

Unclassified

DCD/DAC/GOVNET/M(2008)1/PROV



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

01-Aug-2008

English text only

DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION DIRECTORATE
DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

DAC Network on Governance

DRAFT SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 11TH GOVNET MEETING

17-18 June 2008
OECD Headquarters
Paris

*This document is submitted FOR APPROVAL at the 12th meeting of the GOVNET.
It contains in the annex a summary of the GOVNET Learning Day on "Governance in Sectors: Insights on Governance & Health" held on 16 June 2008.*

Virginia Tortella --- Tel: ++33 1 45 24 18 19 --- virginia.tortella@oecd.org
Sebastian Bartsch --- Tel. ++33 1 45 24 90 21 --- sebastian.bartsch@oecd.org

JT03249386

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

DCD/DAC/GOVNET/M(2008)1/PROV
Unclassified

English text only

DRAFT SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 11TH GOVNET MEETING

Administrative items and scene-setting

1. The meeting started with the election of the Chair and the Bureau, chaired by Mr. Stephen Groff (Secretariat). Mr. Eduard Westreicher (Germany) was re-elected GOVNET Chair for the remainder of 2008. For 2009, Mr. René Holenstein (Switzerland) was elected Chair. Mr. Groff explained that two Bureau members, Mr. Tarik Khan (Canada) and Mr. Sanjay Pradhan (World Bank) will not continue to be part of the Bureau: Mr. Khan has been appointed to a new position, while Mr. Pradhan did not seek re-election due to pressure of other work. Both were warmly thanked for their service to the GOVNET over several years. As new Bureau members, the participants elected Ms. Amy Baker (Canada), Mr. Kevin Carroll (Ireland), Mr. Dennis de Jong (Netherlands), and Mr. Mark Robinson (UK).

2. The Chair opened the meeting with a presentation of the main objectives of the next two days: (i) to establish a shared understanding about tasks for the remainder of 2008, particularly for the GOVNET's main work streams, but also on input into the Accra High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness; (ii) to agree on the main features of the 2009-10 work programme and the additional steps to be taken to further specify tasks and work plans over the next few months; (iii) to ensure that resources and organisational/administrative structures are in place to allow the GOVNET to implement the work programme.

3. The agenda and the summary record of the last GOVNET meeting were approved.

Item 1: Update on recent developments in the DAC

4. The DAC Facilitator for the GOVNET, Mr. Anton Stadler (Switzerland), informed participants about recent developments in the Committee. He put particular emphasis on the Strategic Reflection Exercise that the DAC launched this spring to implement a recommendation of the OECD Council's 2007 In-Depth Evaluation of the Committee conducted last year. Its purpose is to address the key question of how to sustain and increase the relevance of the DAC and its Subsidiary Bodies in the changing development co-operation landscape, building on their strengths and comparative advantage, with a time horizon to 2020. The exercise will (i) take stock of the changing global landscape and assess the role of development financing and cooperation in poverty reduction for the next 10-15 years; (ii) spell out the DAC's comparative advantage and value added in poverty reduction, including in promoting policy coherence for development, by adapting to new realities, demands and opportunities; and (iii) make recommendations on the role, structure, and operating modes of the DAC and its Subsidiary Bodies in carrying out a focused work programme and achieving results and strengthening the DAC's interface with other Directorates and Committees within the OECD, relevant international organisations (World Bank, United Nations, etc.), non-DAC donors, new actors and partner countries.

Item 2: Anti-corruption

5. The Chair opened the session by turning the floor to Ms. Ina Eriksson (Sweden) who was acting in lieu of Mr. Dennis de Jong (Netherlands), Chair of the Anti-Corruption Task Team (ACTT), who was unable to attend. Ms. Eriksson gave a brief overview of the status of the anti-corruption activities as well as

of the horizontal collaboration with other OECD bodies and introduced the speakers for the anti-corruption session.

6. The Secretariat (Mr. Ben Dickinson) presented a progress report on the study of joint donor responses to corruption, which is currently being undertaken. It draws on a literature review and three/four case studies: Afghanistan, Mozambique, Indonesia and probably Cambodia. The Secretariat informed the meeting that all case studies were retrospective to facilitate access to interviewees and minimise disruption to current donor-partner government dialogue and allow some longer-term assessment of impact. The teams will start interviews during the summer. The result will be a set of good practice principles or voluntary code of conduct. **A first draft version will be presented to the Anti-Corruption Task Team meeting in the fall. The objective is to have a final report by the end of the year.**

7. The Secretariat (Ms. Bathylle Missika) reported back from the 2nd Conference of State Parties (CoSP) to the UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), which was held in Bali in January 2008. The OECD was invited as an observer and the Secretariat, as well as many members of the GOVNET ACTT, represented the development community. At the CoSP, draft resolutions were negotiated on the following topics: technical assistance (TA) in support of corruption prevention; review of implementation (monitoring); asset recovery; and bribery of officials of public international organisations. GOVNET members were invited to the first meeting of the TA Working Group. The GOVNET submitted a background paper that defined technical assistance in broader terms than just the provision of targeted expertise and made specific reference to a range of aid modalities in the context of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. Thanks to the persistent negotiating of some ACTT members, the Resolution on TA includes a reference to the Paris Declaration as well as to the role of the GOVNET in co-ordinating donors at the international level in the fight against corruption.

8. The International Centre for Asset Recovery (ICAR) was invited to present its work. Executive Director, Ms. Gretta Fenner, explained that ICAR is a unit within the Basel Institute on Governance. ICAR assists developing and developed countries in improving their capacity to recover assets stolen through corruption and related crimes. The ICAR initiative is complementary to the World Bank Stolen Asset Recovery Initiative (StAR) programme. ICAR and StAR work together in strengthening capacity development efforts in the countries they work with, provide advice and guidance on repatriation of assets, and promote a global policy agenda to increase awareness on asset recovery.

9. Other OECD bodies working on anti-corruption gave brief presentations on the work they are currently involved in. Specifically, members were informed about the activities of the Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) work stream within the General Secretariat, the Innovation and Integrity Division (IID) at the Public Governance and Territorial Development Directorate, and the Anti-Corruption Division within the Financial and Enterprise Affairs Directorate (DAF).

10. The PCD Secretariat (Ms. Raili Lahnalampi) updated the GOVNET on the recent commitment of the OECD Council at ministerial level to strengthen mainstreaming of development in different Committees. The OECD is already very active on anti-corruption, but there is scope to improve horizontal and strategic approaches in a collective manner to streamline OECD's anti-corruption message *vis-à-vis* non-members and OECD stakeholders in general. In this regard, Deputy Secretary-General Amano has launched the initiative to organise an OECD-wide effort to promote more effective joint work on anti-corruption. The initial activities to be undertaken are: an update and revision of a guidance note for developing an anti-corruption strategy, a compilation of most effective toolkits and case studies on international and local anti-corruption instruments, a common OECD website entry point and share drive on anti-corruption initiatives as well as a shared calendar on OECD and external meetings on anti-corruption.

11. The Head of IID, Mr. Christian Vergez, presented the latest developments in his unit. He thanked GOVNET delegates for their valuable comments during the consultations on the checklist for enhancing integrity in public procurement. The Division now has a draft Recommendation of the Council on Enhancing Integrity in Public Procurement, which demonstrates OECD countries' commitment to fight corruption. **He invited GOVNET delegates to participate in the forthcoming Global Forum on 11 and 12 December 2008 in Paris, which will discuss a collective agenda for the implementation of the Recommendation.**

12. Finally, Ms. Olga Savran and Mr. Joachim Pohl from the Anti-Corruption Division at DAF updated members on their most recent initiatives. Ms. Savran, Administrator of the Anti-Corruption Network in East Europe and Central Asia, explained that within the framework of the Istanbul Action Plan, her team is supporting peer reviews and providing technical assistance on legal and agencies' reforms to comply with the OECD Convention on Anti-Bribery. **She invited the GOVNET to participate in a meeting to discuss the role of the private sector and donors in fighting corruption and preventing conflict of interest in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Mr. Pohl, Administrator of the ADB/OECD Anti-Corruption Asia Pacific Initiative, invited members to participate in its next meeting in Singapore in the third quarter of 2008.**

13. Ms. Eriksson informed the meeting of the proposed anti-corruption agenda for 2009-10, namely: 1. Finalisation and field testing of good practice principles for donor joint responses to corruption; 2. Guidance on UNCAC's implementation to ensure application of aid effectiveness principles, and the prioritisation of 'supply side' issues, policy coherence, asset recovery and assessment methodologies; 3. Reports on entry-points for anti-corruption efforts in situations of fragility and conflict (with the DAC Network on Conflict and Fragility).

14. Members gave strong support to the proposed 2009-10 work programme. Regarding joint responses, they were supportive of the work as a key instrument to avoid mixed signals amongst donors. The Secretariat (Mr. Ben Dickinson) explained the study's timeline: **consultants will start their field visits in the summer; a first draft will be issued in early October; a second draft will be discussed during the ACTT meeting in early November with the aim of finalising a code of conduct before the end of the year.**

15. Members welcomed the proposed work on asset recovery and anti-money laundering. They suggested linking it to already existing national frameworks and domestic processes of accountability to avoid overshadowing these national efforts with international initiatives. In addition, members stressed the importance of looking beyond the legal aspects of asset recovery and anti-money laundering to incorporate a whole-of-government approach. For this reason, all members encouraged the GOVNET to collaborate more systematically with other OECD Directorates. In particular, they mentioned the usefulness of **including the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) and the Working Group on Bribery in the regular Anti-Corruption Task Team meetings to influence their activities through a development prism and to avoid fragmented actions.**

16. On the UNCAC process and related Secretariat work, all members agreed that it will be key for state parties to establish a strong review mechanism and an understanding of TA that is aligned with aid effectiveness principles. It was suggested that donors take an active role in preparing for the Working Group meetings in Vienna and the next CoSP in Qatar in order to convince the G77 of the usefulness of TA and a review mechanism for the implementation of UNCAC. An additional comment was that donors should avoid centralising UNCAC efforts at HQs but rather embed TA and review mechanism implications in donor/country consultations. In this context, during the last ACTT meeting it was agreed that **the Secretariat would prepare a background paper for donor field staff highlighting the importance and implications of UNCAC implementation for development.**

17. Members considered the new work stream on anti-corruption in fragile states very important and welcomed GOVNET's collaboration with the Fragile States Group. In particular, donors would be interested in focusing this new work on experiences that shed light on which anti-corruption initiatives work in the context of fragile states.

Item 3: Governance assessment

18. The Secretariat informed members that the Governance Assessment Steering Group had met on the margins of the GOVNET plenary to provide comments on the draft principles and sourcebook. Participants commended the consultants led by Mr. Nils Boesen for the draft principles and concurred that they were ready for GOVNET endorsement. Nevertheless, participants acknowledged the difficulty in harmonising donors to conduct joint assessments and stressed that it was crucial to support partner countries' capacity to conduct locally produced governance assessments. **The Secretariat suggested that next steps would be to get the principles endorsed by the DAC early next year. Members suggested that the use of principles be tested in a year's time. The Secretariat can co-ordinate a one-off exercise to gather feedback from field offices, but agencies themselves will need to disseminate principles. The Secretariat will also attempt to integrate the governance assessment principles into the DAC Peer Review mechanism.**

19. With regards to the sourcebook, members suggested a few changes in terms of simplifying the language and adding more donor methodologies. Mr. Boesen informed the meeting that donors' tools included to date in the sourcebook had been validated with agencies and that he considered the sourcebook to be in its final stages. He agreed to incorporate comments received during the GOVNET plenary and circulate the sourcebook afterwards for a final round of comments, after which point the team would operate on a no-objection basis. Participants agreed with the overall approach and validation process for the product and commended the consultants for their work. **The Secretariat confirmed that remaining changes could be incorporated fairly quickly and that it will deliver the sourcebook layout and production. The Secretariat agreed to host the sourcebook on the OECD DAC GOVNET website, but the validation and updating of the tools need to happen within each agency. It was agreed that no DAC endorsement would be sought for the sourcebook as it is designed as a living document. Finally, Mr. Julius Court (UK) declared that DFID would commit additional funds to produce the sourcebook and principles in a glossy format.**

20. Mr. Joachim Nahem (UNDP) and Mr. Pablo Alonso (IDB) presented a proposal to create a global partnership to carry out a global web-based governance indicators repository concentrated in a single, user-friendly site. IDB currently hosts a governance indicators project (DataGob) that is internet based and this proposal would expand on the current initiative. The initiative is global and it will not have any institutional affiliation. UNDP and IDB requested financial and political support from agencies. Participants were interested in and supportive of the initiative and signalled that DataGob could eventually host the sourcebook, as in the future it could combine governance indicators and assessments. **Members agreed to maintain direct contact with UNDP and IDB to determine the details of their involvement in and support for the DataGob project.**

Item 4: Governance codes

21. The chair of the Informal Task Team on CRS Codes, Mr. Christian Grünhagen (Germany), and the Secretariat (Mr. Sebastian Bartsch) presented a revised proposal for improving the CRS purpose codes for governance. It reflects feedback received in March from the DAC Working Party on Statistics (WP-STAT), whose members had questioned the level of detail in the originally proposed coding structure. Particular concern had been expressed over proposed new code groups for legal and judicial development

and for human rights and what seemed to be an imbalance in the level of detail between these and other parts of the proposal.

22. The presenters explained that a test of the original proposal's functionality validated some of these concerns and made the Informal Task Team rethink its approach. The revised proposal, although more modest in some of its aspirations, would still make substantial progress in resolving many problems raised by the GOVNET at the outset of this effort: It (i) identifies activities (and makes the reporting of agencies on these more accurate) that are subsumed under more general purpose codes in the current CRS governance sector classification; (ii) provides more clarity on certain issues that cause confusion in the current system; and (iii) offers improved clarifications throughout the code group. Initial reactions from the WP-STAT just a few days before the GOVNET meeting were generally favourable regarding the revised proposal.

23. While there was agreement that discussion of substantive issues should be postponed (because of the delay in the preparation and circulation of the document) and handled directly between WP-STAT representatives and GOVNET representatives in each agency, several participants shared their initial thoughts. Those members who expressed a view were generally positive although Canada noted (i) that the scaling back from the previous proposal would limit the ability of analysts to answer or measure specific questions on activities and results, especially in the human rights and legal/judicial domain; (ii) that the new proposal is not structured in the same clear manner as the previous iteration presented to WP-STAT in March. In conclusion, Canada proposed a re-organisation of the codes according to the previous structure (the final product could be similar to, for example, the CRS purpose codes on education), understanding that there would then only be one code under legal/judicial development and one under human rights. The Chair of the WP-STAT, Mr. Geert Deserranno (Belgium), reminded participants that equilibrium needs to be found between necessary change and the need to keep the system simple for user-friendliness and stable for long-term comparability of data.

24. In his summary of the discussion, Mr. Bartsch emphasised that further consultation is needed between GOVNET representatives and WP-STAT representatives in each agency. To this end, **the Secretariat will circulate the current proposal in the coming weeks to both networks and invite members to share their views, ideally only one comment per agency, discussed and agreed between the GOVNET and WP-STAT representatives beforehand. If views were not too far apart, final approval by both networks could be sought subsequently by written procedure. In order to make sure the new structure can be applied as of next year, approval would be required by this fall.**

Item 5: Road to Accra

25. The Secretariat gave an overview on preparations for the Accra High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (HLF) and input that the GOVNET had provided. Mrs. Alexandra Trzeciak-Duval and Mr. Hubert de Milly explained where Accra preparations currently stand, the structure of the HLF and the further process leading to Accra. Mr. James Hradsky informed the GOVNET of work being undertaken to make sure capacity development, a former GOVNET priority theme, gains a prominent place on the agenda for Accra. The Co-chair of the Human Rights Task Team (HRTT), Ms. Amy Baker (Canada), updated participants on the work done by the HRTT to strengthen linkages between human rights (and other so-called "cross-cutting issues") and the Paris Declaration and to make these visible in Accra and in ensuing commitments and actions. Finally, Mr. Ben Dickinson of the Secretariat referred to efforts – including the GOVNET Chair's letter of 27 May 2008 – to bring the themes of anti-corruption and domestic revenue mobilisation into the main Accra documents, especially the HLF Progress Report and the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA). While important parts of the GOVNET's inputs have been picked up, there remains some work to be done.

26. Participants expressed their satisfaction with the inroads made as well as their expectation that the Accra process and the HLF itself will help to make the Paris Declaration and the aid effectiveness discussion more “owned” by partner countries. In particular with regard to human rights and other “cross-cutting issues”, there has been a marked shift in the aid effectiveness discourse compared to 2004-05 when the Paris Declaration was negotiated. Germany referred to the Accra Roundtable on Harmonisation that they are co-leading and their efforts give particular prominence to “cross-cutting issues” at this Roundtable. By contrast, domestic resource mobilisation was identified by participants as an area where more efforts are needed to give it sufficient weight for Accra.

27. The Chair commended the progress made. Mrs. Trzeciak-Duval reminded participants that, while especially the recent London and Bonn workshops (on “cross-cutting issues” and capacity development respectively) created considerable concrete evidence and support, there is no final agreement yet on main Accra inputs and outcomes concerning these “cross cutting” themes. Members would need to ensure that GOVNET issues feature as part of the Accra discussions and commitments so as to secure the stimulus and momentum needed for the Network’s future work.

Item 6: Human rights

28. The HRTT Co-Chair Ms. Amy Baker (Canada) and Mr. Asbjørn Løvbræk (Norway) informed participants about the implementation of the Task Team’s work programme, the way forward for the rest of the biennium, plans for 2009-10 and ideas for a possible presentation to the DAC in the second half of 2008. In accordance with the PWB 2007-08 and the action areas defined in the *DAC Action-Oriented Policy Paper on Human Rights and Development (AOPP)*, current work is aimed at strengthening the inter-linkages between human rights and three areas: aid effectiveness (covered separately in this summary record under item 5, “Road to Accra”), conflict prevention/peace-building and poverty reduction.

29. Joint work with members of the DAC Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation (CPDC) is intended to illustrate how much can be gained by linking human rights and conflict prevention, peace and security strategies for greater coherence and impact and how such linkages can be strengthened at the country level. After an initial scoping paper was completed in the second half of 2007, a stocktaking of field experience in five countries (Colombia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Uganda, DRC and Timor Leste) is currently under way. The **synthesis report**, a draft of which is **expected by mid-September**, will help lay the empirical foundation for the development of the final output of this work stream. This will be a series of “programming notes” on four themes that are particularly suitable for illustrating linkages between human rights and conflict management: transitional justice; children in armed violence; demobilisation and reintegration; and service delivery in fragile states from an economic and social rights perspective.

30. On human rights and poverty reduction, the HRTT shared TORs for a survey-based analysis of development economists’ perspectives on conceptual and operational interfaces between human rights and pro-poor growth and poverty reduction more widely. The objective of this study which will be conducted over the summer is threefold: first, to initiate a dialogue between human rights experts and development economists in order to strengthen the foundations for effective collaboration between different constituencies for sustainable, pro-poor development; second, to explore the relationships between human rights and pro-poor economic agendas, identifying synergies, complementarities and points of connection as well as latent tensions or contradictions, with a view to enhanced policy coherence on the part of donors and partner country governments alike; third, to sound out options for further work of the Task Team in this area in 2009-10. Individual members of the DAC Network on Poverty Reduction (POVNET) will be invited to participate in the survey. **A draft report is expected by October.**

31. Capitalising on the ongoing 2007-08 work programme, human rights work in 2009-10 will deepen the integration of human rights into donor policies and practice. Concrete and practical guidance will be developed on mutual reinforcement of human rights and aid effectiveness principles, with stronger empirical underpinnings and analyses of how human rights are being integrated in aid delivery mechanisms at the country level. Building on current collaboration with the CPDC, a link will be maintained to the by-then merged new DAC Network on Conflict and Fragility for deepening and consolidating joint work in the area of state-building, conflict prevention and peace-building. Linking up with the poverty agenda, guidance will be generated that brings human rights coherently into key dimensions of poverty alleviation, including a focus on human rights instruments that are key in empowering poor and marginalised groups to tackle risks that constrain their path out of poverty. Consultations with stakeholders from partner countries, especially with civil society organisations and human rights defenders, will be an integral part of the GOVNET 2009-10 work programme on human rights.

32. Finally, Ms. Baker presented a proposal to report progress on implementing the guidance of the *Action-Oriented Policy Paper on Human Rights and Development to the DAC*. (The *AOPP* states in its actions part – in connection with a commitment to using the *AOPP*'s principles – that “it is proposed that the GOVNET reports progress to the DAC in 2008”.)

33. Members commended the HRTT for its work and the linkages established to other communities of practice. Concerning the survey on human rights and poverty, several participants made a case for the MDGs as a major framework to refer to. Others pointed out that some of the guiding questions in the TOR were possibly too much influenced by a human rights perspective. Regarding human rights and conflict, members raised the challenges of state-building and how they can be addressed in current and future work. Reference was made to the inclusion of human rights in the *Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations*, but it was also stressed that the link between human rights and fragility requires further exploration and greater conceptual clarity. Several participants underlined the importance of making appropriate links between the new 2009-10 work stream on aid and accountability and the HRTT.

34. Regarding the proposal to report back to the DAC on progress in implementing the *AOPP*, there was broad agreement that a presentation to the Committee could be very useful, and a link was made to the DAC's strategic reflection exercise. However, questions were raised by participants regarding the specific objectives of a presentation to the DAC, key messages, possible outcomes and timing. A majority of speakers preferred a more “holistic” presentation of GOVNET work, which would include capitalising of the experience in implementing the *AOPP* on the ground, progress on joint responses to corruption, and the new governance assessment principles. As thorough preparation is required, participants were of the opinion that **a suitable time for a presentation would be early 2009. The Secretariat will follow-up on this matter with the DAC Chair and Bureau.**

35. In his summary of the discussion, Mr. Sebastian Bartsch (Secretariat) underlined the request that many participants made for more holistic perspectives and multi-disciplinary work. While the HRTT has a particularly good record in reaching out to other policy communities *outside* GOVNET, there is still room for improvement in linking work streams and perspectives within GOVNET. The establishment of the new 2009-10 work stream on aid and accountability will offer new opportunities in this regard. This and other issues, including a concrete work plan for 2009-10, will be further discussed at the **next meeting of the HRTT that is tentatively scheduled for the second half of October 2008.**

Item 7: Links to other DAC work and outreach to non-DAC donors

36. The Secretariat (Mr. Stephan Massing) updated participants on the DAC Fragile States Group's (FSG) work on state-building. The *Framing Paper on Concepts and Dilemmas of State-Building in Fragile States* has helped advancing a common understanding among donors. Current work is applying the "do no harm" principle to state-building, looking in particular at how specific aid modalities and programming areas impact on key state-building dimensions, e.g. state-society relations, state legitimacy and state capacity. Six case studies will be undertaken to identify both positive and negative practice as well as tensions and trade-offs between related agendas. In 2009-10, a new work stream on state-building and peace-building will look, *inter alia*, into peace negotiations and political settlements, assessment methodologies and the challenge of the "right" sequencing between key domains of state-building. Mr. Ben Dickinson highlighted the complementarities between the governance and state-building agendas, including the trend from normative approaches towards "good enough" governance approaches and the pre-occupation with political issues that governance and state-building perspectives have in common. Some of the issues linking governance and state building could be framed in the new work stream on Aid and Accountability.

37. In the discussion, many members referred to the links between state-building and current GOVNET work streams on anti-corruption, human rights and governance assessments. The Co-Chair of the Human Rights Task Team proposed to examine what concretely the HRTT and the future Task Team on State-building and Peace-building of the Network on Fragility and Conflict could do jointly. Legitimacy was seen by many as a critical issue and key concept – both for state-building and governance – that needs to be shifted from an overly normative understanding to more local contextualisation. France and Norway are currently leading a desk study on legitimacy in fragile states in which Germany and the UK are also involved. This research will look, *inter alia*, at complex situations in which the state is considered legitimate by certain social actors, but not by others. Some notes of caution were sounded as well. They concerned the risk of losing the normative force of good governance in "good enough" approaches; the danger that the governance agenda gets distracted by the focus on state-building; the existence of different "do no harm" conceptions in different professional communities; and the need for a genuine "Southern" perspective on state-building, given that advice based on historical processes of "the North" is not likely to be suitable for developing countries.

38. In their summary, Mr. Massing and Mr. Dickinson stated that many of the issues raised will need to be discussed further over the coming months, both in connection with the "do no harm" study and in the process of specifying the work programme for 2009-10. They noted close synergies between the state-building agenda and the GOVNET's main areas of work that should be exploited more systematically in the future, based on a clear division of labour. For the GOVNET, this would entail the question of whether to gear its agenda more strongly and systematically around the state-building framework. **CPDC and FSG will hold a meeting in the third quarter of 2008 to agree on 2009-10 work on state-building and peace-building. GOVNET members are welcome to join and explore ideas for future work on state-building in the newly created aid and accountability work stream. The Secretariat will explore these possibilities further with interested members.**

39. Following up on the discussion at the previous GOVNET meeting in October 2007, where an initial exchange of views on GOVNET outreach possibilities had remained inconclusive, the Secretariat (Mrs. Alexandra Trzeciak-Duval) updated participants on developments in the DAC which include a revision of the Committee's outreach strategy. In the revised strategy, the DAC has endorsed explicitly the "mainstreaming" of outreach into the work of subsidiary bodies. This is in order to leverage non-DAC donors' expertise and knowledge for DAC policy work, inform non-DAC donors' policy orientations, make DAC policy products more relevant, maintain a coherent outreach approach, and thus avoid

uncoordinated, multi-layered dialogue, with potentially contradictory or conflicting messages and approaches.

40. Mrs. Trzeciak-Duval went on to introduce a Fragile States Group proposal for an outreach event on issues of fragility and non-DAC donors' engagement in fragile contexts in late 2008 or early 2009. Possible thematic entry points could be local governance and community development; large-scale infrastructure projects; security system reform; youth employment; public administration. **The GOVNET is invited to consider joining this initiative.**

41. Members supported the idea of finding ways to start working with non-DAC donors. Governance issues need to be raised with non-DAC donors, otherwise governance might lose ground over the coming years. It was pointed out that this implied some broader policy discussions and reflection that donors should have first, before they approach non-DAC donors with important governance issues. Human resource development was proposed as an additional topic worth considering.

42. The GOVNET Chair concluded that, in line with the approach taken by the FSG, one should await the outcome of the G8 summit and then revisit the issue, also with a view to possible synergies with the Heiligendamm Process. Guidance of members on possible ways forward will remain key. **After the G8 summit, the Secretariat will take the initiative to continue the discussion and suggest specific ways forward.**

Item 8: Taxation and governance

43. Mr. Kevin Carroll (Ireland), Chair of the Taxation and Accountability Task Team, started the session by highlighting that the *Taxation, State Building, and Aid Factsheet* providing key messages of the taxation paper had been published and that the work stream's outputs should now be disseminated by GOVNET members. The *Policy Paper Governance, Taxation and Accountability: Issues and Practice* (DCD/DAC/GOVNET(2007)3/FINAL) has been approved and will be published shortly. The work on taxation will be continued under the broader mandate of the new aid and accountability work stream.

44. The Secretariat (Mr. Ben Dickinson) reiterated the value of the GOVNET's relationship with the OECD's Centre for Tax Policy and Administration (CTPA) including the work to develop the *Policy Paper on Governance, Taxation and Accountability: Issues and Practice* and launching the forthcoming international conference in South Africa. The Secretariat updated members on its participation in CTPA's outreach work in Chile where it presented the *Policy Paper on Governance, Taxation and Accountability: Issues and Practice* at the April 2008 CTPA Advisory Group meeting. The GOVNET is currently in discussions with CTPA to agree a seminar on key tax and governance issues as an additional part of the next CTPA Advisory Group meeting in Morocco in 2009.

45. Mr. Richard Parry (CTPA) informed members that **the conference on taxation and governance in collaboration with the South Africa Revenue Service (SARS) and African tax and customs specialists will take place in Pretoria on 28-29 August 2008.** He underlined that the conference is focussing on how taxation can support state building. He added that the GOVNET is one of the pioneers in this line of research and the conference aims to gather African perspectives on the subject. Mr. Parry sought GOVNET members' participation in the conference and announced that SARS was also interested in receiving financial support from participants. The overall cost is 250,000 EUR and donor funds will mostly cover African attendance to the conference.

46. The following discussion highlighted the importance of the message to be sent by the SARS conference and how it will feed into the HLF 3 Meeting in Accra, which takes place a few days later. The

SARS conference will be attended by some of the same African Ministers and high-ranking officials that will also be present during the Accra event.

47. Members welcomed the SARS initiative, especially due to its regional approach. There was consensus that the effort should be supported in order to ensure that key messages coming out of the SARS conference fed into Accra and the Financing for Development Review Conference in Doha later this year. Participants also stressed the importance of continuing the GOVNET's work on state building and governance through domestic resource mobilisation. France, Ireland, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway and the United Kingdom expressed their intention to support the conference financially.

Item 9: 2009-10 work on aid and accountability

48. The Chair introduced the new work stream and explained that the work programme will build on the previous GOVNET initiatives on taxation and governance, which emphasised the importance of donors' support to domestic resource mobilisation as a key pillar of accountability.

49. The Secretariat (Mr. Ben Dickinson) proceeded to present the proposed three intermediate outputs for the new work stream, namely: 1. Guidance on best practices to support 'demand-side' accountability institutions (parliaments, political parties, the media and civil society) using a political economy lens; 2. Lessons learned on aid modalities' impact on domestic accountability; 3. Lessons learned on donor practices to promote domestic accountability, building on the HLF 3 outcomes. The Secretariat informed the meeting that the new line of work would build on GOVNET members' experience of strengthening domestic accountability in partner countries, including in areas such as support to civil society organisations and on the GOVNET's work on governance and the incentives for taxation. In addition, the aid and accountability work stream would complement the work of the DAC Network on Conflict and Fragility on state-building. The GOVNET was asked to suggest how the taxation work should feed into and feature into the new proposal; to consider areas that might be covered under the broader heading of aid and accountability; to consider membership in the new Task Team on Aid and Accountability.

50. Participants were supportive of the three domains presented and agreed with the political economy lens approach taking account the different specific country contexts. The majority of participants expressed their intention to be part of the Task Team. GOVNET members also recognised that a great deal of research and work had already been done in agencies on the "demand side" of accountability institutions, particularly on supporting civil society and the media. It was suggested that the GOVNET focus more on parliaments and political parties and how the different aid modalities can strengthen their development. Case studies and lessons showing successes and failures would be needed. Another recommendation was to focus not only on the demand side but also on the inter-relations between supply and demand taking into account state-society interactions.

51. GOVNET participants also welcomed the aid and accountability work stream on the basis that it provided more opportunities for cross-fertilisation between the different Task Teams in the GOVNET. All members stressed the importance of weaving taxation and state building into the new work stream, bringing more clarity on the linkages between the two. Also, it was recommended that the GOVNET find more linkages and synergies with other work streams in the OECD's Development Co-operation Directorate (DCD) and the Policy Co-ordination Division more specifically. The work on empowerment done by the DAC Network on Poverty Reduction (POVNET), including at community level was given as an example. Finally, members also acknowledged that it was necessary to prioritise and provide more details on what type of outputs and deliverables the GOVNET would like to produce in this work stream.

52. **The Secretariat agreed that it would convene an Aid and Accountability Task Team meeting in the fall in order to flesh out a more concrete work plan. The exact date will be determined at a later stage in order to allow the GOVNET to process all key messages from Accra.**

Item 10: Any other business

53. Members approved an adjustment of the GOVNET mandate in order to comply with a request from the DAC to develop more harmonised and coherent mandates by using a common chapeau and a standardised format. **Over the summer, the Secretariat will complete the mandate text by adding an information note for the next biennium based on the PWB.**

54. Feedback on the Learning Day held on 16 June was positive.¹ Participants were of the opinion that the Learning Day format should be maintained and further developed for future meetings. For similar events in the future it was suggested to create a more learning-friendly environment and maybe to use facilitators. There was also a plea for having a little more time at future learning days for the sharing of information and updating among members. Possible topics for future Learning Days could be, for instance, state-building or decentralisation. **It was agreed that the Secretariat would circulate a questionnaire on topics for future meetings to get a clear sense of members' thematic interests and preferences.**

55. With regard to the current financial situation of the GOVNET, the Secretariat (Mr. Ben Dickinson) explained to members that it was important to start pledging new funds for the next biennium as soon as the pledging window opens in September. The GOVNET needs to ensure that funds arrive in a timely manner in order to continue delivering agreed outcomes and employ staff to carry out the work.

56. The Secretariat (Mr. Jerzy Pomianowski and Ms. Bathylle Missika) gave a brief presentation of the newly created OECD initiative, the Partnership for Democratic Governance (PDG). The initiative is in its early stages and in the process of defining its project portfolio. GOVNET members were interested in the type of demands PDG has received to date and wished to be kept informed of its developments in the future.

Summary and conclusions from the Chair

57. The Chair drew together the highlights of the two days. He then offered some personal reflections on what the GOVNET has achieved over the past three years and the main challenges ahead. Stressing the successes of the network in specific governance issue areas such as anti-corruption, human rights, taxation, informal institutions and governance assessment, he also pointed out that the effectiveness of aid and the impacts of donors' collective efforts in partner countries could be enhanced by a joint definition of good governance and a set of common principles, agreed among donors, for good international engagement for better governance. The Chair reminded participants that the work on anti-corruption, for example, has proven how important it is to speak with one voice and to avoid mixed signals. The existence of common principles could facilitate division of labour, co-ordination of dialogue with partner countries and non-DAC donors, and harmonisation of approaches to conditionality. He therefore encouraged the GOVNET to consider such work for the future within the remit of its mandate.

58. Finally, the Chair expressed his thanks to all participants for their valuable contributions and the Secretariat for its support. In response, Mrs. Mette Gonggrijp (Netherlands) thanked the Chair on behalf of all GOVNET members, for all his efforts during his time in office to move the governance agenda forward and the friendly and efficient manner in which he had conducted the meetings.

1. See the summary of the Learning Day in Annex A.

59. The next meeting of the GOVNET is likely to take place in March 2009. The Secretariat will set the date as soon as possible.

Annex A:
Draft Summary of the GOVNET Learning Day on
“Governance in Sectors: Insights from Governance & Health”

16/6/2008

Introduction and setting the scene

Co-Chair, Steve Groff (Deputy Director, Development Co-operation Directorate, OECD), set the scene for the afternoon and gave some background on GOVNET’s rationale for organising this learning day. This was the first time that the GOVNET had launched such an initiative and it was organised to satisfy the growing donor community interest in governance in specific sectors. The GOVNET chose governance in the health sector as the topic to be discussed in order to benefit from the DAC’s work on health as a ‘tracer sector’ for aid effectiveness, which has been part of preparations for the September 2008 High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Accra.

The goal of the day was to answer a two-way question: how practice in governance and politics can help promote health outcomes and how the health sector presents opportunities to improve the quality of governance. The event was an exchange between health and governance experts designed to identify, on the one hand, the governance issues and challenges facing health specialists and, on the other, to illuminate how these issues resonate with their governance counterparts. The key objective was to assess ways in which the two groups of professionals in donor agencies can work more effectively together.

Co-Chair, Paolo Piva (Adviser, Health System Governance and Service Delivery, World Health Organisation) referred to leadership and governance in the health system framework as the main building blocks for the efficiency and equity of health care delivery.

The presentations focused on three themes: first, an overview of different tools aiming to address governance at sectoral level; second, the conceptual sides and challenges of governance in the health systems; third, an overview of health interventions in fragile states and whether these actions can support state building.

Item 1 – Addressing Governance at the Sectoral Level: Overview

The European Commission represented by Ms. Joanna Athlin (Governance Adviser, Governance, Security, Human Rights, and Gender at the European Commission) and Mr. Jean Bossuyt (Consultant, European Centre for Development Policy Management) and the Asian Development Bank represented by Ms. Sandra Nicoll (Principal Governance Specialist, Asian Development Bank) were invited to present their work to address governance at the sectoral level and to present tools they have developed to analyse and deal with governance issues in sector programmes.

The EC presented a governance assessment tool that is currently being field tested with sector practitioners. The EC’s approach takes good enough governance as the basis. The assessment model is applied in three steps: 1. Assessment of the context of sector governance; 2. Stakeholder mapping (interest, power and incentives); 3. Analysis of governance and accountability relations. The goal is to support the development of realistic approaches and build domestic capacity for enhancing and monitoring sector governance in line with domestic readiness and change management capacity. After the reference

document is adapted to sector specificities, the next step is to develop training modules and governance indicators at sector level.

ADB's assessment model, Governance and Anti Corruption Action Plan (GACAP) II, outlines a comprehensive risk-based approach to managing governance and fighting corruption. The focus is to achieve results in three priority areas within sectors: improving public financial management, strengthening procurement systems, and combating corruption. The themes apply to national and subnational levels of government and focus on operationally relevant sectors. The model operates through Risk Management Plans (RMPs) based on action indicators for easy monitoring and evaluation, which inform sector road maps.

The subsequent discussion covered the following issues:

- There are definitional issues around governance; while not all actors use the same language there are probably goals in common that include coherence, transparency and accountability. Since governance in general, and in the health sector more particularly, constitute a domestic agenda, there are limits to what donors can do.
- There is a need to maintain consistency between national, sectoral and local level policies, as well as with donor policies. While not enough research has been done on the subject, whole-of-government approaches, both across ministries (e.g. planning, finance, health) and at different levels of government (local and national) are essential.
- EC work in Mali and Kyrgyzstan indicates that decentralisation of services has allowed districts to gather quantitative indicators through household surveys on informal payments to professionals. The results and outcomes from the district to the sector level may serve to elucidate policies at national level, which in turn can influence donors' policies.
- Contextual (level of political will to address corruption, financing health system features, citizens' demand for better governance, *etc.*) and country specific factors need to be taken into account when designing interventions to address governance in health systems. Health is a political and culturally bound issue, and solutions need to be tailored to different political and cultural contexts, although some donor experience could be relevant.
- There were mixed views as to whether financial incentives from donors could improve the quality of governance, since donor portfolios range from budget support to projects. It was suggested to connect all the different instruments, including taxes, which make up the country's overall resources to promote good governance.
- There were mixed views as to whether financial incentives from donors could improve the quality of governance, since donor portfolios range from budget support to projects. It was suggested to disaggregate incentives, connect all the different instruments, including taxes, which make up the country's overall resources, and examine what incremental steps had worked in supporting good governance.

Item 2 – Main Governance challenges facing health care delivery in developing countries

Given the funds invested in the health sector, results have been mixed in many countries. The discussion centred on whether health programmes have taken sufficient account of governance dimensions such as participation, ownership, the right to health, transparency and accountability—all factors which

may contribute positively to health outcomes. A practical question was how entry points for action can be identified.

Three panellists were invited to discuss the different aspects of governance challenges experienced in the health sector. Ms. Maureen Lewis (Human Development Network, World Bank) took account of the difficulties in measuring and promoting good governance in health care delivery and financing. Mr. Marco Gerritsen (Health Adviser, Health Gender and Civil Society Department, Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs) gave an overview of the challenges faced by health specialists in identifying and taking action on governance issues. Mr. Eddie Addai (Director of Policy Planning Monitoring and Evaluation, Ministry of Health in Ghana) presented the Ghanaian Health Ministry's institutional experience and the measures his government has taken to improve performance.

Ms. Lewis' presentation dealt with definitions and measurements of governance. Measuring corruption and good governance at sector level can provide actionable data and may be more useful than national level comparisons of good governance. It is important to differentiate between obvious forms of corruption such as "selling" official positions, kickbacks or outright theft from other governance areas, which are less clear and can include simple mismanagement, inefficiency, or inertia. The evidence suggests that effectiveness in the health sector can be improved through raising accountability actions, greater oversight, and incentive programmes for good performance, although there is evidence to suggest that salary increases alone rarely impact on corruption.

Mr. Garritsen gave his views as a health expert posed with adverse governance conditions in the health programmes under his responsibility. The first tendency was to ignore governance issues and focus on delivering health services. Health experts are usually aware of governance problems (absenteeism, informal payments, lack of accountability, etc) but are pressed by other priorities. Health experts often lack the expertise and authority to tackle governance issues, so they tend to work around them. While health practitioners cannot implement governance reforms, taking better account of these dimensions would still make impact on health reforms.

The presentation from Ghana explained what the main challenges are for the Ministry of Health to improve good governance. One of the main factors is the fragmentation and lack of collaboration and coordination between actors in the health sector coupled with serious communication issues such as limited participation in policy dialogues and weak information management systems. The Ghanaian health sector is also affected by weak control and weak policy and legislative frameworks that in turn impact compliance and enforcement of sanctions or incentives. Further complicating the picture is the provision of vertical programmes and health providers outside of the Ministry's national plan, which stretches the Ministry of Health's resources to the limit. Mr. Addai's suggestions to improve good governance were to install a corporate approach to doing business as governance and finance go together; to set up institutional arrangements for dialogue that are underpinned by sound technical analysis; to build accountability mechanisms through broad stakeholder participation; and to establish incentive programmes.

The discussion covered the following issues:

- To promote good governance it is necessary to produce data and information. Indicators that allow for a clear differentiation between corruption and mismanagement are needed. It is important that donors support in-country initiatives to generate locally reliable data and analysis on health. Donors should harmonise their tools of analysis and encourage country led assessment processes.
- Though many governance indicators have been developed for countries in the aggregate, governance indicators for specific sectors, such as health, are not readily available. More

investment is needed in research to determine which factors and elements are key for good governance in the health system. It is also important to increase opportunities to use evidence in policy making and disseminate findings beyond ministries of health.

- Good governance is about creating endogenous institutions. The donors' role should be to help partner countries strengthen and build their oversight institutions. Partner countries' institutions should provide adequate incentives for oversight and accountability. But there seems to be a disconnection between institutions in country (cabinets and parliament) and macro and sectoral level policies. It is necessary to bring together links at field level that foster democratic processes in order to set in place adequate incentives and accountability.
- Health stewardship institutions need to gear their efforts towards promoting desirable behaviours through rewards and sanctions, set in place systems for audits and other supervision mechanisms and enforcement of rules and regulations.
- Donors need to move away from only pursuing anti-corruption strategies and promote good governance and accountability approaches, which are crucial for the effectiveness of the health sector.
- There is a clear relationship between management and finance. Health sector performance often depends on factors outside of the sector. For instance if Ministry of Finance is a weak performer, it will be difficult for the Ministry of Health to achieve results.
- In order to increase avenues for alignment, it is essential to support countries to have strong policies and capacity to deal with donors, including the development of donor guidelines to align with partner country priorities and health plans.

Item 3 – Can the health sector contribute to state building in fragile states?

The second panel was formed of four members with experience in field research and expertise in think tanks and NGOs. They discussed whether and how work in the health sector has contributed to state building processes, particularly in fragile states.

Mr. Egbert Sondorp (Senior Lecturer, Public Health and Humanitarian Aid Health Policy Unit, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine) presented a study on Afghanistan where a few donors are collaborating with the Afghan Ministry of Health to contract out non-state providers to deliver a basic package of health services (BPHS) through a variety of performance-based contracts and grants mechanisms aligned with the government health policy framework. The early results of this scheme are so far positive. To date, the rolling out of a BPHS has resulted in a modest strengthening of policy and planning and M&E systems and has facilitated the task of building capacity within the Ministry of Health. The long term effects of the initiative however, cannot be gauged at this early stage and it remains to be seen whether short term improvements will be sustained over time.

The Health and Fragile States Network represented by Jack Eldon (Lead Governance Specialist, HLSP Institute) presented a study exploring the interactions between health sector strengthening and state-building based on a combination of desk and field research in two countries: Nigeria and Sierra Leone. Evidence suggests that links between health sector and state building can be drawn. Strengthening health systems can contribute to state building in the health sector by signalling state willingness to act positively thereby creating legitimacy and improving the social compact. There are key factors influencing this outcome including the length of engagement by donors, the quality of stewardship and the degree of

government ownership. The study also showed that inappropriate funding mechanisms and/or donor interventions can undermine state building.

Ms. Fiona Campbell (Head of Policy, Merlin) explained that NGOs are important actors in fragile situations as they provide health basic services in contexts where the state is not able to fulfil its functions. For NGOs however, the challenge is to deliver health in the immediate term while at the same time contribute to institution building in the longer term. Merlin and other NGOs engage in partnerships with Ministries of Health to conduct their programmes and Merlin has been gathering some best practices. The key aspect for partnership as well as for ensuring institutional capacity/sustainability is ownership. There are several factors affecting the degree of ownership, which are dependent on the NGO working model and whether it is in its mandate to hand over responsibilities over time, the state perceptions of NGOs, the existing capacity within the system, and lastly the predictability of donor funding.

The last intervention was by Marta Montesó (Coordinator for Europe on HIV&AIDS, ActionAid). ActionAid's approach to state building through health care service delivery is through community empowerment. Donor support must strengthen the demand and supply side of public service delivery. Donors need to find a balance between investing resources in infrastructure and medical training (supply side) while at the same time promoting citizens' demands for health as an asset and holding their governments to be accountable for budgets and resource allocations (demand side).

Discussion covered the following issues:

- It is important to examine the type of state donors are trying to support. Definitions are often very much taken from western states. In societies that are tribal or clan based and not founded on western state concepts, more efforts are needed to look into the design of donor interventions.
- State formation vs. state building. The process of building a state is not mechanical. The idea that by sequencing, everything will fall into place must be challenged.
- Results in education have improved, but health outcomes are flat. Analysis across sectors may be worthwhile. Country comparisons would also be useful.
- Governance machinery at sub-national level is as important as central state. It is at the sub-national level where synergies between food, water, environmental protection and health are created.
- The aid effectiveness agenda is not part of the everyday dialogue between donors and partners working on health reform. Greater attention could be placed on strengthening ownership in health care delivery.
- Support for health staff in partner country ministries to do outreach to other government institutions to generate support and awareness of governance issues is a priority. Reaching civil society, including media, to foster public support is also important.
- Evidence of links between health and state building is anecdotal, inconclusive, sometimes contradictory, and often "ideologically driven" and shaped by organisational interests. More research is needed to understand the links and impacts of other key influencers such as country context and relationships between health strengthening, citizen and government expectations and the social compact.

- In post conflict situations there is a need to improve donor mechanisms to ensure resources are available for capacity building, system reform or demand side accountability programmes to strengthen civil society and citizen participation in health oversight activities. There is a need to increase predictability and flexibility of funds to support interventions in conflict areas.

Annex B:
LEARNING DAY ON GOVERNANCE IN SECTORS:
INSIGHTS ON GOVERNANCE & HEALTH

16 JUNE 2008 (AFTERNOON)

Agenda

The meeting will be held at the OECD Conference Centre (La Muette), Room CC 13
 2, rue André Pascal – 75016 Paris

The event will be chaired by **Steve Groff** – Deputy Director, Development Co-operation Directorate, OECD
Paolo Piva – Adviser, Health System Governance and Service Delivery, World Health Organisation

INDICATIVE TIME	AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSANTS
14:00-14:15	Welcome and introduction	
14:15-14:45	1- Addressing governance at the sectoral level	<p>Joanna Athlin - Governance Adviser, Governance, Security, Human Rights and Gender, European Commission</p> <p>Jean Bossuyt - Consultant, European Centre for Development Policy Management</p> <p>Sandra Nicoll - Principal Governance Specialist, Asian Development Bank</p>
14:45-16:15	<p>2. Main governance challenges facing health care delivery in developing countries</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">➤ discussion</p>	<p>Maureen Lewis - Human Development Network, World Bank</p> <p>Marco Gerritsen - Health Adviser, Health, Gender and Civil Society Department, Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>Edward Addai - Director of Policy Planning Monitoring and Evaluation, Ministry of</p>

INDICATIVE TIME	AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSANTS
		Health, Ghana
16:15-16:30	Coffee break	
16:30-17:45	<p>3. Can the health sector contribute to state building in fragile states?</p> <p>➤ discussion</p>	<p>Egbert Sondorp - Senior Lecturer, Public Health & Humanitarian Aid Health Policy Unit, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine</p> <p>Jack Eldon - Lead Governance specialist, HLSP Institute</p> <p>Marta Monteso - Coordinator for Europe HIV&AIDS, ActionAid</p> <p>Fiona Campbell - Head of Policy, Merlin</p>
17:45-18:15	Concluding remarks	<p>Ben Dickinson - Unit Manager, Governance, Peace and Security, Policy Coordination, Development Co-operation Directorate, OECD</p> <p>Paolo Piva - Adviser, Health System Governance and Service Delivery, World Health Organisation</p>