

Unclassified

DCD/DAC/POVNET/M(2004)1



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

03-Aug-2004

English text only

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

DAC Network on Poverty Reduction

SUMMARY RECORD

**Global Picture for Infrastructure and Pro-Poor Growth
1st Workshop of the Infrastructure for Poverty Reduction Task Team**

Meeting held on 29-30 (a.m.) March 2004

This summary incorporates comments made on an earlier, provisional version by participants to the workshop.

Contact Person: Annabel Muelder - Tel: +33 (0) 1 45 24 84 57 - Fax: +33 (0)1 44 30 63 33 -
Email: annabel.muelder@oecd.org

JT00167913

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

DCD/DAC/POVNET/M(2004)1
Unclassified

English text only

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**DAC NETWORK ON POVERTY REDUCTION
GLOBAL PICTURE FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND PRO-POOR GROWTH**

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE MEETING HELD ON 29-30 MARCH 2004.....	3
I. Introduction	3
II. Participation	3
III. Overview of the discussion and outcomes.....	3
Session I: Infrastructure for Pro-Poor Growth: The Global Picture	3
Session II: Donors activities on Infrastructure: Tendency, Strategies and Examples.....	5
Session III: Overview of the Works of Multilateral Development Banks on Infrastructure and Poverty Reduction	8
Session IV: Summing Up and Next Steps	9
ANNEX 1.....	11
PARTICIPANTS LIST.....	11

DAC NETWORK ON POVERTY REDUCTION

GLOBAL PICTURE FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND PRO-POOR GROWTH

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE MEETING HELD ON 29-30 MARCH 2004

I. Introduction

1. The first workshop of the Task Team of Infrastructure for Poverty Reduction was held on March 29 and 30 (a.m.) March, 2004 in Room 4 of the OECD Headquarters in Paris.

II. Participation

2. Fourteen member countries were represented at the workshop, which were Australia, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, UK and US. Representatives of the European Commission also attended the workshop. Five multilateral development agencies attended this workshop as observers and active discussants, which were World Bank, International Monetary Fund, Inter-American Development Bank, Asian Development Bank and African Development Bank.

III. Overview of the discussion and outcomes

Session I: Infrastructure for Pro-Poor Growth: The Global Picture

(a) How important is infrastructure for achieving pro-poor growth?

3. A consultant financed by the UK presented ways of measuring and targeting pro-poor growth (PPG). The presentation summarized the main results of research on infrastructure's contribution to growth and identified mechanisms for contributing to pro-poor growth. Infrastructure mainly contributes to PPG by increasing the productivity of the poor. The consultant illustrated trade-offs in growth vs. distribution effects from infrastructure investments, drawing principally on IFPRIs data-set on rural development in China and urging careful attention to both. After examining recent experiences of a number of African and Asian countries, the presenter concluded that quantity and quality of infrastructure services were important for attaining pro-poor growth, and that any pro-poor growth strategy would typically require greater investment in infrastructure than a simple growth strategy. The consultant proposed (i) that infrastructure bodies should become leading agents for pro-poor growth (ii) that, as such, they would seek out projects to relieve hidden bottlenecks and black spots which are less apparent because they affect mainly the productive capacities of those less politically vocal, (iii) that opportunities be sought for enhancing the viability of such project by combing them with

complementary initiatives in other sectors that would accelerate the flow of benefits from the infrastructure, and (iv) that, to enable the above, increased attention should be given to strengthening the accountability of these agents (for the contribution that the assets under their control make to PPG), within a regulatory framework promoting competition among service providers.

4. The subsequent discussion touched on (i) *urban poverty* (not covered in the presentation) (ii) ways to include supportive productive activities for economic growth (iii) *fiscal space* issues for both investment and maintenance requirements (iv) cost recovery (access versus affordability) and (v) efficiency issue (particularly corruption associated with procurement) and (vi) accountability on project intervention impact. As regards to current knowledge, the discussion raised the need for better baseline data and improved understanding of the production function of the MDGs. Reliable baseline data should be informative about both initial access and initial affordability. Different *initial conditions* of partner countries should be taken into consideration in comparing pro-poor growth experiences.

5. Key messages: The preferred PPG measure is the *growth of the mean income of the poor*. The main mechanism by which infrastructure contributes to PPG is by *increasing the productivity* of the poor. Infrastructure investment and service quality are even more important for pro-poor growth than for growth *per se*. Trade-offs between growth and distribution do arise in planning infrastructure expenditure and should not be brushed over. When faced with such trade-offs, policy choices should be fully informed by transparent analysis of all associated costs and benefits. Some suggested that growth should not be sacrificed for the sake of distribution; while others considered that infrastructure projects should yield at least a positive rate of return. But there was broad agreement that identifying the less obvious bottlenecks and black-spots, which sometimes have greatest significance for the poor, was a key task for infrastructure agencies. Viability of projects to relieve these problems can often be increased by synergistic investments, and more attention should be given to exploiting such opportunities.

(b) Measuring the impact of Infrastructure Projects: Some examples

6. Analytical studies and thematic works on poverty impact assessment and measuring tools were introduced by participants. The presentations were divided by sectors.

7. *Transport:* The impact studies presented for the transport sector included the Transport Infrastructure Project in Northern Vietnam (Japan), the My thuan Bridge-Mekong River Crossing in Vietnam (Australia) and Chongqing Railway line project in Huaihua China (Germany). The discussion focused on i) the importance of baseline surveys in examining the impact of infrastructure projects (ex ante poverty assessment); ii) problems of attribution in conducting impact studies; iii) difficulties in defining the assessment (i.e. project area vs. impact area); and iv) the need for better assessment of service affordability. *External factors* or interventions (i.e. rural credit, human resource development and agricultural support) were considered important for transport project impact. Sector integrated approaches were also highlighted as well as the relevance of area based approaches and sector level dialogue in designing pro-poor growth strategies and integrating sector strategies into the PRSPs.

8. *Energy:* The impact studies presented for the energy sector include the Orissa Rural Community's electricity supply in India (UK), a joint US/Japan program on the Rural Electrification Project in Bangladesh (USA) and the Thematic Evaluation Study of Rural Electrification Projects (Sweden). The discussion on the energy sector focused on importance of local ownership and participation and linking projects to production activities and growth. For the latter, the objective of increased agricultural production was pertinent for PPG impact in Bangladesh. Some participants emphasized that energy infrastructure, to be most poverty relevant, should (i) more directly promote productive activities of the poor, and ii) include more public goods such as street lighting (with strong impact on poverty reduction, and gender safety). The importance of energy for achieving the MDGs was pointed out by one participant; while another mentioned the impact of an electricity tariff increase on water tariffs for irrigation, thereby stressing the need to consider the comprehensive effect of cost recovery measures.

9. *Water and Sanitation:* The impact studies presented for the water sector include a project on Irrigation in Sri Lanka (Japan) and the PROSPECT-Community Urban Water Supply in Lusaka (UK). Despite project success (such as a significantly reduced cost of water for the poor in Lusaka), methodological limitations applied; the baseline data could not be used to monitor poverty reduction and data management was not linked to local authorities, thus reducing the usefulness of the new dataset. The discussion focused on i) sustainability issues (cost recovery and subsidy); ii) integrated or multi-sector approaches (i.e. the need for health assessments to maximize health benefits from water projects); iii) the need to establish linkages between the infrastructure investment strategy and PRSPs and iv) infrastructure safety nets for transition periods.

10. Key messages: While baseline poverty information is needed for meaningful impact assessment this information is more often than not missing. In order to maximize other benefits from infrastructure investment, such as productivity/growth gains or health benefits, an upfront integration of these aspects into project design is paramount. Causal relationships (i.e. between infrastructure and productivity gains) cannot be assumed, highlighting the need to formalize such linkages in project design to maximize synergistic benefits. Other central challenges include financial viability and cost recovery.

Session II: Donors activities on Infrastructure: Tendency, Strategies and Examples

(a) Current Donor Practices and the Development of Bilateral Donors' Infrastructure Portfolio

11. A consultant financed by Germany presented recent trends in donors' infrastructure portfolio. The major findings were the following:

- Approximately 70% of infrastructure investment in developing countries in the 1990s was financed by national governments. The private sector and ODA accounted for the remaining 25% and 5%. This data masks the importance of ODA financed infrastructure in poorer countries, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa.
- Bilateral ODA commitment on infrastructure declined over the 1990s. This is due to the withdrawal of key bilateral donors from the sector. Multilateral donors (including EC) did not compensate for this shortfall. Overall this resulted in both a smaller infrastructure share and reduced total ODA spending.

- Transport is the leading sector of ODA commitment for infrastructure, which is followed by energy and water. Recent financing has shifted to roads and water and sanitation
 - Regional analysis showed stable financing over the 1990s with most resources going to Asia (59%) and only a fraction allocated to Africa (17%).
 - Private sector involvement in infrastructure funding has shown an increasing trend during the 1990s, but has not developed as strongly as expected, and has not leveraged the decline in other funding sources. Private sector funding for infrastructure substantially declined after the Asian, Mexican and Russian crises in 1997. Furthermore, private sector investment for infrastructure was concentrated on ICT and energy and on a few (8) middle income countries. The private sector is not the driving force for poverty relevant infrastructure in poor countries.
 - Public funding for infrastructure also declined since the late 1990s, due to the reduced fiscal space after the above mentioned economic crises and other reasons. Overall little is known about public infrastructure financing patterns in developing countries.
12. The subsequent discussion focused on the following questions posed to the group.
- *What is the rationale behind the general decline in ODA commitments for infrastructure?* The discussion focused on the main reasons for decline, such as i) shift of attention to poverty reduction due to the introduction of MDGs; ii) weak performance of past infrastructure projects, i.e. isolated from other interventions and sometimes generating few benefits to the poor; iii) critical attitude to credit schemes as shown in adoption of the Helsinki Package and iv) shift in instruments to grant financing amongst several donors. Given the World Bank estimates of future demand for infrastructure investment, some argued that there is no rationale to reduce ODA budgets for infrastructure investment.
 - *Did / Do we rely too much on the private sector to provide funding for infrastructure?* The discussion focused on the decline for private sector funding in infrastructure from its peak immediately before the Asia crisis of 1997-98. In the first half of the 90's, Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) were seen as a tool to get over the rising financing gap, but the results to date have been limited. Some private infrastructure service contracts were revised after the first contract period was over, and, in some cases, the fiscal burden for providing infrastructure services under such schemes became even larger than it had been before. In certain developing countries, a shift from private to public debt has been observed. The consequences of these phenomena for the overall level of investment in infrastructure were made more serious by the withdrawal of some public aid agencies from infrastructure provision on the assumption that private funds would continue to be available.
 - *Why did donors shift towards transport and water in the context of the poverty agenda of the late 1990s?* The discussions focused on how the introduction of MDGs influenced budget allocation for infrastructure interventions. For example, with the advent of the MDGs, water projects have received higher financial allocations than the others, despite their lower rate of return. Lower private sector investment was also given as reason for more public investment in these sectors.

- *What are the most relevant sectors for poverty reduction?* The current sector priorities are seen as most relevant for poverty reduction. The question then becomes what are the most relevant sectors for pro-poor growth? Are water and sanitation still as relevant under this new objective?
- *What are we doing in Africa, where we have high poverty incidence and relatively low infrastructure investments?* The discussion on this point was not conclusive. Some donors indicated recent percentage increases in their infrastructure financing in Africa more than in other regions (for example the EC).

13. Key messages: Many bilateral donors have moved out of infrastructure funding or have reduced their shares due to a programmatic change to non-economic infrastructure assistance. This conflicted with the past record of infrastructure ODA. In the new debate, the infrastructure sector is attracting more and more attention and donors are increasingly interested in the linkages between infrastructure development and poverty reduction. In order to achieve higher ODA shares for infrastructure development (and recent World Bank data indicate huge demand) infrastructure ODA's contribution to pro-poor growth has to be strengthened and become more outcome oriented.

(b) Innovative Components for Effective Poverty Reduction: Project Examples

14. Best practice infrastructure projects were introduced by several participants, focusing on the innovative components of the projects to achieve PPG objectives.

15. *Transport and ICT*: Projects presented included the Rural Road Networks in four African countries (Ireland), Cairo Transport Master Plan (Japan) and GrameenPhone's Village Phone Program in Bangladesh (Secretariat). The importance for conducting baseline surveys was stressed again and there was agreement on the need of developing a *common analytical framework* to measure poverty reduction impact. Participants suggested that some further information on a) the cross sectoral planning (complementarity) done at local government level and b) specific targeting of the poor would be useful. It was suggested that the method of poverty assessment used for the Irish road projects could be regarded as a good "template" in assessing poverty impact of other road projects. Many participants were interested in the experience of GrameenPhone coupled with the innovative financing mechanism of the Grameen Bank. Some participants asked about the replicability of this experience to other countries, particularly as ICT requires – as a precondition – major investments in basic infrastructure (telecommunication, fibre lines etc) which is not available in many countries. The existence of nationwide railway networks alongside of which the fibre optic cable network in Bangladesh was constructed was one of the factors to make this project successful. This raised the question of how to mobilize financial resources and recover costs from such huge investments. Further, given that the GrameenPhone system is closely affiliated with the Grameen Bank's microfinance service, countries without such services may face difficulties in introducing similar mobile phone systems.

16. *Energy*: The presentations on energy included the joint Japan/US donor program on the Rural Electrification in Bangladesh (presented by Japan) and the Solar Home System Program in Namibia (Germany). The discussion on the latter focused on the lack of growth impact from the solar power system project and the limitations of renewable energy for the poor. Several participants questioned whether donors should implement a project that would only improve

social, or non-income, benefits but would not result in the promotion of productive activities. Such projects would, therefore be less relevant for pro-poor growth, while they may well be relevant for the social living standards of the poor.

17. *Water and sanitation:* The projects presented include Domestic Drinking Water in Mali and Haiti (France), Small Town Water Supply in Senegal (Belgium), Irrigation for Agrarian Reform Communities (Japan) and a Water and Sanitation project in South Africa (EC). Participants highlighted the need to establish a mechanism to facilitate sector wide approaches in all countries and questioned which sectors and project designs should be promoted for pro-poor growth. In addition, the role of the water sector to contribute to other social MDGs (MDG 4-6) and to reduce income poverty (MDG 1; related to irrigation) was highlighted. Furthermore, the need for a closer look on the importance of irrigation within the water sector was stressed.

18. Throughout the sectoral sessions, participants repeatedly highlighted the need for *coordinated and integrated donor* approaches. The US and UK also raised the issue of how to secure the use of subsidies to provide an incentive to service providers to target the poor specifically. In addition, the following issues were raised by various participants: cost recovery, affordability and accessibility, (including use of subsidy in this context), capacity building and accountability of infrastructure institutions, role of private sector in providing infrastructure services, integration of social sector components, the need to enhance institutional aspects in providing physical investment, the need to conduct baseline surveys with standardized methods and the capacity building of both donors and the developing country institutions.

19. Key messages: Participants agreed on the importance of i) developing standardized methods for conducting baseline infrastructure surveys, ii) institutional settings for sustainability in addition to physical investment; and iii) coordinated and integrated approach (such as developing sector wide diagnostic and frameworks with multi-sectors). So far unanswered questions of participants include how to increase infrastructure coverage in the PRSP process and how to maximize synergies across sectors and integrate sector strategies into PRSPs. Not all infrastructure sectors are contributing equally to pro-poor growth; transport and energy appear more successful in this regard than water and sanitation. This however, does not imply that water and sanitation projects are not important for achieving poverty reduction impact.

Session III: Overview of the Works of Multilateral Development Banks on Infrastructure and Poverty Reduction

20. The World Bank and the Asian Development Bank (ADB) introduced current discussions on infrastructure for pro-poor growth in their multilateral institutions.

21. A representative of the World Bank presented key emerging policy issues related to infrastructure intervention for poverty reduction, such as access, affordability and cost recovery. The newly developed Infrastructure Action Plan recognizes that the World Bank needs to be flexible enough to engage anywhere along the continuum of private to public infrastructure. Targeted subsidies and a plan for gradual cost recovery form part of this new approach. The experiences of the World Bank in supporting infrastructure in Africa and in South Asia were used to illustrate the Bank's recent projects in the two regions.

22. The presentation by the Asian Development Bank mainly focused on a recent study to assess the impact of transport and energy infrastructure on poverty reduction in Asia. The study analyzed 4-5 energy and transport interventions in Thailand, India and Shaanxi province (China) completed 5-10 years ago. According to the study, transport projects have immediate effects on poverty reduction while energy projects have more long term impacts. The study also concluded that a service provision approach is vital for poverty reduction impact and that perceived inequality may rise since some groups miss out (e.g. the chronically poor). Moreover, complementary programs, such as credit or training, played an important role for poverty reduction impact.

23. One of the most frequently highlighted issues in the subsequent discussion was *subsidization of service delivery* to the poor. It became evident that subsidization would no longer be a taboo and could be discussed within the context of cost recovery and affordability. Some participants were concerned about sustainability and appropriate duration of subsidies. The importance of designing subsidies that minimize corruption and encourage efficiency (“smart subsidies”) was emphasized.

24. *Private provision of infrastructure services* was also discussed. It was proposed to enhance communication with the Private Sector Task Team of POVNET. Participants suggested that an additional MDG “Target” should be created, which focuses on the enhancement of productivity by improving transport or energy infrastructure.

25. Finally, the issue of how to organize integrated donor approaches and align coordinating responsibilities in studies and interventions was raised. While regional organizations may seem to be natural coordinators, they are often weak in institutional capacity and other resources.

26. Some participants seemed to favour a pilot effort towards a systematic assessment of a developing country’s institutional structure for managing infrastructure and recent expenditure patterns from the view of their supportiveness for pro poor growth. This would aim to identify missed opportunities and how adjustments in institutional framework, structure and accountabilities, etc. may help to avoid their recurrence.

27. Key messages: This session confirmed that access, affordability and appropriate design, duration and targeting of subsidies as well as the role of the private sector and cost recovery are key emerging issues for this task team. With two multilateral institutions conducting work on infrastructure, growth and poverty reduction, this session also indicated clearly the current momentum for developing guidance for infrastructure and pro-poor growth for bilateral donors.

Session IV: Summing Up and Next Steps

28. The chair proposed the framework and topics for the second workshop; those are i) the themes to be discussed, ii) method for preparation, iii) participants and iv) voluntary financial contributions. Following the presentation, the discussion mainly focused on the selection of themes for the next workshop. The key issues raised at this session are summarized.

29. Several participants emphasized the *importance of cross cutting issues* such as governance or domestic financing, and showed reluctance to discuss features of infrastructure investment by sector. Other participants, however, pointed to *the benefit of a sector focus* in

examining pro poor aspects of infrastructure projects. There was consensus that the task team is to discuss *concrete measures* that make infrastructure projects more pro-poor. Some donors suggested creating a guiding principle for pro-poor growth and infrastructure investment as the final outcome of the workshop. The following issues were raised in this session

- How to secure financial resources for huge infrastructure investment needs;
- The necessity to agree on concrete and applicable *indicators* to measure the impact of infrastructure on the poor;
- The importance of having (ex ante) *poverty assessment data* in planning infrastructure investment and;
- The linkage between the *MDGs and pro-poor growth*.

30. The representative from the World Bank offered to provide the task team with basic *data on infrastructure profiles* of each developing country prepared by the Bank for the next workshop. It was agreed to invite *participants from developing countries* to this workshop. The representative from the ADB offered to contribute to the cost of inviting participants from developing countries, and asked the budget estimate. The representative of the GenderNet, as an ex officio member of the POVNET, proposed to contribute a gender related study of infrastructure for the workshop. It was furthermore suggested that the Private Sector and the Agriculture Task Teams might play a supporting role in the second workshop by introducing cross cutting issues on private sector finance for infrastructure and urban vs. rural infrastructure needs. Furthermore, it was agreed that ICT discussions should be integrated in this task team work.

ANNEX 1

**FINAL PARTICIPANTS LIST FOR NETWORK
ON POVERTY REDUCTION - INFRASTRUCTURE WORKSHOP**

**LISTE FINALE DES PARTICIPANTS POUR RÉSEAU
SUR LA RÉDUCTION DE LA PAUVRETÉ - ATELIER SUR L'INFRASTRUCTURE**

**29 March 2004 - 30 March 2004
OECD, Château de la Muette, Paris**

Chairman/Président

Mr. Hitoshi SHOJI
Deputy Director General
JBIC
1-4-1 Ohtemachi Chiyodaku
100-8144 Tokyo
Japan

Tel: + 81 3 5218 9657
Fax: +81 3 5218 9684
e-mail: h-shoji@jbic.go.jp

**Session Chairs
Présidents de session**

Mr. Marek WALLENFELS
GTZ - German Agency for Development
Cooperation
65726 Eschborn - Germany

Tel: +49 6196 791349
e-mail: marek.wallenfels@gtz.de

M. Armin BAUER
Senior Economist
Kreditanstalt fuer Wiederaufbau (KfW-
AS3)
Am Palmengarten 5-9
D-60325 Frankfurt - Germany

Tel: +49 (69) 7431 3296
Fax: +49 (69) 7431 3363
e-mail: armin.bauer@kfw.de

M. Alistair WRAY
Acting Head of Infrastructure
Department for International Development
(DFID)

Tel: +44 (0)207 023 0116
e-mail: a-wray@dfid.gov.uk

Mr. Bryan GREEY
European Commission
rue de la Loi
1049 Bruxelles

Tel: +32 2 299 26 10
Fax: +32 299 06 03
e-mail: Bryan.Greey@cec.eu.int

Country/Pays

Allemagne /Germany

Mr. Rainer KRAETSCH
Head of the Poverty Reduction and Social
Protection Division
Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation
and Development (BMZ)
Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 40
53123 Bonn
Germany

Tel: 0049-228-535-3730
Fax: 0049-228-535-44 32
e-mail: Kraetsch@bmz.bund.de

Mme Birgit PICKEL
Deputy Head of Division
Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation
and Development (BMZ)
Friedrich-Ebert-Allee 40
53123 Bonn
Germany

Tel : 0049-228-535-0
Fax : 0049-228-535-44 32
Email : birgit.pickel@bmz.bund.de

Ms. Annette VAN EDIG
Senior Expert, Infrastructure Department,
Federal Ministry for Economic Co-
operation and Development (BMZ)

Dr. Frank WEILER
Economist
Economist/Analyst
Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (KfW)
Palmengartenstr. 5
60325 Frankfurt
Germany

Tel: +49 69 7431-1684
Fax: +49 69 7431-2738
e-mail: Frank.Weiler@kfw.de

Australie/Australia

Ms. Kerri ELGAR
Adviser (Development)
Permanent Delegation
4, rue Jean Rey
75724 Paris Cedex 15
France

Tel: + 33 (0) 1 40 59 33 43
Fax: + 33 (0) 1 40 59 33 67
e-mail: kerri.elgar@dfat.gov.au

Autriche/Austria

M. Manfred SCHNITZER
Director Rural Development
Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the
Republic of Austria
Minoritenplatz 9
A-1014 Vienna
Austria

Tel: +43-1 531 15 4469
Fax: +43-1 536 66 4469
e-mail: manfred.schnitzer@bmaa.gv.at

Belgique/Belgium

Dr. Ir. Moussa BADJI
Lead specialist, Basic infrastructure, Water
and Sanitation
Directorate General for Development
Cooperation (DGDC)
Rue Brederode, 6
1000 Brussels
Belgium

Tel: +32 2 519.05.35
Fax: +32 2 519.06.83
e-mail: moussa.badji@diplobel.fed.be

Dr. Martinus DESMET
Attaché Coopération Internationale,
Délégué au CAD a.i.
Délégation Permanente
14, rue Octave Feuillet
F-75116 Paris
France

Tel: + 33 (0) 1 56 75 34 53
Fax: + 33 (0) 1 56 75 34 70
e-mail: martinus.desmet@diplobel.be

Canada/Canada

M. Pierre GIROUX
Counsellor
Délégation Permanente
15, bis rue de Franqueville
75116 Paris
France

Tel: + 33 (0) 1 44 43 20 27
Fax: + 33 (0) 1 44 43 20 99
e-mail:
pierre.giroux@dfait-maeci.gc.ca

Mr. Mark GAWN
A/Director
Senior Manager
Agence canadienne de développement
international
200 promenade du Portage, Hull
Québec
Canada

Tel: +1 (819) 997 7866
Fax: +1 (819) 953 5229
e-mail: mark_gawn@acdi-cida.gc.ca

CE/EC

Mr. Gilles FONTAINE
Ministre conseiller
Permanent Delegation
12, Avenue d'Eylau
75116 PARIS
France

Tel: + 33 (0) 1 44 05 31 60
Fax: + 33 (0) 1 44 05 31 79
e-mail: Gilles.Fontaine@cec.eu.int

Etats Unis/United States

Mr. George CARNER
U.S Representative to the DAC
Executive Director
Permanent Delegation

Tel: + 33 (0) 1.0145247434
Fax: + 33 (0) 1.0145247489
e-mail: carnergx@state.gov

Mr. Mark KARNS
Senior Privatization Advisor
U.S. Agency for International Development
(USAID)
1300 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W.
20523-2110 Washington, D.C.

Tel: 1 202 712-5516
Fax: 1 202 216-3025
e-mail: mkarns@usaid.gov

Mr. Tim MAHONEY
Director, Office of Poverty Reduction
Senior Manager
USAID
1300 Pennsylvania Av. N.W.
Washington D.C.
United States

Tel: 1 202 712-4096
Fax: 1 202 216-3526
e-mail: tmahoney@usaid.gov

Ms. Emmy SIMMONS
Assistant Administrator
US Agency for International Development
(USAID)
1300 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W
20523-2110 Washington D.C.
United States

Tel: +1 202 712 1190 / 0670
Fax: 00 1-202-216 3235
e-mail: emsimmons@usaid.gov

Ms. Susan THOMPSON
Senior Policy Advisor
U.S. Agency for International Development
(USAID)
1300 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W.
20523-2110 Washington D.C.
United States

Tel: +1-202 712 1716
Fax: +1-202 216 3010
e-mail: sthompson@usaid.gov

M. Bradley WALLACH
Director, Enterprise Development and
Financial Markets Team
U.S. Agency for International Development

Tel: +1 202 712 0128
e-mail: bwallach@usaid.gov

Finlande/Finland

Mr. Timo VOIPIO
Social Development Adviser
Economist/Analyst
Ministry for Foreign Affairs
P.O. Box 176
Helsinki
Finland

Tel: +358 9 160 555 09
Fax: +358 9 160 561 00
e-mail: timo.voipio@formin.fi

France/France

Mme Caroline BALOSSIER
Agence Française de Développement
(AFD)
5, rue Roland Barthes
75012 Paris
France

Tel: 01 53 44 38 05
e-mail: balossierc@afd.fr

M. Jean-Francis BENAMOU
Agence Française de Développement
(AFD)
5, rue Roland Barthes
75012 Paris
France

e-mail: benamoujf@afd.fr

Mme Béatrice BIROT
Chargée d'études
Agence Française de Développement
(AFD)
5, rue Roland BARTHES
75012 Paris
France

e-mail: birotb@afd.fr

M. Guillaume COUNIO
Adjoint au chef de secteur OCDE
Senior Manager
2, Boulevard Diderot
75013 Paris
France

Tel: +33 (0)1 44 87 11 74
Fax: +33 (0)1 44 87 10 99
e-mail: guillaume.counio@sgci.gouv.fr

M. Bernard DEVIN
Consultant
Consultant/Self-Employed
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères
2 rue des Gres
GIF sur YVETTE
France

Tel: 01 6928 2990
Fax: 01 6928 2990
e-mail: devin.bernard@wanadoo.fr

Mr. Christian FLAMANT
Advisor to the Executive Director
Middle Manager
Agence française de développement
5, rue Roland Barthes
Paris
France

Tel: +33 (0)1 53 44 36 72
e-mail: flamantc@afd.fr

M. Hervé GALLEPE
Chargé de mission
Agence Française de Développement
(AFD)
5, rue Roland Barthes
75012 Paris
France

Tel: 01.53.44.35.86
e-mail: gallepeh@afd.fr

M. Alain HENRY
Directeur des infrastrucutres et du
développement durable urbain
Agence Française de Développement
(AFD)
5, rue Roland Barthes
75012 Paris
France

e-mail: henrya@afd.fr

Irlande/Ireland

Mr. Earnan O'CLEIRIGH
Senior Development Specialist
Development Cooperation Ireland
Bishops Square
Redmonds Hill
Dublin 2
Ireland

Tel: + 353 1 4082920
e-mail:
earnan.ocleirigh@iveagh.irlgov.ie

Japon/Japan

M. Kuniaki AMATSU
Official
Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs
(MOFA)
2-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
100-8919 Tokyo
Japan

Tel: +81-3-3580-3311 ext. 2564
Fax: +81-3-5501-8364
e-mail: kuniaki.amatsu@mofa.go.jp

Mr. Takeharu KOJIMA
Senior Programme Officer
Japan International Cooperation Agency
(JICA)
Shinjuku Maynds Tower Bldg.
1-1, Yoyogi
10th floor
2-Chome
Shibuya-ku
151-8558 Tokyo
Japan

Tel: +81 3 53 52 51 30
Fax: +81 3 53 52 54 90
e-mail: kojima.takeharu@jica.go.jp

Mr. Futoshi MATSUMOTO
First Secretary
Permanent Delegation
11, avenue Hoche
75008 Paris
France

Tel: + 33 (0) 1 53 76 61 83
Fax: + 33 (0) 1 45 63 05 44
e-mail: fm@deljp-ocde.fr

Mr. Yasuhisa OJIMA
Deputy Director
JBIC
Tokyo
Japan

Tel: 81 3 5218 3589
Fax: 81 3 5218 3969
e-mail: y-ojima@jbic.go.jp

Mr. Makoto SUNAGAWA
Senior Advisor
Japan International Cooperation Agency
(JICA)
Japan

e-mail: Sunagawa.Makoto@jica.go.jp

Mexique/Mexico

M. Noel GONZALEZ SEGURA
Third Secretary
Délégation Permanente
8, rue de Berri
Paris
France

Tel: +33 (0)1 56 59 29 28
Fax: +33 (0)1 45 63 03 63
e-mail: ngonzalet@sre.gob.mx

Norvège/Norway

M. Ørnulf STRØM
Head Infrastructure Group
Norwegian Agency for Development
Cooperation - NORAD
PO Box 8034 Dep
0030 OSLO
Norway

Tel: +47 222 40218
e-mail: ornulf.strom@norad.no

Pays Bas/Netherlands

Mr. Jan VLAAR
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Postbus 20061
2500 EB Den Haag
Netherlands

Tel: +31 70 34 87 027
Fax: +31 70 34 85 956
e-mail: jan.vlaar@minbuza.nl

Royaume Uni/United Kingdom

Mr. Peter DAVIES
Senior Energy Advisor
DFID
1 Palace street
SW1E 5HE London
United Kingdom

Tel: + 44 207 023 0924
e-mail: p-davies@dfid.gov.uk

Mme Kathryn TOVEY
Department for International Development
(DFID)

Tel: +44 207 023 0086
e-mail: K-Tovey@dfid.gov.uk

Suède/Sweden

Karin ANDERSSON
Program Manager
Swedish International Development
Cooperation Agency (SIDA)
105 25 Stockholm
Sweden

Tel: +468 698 5507
e-mail: karin.andersson@sida.se.

Mr. Dag EHRENPREIS
Senior Advisor
SIDA - Swedish International Development
Cooperation Agency
105 25 Stockholm
Sweden

Tel: +46 86 98 40 30
e-mail: dag.ehrenpreis@sida.se

Mr. Mikael SODERBACK
Chief Policy Coordinator, Department of
Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation
Sida
10525 Stockholm
Sweden

Tel: + 468 698 5087
e-mail: mikael.soderback@sida.se

Suisse/Switzerland

M. Olivier BOVET
Programme Manager
Département fédéral de l'Economie
Effingerstrasse 1
CH-3003 Berne

Tel: +41 31 324 08 39
e-mail: Olivier.Bovet@seco.admin.ch

Mr. Thomas ZELLER
Co-Head, Social Development Division
Senior Manager
Swiss Agency for Development and
Cooperation
Freiburgstrasse 130
BERN
Switzerland

Tel: + 41 31 322 3442
Fax: + 41 31 324 1695
e-mail:
Thomas.Zeller@deza.admin.ch

International Organizations

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

Dr. Yuejiao ZHANG
Resident Director General
Asian Development Bank
Rahmhofstrasse 2-4
60313 Frankfurt
Germany

Tel: +49 69 2193 6400
Fax: +49 69 2193 6444
e-mail: yzhang@adb.org

**Banque africaine de
développement/African
Development Bank (AFDB)**

Mr. John Sande KANYARUBONA
Program Coordinator
Economist/Analyst
African Development Bank (AFDB)
13, avenue du Ghana
Tunis-Belvédère
Tunisia

Tel: +216 71 102 493
Fax: +216 71 830 587
e-mail:
J.KANYARUBONA@AFDB.ORG

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

M. Yann BRENNER
Middle Manager
Inter-American Development Bank
66, avenue d'Iéna
75116 Paris
France

Tel: +33 1 40 69 31 06
Fax: +33 1 40 69 31 20
e-mail: yannb@iadb.org

Banque Mondiale /World Bank

Mrs. Dipa BAGAI
Senior Partnerships Officer
Permanent Delegation
66 avenue d'Iéna
75116 Paris
France

Tel: + 33 (0) 1 40 69 30 30
Fax: + 33 (0) 1 47 23 74 36
e-mail: dbagai@worldbank.org

Mr. Antonio ESTACHE
Senior Economic Adviser
The World Bank

Tel: +1 202 458 1442
e-mail: aestache@worldbank.org

**Fond Monétaire International
(FMI)/International Monetary
Fund (IMF)**

Ms. Sonia BRUNSCHWIG
Senior Economist
Permanent Delegation
66, Avenue d'Iéna
75116 Paris
France

Tel: + 33 (0) 1 40 69 32 12
Fax: + 33 (0) 1 47 23 40 89
e-mail: sbrunschwig@imf.org

OECD

Mr. Michael ROESKAU
DCD Director
2, rue André Pascal
75016 Paris
France

Tel: 01 45 24 90 00
e-mail: Michael.ROESKAU@oecd.org

Mr. Richard H CAREY
DCD Deputy Director
2, rue André Pascal
75016 Paris
France

Tel: 01 45 24 89 83
e-mail: Richard.CAREY@oecd.org

Mr. William R NICOL
DCD-COH Head of Division
OECD
2, rue André Pascal
75016 Paris
France

Tel: 01 45 24 91 37
Fax: + 33 (0) 1 44 30 63 33
e-mail: William.NICOL@oecd.org

Mr. Ichiro TAMBO
Senior Advisor on ICT
OECD
2, rue André Pascal
75016 Paris
France

Tel: 01 45 24 14 25
e-mail: Ichiro.TAMBO@oecd.org

Ms. Annabel MUELDER
2, rue André Pascal
75016 Paris
France

Tel: 01 45 24 84 57
e-mail: annabel.muelder@oecd.org

Other participants/autres participants

Mr. Benoît D'ANSEMBOURG
Consultant
Rue général Henry, 45
1040 Brussels
Belgium

e-mail:
benoit.dansembourg@skynet.be

Mr. Christopher WILLOUGHBY
Oxford Policy Management
8600 - 310 Lagos
Portugal

Tel: +351 282 764 134
Fax: +351 282 764135
e-mail:
chrismariewilloughby@msn.com

Ms. Susanne HESSELBARTH
SHDC
Oberblachen 2
CH-6345 Neuheim

Tel: 0041-41-756-08 28
Fax: 0041-41-756-08 29
e-mail: susanne.hesselbarth@shdc.ch