

OGP Subcommittee Meetings

September 23, 2014

New York City

OGP Peer Learning and Support (PLS) Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

PLS Subcommittee Mandate

Martin Tisné walked members through the revised mandate of the Peer Learning and Support (PLS) Subcommittee. He first clarified the role of the PLS as distinct from other subcommittees, which are largely policy-focused. He then summarized the Oversight, Advise, and Direct Engagement functions of the PLS, outlining key priorities under each category.

There was broad consensus on the revised mandate and priorities. Participants noted that the revised framework accurately described the work of the PLS Subcommittee and provided a useful structure for engagement on peer exchange.

Participants also provided suggestions to refocus the work of the PLS Subcommittee in accordance with its revised mandate. The following suggestions were discussed:

- The subcommittee should determine practical ways in which it will perform its oversight function in line with its mandate.
- The subcommittee should regularly self-report on individual member's peer exchange efforts, discussing specific examples to determine which approaches work best.

The discussion concluded with the subcommittee taking stock of individual member contributions to peer exchange on country eligibility, action plan design and implementation, and external outreach to promote OGP.

Peer Exchange Strategy

The Support Unit walked participants through key components of its Peer Exchange Strategy. Members broadly agreed on the strategy and suggested the following points for future consideration and implementation:

- Determine how multilateral partners can be used more effectively to support the Support Unit's peer exchange program.
- Consider using baseline data from the IRM to determine peer exchange and learning needs and to inform the Support Unit's peer exchange activities.
- Establish ways of systematically tracking peer exchange occurring across the partnership.

Private Sector Council

The PLS Subcommittee discussed the letter from the Private Sector Council requesting guidance on how the council can support OGP objectives in the coming year. Members acknowledged the work of the council thus far, particularly on outreach. The subcommittee decided that the council should continue

calling itself the Private Sector Council and should continue working independent of OGP until the end of the Working Group pilot as outlined in its letter. The subcommittee stressed that the Private Sector Council should not call itself the 'OGP Private Sector Council' as it would denote official affiliation with OGP.

Following the pilot, the council should report on the results of its efforts and make recommendations on how to effectively engage the private sector in OGP to the PLS Subcommittee.

Working Groups

The PLS Subcommittee was joined by the Working Group co-anchors for a discussion on how to help the Working Groups scale up their activities and increase their impact.

The co-anchors shared with subcommittee members progress achieved to date and identified key areas where they need clearer guidance from the Support Unit. Participants suggested the development of draft guidelines that can guide the Working Groups, which should be agreed by all co-anchors. It was suggested that these guidelines should be developed before the end of the pilot period to accelerate the institutionalization of the Working Groups in OGP.

Mandate and Functions

The Working Groups requested clearer guidance on their mandate, status, and authority within the context of OGP's strategic objectives and theory of change. Moreover, they seek closer integration with OGP processes—particularly the action plan cycle—to take advantage of strategic opportunities for intervention and support. The Working Groups raised the following points for further clarification:

- What is the status of the expert input that they provide to government POCs on their draft action plans? In other words, on whose behalf do the Working Groups speak when they provide technical expertise and advice to countries?
- Can the Working Groups play more of a proactive advocacy role rather than a demand-driven advisory role with the broader goal of promoting more ambitious OGP commitments and better implementation?
- What measures can ensure the integrity of the national process (i.e. consultations between government and civil society are not being circumvented) when Working Groups assist OGP countries?
- To what extent can Working Groups promote international open government norms? What happens if norms are contested (e.g. in the natural resources governance space)?
- How can the Working Group activities be linked to IRM findings for greater strategic impact?

Governance

The subcommittee recognized the energy and interest generated by the Working Groups, which, in part, are a product of the flexibility they enjoy. Noting some clear distinctions in how the different groups are governed, the Working Groups seek the development of minimal standards to bring consistency and accountability to all five groups, without compromising their flexibility. The Working Groups raised the following points for further clarification:

- Can the Working Groups develop partnerships with external groups on their own?
- What are the parameters for the participation of multilateral institutions in the Working Groups?
- What are the minimum standards of transparency that should govern Working Groups?

- How can the Working Groups ensure widespread participation in activities beyond their anchors and Steering Committee members?

Fundraising

Participants noted the varying levels of success of the groups' fundraising efforts and differed on the extent of Support Unit funding required for each group. The Working Groups requested flexibility in deciding how to spend funds allocated to each group. However, they would like more guidance on raising external funds, coordinating fundraising efforts with the Support Unit, and allocating funds to Working Group activities. The Working Groups raised the following points for further clarification:

- Are Working Groups responsible for raising external funds?
- What are the rules governing external fundraising and linkages with the Support Unit? For example, are the co-anchors in charge of raising funds on behalf of the Working Groups or their anchor organizations?
- How are the funds to be allocated and who makes decisions on spending?
- From OGP's perspective, what are the expected expenses for the Working Groups?

Communication

The Working Groups also discussed internal and external communication practices and recommended developing networks of line ministry contacts (beyond the POCs) that can participate in peer exchange activities. The Working Groups raised the following points for further clarification:

- Can Working Groups proactively reach out to POC and line ministry contacts?
- Can the Working Groups be more critical than the Support Unit on feedback to countries?
- How can activities be better coordinated across Working Groups?
- How can information sharing among Working Groups be made more effective?

Following the discussion, it was suggested that the working group pilot phase may be shortened to end earlier than the planned July 2015 end date (considering the pace of progress to date).

Closing

Martin Tisné thanked participants and closed the meeting.

PLS Participants

Norway

Terje Dyrstad
Asbjørn Seim

Ministry of Local Government and Modernisation
Ministry of Local Government and Modernisation

Philippines

Patrick Lim
Tania Maxima

Department of Budget and Management
Department of Budget and Management

South Africa

Lebohang Mafokosi
Xolisile Dlamini

Department of Public Service and Administration
Department of Public Service and Administration

United Kingdom

Kitty von Bertele

Cabinet Office

Civil Society Members

Martin Tisne

Aruna Roy
Nikhil Dey
Veronica Cretu
Iara Pietricovsky

Transparency and Accountability Initiative (Omidyar Network)
MKSS
MKSS
Open Government Institute
INESC

Working Groups

Laura Neuman (ATIWG)
Ximena Puente (ATIWG)
Joel Salas (ATIWG)
Sanjeev Khagram (FOWG)
Ken Wollack (LOWG)
Greg Brown (LOWG)
Stephen Walker (ODWG)
Carole Excell (ONRWG)

Carter Center
IFAI
IFAI
Global Initiative for Fiscal Transparency
National Democratic Institute
National Democratic Institute
Government of Canada
World Resources Institute

Observing

United States

Lawrence Sperling

Department of State

OGP Staff

Abhinav Bahl
Alonso Cerdan
Paul Maassen

Support Unit
Support Unit
Support Unit, Civil Society Engagement

Note: the Criteria and Standards (CS) and Governance and Leadership (GL) Subcommittees held closed sessions to prepare for the Steering Committee meeting on September 25. Short summaries have been provided.

OGP Criteria and Standards (CS) Subcommittee Working Session

Summary

During the meeting of the Criteria and Standards Subcommittee, participants discussed (1) the final contents of the proposed IRM Charter, (2) proposed changes to the Asset Disclosure Database for and (3) the approach to the OGP Response Policy. The Subcommittee reaffirmed the drafts and written and discussed how to present the proposals to the larger, working-level Steering Committee meeting. In addition the subcommittee agreed a communications strategy for changes in the asset disclosure metric, to be implemented if the Steering Committee meeting agreed the proposed changes.

CS Participants

Brazil

Claudia Taya
Roberta Solis Ribeiro

Office of the Comptroller General of Brazil
Office of the Comptroller General of Brazil

Tanzania

Obey Assery
Susan Mlawi

Prime Minister's Office
Government State House

United States

Lawrence Sperling
Corinna Zarek

Department of State
White House

Civil Society Members

Maryati Abdullah
Alejandro Gonzalez
Warren Krafchik

Publish What You Pay (Indonesia)
GESOC
International Budget Partnership

Observing

South Africa

Alex Lesiba Mahapa
Zamokwakhe Somhlaba

Department of Public Service and Administration
Department of Public Service and Administration

OGP Staff

Joe Powell
Jack Mahoney
Joseph Foti

Support Unit
Support Unit
Independent Reporting Mechanism

OGP Governance and Leadership (GL) Subcommittee Working Session

Meeting Summary

During the meeting participants discussed the following:

- 1) Final preparations and run of show for the OGP High-Level Event on September 24th
- 2) Final review of the agenda and chairing responsibilities for the OGP Steering Committee Meeting on September 25th
- 3) Key talking points for the OGP Donor Meeting on September 25th
- 4) Timeline for GL to discuss the options memo presented by Harmon, Curran, ideally at an in-person meeting in November.

GL Participants

Indonesia

Tara Hidayat

Fithya Findie

President's Delivery Unit (UKP4)

President's Delivery Unit (UKP4)

Mexico

Guillermo Ruiz de Teresa Mariscal

Roberto de León

Coordinator of the National Digital Strategy

Ministry of Foreign Affairs

South Africa

Deputy Minister Ayanda Dlodlo

Alex Lesiba Mahapa

Zamokwakhe Somhlaba

Department of Public Service and Administration

Department of Public Service and Administration

Department of Public Service and Administration

United Kingdom

Oliver Buckley

Cabinet Office

Civil Society Members

Alejandro Gonzalez

Suneeta Kaimal

Warren Krafchik

Rakesh Rajani

GESOC

Natural Resource Governance Institute

International Budget Partnership

Twaweza

OGP Staff

Linda Frey

Joe Powell

Support Unit

Support Unit