0)1 45 24 90 36

JT03281683

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



**DCD/DAC/EV/M(2010)1
Unclassified**

English - Or. English

**SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TENTH MEETING
OF THE DAC NETWORK ON DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION**

I. Opening Session

a) The Chair welcomed members and extended a special welcome to Korea as a new member of the DAC. New participants were given an opportunity to present themselves.

b) The 10th meeting Agenda (DCD/DAC/EV/A(2010)1) was adopted, with one adjustment in Day 2 to meet the request of the Delegation of EU to move the presentation on outcome indicators earlier in the agenda.

c) The Summary Record of the 9th meeting (DCD/DAC/EV/M(2009)1) was approved.

d) An update was given by the Secretariat on the DAC current discussions of the DAC programme of work and budget (PWB) for 2011-2012. The Secretariat highlighted that the Network needs to contribute effectively to a broad range of issues being addressed by the DAC. This should be reflected in the Network's collaboration with other DAC subsidiaries and in the outcomes included in the 2011-2012 PWB. A number of members expressed concern about the proposed budget cut and underlined the policy relevance of a number of current joint evaluations and the importance of the Network's effort to harmonise evaluation approaches and tools for improved accountability and learning. At the same time, it was felt that the proposed cuts indicated a need for a strategic discussion on the future of the Network (the matter was discussed further under other business). The DAC Facilitator reported on the results of the reflection exercise and the follow up task teams created by the DAC. The results are being implemented and will feed into the ongoing PWB and DAC mandate discussions.

Actions:

- Members to provide any further feedback to the proposed work streams as laid out in room document I, d Programme of work and budget 2011-2012 - work proposals.
- Secretariat to keep members informed of further developments in the DAC PWB discussion as it develops during the spring.
- The Network will engage in a strategic discussion in light of the outcome of the DAC reflection exercise, ongoing discussions on the future DAC mandate and PWB.

II. Member study

The Secretariat presented key findings of the recently completed draft study of central evaluation unit resources and key elements of member evaluation systems, framed by the core principles for evaluation and building on prior studies by the Network.

Members welcomed the report and expressed appreciation of the quality of the report highlighting that the findings would be useful for setting benchmarks and informing discussions within their own agencies and governments. In addition to providing a broad picture of the “state of art” in development evaluation, members stated that the report provided insight into many areas for improvement, including involving partners in joint evaluations. During the discussion, the issue of use and follow-up on evaluations was identified as a priority concern and flagged for future work within the Network. Specifically, members expressed interest in working together to strengthen the communication of evaluation results and share best practices in innovative communication tools, management response and follow-up systems. It was pointed out that there is a need to strike a balance between report production and knowledge management. Links between use and issues of relevance and quality will also need to be further elaborated.

The issue of partner country evaluation systems capacity and use was also highlighted as an important topic for further investigation and joint work. There was support for moving forward more decisively and strategically on the commitment to involve partner countries and other emerging stakeholders. A number of members emphasised the links between the findings in the draft report and other Network efforts in the areas of joint evaluation and capacity development. The topic of staff and consultant skills also garnered some interest as a potential area for further work.

It was suggested that the conclusions section of the report should include recommendations for moving forward. It was noted that the survey was based on self-reporting which potentially has some influence on the data, (although an alternative approach for obtaining the data was not deemed feasible within the budget and time-frame of the study). It was agreed that accuracy and comparability of data needs to be checked before wider distribution of the report.

Actions:

- Members are invited to submit written comments before 12 March to the Secretariat.
- Secretariat to finalise profiles and report for publication and dissemination.
- Recommendations for next steps and short key message summaries will be developed by the Secretariat.

III. Planning and coordinating evaluations

a) The monitoring exercise for tracking progress on commitments on joint evaluation and involvement of partner countries was presented by France. Baseline data for selected indicators was also provided, along with discussion questions. The baseline data shed light on areas where progress is welcome, notably on involving partner country stakeholders early and systematically in evaluation processes. Some concerns were raised about the self-reporting data used for the baseline and about the difficulties of comparing members with centralised/decentralised evaluation systems. It was agreed that the matrix should be seen as an evolving working tool and be for internal use by the Network for the time being. Regarding partner country involvement, members emphasised the value of a learning-by-doing approach and the need for members to “be more courageous at early stages”, to be willing to take risks and to support partners instead of “managing” them in order to build real ownership of evaluation processes. Members reiterated some of the advantages of joint approaches to evaluation including the imperative to avoid creating “evaluation avalanches” in partner countries.

Actions:

- France will continue in the lead on refining the matrix to finalise the baseline data for monitoring joint evaluations. The monitoring exercise will be repeated in 18 months time.
- The Secretariat will make available the baseline data and subsequent monitoring findings on the Evaluation Platform.

b) The Secretariat presented the inventory of members' evaluation plans and the progress made since last meeting. The inventory can be used to find areas of possible collaboration among members and it also shows overall trends among evaluation topics and themes. The Secretariat drew attention to areas where further opportunities for collaboration among members would seem feasible. The discussion indicated continued interest in keeping the inventory up to date and clarified that members would find it beneficial to include more information about each potential joint evaluation in the inventory.

Actions:

- Members who have not yet sent in their plans and emerging ideas to send them to the Secretariat in spreadsheet format.
- Members to include contact information for lead persons on each possible joint evaluation when submitting their plans (contact details for plans already included in the inventory can be added by sending details to the Secretariat).
- Secretariat to modify the inventory to improve information sharing, allowing for inclusion of contact details and more information on "jointness".

The Secretariat presented the online evaluation platform which was launched in August 2009. The platform facilitates the exchange of information and interaction among members outside of meetings, allowing members to upload documents, start a discussion and post comments. The platform is restricted to member agencies of the Network. Although there has not yet been much interaction on the platform members were supportive and stressed the potential of the platform as a practical working tool for exchange and co-ordination both on future and ongoing evaluations. It was stressed that the usefulness of the platform depends on members' willingness to participate actively in the discussions on the platform.

Actions:

- Secretariat to re-circulate log in details and members to log on and explore potential of to the platform.
- Members to encourage their staff to use the platform.
- Secretariat to highlight possible joint evaluations on the platform.

c) The Secretariat provided an update on the DAC Evaluation Resource Centre, (DEReC) including improvements that have been made to the sector classifications and search function to improve access to reports. Members welcomed the ongoing improvements and the 'Front Page' featuring reports relevant to current policy topics. The Secretariat shared findings from a recent poll that shows that nearly all members regularly use DEReC. Participation in submitting reports continues to grow and members were encouraged to increase their efforts to make sure that all completed reports from their departments are submitted.

Action: Members, who have not already done so, to establish a web contact person in their department to submit completed reports in PDF format, including key words to the Secretariat.

IV. Multilateral effectiveness

a) The Secretariat provided an overview of ongoing DAC work, including results from the annual report on multilateral aid.

b) CIDA, as lead for the Task Team on developing an approach on assessing multilateral effectiveness, presented a revised proposed approach 'to strengthen information on the development effectiveness of multilateral organisations'. The presentation stressed that further developments of the approach will be needed in taking forward this work and that piloting the approach will inform it further. It was highlighted that the approach builds on work done by multilateral organisations, Network members, and MOPAN. The Secretariat noted that the work on a joint approach could contribute to the DAC work on multilateral aid which was also highlighted as an important objective in the DAC's reflection exercise. Several members stressed the importance of a common approach and moving forward drawing on the lessons from ad hoc evaluations in the past and from MOPAN. In the discussion, questions were raised on the demand for assessments and the role of the boards of the multilateral organisations and there was general agreement that the purpose and value added of the approach needs to be spelt out. It was also highlighted that further details were needed on the approach itself, including clarified links to MOPAN, more detail around the methodology and costs implications. The importance of collaborative work, rather than parallel assessment systems, was stressed by several participants.

Actions:

- Task team, under CIDA's lead, to continue working on the details of the approach.
- Task team to pilot meta-evaluations of data provided by multilaterals to clarify where the information gaps lie.

c) The Netherlands provided an update of the joint DAC-UNEG peer reviews of evaluation functions and highlighted that further discussions will be held at a meeting in Vienna on the 20th of April. Issues to discuss at that meeting include the possible need for a refined framework, the use of the reviews and the few voluntary multilaterals to review. The EBRD provided an update on the peer review of IFAD's evaluation function which was the first peer review undertaken by the ECG. It is now in the final stages.

Action: Task team to take stock of the peer reviews for discussion at the next meeting.

V. Supporting evaluation capacity development

DFID and the Secretariat presented a draft tip-sheet on supporting evaluation capacity development and made a proposal for the creation of a task team. Members were invited to provide concrete examples to support the messages of the tip-sheet.

A working group was formed, made up of DFID, Ireland, Sadev, AfDB, UNDP and the Secretariat, to take forward the development of a joint strategic approach to capacity development. The group will also explore ways to involve partner country stakeholders better.

Sweden gave an update on the CLEAR project and UNEG shared highlights of a recently held workshop.

Actions:

- Secretariat and DFID will circulate the draft tip-sheet for further written comments. Members invited to share concrete experiences or suggestions for the draft tip-sheet with the Secretariat. The Secretariat and DFID will then finalise and publish.
- Task team to develop strategic approach to evaluation capacity development. Any additional interested members invited to contact DFID to join.
- Interested members to contact Sida or the World Bank for further information on the CLEAR project.

VI. Phase 2 of the joint evaluation of the implementation of the Paris Declaration

The Secretariat for the evaluation of the Paris Declaration provided an update on the evaluation, indicating that the greater part of finances for the various studies have been secured and what remains is likely to be secured shortly. Work is going ahead according to plan with regional workshops planned over the next months.

VII. Developing evaluation standards and guidance

a) The Secretariat presented the process by which the DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation were finalised and agreed. The Chair then opened the floor for discussion. There was general agreement among members that the Standards are of high quality and based on a long and thorough process of consultations. The Delegation of the EU notified the Network that it will apply an interpretation of standards 1.4 and 2.5. On standard 1.4, partnership approaches will be considered whenever appropriate and whenever possible. Standard 1.5 will be interpreted as consultation with stakeholders. With these interpretations, the EU accepted the standards. The discussion highlighted that the Standards is a point of reference and that even though everyone may not be able to apply every point there was general agreement on the usefulness of the document.

Action: Secretariat to publish and send out requested copies to members.

b) Germany gave a brief update on NONIE, informing members that the next NONIE meeting will be held on 29-30 March in Bonn. Karen Jorgensen, in her capacity as 3ie board member, informed the Network members of the current status of the initiative and of the member conference on 12 February.

Action: Interested members to indicate participation at the next NONIE meeting in Berlin 29-30 March.

c) The World Bank gave an update on their work on evaluating global and regional partnerships, indicating that a guidebook including practical examples is being developed and that comments from Network members will be sought before its finalisation.

d) Norway, Belgium, the Netherlands and the INCAF Secretariat gave brief updates on the finalised and ongoing evaluations using the draft Guidance on Evaluating Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding. Norway again offered to host a workshop on the application and use of the guidance towards the end of the year.

Action: Norway to co-ordinate with the co-chair of INCAF on preparations for a workshop in the autumn.

e) The Secretariat of Aid for Trade provided an overview of work, including a meta-evaluation in the area of transport and storage, which the DAC and the Trade Committee of the OECD is collaborating on. It was highlighted that guidance on evaluating aid for trade will not necessarily be developed as the use of generic guidance has been encouraged.

Actions:

- Secretariat to share evaluation plans related to aid for trade with the aid for trade community.
- Members invited to send the Secretariat any evaluations or work they have done on evaluating the transport and storage sectors.

f) The Delegation of the EU made a presentation on their work on outcome and impact level indicators.

g) Members involved in piloting the evaluation methodology of budget support reported back to the Network on the various evaluations. Evaluations led by the Delegation of the EU in Tunisia and Mali are underway. The evaluation in Zambia led by the Netherlands is also coming along, while a proposed evaluation in Tanzania needs some additional work before it can start.

VIII. Other business

This session started off with a discussion on how to co-ordinate evaluations in Haiti. It was stressed that members should strive to collaborate with each other, OCHA, and ALNAP instead of doing their own evaluations.

Actions:

- UNDP to contact OCHA to explore possibilities of Network members joining OCHA's real time evaluation of aid efforts.
- Members to co-ordinate as they respond to policy makers demands for accountability for the relief and reconstruction aid being sent to Haiti.
- Secretariat to track policy discussion in the wider DAC and identify opportunities to contribute evaluation insights.

The second topic discussed was how to take the strategic discussion on the role of the Network forward. A task team was formed and it was decided that it should work out a first input to be posted for discussion on the online evaluation platform.

Action: Members to discuss the future strategic direction for the Network on the evaluation platform. Chair, Vice-chairs, Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, and Secretariat will work out a first input to start the discussion.

Informal afternoon session

During the informal session the Gates Foundation made a presentation on their commencing work on evaluation. Other topics discussed included progress on joint evaluations such as evaluations on anti-corruption, public financial management and public sector governance reform. Denmark presented an example on how they communicate evaluations and DFID highlighted their analysis on voice and accountability indicators.

Some possible topics for possible joint work were also highlighted:

- Human rights – contact SADEV
- Country evaluation in Afghanistan – contact Norway
- Efforts in aid programme for disabled people – contact Norway
- Effects and use of allowances – contact Norway
- Support to health systems in DRC – contact Belgium
- Climate change – contact DFID

Actions:

- Members to provide feedback to Lina Payne (l-payne@dfid.gov.uk) on voice and accountability indicators.
- Ways to strengthen the co-ordination of the governance evaluations will be explored by the lead members of the respective evaluations with support of the Secretariat.

Participants list for DAC Network on Development Evaluation/Liste des participants pour Réseau du CAD sur l'évaluation du développement

10/2/2010 - 11/2/2010

Chair

Mr. Nick YORK *Head
Evaluation Department
Department for International Development (DFID)*

Australia/Australie

Ms. Lyndal MANSON *Advisor (Development Cooperation)
Permanent Delegation*

Ms. Talia MELIC *Program Officer
Development Cooperation
Permanent Delegation*

Austria/Autriche

Ms. Karin-Christine KOHLWEG *Head of Evaluation Unit
Austrian Development Agency - ADA*

Ms. Laurence HENGL *Evaluation Unit
Austrian Development Agency - ADA*

Mr. Alexander MOLTERER *Trainee
Permanent Delegation*

Belgium/Belgique

Mme Isabelle WITTOEK

*Attaché de la Coopération
Délégation Permanente*

**Mr. Dominique DE CROMBRUGGHE DE
LOORINGHE**

*Evaluateur Spécial
Evaluation Spéciale Coopération au Développement
SPF Affaires Etrangères*

Canada

Mr. Goberdhan SINGH

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

Mr. Dieudonné MOUAFO

*Evaluation Manager
Strategic Policy and Performance Branch (SPPB)
Canadian International Development Agency
(CIDA)*

Denmark/Danemark

Mr. Frode NEERGAARD

*Deputy Permanent Representative
Permanent Delegation*

Mr. Ole ANDERSEN

*Head of the Evaluation Department
Denmark's Development Assistance (DANIDA)
Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

Ms. Margrethe HOLM ANDERSEN

*Deputy Head
Evaluation Department
Denmark's Development Assistance (DANIDA)
Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

France

Mr. Frédéric BOBAY

*Deputy Head of Unit
Unité d'évaluation des activités de développement
(UEAD)
Direction Générale du Trésor et de la politique
économique
Ministère de l'économie, de l'Industrie et de l'emploi*

Mr. Benoit CHERVALIER

*Head of Unit Evaluation
Direction générale du Trésor et de la Politique
économique (DGTPE)
Ministère de l'économie, de l'Industrie et de l'emploi*

Ms. Ewelina OBLACEWICZ

*Unité d'évaluation des activités de développement
(UEAD)
Direction générale du Trésor et de la Politique
économique (DGTPE)
Ministère de l'économie, de l'Industrie et de l'emploi*

Mr. Jean David NAUDET

*Chef de l'unité d'évaluation et de capitalisation
Agence Française de Développement (AFD)*

Mr. Daniel VOIZOT

*Chef du Pôle de l'évaluation
Direction Générale de la Mondialisation, du
Développement et des Partenariats
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)*

Pr. Eva TERBERGER

*First Vice President/ Head of Financial
Cooperation Evaluation
Credit Bank for Reconstruction
Entwicklungsbank/ Development Bank (KfW)*

Ms. Katrin VON DER MOSEL

*Evaluation Manager
Evaluation and Audit Division
Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and
Development*

Ireland/Irlande

Mr. William CARLOS

*Head of Evaluation and Audit
Department of Foreign Affairs*

Mr. Fintan FARRELLY

*Senior Evaluation Specialist
Evaluation and Audit Unit
Department of Foreign Affairs*

Mr. Niall MORRIS

*Development Officer
Irish Delegation to the OECD*

Italy/Italie

Mr. Stefano NICOLETTI

*First Counsellor, DAC Delegate
Permanent Delegation*

Mr. Giancarlo PALMA

*Evaluation Unit
Department for Development Cooperation
Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

Japan/Japon

Ms. Masumi OWA

*Advisor
Development
Permanent Delegation*

Ms. Akiko HAYASHIDA

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

Ms. Masumi SHIMAMURA

UFJ Research and Consulting Co.Ltd

Mr. Masami SUGIMOTO

Shinko Overseas Management

Ms. Satoko TANAKA

JICA Headquarters

Ms. Naoko TSUBURAYA

*Representative
JICA*

Korea/ Corée

Mr. Hyunsoo YUN

*First Secretary
Permanent Delegation*

Mr. Jinkyn JEONG

*Counsellor
Permanent Delegation*

Ms. Jaeun PARK

*Deputy Director
International Economic Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Strategy and Finance*

Ms. You-ra KANG

*Manager Evaluation Team,
Economic Development Cooperation Fund
Planning Department*

Ms. EunJu CHA

*Manager
Evaluation Office
Korea International Cooperation Agency*

Mexico/Mexique

Ms. Stephanie FROIMOVICH

*Intern
Permanent Delegation of Mexico to the OECD*

Netherlands/Pays-Bas

Antonie DE KEMP

*Evaluator
Policy and Operations Evaluation Department
Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

Dr. Henri E.J. JORRITSMA

*Deputy Director
Policy and Operations Evaluation Department
MINISTERE DES AFFAIRES ETRANGERES*

Mr. Ted KLIEST

*Policy & Operations Evaluation Department
Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

Paris Declaration Evaluation

Mr. Niels DABELSTEIN

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

Norway/Norvège

Mr. Asbjorn EIDHAMMER

*Director
Evaluation Department
Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation*

Portugal

Mrs. Manuela AFONSO

*Head of Evaluation Division
Portuguese Development Support Institute (IPAD)*

Ms. Ana Paula FERNANDES

*Counsellor
Permanent Delegation*

Spain/Espagne

Ms. Cecilia ROCHA DE LA FUENTE

*Head of Evaluation Division
Directorate General of Development Policy
Planning and Evaluation
State Secretariat of International Cooperation
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation*

Mr. Carlos RODRIGUEZ-ARIZA

*Policy Advisor
Directorate General of Development Policy
Planning and Evaluation
State Secretariat of International Cooperation
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation*

Sweden/Suède

Ms. Katarina RANGNITT

*Counsellor, Deputy Permanent Representative
Permanent Delegation*

Ms. Anette GROJER

*Head of Evaluation
Swedish Agency for Development Evaluation
(SADEV)*

Ms. Åsa KARLSSON

Ministry for Foreign Affairs

Mr. Joakim MOLANDER

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

Switzerland/Suisse

M. Gerhard SIEGFRIED

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

Ms. Catherine CUDRE-MAUROUX

*Chef suppléante
Evaluation and Controlling
Département fédéral de l'économie DFE
Secrétariat d'Etat à l'économie SECO*

Mr. Mathias RICKLI

*Controlling and Evaluation
Swiss Development Cooperation*

United Kingdom/Royaume-Uni

Mrs. Elizabeth ROBIN

*Head of Capacity and Quality Evaluation
Department
DFID*

Ms. Helen WEDGWOOD

*Head of Studies
Evaluation Department
DFID*

**Mr. Nick YORK
(See CHAIR)**

*Head
Evaluation Department
Department for International Development (DFID)*

United States/États-Unis

Ms. Lucy TAMLYN

*EEST Counselor
Permanent Delegation*

Mr. Gerald BRITAN

*Chief
Management Policy, Budget & Performance
US AID*

Mr. Peter DAVIS

*Coordinator
Planning and performance Management
Office of Director of United States
Foreign Assistance, Department of State*

Mr. Jack MOLYNEAUX

*Director
Impact Evaluations, Department of Policy and
International Relations
Millennium Challenge Corporation*

Delegation of the EU

Mr. Michael BERRISFORD

*Chef d'Unité
Audit et Evaluation
European Commission*

Mr. Jean-Louis CHOMEL

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

Mr. Donato DI BARTOLOMEO

*Assistant
Delegation European Union
Permanent Delegation*

Mr. Giovanni MASTROGIACOMO

*Counsellor
Permanent Delegation*

Mr. Cormac QUINN

*Evaluation Unit
(AIDCO/03)
European Commission*

African Development Bank (ADB)/Banque africaine de développement (BAD)

Mr. Colin KIRK

*Director
Operations Evaluation Department (OPEV)
African Development Bank (AfDB)*

M. Mohamed MANAI

*Division Manager, Project and Program
Evaluations
Operations Evaluation Department (OPEV)
African Development Bank (AfDB)*

Asian Development Bank (ADB)/Banque asiatique de développement (ADB)

Ms. Hemamala HETTIGE

*Director
Independent Evaluation Department, Division 2
Asian Development Bank (ADB)*

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

Mr. Fredrik KORFKER

*Chief Evaluator
Project Evaluation Department
European Bank for Reconstruction and
Development (EBRD)*

Ms. Elena LUKOIANOVA

*Senior Economist, Evaluation Department
European Bank for Reconstruction and
Development (EBRD)*

Mr. Wolfgang GRUBER

*Senior Evaluation Manager
European Bank for Reconstruction and
Development (EBRD)*

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

Dr. Saraswathi MENON

*Director, Evaluation Office
UNDP*

Dr. Juha UITTO

*Deputy Director
Evaluation Office
UNDP*

World Bank/Banque mondiale

Ms. Daniela GRESSANI

*Senior Advisor and Deputy to Director General
Independent Evaluation Group of The World Bank*

OECD/OCDE

Ms. Karen JORGENSEN

*Head of Division
DCD/PEER
OECD*

Ms. Megan Grace KENNEDY-CHOUANE

*Policy Analyst
Evaluation Network
DCD/PEER
OECD*

Mr. Hans LUNDGREN

*Head of Section
DCD/PEER
OECD*

Ms. Nathalie BIENVENU

*Assistant to Division
DCD/PEER
OECD*

Ms. Anna HELLSTROM

*Administrator
DCD/PEER
OECD*

Ms. Emily BOSCH

*Policy Analyst,
Multilateral Aid, DCD/AAF
OECD*

Other/Autre

Gates Foundation

Ms. Jodi NELSON

*Senior impact Planning and Improvement Officer
Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation*