Open Government Partnership (OGP)
Ministerial Level Steering Committee Meeting Minutes
London, United Kingdom
December 4, 2012

Participants

Brazil
Roberta Solis Ribeiro   Government of Brazil

Indonesia
Tara Hidayat   Deputy for Strategic Initiatives, President's
                                     Delivery Unit, Government of Indonesia
Prayoga Wiradisuria   President's Delivery Unit, Government of Indonesia

Mexico
Alfonso Onate   Federal Access to Information Agency, Mexico

Norway
Terje Dyrstad   Ministry of Government Administration, Reform
                                     and Church Affairs, Norway

Philippines
Florencio Abad   Secretary of the Department of Budget and
                                     Management, Philippines
Emmanuel Guzman   Philippines Embassy

South Africa
Ayanda Dlodlo   Deputy Minister of Public Service and
                                     Administration, South Africa
Ismail Davids   Government of South Africa

Tanzania
Susan Mlawi   Government of Tanzania

United Kingdom
Francis Maude   Minister for the Cabinet Office, United Kingdom
Nick Hurd   Minister for Civil Society, Cabinet Office

United States
Maria Otero   Under Secretary of State Democracy, US
                                     Government
Heather Flynn   US Government

Tom Blanton   National Security Archive

Alexandre Ciconello	INESC
Suneeta Kaimal	Revenue Watch Institute
Juan E. Pardinas	IMCO
Rakesh Rajani	Twaweza
Martin Tisne	Omidyar Network, representing Transparency and Accountability Initiative
Anthony Richter	Open Society Foundation, representing the Transparency and Accountability Initiative

<u>Apologies</u>

Minister Jorge Hage	Government of Brazil
Minister Kuntoro Mangkusubroto	Government of Indonesia
Minister Mathias Chikawe	Government of Tanzania
Warren Krafchik	International Budget Partnership/Civil Society Co-Chair
Gladwell Otieno	AFIEGO
Nikhil Dey	MKSS
Iara Pietricovsky	INESC

<u>In Attendance</u>

Indonesia

Teuku Zulkaryadi	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Government of Indonesia
Veronika Vonny	Indonesian Embassy
Jourdan Hussein	President's Delivery Unit, Government of Indonesia
Odo Manuhutu	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Government of Indonesia
Bramono Satryo	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Government of Indonesia

South Africa

Mataywa Busieka	Government of South Africa
Fungi Rakoena-Tshabalala	Government of South Africa

United Kingdom

Richard Heaton	Permanent Secretary to the Cabinet Office,

	United Kingdom
Michael Anderson	Director General for Policy and Global Issues, Department for International Development, United Kingdom
Laura Blizzard	Foreign and Commonwealth Office, United Kingdom
Ollie Buckley	Cabinet Office, United Kingdom
Laura Clarke	Cabinet Office, United Kingdom
Lu Ecclestone	Department for International Development, United Kingdom
Annabel Gerry	Department for International Development, United Kingdom
Ilaria Miller	Cabinet Office, United Kingdom
Sophia Oliver	Cabinet Office, United Kingdom

United States

Lisa Ellman	US Government
Steven Goldrup	US Government
Andrew Stevenson	US Government

Paul Maassen	Independent Civil Society Coordinator on OGP, supporting the Civil Society Co-Chair

Open Government Partnership

Abhinav Bahl	Global Integrity - Open Government Partnership Networking Mechanism
Joseph Foti	Independent Reporting Mechanism Program Manager
Linda Frey	Open Government Partnership Support Unit
Julie McCarthy	Director, Open Government Partnership

I. Welcome and approval of minutes

The meeting opened with a welcome from the co-chairs, Minister Francis Maude and Tara Hidayat on behalf of the Governments of the United Kingdom and Indonesia, and Rakesh Rajani of Twaweza, filling in for the Civil Society Co-Chair Warren Krafchik of IBP who could not attend the meeting.

As the first point of order, the Steering Committee (SC) approved the minutes from the SC meeting of September 2012.

II. Peer Learning and Support Discussion

Networking Mechanism Update and Discussion

Abhinav Bahl of the OGP Networking Mechanism (NM) gave an update on work to date, lessons learned, and ideas for further enhancing work with OGP participating countries this year. He noted that while demand for NM assistance was initially weak, with only 8-9 governments actually requesting assistance, the NM has now switched to a more proactive role this year, specifically through reviewing action plans and targeting their services more directly at governments.

The NM is supporting regional outreach through in person meetings in Chile in January and Africa in May, trying to ensure robust CSO participation and an agenda that facilitates action plan implementation for each region. Lessons learned to date include a real hunger among civil society to commitments be implemented, a strong desire among governments to meet in person with each other and issue experts to facilitate effective knowledge exchange, and a major need for more coordination between OGP and the various multilateral bodies and initiatives eager to support OGP outreach and implementation and already doing quite a bit at the country level.

The NM noted that it would be helpful if Peer Learning and Support Sub-Committee members could work more closely with it to support government to government exchange, given their convening power, and to put the Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) on the agenda at OGP and multilateral meetings to clarify expectations about reporting and monitoring processes.

SC members asked whether the NM can demonstrate yet that it is spurring transfer of ideas, knowledge and innovation across countries. The NM noted that at this stage OGP is still trying to institutionalize learning, whether through in person exchanges, webinars, or documenting case studies across countries to highlight innovation such as checkmyschool, which has been done in the Philippines and then replicated in Indonesia. The test will then be whether the NM can effectively facilitate more intensive exchange around case studies on innovation. The NM also referred SC members to the briefing note it prepared, which summarized engagement and progress to date with OGP participating countries.

SC members also asked the NM to provide information about the outcomes of the assistance provided to the 8-9 governments that have requested it so far. It was noted that this information could help spur interest from other OGP participating countries.

Decision: Overall there was agreement on all sides that NM has not achieved sufficient traction, and that the working arrangements will need to be reviewed to arrest this challenge. This will include addressing the monitoring structure for the NM within the Steering Committee and how the Peer Learning and Support Sub-Committee and the Support Unit are engaging and supervising the NM.

Africa and Asia Regional Outreach Discussion

South Africa gave a report on an Africa regional outreach planning meeting held in South Africa on November 30, attended by the hosts, Tanzania and Kenya, with Liberia and Ghana absent on the government side, and Ghana, South Africa, Tanzania and Kenya on the civil society side. The meeting shared information about country developments, and the group also tentatively settled on a possible date, hosting, institutional arrangements and responsibilities. Kenya has offered to host a meeting in May 2013, and the Government of South Africa is going to confirm this arrangement with the Government of Kenya in the coming weeks. The Kenya meeting will focus on themes and outcomes related to action plans, and will also focus in particular on the four OGP eligibility criteria, so that countries from across Africa that are not currently participating can discuss progress and plans in these areas. A planning committee of regional governments and civil society will try to finalize a basic agenda by the end of the year.

The Government of Indonesia gave an update on the Bali Democracy Forum regional outreach session, where they introduced OGP to participants at a lunch event held during this high level summit in November. Palestine, Nigeria and Myanmar all expressed strong interest in participating, and Myanmar has subsequently announced it intends to become OGP eligible by 2016. Mongolia expressed concern about the status of its action plan, noting the domestic OGP process was not moving as fast as they would like because of internal political changes. There will be a Community of Democracies ministerial meeting on April 29, 2013 in Mongolia, which will be an opportunity both to do regional outreach, as well as for SC members to have more rigorous discussions with the Government on how make progress on its action plan. Mongolia currently serves as president of the Community of Democracies.

Regional Outreach Meeting Guidelines Discussion

The Support Unit presented the draft Regional Outreach Meeting Guidelines for discussion, noting the need for OGP to have quality control standards for meetings it attaches its name to and offers intensive support to implement. SC members were pleased to see the guidelines and requested that the document be amended to ask organizers to summarize lessons learned following meetings; and reframe the guidelines as principles. Other changes agreed include changing references to the independent OGP Civil Society Coordinator to the Civil Society Co-Chair and mentioning cost-effective alternatives to large in-person meetings and value for money considerations when organizing. It was also clarified that these guidelines only apply to official OGP branded events or events called in the name of OGP; governments and civil society may organize other meetings where OGP is discussed as a sub-agenda where these principles are encouraged but not required.

Decision: The OGP meeting guidelines/principles document was approved with these changes and clarifications.

III. Multilateral Partnership Discussion

At the request of the Governance and Leadership Sub-Committee, the US Government presented the draft OGP Framework for Multilateral Cooperation, noting the importance of identifying a means to enhance strategic cooperation and coordination with multilateral organizations and initiatives already working to support OGP at the country level. This enhancement of cooperation also implies more institutionalized coordination and increased efficiency through, for example, having one single contact point at each organization. SC members made the important distinction that this Framework is about association with multilateral organizations specifically and leveraging their capacity to support eligibility and action plan implementation, not official participation in OGP, which would entail a different set of potential steps on open government related to internal practices.

All noted that the Framework should facilitate flexible though focused cooperation, rather than create constraints. SC members also noted the importance of reaching out to a balanced set of multilateral partners at the regional level to ensure strong partners in all areas of activity. SC members also agreed that any assistance from multilateral organizations involving technical assessment or reports about the progress of OGP countries should avoid any implication of ranking.

SC members welcomed the Framework, and suggested a number of amendments. These include eliminating the time frame for considering letters of intent so as to not create expectations about response within a specific period; asking letters of intent to go beyond endorsement of OGP's mission to principles embodied in the OGP Declaration; ensuring that funding is explicitly captured as part of the assistance that multilateral organizations can provide; making the option of more intensive work plans with OGP more explicit; taking out mention of international initiatives, which will be dealt with in a separate policy paper; including a formal response letter from the Co-Chairs; clarifying that support is to all stakeholders, not just governments and; flesh out the section "after letters of intent" to discuss how multilaterals, OGP and other stakeholders will work to co-create work plans and activities together.

Decision: The Multilateral Partnership Framework was endorsed subject to the changes noted above, final version to be circulated to the SC for one last review before adoption.

IV. Eligibility Discussion

The Criteria and Standards Sub-Committee presented an eligibility concept note for SC consideration. The purpose of the document is to clarify the rationale for the criteria, as well as the processes for updating and disclosing eligibility-related information. The discussion focused specifically on the narrow question of whether or not to proactively disclose information about ineligible countries on the website. All SC members agreed that information about ineligible countries should be disclosed to third parties in response to requests. Certain SC members-both civil society and government-felt strongly that

given OGP's values and mission its default position should be proactive disclosure, that information on ineligible countries is already in the public domain, that it has tremendous value for aspiring countries to know where they stand on eligibility criteria so that they can take steps to improve, and that it would be better for OGP to release the information itself and provide appropriate context about it; not doing so may mean third parties would release it without the benefit of framing. These members expressed concern of the reputational risk to OGP of not proactively disclosing this information. Other SC members—one of them being Brazil[1]—were concerned that disclosing this information proactively would have the effect of appearing to rank and pass judgment on countries, which runs counter to their governments' foreign policies and the OGP Declaration of Principles. Similarly, these members felt that because OGP is a voluntary initiative, and ineligible countries did not ask to be assessed by OGP, it has no mandate to proactively disclose information about them that may be seen in a negative light, and that may discourage them from engaging with the OGP in the future.

Decision: The SC resolved that the best way to pursue its commitment to openness without harming the initiative or its members was to make information about ineligible countries available upon request to third parties, and to accompany the disclosure of this information with a clear statement/ constructive framing about how OGP encourages improvement and 'race to the top' from all countries rather than tiered analysis or ranking. The SC resolved to strike out the statement in the current version of the eligibility note that states OGP will not proactively disclose information about ineligible countries. The SC also agreed to clarify that eligibility performance will be addressed by the IRM specifically as they relate to commitments made in countries' action plans, and that the IRM reports will provide broader context on eligibility performance, whenever applicable, while refraining from making any judgment.

V. IRM Update and IEP Guidelines

The IRM Program Manager reported that the International Expert Panel is now complete, with all 8 invited members confirmed (3 Senior Advisors and 5 Technical Experts). He noted that the Criteria and Standards sub-committee has been working to develop an overall guidance document to inform the IEP's work, which was presented to the SC for consideration, and public comments on the IRM have now been incorporated where relevant into the concept note. The IRM concept note has also been amended to reflect the IEP Guiding Principles document, and the program manager has been developing a method note, local researchers TORs and other relevant materials for the IEP to discuss in the coming weeks.

The SC then discussed a number of decisions related to the IRM.

First, the Program Manager reported that the SC had received letters from Mary Robinson and Mo Ibrahim (newly appointed Senior Advisors) advising expansion of the IEP by two, or more, additional Senior Advisors to ensure greater regional balance – for example, by including Senior Advisors from Asia and Latin America. The SC accepted

[1] Exception to the Chatham-House rules adopted by the SC requested and authorized by the country.

this proposal, pending follow-up with Graça Machel, and resolved to follow a slightly modified version of the previous nominations process to identify two new advisors according to transparent criteria, and the rules on conflicts of interests drafted by the Criteria and Standard sub-committee and endorsed by the SC. The Criteria and Standards sub-committee will issue an open call for nominations specifically for Senior Advisors from Asia and Latin America, and they will also ask current IEP members for recommendations, as well as draw on any relevant candidates from the last round of nominations. The Criteria and Standards sub-committee will then assess the full combined pool of candidates according to transparent criteria, and present a shortlist to the larger Steering Committee for input and final approval. The sub-committee will ensure that there are multiple choices for each of the two new advisors, and that a full account of the process by which they were selected for the shortlist is provided. The SC noted, however, that the IRM should move forward with its work and not wait until the two additional advisers are appointed, given that the technical advisors are all on board and are the primary group charged with elaborating the IRM's methodology and overseeing research.

Decision: The SC approved the establishment of two additional senior advisors, pending follow-up with Graça Machel, and recommended that the work of the IRM should commence henceforth with the 3 senior advisors, 5 technical experts and Program Manager already in place.

Second, the SC discussed the IEP Guidelines document. The IRM Program Manager recalled that once this document is approved, the SC would delegate management of the IRM to the IEP to proceed with autonomy. Members noted the need for more specific language on the role of the IRM in providing context to eligibility-related developments, to ensure that the IRM does not stray into assessing eligibility of countries to join the OGP (which is overseen by the OGP Support Unit and the Criteria and Standards Sub-Committee) and focuses on action plan development and implementation. Members also recalled the importance of not micromanaging the IEP through this document, and respecting the expertise of the advisors and experts that have been recruited, while simultaneously providing clear guidance to clarify the overall scope of work.

Decision: The SC approved the IEP Guidance document with the emphases and phrasing changes noted above.

Third, the SC noted the importance of establishing a clear OGP annual calendar with explicit timelines for all reporting and plan development (IRM and Government Self-Assessments, action plan development and launch, etc.). The SC discussed the proposed timeline for IRM reports, and approved the publication of the first round of IRM reports for OGP's founding countries in September 2013. This date has been fixed, however, only for the first year of the IRM's work, due to the delays so far in its full establishment and start of operations. The SC will establish a calendar for subsequent years early next year, after discussions in and a proposal from the Criteria and Standards sub-committee.

Decision: As per preceding paragraph

VI. Government Self-Assessment Reports

The SC considered and approved guidance on government self-assessment reports, as well as the timeline for their publication in the next year.   Members agreed that for the founding 8 countries that presented their action plans in September 2011, the reporting deadline will be March 31, 2013. For countries that launched their plans in Brazil last April, reports would be due by September 30, 2013. Going forward, clear reporting timelines for all countries will be established and included in the overall OGP annual calendar to establish greater predictability for all stakeholders.

Decision: As per preceding paragraph

VII. Vibrancy and Engagement

The Government of Indonesia presented ideas on next steps after the first round of country action plans, which SC members welcomed as a means to make explicit the expectation that OGP is an ongoing effort rather than a one-off commitment for participating countries. Members particularly liked the ideas of asking countries to maintain (or increase) their current level of ambition to encourage continual progress, of allowing countries a grace period to update/refresh/create new action plans, and of maintaining momentum by potentially deepening OGP's work with other stakeholders. Members also endorsed the idea of active and inactive members, noting however the importance of verifying a country's desire to be rendered "inactive" before doing so, and taking every possible step to keep all current participants as "active" status partners, including through direct consultation with the relevant governments. Members noted that consistent with the structure and spirit of OGP, country action plans are to be "co-created" by governments and civil society. The group agreed that all participating countries should send a letter to the Co-Chairs confirming their desire to continue to participate in the initiative within three months of the publication of each IRM report. Members also agreed that language on inactive countries should be elaborated to clarify how "inactive" countries can reactivate their membership.

Decision: As per preceding paragraph

VIII. Finance Update and Government Funding Concept Note

The Support Unit gave an update on OGP's overall finances, presented the 2013-2014 two-year budget, discussed fundraising efforts to date and gave an overview of the Government Funding Concept Note, emphasizing the importance of OGP receiving additional resources in the bank in the very near term. The SU Director noted that several of OGP's grants are reimbursement agreements, rather than cash up front, which has created liquidity challenges. She noted that OGP was very low on cash for an organization of its size and will face serious liquidity issues if it does not get an injection of resources early in the New Year. She noted that a private foundation grant was expected in coming weeks, followed by several other private foundation grants late in the

first quarter and early in the second quarter of 2013, which should avert any immediate crisis. However, while civil society/private foundations had come through, funding from governments had been less reliable. Since OGP is built on equal partnership between governments and civil society, difficulties of obtaining predictable government financing was a concern. The civil society members from private foundations noted that for them to continue providing funding, they need to demonstrate that governments are also contributing their fair share.

Members agreed that the OGP budget contains only essential elements and therefore that the SC must come up with the resources to fully fund it. All SC members strongly agreed with the principle of reciprocity of funding (i.e. governments fund at least half of the budget). Members agreed that the current funding scheme of relying on only a few large foundations to fund 50 percent of the overall budget is too risky. Long term, this is not a sustainable scenario, and OGP needs to diversify its funding to include more governments, and additional private foundation and potentially multilateral donors. On the other hand, to avoid over dependence and potential undue influence of any one entity, members endorsed a ceiling of 25% of the OGP core budget coming from any one source. Moreover, OGP requires predictable multi-year funding commitments to do its work effectively. Members also noted the importance of ensuring that the Support Unit Director needs to spend limited time on fundraising so as to concentrate on more strategic activities.

The SC resolved that all government members of the SC should contribute at least 50 percent to the OGP budget, that contributions should be an expectation for all SC governments, that these commitments should be multi-year (subject to domestic approval and allocation rules) and that OGP should adopt a sliding scale for minimum contributions using the (World Bank) income categorization as follows: $200,000 per year of high-income countries, $100,000 per year for middle income countries and $50,000 per year for low income countries. Moreover, members resolved to also consider requesting contributions from participating countries not on the SC

Notwithstanding the above, members noted that the ability to contribute should not limit the participation of any entity in the Steering Committee, or be seen as a pre-condition to join the SC or OGP, and that alternative resources from other donors could potentially be found to pay their share in instances of hardship.

Members asked that going forward the budget presentation be accompanied by the previous years' budget to compare figures, and also that in-kind contributions such as those of the lead chair's hosting of the annual meetings be included in the budget. The SC also agreed that in-kind contributions of chairs to hosting meetings should be recognized more clearly as a note in the financial statements, but that they were not a substitute for countries contributing annually to OGP's core costs. Members suggested including a small reserves line item to begin accumulating contingency resources for OGP, and to also explore options for a line of credit as a last resort.

Decision: As per preceding four paragraphs

IX. Support Unit Staffing Update

The Support Unit Director provided a staffing update, noting and introducing the new OGP SU Director, Linda Frey, who will begin work on January 2, 2013, based in San Francisco. The OGP is finalizing appointment of a new program associate, also to be based in San Francisco. OGP is also recruiting for a Deputy Director, and is especially interested in qualified international candidates for the position, to be based in Washington, D.C. at OGP offices there. Once these three positions are on board, the new SU Director will take stock of needs and determine what additional new positions (likely 2) are needed, and will then proceed to recruit them in mid-2013 for an overall Support Unit of 5 people. OGP also welcomed Joseph Foti, the new IRM Program Manager, and noted that he would be hiring a program assistant in the New Year as well. Finally, the current Support Unit Director, Julie McCarthy, announced that she will be stepping down from her role as of December 31, 2012 and taking up a new position on open government issues at the Open Society Foundation, where she will continue to remain involved with and supportive of the OGP.

X. Disclosure Policy Update

The Support Unit updated the SC on efforts to address workflow challenges related to information requests, and clarified the current policy with respect to the authority of the Support Unit, the eligibility of sub-committee draft documents for disclosure, and the non-confidentiality of stakeholder correspondence with OGP. The Support Unit also informed the SC that it would be moving in the New Year to create an independent appeals mechanism—per OGP's disclosure policy—for requests denied by the Support Unit and Steering Committee.

XI. CSO Rotation Proposal

On behalf of the civil society co-chair, the independent civil society coordinator, Paul Maassen, summarized the proposal for a new, transparent process for identifying civil society candidates to rotate onto the OGP Steering Committee. Paul noted the public consultation on the proposal to date and the desire to move away from the current "one vote per civil society representative per country" approach envisioned in the Articles of Governance. Per the proposal, civil society will use an open nominations process and transparent criteria to come up with a balanced set of candidates along regional, thematic and gender lines, by March 2013. This will mean that civil society rotation will not be in sync with government rotation slated for October 2013 (see below), and three new civil society SC representatives will have to serve an extra 6 months so that rotation schedules can sync up again going forward.

Decision: The SC approved the proposal, and resolved to amend the OGP Articles of Governance accordingly. The CSO rotation document will also be amended to replace the Independent Civil Society Coordinator with the OGP Civil Society Co-Chair.

XII. Government Rotation Proposal

The Government of Indonesia presented a proposal for Government rotation, which would involve moving rotation from March 2013 as originally scheduled (when the next OGP annual meeting had been anticipated) to October 2013 when the next OGP annual meeting will be held.   SC members agreed to move rotation to the next annual meeting in October 2013. This more realistic time frame will ensure that OGP has a credible, transparent process for soliciting a diverse slate of nominations, and ensuring that communication challenges or rushed consultations do not interfere with this important process. The October date will also align with co-chair rotation at the annual meeting, and allow government stakeholders to vote in person. Some members noted concern about the viability of moving to online voting for government rotation off the SC at this point in OGP's development. One member noted concerns about certain members being asked to volunteer to rotate off while others were encouraged to remain on, and all SC members agreed on the need to move forward with full transparency, fairness and trust regarding rotation discussions. SC members also underscored the importance of confirming with the new Mexican government its intention to serve as the next co-chair of OGP; this will serve to inform planning for a possible vote, if needed, for the next incoming OGP co-chair.

Decision: The SC adopted the proposed new timeframe and resolved that a vote on government members to rotate off in October 2013 will take place in July 2013, possibly virtually, through a fair and transparent process. OGP will amend the Articles of Governance to reflect these changes with respect to Government Rotation as well as Co-Chair selection. OGP will confirm Mexico's intent to serve as the next co-chair of OGP.

XIII. Steering Committee Decision-Making Processes Discussion

The UK Government presented a proposal to clarify and improve SC decision making processes such that they help the SC and its sub-committees work more efficiently and effectively, and enable better distinction between routine matters and strategic issues. The proposal envisages a more structured way for the SC to have input into sub-committee work, while still ensuring that sub-committees undertake the heavy lifting.

The SC approved the proposal, noting that they would review and refine it as needed. The SC agreed that all sub-committees must begin operating at the same level of intensity, and future SC agendas should be organized according to sub-committees agendas. All SC meetings will also be organized such that there is a reporting on what has been accomplished since the last meeting at the start of each session, and the meeting concludes with a review of what is on the agendas of each of the sub-committees going forward. The SC agreed as a point of order that minutes from previous meetings will henceforth be summarized, reviewed and approved at the beginning of all meetings. The SC agreed that sub-committee members that are unable to join particular meetings will be given an opportunity to comment on sub-committee decisions within a reasonable timeframe before moving forward with sub-committee business. The SC agreed that

going forward, the sub-committees should have face-to-face meetings on the margins of SC meetings, and SC meetings should generally be of at least one and half days to ensure discussions are not rushed. The SC also agreed that each sub-committee would have a (government or civil society) chair, to be elected in the coming weeks, to ensure effective functioning as per above agreements. Some members expressed concern about who would be responsible for carrying out the tasks in the proposal, and about it being potentially onerous. One member noted the positive feedback received regarding the posting of draft SC meeting documents online prior to the meeting, as representing excellent practice that should be continued.

Decision: As per preceding paragraph

XIV. Update from UK on Vision and Meeting Timing

The UK Government summarized its lead chair priorities, with a focus on the role of transparency in driving economic growth and prosperity for all, securing the foundation for OGP as a globally recognized and respected initiative, and focusing on the relationship between governments and civil society in delivering on action plan implementation. The UK Government noted this was a time for delivering on the OGP promise with concrete realization of commitments and having the IRM function robustly. The risk of OGP becoming an empty self-congratulatory effort for governments should be avoided, and that the active civil society position and role at all levels of the OGP structure and functioning was an essential antidote to this complacency.

The SC agreed that the next SC meeting would be ministerial level, and would take place in April 2013 in London, dates to be circulated for agreement within two weeks of this meeting. A working level SC meeting will also take place in July 2013, and then the annual High Level Conference will take place October 31-November 1, 2013, with an SC meeting on October 30. The group also agreed there will be some kind of OGP event on the margins of the next UN General Assembly in New York in September 2013 to launch the first round of IRM reports.

The Chair then thanked the Support Unit Director for her service and work she had done to launch the initiative in its early days, and the entire SC joined him in noting their appreciation for the remarkable role she had played in the establishment of the OGP.

Appendix A. Steering Committee Meeting Agenda

Schedule of Meetings
Open Government Partnership, 3-5 December, London

This note contains times and locations for all meetings – including:
- Overview of meetings held over the three days
- Sub-Committees Agenda
- Steering Committee Agenda
- Peer Engagement Agenda

Overview

Monday 3 December: Sub-Committee meetings, 13.00-17.00

These are <u>working-level</u> meetings to allow for preparation ahead of discussion with Principals / Ministers the following day. Agendas will mirror key discussion points for SteerCo the next day. <u>All Steering Committee delegations are welcome to send representatives,</u> whether or not you are a regular member of the sub-committee.

Venue: Locarno Suite Conference Room, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, King Charles Street, Whitehall, London, SW1A 2AH - Click on link for MAP

- 13.00-14.00: Peer Engagement
- 14.00-15.45: Criteria and Standards
- 16.00-17.00: Governance and Leadership and Finance & Audit

Tuesday 4 December: Steering Committee: 9.00-18.00

Full Steering Committee meeting, including Principals / Ministers

Venue: Locarno Suite, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, King Charles Street, Whitehall, London, SW1A 2AH – Click on link for MAP

Tuesday 4 December: OGP Reception: 18.15-20.00

Standing reception to which all Steering Committee delegates and participants in the Peer Engagement event are invited.

Venue: Admiralty House, Ripley Courtyard, Whitehall, SW1A 2DY (Map attached)

Wednesday 5 December: Peer Engagement Session: 9.00-17.30

This session is targeted at representatives from countries new to OGP; it is predominantly a <u>working-level</u> event, and <u>Steering Committee members are not expected to attend</u> unless invited to facilitate or present at the session.

Venue: Admiralty House, Ripley Courtyard, Whitehall, SW1A 2DY (Map attached)

Agenda for Working-Level Sub-Committee Meetings
3rd December 2012

1300 – 1400   PLS Sub-Committee

1. Discussion on Networking Mechanism activities

2. Discussion of regional outreach events and activities in 2013 (Governments of South Africa and Philippines, Support Unit)

3. Encouraging greater peer-exchange among governments

1400 – 1545:   Criteria and Standards Sub-Committee Agenda

1. IRM - proposal for additional senior advisers

2. Vision for eligibility criteria

3. Guidance for IEP on IRM reporting

4. Government Self-Assessment Template

1545-1600:   Break

1600 – 1730:   Governance and Leadership & Finance and Audit Sub-Committee Agenda

1. Multilateral Engagement Document

2. Vision for country participation after first round of Action Plans

3. Government funding

4. Steering Committee rotation – proposal on process

5. Proposal on OGP decision-making

Agenda for
Ministerial-Level Steering Committee of the Open Government Partnership
4th December 2012

0830-0900: **Arrival and Coffee**
0900 – 0915: **Welcome**
- Agree agenda and Co-Chairs' Welcome

0915 – 1000: **Peer Learning & Support**
Reports:
- NM learning from recent in-person regional meetings and related networking activities
- PLS plans to support regional outreach events and activities in 2013

Discussion:
- Process and criteria for OGP regional or themed events - *Proposal paper*
- How to track and support OGP developments at regional and country level

1000 – 1100: **Opening discussion – Engagement with international and multilateral fora**
Discussion:
- Multilateral and international fora – *Multilateral engagement framework paper and specific proposals*

1100 – 1115: **Break**
1115 – 1230: **Criteria and Standards – Part I**
Reports
- Report from IRM Programme Manager

Discussion Part I
- Proposal for additional senior advisors – *Letter from Current Senior Advisors*
- Discuss vision for eligibility criteria – *Eligibility concept paper*

1230 – 1330: **Lunch**
13:30– 1430: **Criteria and Standards – Part II**
Discussion Part II
- Approve guidance for IEP on IRM reporting – *IEP guidance paper*
- Approve template for Government self-assessment - *Proposed template*

1430 – 1500: Vibrancy and engagement
Discussion:
- Vision for Country Participation After First Round of Action Plans – *Next Generation OGP Concept Paper*

1500 – 1530: Finance & Audit
Reports:
- 2013-2014 budget
- Report on funding secured to date

Discussion:
- Government funding – 2 year cycle, encouraging contributions from wider pool of participating countries - *Government funding paper*

1530 - 1600: Break

1600 – 1700: Governance & Leadership
Reports:
- Support Unit staffing
- Disclosure Policy Update

Discussion
- Steering Committee rotation –*, Proposal on Process for Rotating, Proposal for Revised CSO Rotation Process*

1700-1730 Decision-making in the OGP
Discussion
- Proposal for improving decision-making processes within the Steering Committee and its Sub-Committees

1730 – 1740: Update on Lead Co-Chair vision and timing for SC meetings and plenary 2013

1740- 1750: AOB

1815 – 2000: Reception for Steering Committee and Peer Exchange participants

OGP Peer Exchange Meeting Draft Agenda
December 5, 2012

9:00am-10:00am	**Opening Plenary**: **Reflections from Governments and Civil Society on Action Plan Development**

Moderator: **Roberta Solis-Ribeiro, Government of Brazil**

Tara Hidayat, Government of Indonesia
Juan Pardinas, IMCO, Mexico
Minister Mathias Chikawe, Government of Tanzania
Alan Hudson, ONE Campaign, United Kingdom

Reflections on action plan development and implementation to date, lessons learned and hard-won advice, moderated in journalistic style

---

10:00am-10:30am   **Coffee Break and Networking**

10:30am-12:30pm   **Breakout Groups: Progress on Action Plans to Date**

New OGP countries will make 7-minute presentations on their action plans during the first hour, moderated by an SC member. The second hour will kicked off by a CSO discussant, followed by open Q and A with an audience of SC members, governments, civil society and multilaterals.

[Each country presentation will cover (1) current state of play with respect to civil society consultation and action plan development internally, (2) Key open government themes that action plans will likely focus on, (3) goals for finalizing action plan including estimated timeline and (4) areas they need assistance on]

Group I

Moderator: **Stephen Walker, Government of Canada**

1. Liberia
2. Ghana
3. Argentina
4. Costa Rica
5. Trinidad and Tobago

6. Panama

CSO Discussant: **Alexandre Ciconello, INESC, Brazil**

Open Q and A

Group II

Moderator: **Suneeta Kaimal, Revenue Watch Institute**

1. Russia
2. Serbia
3. Finland
4. Hungary
5. Lithuania
6. Mongolia

CSO Discussant: **Sandor Lederer, K-Monitor Watchdog for Public Funds, Hungary**

Open Q and A

12:30pm-1:30pm	**Lunch: Open Networking Time**

1:30pm-3:45pm   **Action Plan "How To" Breakout Sessions**

During Part I, participants will alternate between two 45-minute sessions running in parallel on (1) civil society consultation and (2) action plan development, where speakers will share learning and best practice to date from OGP countries.

During Part II, participants will get to choose one additional 45 minute session from among two options running in parallel: (1) How to Drive Interagency Engagement and (2) An Introduction to the Independent Reporting Mechanism

1:30pm-3:00pm   *Part I.*

*I. How to Organize Ongoing Public Consultations and Mobilize CSOs on OGP Action Plans—***Paul Maassen, Independent OGP Civil Society Coordinator**

	II. How to Create Effective Commitments and Benchmarks for Action Plans—**Abhinav Bahl, Networking Mechanism**
3:00pm-3:45pm	*Part II:*
	I. How to Drive Inter-agency Engagement, Build Momentum and Sustain Political Will on OGP action Plans—**Government of Mexico (Alfonso Onate, IFAI) and Government of United States**
	II. An Introduction to the OGP Independent Reporting Mechanism—**Joseph Foti, IRM Program Manager**

3:45pm-4:00pm	**Coffee Break and Networking Time**

4:00pm-4:30pm	**Plenary: Support from Multilateral Organizations**
	The World Bank and OECD will discuss ways that they seek to support OGP countries.
4:30pm-5:00pm	**Updates from Aspiring OGP Countries**
	Chaired by Government of Indonesia
	Observer countries will share ongoing efforts in their countries to promote open government and/or become eligible to participate in OGP.
5:00pm-5:30pm	**Plenary: Reflections on Progress and Next Steps**
	Chaired by Government of United Kingdom
	Moderators and discussants from morning sessions share insights from group discussions
	Co-chairs offer final reflections

Office hours during breaks: The OGP Support Unit will be in the hallway with on-boarding packets and available for people to visit and ask questions about OGP 101 during breaks.