

**Open Government Partnership (OGP)  
Steering Committee Meeting Minutes**  
London, United Kingdom  
April 22-24, 2013

**Monday, April 22: Working-level Steering Committee Meeting**

**Welcome**

The Government of the United Kingdom welcomed delegates to the meeting on behalf of the co-chairs of OGP. The Steering Committee also welcomed the three new representatives to the Open Government Partnership (OGP) Steering Committee, Maryati Abdullah of Indonesia, Veronica Cretu of Moldova and Alejandro Gonzalez of Mexico.

**Governance and Leadership: Strategy Update**

The four members of the Governance and Leadership Subcommittee (GL) each presented one element of a revised strategy proposal that was developed after a February subcommittee meeting in Jakarta. Some members of the SC felt that the proposed OGP vision statement should encourage governments to be more ambitious in their action plans. SC members also suggested highlighting the importance of citizen participation in policymaking and improving dialogue between government and civil society in participating countries. SC members then discussed the proposed strategic principle that OGP should primarily focus on deepening engagement in existing OGP countries. SC members agreed that while individual members will still reach out to potential partners within their region, OGP should focus in the coming years on delivering results in the 58 countries that have already joined.

The GL raised the issue of how to maintain high-level political commitment for OGP, potentially through hosting an annual Heads of Government meeting, perhaps on the sidelines of the UN General Assembly. Members discussed the issue and agreed that maintaining high-level political engagement is important, but they did not reach a firm conclusion on whether to link a Heads of Government meeting to the UN or another event. The SC discussed ways OGP can deepen engagement with civil society groups. Members agreed that OGP should improve its external communications to better make the case for OGP with civil society networks, and that the October conference is an opportunity to bring these groups together. Lastly, the GL raised the issue of what the appropriate size of the Support Unit (SU) should be. A brief discussion followed on the need for greater and timely financial support to the SU, and it was agreed that there should also be discussion of expanding the size of the SU in the medium term.

**Governance and Leadership: Governance Proposals**

The SU Director outlined the governance proposals for discussion by the Steering Committee. The first proposal was to confirm three-year terms for current OGP governments on the SC

(September 2011 – September 2014) and thereafter to organize an annual election beginning in 2014 to ensure a continuous rotation of government members. The SC agreed to delink the timing of this election from the OGP Annual Conference to ensure that rotation happens at a consistent time each year. One SC member proposed a one-time staggering of terms for members elected in 2014 to ensure that a minimum of three spots would thereafter open up on the SC each year. There was also agreement that the vote must be organized, as expressed in the Articles of Governance, in such a way to ensure that the regional balance is maintained on the SC.

Members agreed to add an additional member of the SC on both the government and civil society sides beginning in 2014, in part to strengthen the capacity of the subcommittees. The GL also proposed adopting a ‘troika’ system for the governance of OGP, whereby the outgoing government Lead Chair would retain its seat on the SC for one additional year. This will help support transitions from one year to the next and aid in maintaining institutional memory. There was general agreement on this proposal, but several members also requested more clarity on the role and appropriate subcommittee membership of the outgoing chair. It was agreed that GL should address these questions in the more detailed proposal to be prepared for July.

Members agreed to the proposal that the GL subcommittee should review subcommittee mandates and membership on an annual basis, based on criteria to be presented by the GL in the more detailed proposal for July. However, some SC members did express concern that the GL subcommittee might be taking on too much, and that perhaps some functions should shift to another subcommittee or to an ad hoc oversight committee instead. It was also agreed that the Finance and Audit subcommittee (FA) should be dissolved; some of its members will join the Peer Learning and Support subcommittee (PLS), given OGP’s new strategic focus in this area. The GL finally proposed that there should be a second civil society co-chair to ensure parity between government and civil society in OGP’s leadership group. Members acknowledged that parity is a core value of OGP, but asked for further clarification on the rationale for making this change and how the new system would work in practice, especially in tandem with other proposed changes (like the ‘troika’ system).

The session concluded with an agreement that the SU would adjust the governance proposals to incorporate the suggestions of members in a series of resolutions to be discussed at the Ministerial-level meeting.

## **October Annual Conference**

SC Members divided into four groups to discuss the aims and priorities of the October Annual Conference in London. Each group was asked to think through several questions, and then came together again in the plenary to discuss important takeaways.

There were several common themes that emerged, including:

- An interactive conference with a dynamic, tech-savvy ‘look and feel.’

- Focus on what is happening on the ground in participating countries as a result of OGP commitments; showcase impact and stories of success.
- Use this opportunity to engage with other multilateral initiatives, including bringing together the heads of transparency and accountability initiatives in specific sectors to discuss how OGP can help put energy and momentum behind some of these initiatives.
- In order to encourage the participation of Heads of Government, suggestion that the Conference may need to demonstrate how the OGP principles and approach can help tackle a global problem.

Specifically, on behalf of the Transparency and Access to Information Network (Red de Transparencia y Acceso a la Información, RTA), Mexico proposed organizing a special session during the October conference on the role of information commissions and other bodies in charge of access to information regulations.

### **Independent Reporting Mechanism**

Joseph Foti, the Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) Program Manager presented on the progress the IRM has made since the December meeting, and invited Dr. Rosemary McGee of the International Expert's Panel (IEP) to discuss the work of the technical experts. The IRM is fully functional and operating in the founding eight OGP countries, with an anticipated publication date of late August 2013. The IRM has hired an additional staff member, who will be starting in May and will help launch the recruitment process for the 39 countries in Cohort 2 (countries that joined in Brasilia).

Dr. McGee presented on the process used to develop the IRM questionnaire that national level researchers use to direct their research. The questionnaire includes seven sections and outlines the minimum set of expectations for all of the researchers. After the researcher has written an initial draft, there will be ample time for both governments and civil society groups to comment on the reports prior to final publication. The IEP will meet in June in London to review the first drafts of the reports.

During the subsequent Q&A several members asked about the recruitment of two additional senior advisors (one from Latin America and one from Asia.) The call for applications will close in May, and the IRM Program Manager will work with the Criteria and Standards subcommittee to develop a shortlist. Others questioned how the IRM could incorporate an assessment of 'stretch' in its reporting, including ensuring that countries were making incremental year-on-year progress and that additional commitments were being made to 'business as usual'. There was some discussion on the remuneration for the national level researchers, and whether budget constraints would result in insufficient time for field research and consultation. Finally, members stressed the importance of the first round of IRM reports being used to inform new action plans for the founding eight countries.

The SC then approved two minor revisions to the IRM Concept Note: 1) removal of the cap on the number of IRM staff; 2) adjustment to the governance structure for the IRM Program

Manager. The IRM Program Manager now reports to the IEP for all issues related to the IRM method and reports, and to the SU Director for day-to-day administration (staff, budget, etc.)

## **Peer Learning and Support**

The discussion in this session centered on the Country Support and Peer Learning Proposal, which was developed by the Support Unit and the OGP Networking Mechanism (NM) with input from the Peer Learning and Support subcommittee. The SU Director provided an overview of the strategy proposal, which seeks to unpack the elements of how OGP can effectively support countries in achieving their commitments, particularly through sharing experiences across countries. It also presents preliminary cost and staffing estimates to implement the strategy. The proposed strategy would bring many of these functions within the SU over the coming year, and will begin to phase out use of the term 'Networking Mechanism,' as many have found it to be confusing. Global Integrity will remain involved in supporting activities in the peer exchange category, including webinars and regional workshops.

Members expressed strong support for the proposal, as well as for building the capacity of the Support Unit to be able to implement the proposed activities. Several members indicated that OGP's focus should be first and foremost on targeted support to individual countries, but that some of the other proposed activities (e.g. case studies and working groups) would clearly facilitate this direct, customized support.

There was significant enthusiasm about thematic working groups, including the potential to increase their effectiveness through online platforms to share experiences. Some thought that case studies could be used as a way to generate interest in the working groups and potentially even generate new ideas. Several participants also underscored the importance of regional events to bring together different countries and generate in-person peer exchange. The October Conference was another focus of the discussion, and specifically how peer learning can be integrated into the agenda.

During the discussion, several members noted that the Support Unit has limited capacity to carry out some of these labor-intensive activities. One suggestion was to look for ways to engage non-SC participating governments and organizations more effectively, including as 'force multipliers' to support the work and functions of the SU. Others emphasized the importance of brokering more support from multilateral institutions. The SU noted that of the 6 multilaterals that have been invited to partner with OGP, three are working on responses and one (the World Bank) has already delivered a response.

Finally, South Africa gave an update on the planned Africa Regional Event. Currently scheduled to be held in Nairobi May 29-30, the event is still in the planning stages, and invitations are to be sent soon.

## **Tuesday, April 23: Working-Level Steering Committee Meeting**

### **Finance and Audit/Governance & Leadership: Fundraising Strategies**

The SU Director outlined the Finance and Audit Update and Recommendations for the SC, noting that the financial situation is better than in December, as the SU has received three private foundation grants and contributions from three governments. However the SU is projecting shortfalls in the budget approved by the SC in December, and this requires the SC to reevaluate OGP's fundraising strategy.

Government SC members agreed that they could consider revisiting the sliding scale for contributions for 2014 contributions, according to the revised budget proposal to be presented by the SU in July, but increasing it for 2013 would be difficult because they have already budgeted based on the amounts agreed in December. Some members noted that it is important to maintain the model of SU funding being equally split between governments and private foundations, and that governments therefore need to get their funding in quickly. There was general consensus that all OGP participating countries should be asked to contribute to the SU. One member noted that securing these grants might have high transaction costs, so the minimum contribution level should take this into account, as previously discussed by the SC. Some also noted that governments should make multi-year grants – perhaps paid upfront – to make it easier for the SU to plan and budget. Others expressed support for reaching out to bilateral development agencies, including from both SC member governments and non-SC countries with aid agencies.

Members agreed on several recommendations to be presented to the ministerial meeting on Wednesday: 1) the SU should send a letter to all governments indicating that OGP is considering requiring annual dues from all participating countries; 2) The SC should consider increasing the sliding scale for SC contributions in 2014; 3) the SU will continue to reach out to other potential private foundation donors; 4) GL and the SU will reach out to several bilateral development agencies and invite them to a funder meeting in July.

### **Finance and Audit: Support Unit 2013 Budget**

The SU Director reported that the SU has sent invoices to all of the SC member governments for their 2013 contributions. The session chair then asked all countries when their 2013 contributions could be expected. Three countries have already submitted their dues (Norway, South Africa and the Philippines), three announced they will submit by July (Mexico, the UK, Tanzania) and two are still working through internal approval processes and hope to submit by October (Indonesia and Brazil). Several governments noted that they have had difficulty articulating the status of OGP in legal terms, and this has resulted in delays. It was agreed that the six remaining governments will submit their contributions as soon as possible, and the SU will work with them to provide a clear explanation of the legal status of the SU and its relationship to the Tides Center. The SC also agreed on the recommendation to conduct a Certification of Revenue and Expenditures for 2012, but to commission a full independent audit for 2013.

## **Criteria and Standards**

The CS subcommittee chair presented the subcommittee's recommendation to shift to a biannual reporting calendar for OGP action plans and reporting. The SU Director explained that this proposal was inspired in large part by OGP's updated strategy focusing on delivery and results. Under a biannual calendar, countries will have more time to focus on implementation, as well as genuine consultation. The IRM Program Manager and IEP are also strongly in favor of the proposal, as it would enable the IRM to coordinate staffing more effectively and potentially allocate more resources per report to ensure higher quality and more in-depth reporting. There was broad consensus that a biannual calendar makes sense, but that there should still be a check-in on progress at the one year mark. The SC therefore agreed that OGP should move toward a biannual calendar for action plans and reporting, and that the Criteria and Standards subcommittee should develop a more detailed proposal on this for review and approval in July.

A member of the subcommittee also proposed that the SC discussed how to encourage countries to 'stretch' more in their action plans to achieve incremental progress. Since this was a new proposal, not thoroughly discussed by the subcommittee before the meeting, the SC agreed in principle this was necessary, but asked for more clarification on exactly how OGP should encourage stretch. It was noted that the IRM already does consider the notion of stretch, but there is not clarity on exactly how 'stretch' is defined or if it refers to the eligibility criteria, the commitments, or both. The SC therefore agreed that the CS subcommittee should develop a more detailed proposal for July on defining and encouraging stretch, including on both action plans and eligibility criteria.

At the end of the session one member proposed that the Steering Committee should commission a mid-term review of OGP to take stock of progress to date and consider areas for improvement. The SC agreed to discuss this proposal further in July with the goal of commissioning the review later this year.

## **New Country Action Plan Presentations**

Representatives from the governments of eight new OGP countries (Argentina, Costa Rica, Finland, Ghana, Hungary, Liberia, Panama and Trinidad and Tobago) presented on the process for developing their action plans, and also on the core commitments they have incorporated into their plans. Representatives from civil society organizations in the countries also were asked to comment on the process and action plans. The SC Members in the meeting then asked questions before the groups broke into three smaller groups for mentoring sessions.

## **Small Group Mentoring Sessions**

The representatives from all of the new OGP countries (both governments and civil society) were divided into three groups and paired with SC members to discuss the development and

content of their action plans.

Group One consisted of representatives from Argentina, Costa Rica and Panama (both from government and from civil society), as well as members of the OGP Steering Committee. The group discussed the action plans from the three countries, and the discussion focused on the consultations each government held with civil society while drafting the action plans. In exchanging experiences, the participants found that there were both positive and negative perspectives of the consultations in the three countries. One SC member gave specific input into some of the plans, which had been read before the session. One SC member reflected after the debate on how the process in his country worked well because the government proactively sought civil society input.

In Group Two, representatives from Russia, Liberia and Hungary met to discuss action plans together with members of the OGP Steering Committee. SC members gave specific input into the plans, which they had read before the session. They suggested allocating budgets for OGP action plan implementation and monitoring, and also suggested ways to broaden the process to include more stakeholders from other government institutions or civil society groups. There were also representatives from civil society groups in the new countries, and those participants questioned the consultation processes. They also argued that governments should do more to incorporate the suggestions of civil society groups in the action plans.

The third group had government representatives from Ghana, Finland and Trinidad and Tobago, as well as a civil society representative from Serbia. Many of the initial questions from the new countries were on how governments can broaden engagement with civil society. One SC member discussed how in her country the coordinating agency tasked with OGP implementation worked with a coalition of groups to set up individual meetings between agencies and civil society groups. Participants shared challenges they had faced in bringing together government with civil society groups and discussed several different possible models for effective collaboration. One new country representative asked about how to prioritize commitments for implementation in light of limited resources.

Participants in each group noted that these mentoring sessions provided a unique opportunity for frank discussion, and that these peer-to-peer exchanges are very important for OGP's success. It is hoped that participants from the new countries left with specific ideas to strengthen the implementation of their action plans in the coming months.

### **National Action Plan 2.0 Lightning Talks**

All eight of the founding countries provided a preview of highlights from their second action plans. The countries shared lessons learned from their first self assessment reports, as well as how they have adjusted the consultation processes in this second action plan development stage. Representatives from civil society were also given the chance to ask questions of each of the founding eight countries. There was an interesting discussion following each of the presentations, and many of the questions were from new countries directed at the founding countries who had made presentations.

## **Wednesday, April 24: Ministerial-Level Steering Committee Meeting**

### **Opening Session**

The session chair (the United Kingdom) welcomed delegates, particularly the Ministers who had joined for the final day. Noting that this is a significant point in the development of OGP, the chair encouraged the SC to work diligently to make 2013 a productive year for the partnership.

The chair then thanked the three members of the SC from civil society who are rotating off, Tom Blanton, Juan Pardinás and Gladwell Otieno for their service to OGP during these last two years. Their successors on the SC were acknowledged as well, Maryati Abdullah, Alejandro Gonzalez and Veronica Cretu.

The chair invited the Support Unit Director to provide an update to the SC on the work of the SU since the last SC meeting in December. The Director summarized the activities of the subcommittees and of the Support Unit over the past four months, including on progress towards addressing action items from the December Meeting. This included the following:

- Developed an overall OGP strategy update following on the Jakarta meeting and worked with GL to develop revised proposals to ensure government rotation on the OGP Steering Committee.
- Worked closely with the Networking Mechanism to develop a revised approach for “Country Support and Peer Learning.”
- Initiated conversations with a number of multilateral institutions to develop formal partnerships with OGP.
- Performed an update of OGP eligibility that is now posted online.
- Secured confirmation from the Government of Mexico that it will become the next government co-chair of OGP (beginning in October 2013).
- Hired a Deputy Director, advertised for a communications manager, and confirmed DFID agreement to second a Program Officer for Peer Learning.
- Invoiced all SC member countries for their 2013 contributions and followed up individually with each one. Secured three private foundation grants.
- Local researchers have been hired and trained, and the IRM is up and running in all 8 founding countries.

### **Criteria and Standards: Self-Assessment Reports**

The session chair (Suneeta Kaimal) invited the eight founding governments to deliver a brief reflection on the process for drafting their first OGP self assessment reports. Speakers from all eight governments spoke, giving special attention to how they developed their consultation process and the lessons learned from the implementation of the first action plan. All SC Members were then given the opportunity to ask questions or make comments. There was general agreement that the self assessments proved to be an effective tool for increasing engagement between government and civil society. It was also a chance for the governments to expand their consultations to civil society groups that were not previously engaged in the



process. Some SC members commented that they believed countries should stretch in this second action plan to achieve more significant progress. The SC also acknowledged that some countries have incorporated consultations with civil society successfully to the degree of co-creating an action plan together with government. Some of the takeaways from the discussion included:

- Representatives from civil society and governments emphasized the importance of advance planning and allowing sufficient time to ensure a strong consultation process. The SC also agreed that describing commitments in clear language was important to broadening citizen participation.
- It was agreed that it was vital to build trust between civil society and government in order to work together effectively in co-creating the second OGP action plan. It was clear this is an area where countries are learning a lot from the experiences of their peers, particularly within regions.
- One member described how their government had incorporated the principles of gender equality into their consultations and action plans. Others reflected on efforts to broaden citizen participation, for example by using communication platforms/technologies, travelling outside the capital and even using community outreach workers to seek household input.
- Some countries noted that their initial action plans were overly ambitious and lacked strategic focus, and that they were seeking to define a much more targeted set of commitments (and pursuant outcomes) in their updated plan.
- There was general agreement that commitments need to be concrete, measurable and time-bound.
- Countries also reflected on the importance of securing buy-in for OGP action plans at the agency-level, including both on the content of commitments, as well as on maintaining dialogue with civil society experts throughout the implementation period.

### **Governance and Leadership: OGP Strategy 2013 – 2014**

The session chair (the United Kingdom) opened by providing some context from the GL subcommittee meeting in Jakarta in February. The SU Director was then asked to summarize key takeaways from the working-level discussion on Monday. She noted that there was strong support for the proposed vision statement with a few minor modifications (see Monday minutes), as well as for the proposed strategic priorities for OGP over the next two years. With respect to the principle of deepening (vs. broadening), the SC noted that while the two are not mutually exclusive, the emphasis should be on deepening. Members agreed that while there are certain regions where OGP should continue to reach out to potential members (Asia and Africa), this outreach should be pursued by individual SC members, as opposed to being a priority for the Support Unit.

The SC next discussed how to maintain high-level political engagement in OGP, including the possibility of linking an annual OGP Heads of Government meeting to other events, such as the UN General Assembly in New York. Some thought piggybacking on an event like the UN was a

good idea, while others thought it may be too difficult logistically (to organize every year) and that OGP should consider other possible venues.

The final topic for discussion was how OGP can generate more private sector engagement, particularly since this was part of the initial 'partnership' model but has since dwindled. It was noted that there are several potential roles for the private sector in OGP, and it may be helpful to differentiate between these in outlining a strategy for renewed engagement. First, in certain industries, companies may have a key role to play in ensuring the successful delivery of OGP action plans, for example in the construction sector and the extractive industries. Second, OGP could seek corporate sponsorship of events, or even in-kind contributions for technical assistance to OGP countries (e.g. to build online platforms). Finally, it would be useful to do more to encourage private sector engagement in action plan consultations and implementation at the country-level, including with particular technology companies involved in open data. The SC agreed to continue discussing this at the next meeting.

### **Peer Learning and Support**

The SU Director summarized Monday's discussion on the Country Support and Peer Learning strategy, and presented resolution 5.1 for approval at the Ministerial level of the SC. After the presentation, the session chair (South Africa) invited discussion from the participants. There was further discussion around the need for case studies and thematic working groups, and the NM responded to a question about the webinars by explaining their cost effectiveness as a way of reaching a broad audience. SC members also asked about partnerships with multilateral institutions, and the SU gave a status report on the ongoing communications with the four institutions that have expressed interest. It was agreed that thematic working groups should be structured in such a way as to generate peer exchange without placing an additional burden on the SU, and that OGP should capitalize on the interest of other institutions as 'force multipliers' in providing this type of support.

**Decision Point:** Agreement on the resolution as follows:

The Support Unit will increase its capacity to provide three types of support to OGP countries: direct country support, peer exchange, and learning/impact. Some of the functions within these three categories that are currently outsourced to Global Integrity will be brought within the Support Unit. This shift will take place by the end of 2013 and will require revisions to the Articles of Governance.

### **Finance and Audit/Governance and Leadership: Fundraising Strategies**

The session chair (Norway) introduced the issues for discussion, and the session began with several comments on the need for the SU to secure its budget much earlier in the calendar year and for member countries to submit their dues as soon as possible. SC members were also asked to comment on the five resolutions that were proposed following the working-level discussion on Tuesday. There were strong views that if OGP is going to ask for contributions

from all participating countries, these should be mandatory. The SC agreed that the SU will continue to work with GL to determine the amount countries should be asked to contribute.

**Decision Point:** Agreement on the resolutions as follows:

By July 2013, the Governance and Leadership subcommittee will convene a meeting (possibly hosted by DFID) of Steering Committee and non-Steering Committee aid agencies with the potential to fund OGP.

The co-chairs will write to all OGP participating countries by June requesting a voluntary financial pledge for 2013 of at least \$25k at the October Annual Conference. The co-chairs will indicate that the Steering Committee plans to make annual contributions [exact amounts TBD] from all participating countries mandatory from 2014 to help cover the recurring costs of the Support Unit and the IRM.

All Steering Committee members agreed in December 2012 to make multi-year contributions according to the current sliding scale. In budgeting for future contributions to OGP, the Steering Committee will consider adopting an increased sliding scale of \$100k/year for low income countries, \$200k/year for middle-income countries and \$300k/year for high-income countries.

By July, the Support Unit will seek to produce a legal document clearly defining the institutional status of the OGP Support Unit as a project of the Tides Center. As part of the mid-term evaluation of OGP, other possible legal and institutional arrangements for the Support Unit that might be preferable in the long-term will be considered.

All current Steering Committee members have made efforts and will continue to push for disbursement of their 2013 contributions as soon as possible.

### **Governance and Leadership: October Annual Conference**

The session chair (Warren Krafchik) provided a brief introduction. The UK then summarized the takeaways from the breakout sessions on Monday. There was consensus that the look and feel of the event needs to be interactive and dynamic, and that the focus should be on tangible progress in OGP countries. The UK also outlined several ideas for featured sessions at the Conference, including an IRM launch event, an open government innovation award, a high-level “summit” bringing together the global leaders of other transparency initiatives, a session to develop an open government charter, and a discussion on appropriate measures to take if OGP countries take actions that violate OGP principles.

There was consensus that OGP should use the conference to focus on telling the stories of change and delivery of action plans. However, there are remaining questions about how to reconcile this objective with the need to secure high-level government representation at the event. Some governments asked for more clarity on the goals and agenda for the Annual Conference before committing their head of State to attend.

There was strong support for the idea of developing an OGP Annual Prize, but some concern about the short time period to develop the competition and select winners in advance of October. One member suggested that it might be best to use the time between now and October to develop the guidelines for the competition, and then to announce the launch of the prize competition at the Annual Conference.

The UK Cabinet Office will draft a concept note on potential themes for the October Annual Conference within the next few weeks and share with the Steering Committee. It was agreed a planning committee for the October conference will be set up in the near future.

### **Governance and Leadership: Governance Proposals**

The session chair (Indonesia) introduced several resolutions (see below) based on discussions earlier in the week. SC members asked some procedural questions about the voting for the new SC to take place in October 2014. The SC agreed that the technical aspects of the voting would be addressed at the July SC meeting, based on a proposal from GL. One member suggested that the timelines for rotation of the civil society SC members and the government SC members should be synchronized beginning in 2014. The troika system that was proposed earlier was noted as being a suitable arrangement to encourage continuity and stability, although further details about its functioning were still needed.

The SU then introduced the resolutions in section two. One member, Brazil<sup>1</sup>, objected to resolution 2.3, which proposed adding a fourth co-chair on the civil society side. This member suggested that a policy change of this nature should be presented in a clearer, more structured and timely way to SC members before meetings, in order to allow for adequate discussion and analysis before adoption by consensus. Along with one other member/others, this member also requested more clarity on how the GL and co-chair functions would be integrated. The resolution was subsequently approved by majority with Brazil's objection noted.

**Decision Point:** Agreement on the resolutions as follows:

#### **Government Rotation**

The Steering Committee confirms 3-year terms for current government Steering Committee members (September 2011 – September 2014).

In 2014 the Steering Committee will be expanded by 1 government member and 1 civil society member. The Steering Committee will comprise of 20 members.

Starting in 2014 and henceforth, the term of the government that is outgoing lead chair (Indonesia in 2014) will be extended for 1 year, provided that government wishes to continue. The term of the support chair (Mexico in 2014) will be extended for 2 years, and the term of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Exception to the Chatham-House rules adopted by the SC requested and authorized by the country.

incoming chair (TBD) will be extended for 3 years.

In 2014, 7 government Steering Committee seats will be open (6 current seats plus one new seat). Any OGP participating country must indicate by letter to the executive director of the Support Unit at least three months before the election that they wish to compete for one of the open seats. Similarly, current government Steering Committee members must indicate by the same date whether they plan to stand for reelection.

In 2014 all OGP participating governments will vote on which 7 governments to elect to the Steering Committee. In the 2014 election, three governments will receive 3-year terms; two governments will receive 2-year terms; and two governments will receive 1-year terms. This will ensure that a minimum of 3 government seats on the Steering Committee will open each year for rotation. Beginning in 2015 and for all subsequent elections, Steering Committee members will be elected for 3-year terms.

The vote will take place each year by the end of October, and therefore will not necessarily be linked to the OGP Annual Conference.

The Support Unit will work with GL to develop a more detailed proposal for approval in July on the timeline and logistics of the voting process, including a means to ensure continued regional diversity of governments on the Steering Committee, as well as the mechanism for allocating staggered terms in the 2014 election (see 1.5 above).

### **Subcommittee Membership and Mandates**

In consultation with the subcommittee chairs and the Support Unit, GL shall review subcommittee membership and mandates on an annual basis. This year, GL will make recommendations in writing to the Steering Committee for comment by the end of May 2013.

The Finance and Audit subcommittee will be dissolved, and GL will work with the Support Unit on fundraising. Beginning in 2014, the Steering Committee will set up a 2-member (1 government, 1 civil society who are not members of the GL) ad hoc audit oversight committee to work with the Support Unit to commission the annual external/independent audit of the OGP Support Unit's accounts.

The four members of the Governance and Leadership group will henceforth be considered the co-chairs of the OGP Steering Committee. Where consensus cannot be reached within the subcommittee and there is a parity of votes, the lead government chair shall have the determining vote. This change is proposed in order to:

- Reflect the core principle of parity between government and civil society in the OGP;
- Eliminate the confusion that emerges frequently in practice between the GL and co-chairs entities;
- Enhance and strengthen the leadership of the OGP;
- Strengthen continuity and transition in leadership when the CSO co-chair completes his or her term, as is the case for transition from lead to support chair among government;

- Ensure succession planning between CSO co-chairs.

### **Criteria and Standards: OGP Calendar**

The session chair (Brazil) introduced the resolutions to be considered by the SC. After brief discussion, the committee decided unanimously that moving toward a biannual calendar for action plans and reporting is the right approach for OGP.

On the issue of defining and encouraging ‘stretch’ in action plans, the SC agreed that the subject merited further discussions and a more detailed proposal by the CS for the July meeting.

**Decision Point:** Agreement on the resolutions as follows:

Criteria and Standards will develop a proposal for shifting OGP to a biannual calendar for action plans, full self-assessment reports, and IRM reports. This proposal will consider various options for an annual interim report to be produced – and made public – by governments.

Criteria and Standards will also develop a proposal to clarify the definition of ‘stretch’ and to encourage progress on action plans and eligibility criteria.

### **Independent Reporting Mechanism: Launching the IRM**

The session chair (Martin Tisne) opened the discussion. The IRM Program Manager reviewed some of the key points from his report, updating the Steering Committee on the IRM’s progress since December. The chair then asked the SC to offer suggestions on how OGP should support the launch of the first eight IRM reports. Discussion begun with the various possible models for launching the reports, and it was noted that there are actually three distinct opportunities to share the IRM findings: 1) the release of information through a dialogue with country-level stakeholders; 2) a national public launch event [presumably with media coverage]; and 3) a global press event to launch the reports from all eight founding countries.

There was a lively discussion on the pros and cons of different models, resulting in a general consensus that the IRM and IEP should take the lead on the first type of event (dialogue with country-level stakeholders), in coordination with national actors, but that individual countries will need to determine the best approach for organizing the second type of event (national launch event), if that is planned for the country. Based on individual members’ comments, it seems that some governments may choose to organize IRM launch events themselves, while in other countries civil society organizations or independent research institutes -- perhaps affiliated with the IRM local researchers -- are better placed to play this role. The SC agreed that the country launch events should be followed by a global launch event at the October Annual Conference. It was noted that there are currently no allocated funds or staff dedicated to the national launch events.

Following on this discussion, the IRM Program Manager will work with the IEP to develop

guidance for the stakeholder dialogues to discuss the IRM report findings, and at its July meeting the Steering Committee will pick up the discussion of the global IRM launch event.

## **Review Decisions Taken and Adjourn**

The SU Director was asked to summarize key action items for each of the OGP subcommittees emerging from this meeting:

### Criteria and Standards

- More detailed proposal for shifting to a biannual calendar – considering the various implications and outlining a mechanism for an annual ‘check-in’
- Concept note on how to encourage stretch – both in the level of ambition of action plans, as well as progress on eligibility criteria.

### Peer Learning and Support

- Green light to implement Country Support and Peer Learning proposal. Support Unit will negotiate a new agreement with Global Integrity based on these terms.
- Follow up with the multilaterals to present proposed MOUs for discussion at the working-level in July

### Finance and Audit (this committee will be dissolved in June)

- Proceed with commissioning a certification of revenues and expenditures for 2012. Set up an ad hoc oversight committee to commission an audit of OGP’s 2013 accounts.
- Support Unit to develop revised budget projection for July

### Governance and Leadership

- Develop detailed proposal on voting and nominations process for government Steering Committee members (including proposal on process for selecting the next co-chair)
- Present recommendations on subcommittee membership and mandates by June 1
- Propose a package of revisions to the Articles of Governance (based on SC decisions)
- Work with SU to implement fundraising proposals (see agreed resolutions)

## **Participants**

### *Brazil*

Sergio Seabra  
Roberta Solis Ribeiro  
Secretary of Corruption Prevention, Brazil  
International Affairs Advisor, Office of the Comptroller General, Brazil

### *Indonesia*

Kuntoro Mangkusubroto  
Tara Hidayat  
Jourdan Hussein  
Veronika Vonny  
Head, President's Delivery Unit, Indonesia  
Deputy for Strategic Initiatives, President's Delivery Unit, Indonesia  
President's Delivery Unit, Indonesia  
Indonesian Embassy in London

### *Mexico*

Jacqueline Peshard  
Julian Olivas Ugalde  
Juan Pablo Guerrero  
Teresa Gómez del Campo  
Alonso Cerdan Verastegui  
Information Commissioner, Federal Access to Information Agency, Mexico  
Undersecretary of Management and Public Procurement Responsibilities, Mexico  
Secretary General, Federal Access to Information Agency, Mexico  
Head of the Transparency and International Cooperation Unit, Mexico  
Director of Accountability and Transparency Studies and Evaluations, Mexico

### *Norway*

Tone Toften  
Terje Dyrstad  
Tom Arne Nygaard  
State Secretary, Ministry of Government Administration, Reform and Church Affairs, Norway  
Deputy Director, Ministry of Government Administration, Reform and Church Affairs, Norway  
Senior Adviser, Ministry of Government Administration, Reform and Church Affairs, Norway

### *Philippines*

Richard Moya  
Francis Y. Capistrano  
Undersecretary of the Department of Budget and Management, Philippines  
Head, Reforms and Innovations Unit, Philippines

### *South Africa*

Ayanda Dlodlo  
Qinisile Delwa  
Deputy Minister of Public Service and Administration, South Africa  
Head of the Office of the Deputy Minister, South Africa



Ismail Davids	Director of Service Delivery and Organisational Transformation, South Africa
Onkgopotse Tabane	Communications Specialist, South Africa
Alex Mahapa	Deputy Director General, South Africa
<i>Tanzania</i>	
Mathias Meinrad Chikawe	Minister for Constitutional and Legal Affairs, Tanzania
Susan Mlawi	Deputy Permanent Secretary, President's Office Tanzania
Obey N. Assery	Director of Coordination of Government Business, Tanzania
Charles Joseph Mmbando	Department for Constitutional and Legal Affairs, Tanzania
<i>United Kingdom</i>	
Francis Maude	Minister for the Cabinet Office, United Kingdom
Nick Hurd	Minister for Civil Society, United Kingdom
Paul Maltby	Director, Transparency and Open Data, Cabinet Office, United Kingdom
Andrew Mitchell	Director of Prosperity, Foreign Office, United Kingdom
Oliver Buckley	Head of International Transparency, Cabinet Office, United Kingdom
Jeff Glekin	Foreign Office, United Kingdom
Lu Ecclestone	Department for International Development, United Kingdom
Gemma Ralph	Foreign Office, United Kingdom
Laura Clarke	Cabinet Office, United Kingdom
Mark Robinson	Department for International Development, United Kingdom
Ilaria Miller	Cabinet Office, United Kingdom
<i>United States</i>	
Heather Flynn	Senior Adviser, Department of State, United States
Mary Beth Goodman	Director for International Economic Affairs, National Security Council, United States
Lisa Ellman	US Government
<i>Civil Society Representatives</i>	
Tom Blanton	National Security Archive
Nikhil Dey	MKSS
Suneeta Kaimal	Revenue Watch Institute
Warren Krafchik	International Budget Partnership
Juan E. Pardinias	IMCO

Iara Pietricovsky	INESC
Rakesh Rajani	Twaweza
Martin Tisne	Omidyar Network, representing the Transparency and Accountability Initiative (T/AI)
Anthony Richter	Open Society Foundations, representing the Transparency and Accountability Initiative (T/AI)
Veronica Cretu	CMB Training Centre
Maryati Abudllah	Publish What You Pay (PWYP) Indonesia
Alejandro Gonzalez	GESOC
<i>Open Government Partnership</i>	
Linda Frey	Executive Director, Open Government Partnership Support Unit
Joseph Powell	Deputy Director, Open Government Partnership Support Unit
Jack Mahoney	Program Associate, Open Government Partnership Support Unit
Abhinav Bahl	Global Integrity - Open Government Partnership Networking Mechanism
Hazel Feittengblatt	Global Integrity - Open Government Partnership Networking Mechanism
Joseph Foti	Independent Reporting Mechanism Program Manager
<i>OGP Civil Society Coordination</i>	
Paul Maassen	Independent Civil Society Coordinator on OGP
Emilene Martinez	Independent Civil Society Coordinator on OGP for Latin America
<b><u>Apologies</u></b>	
Minister Jorge Hage	Government of Brazil
Minister Florencio Abad	Government of the Philippines
Gladwell Otieno	Africa Centre on Open Governance