

**Open Government Partnership
Criteria and Standards Subcommittee monthly call**

Tuesday January 17, 2017

*10:00 WASHINGTON / 12:00 BUENOS AIRES – SANTIAGO / 16:00 MADRID / 17:00 BUCHAREST -
JOHANNESBURG*

Agenda items

- 1. Co-creation updates and final approval timeline**
- 2. Update on country performance: NAPs and SARs received**
- 3. Montenegro letter**
- 4. Hungary debrief**
- 5. Azerbaijan summit meeting report back**
- 6. General updates**

Participants:

- Francisco Sánchez, Rodrigo Mora; Government of Chile
- Radu Puchiu; Government of Romania
- Camille Eiss, Cori Zarek; Government of the United States
- Nathaniel Heller; Results for Development Institute (R4D)
- Suneeta Kaimal, NRGi
- Helen Darbishire, Access Info Europe
- Maria Baron, Directorio Legislativo
- Paul Maassen, Joe Powell, Alonso Cerdan, Helen Turek: Support Unit (SU)
- Denisse Miranda, IRM
- Tim Hughes, Involve

Summary

1. Co-creation updates and final approval timeline

The Support Unit (SU) met with the International Experts (IEP) in December to discuss the new co-creation guidelines. The IEP expressed some concern regarding the measurability of some of the requisites included. They provided detailed input by early January, and the SU has worked to include their comments. The version for CS approval was presented by Tim Hughes during the subcommittee call, noting the following main changes:

- Change to the structure, high-level components are laid out first, followed by detailed elements
- Change to title, now entitled 'Participation and co-creation standards'
- Worked on the level of specificity
- Worked to tighten language to ensure measurability
- Minor additions in content

The following initial comments were given by CS:

- There is a need to give feedback on how the inputs were managed and incorporated. Tim Hughes will be writing a blogpost outlining the process. In future, it is recommended that a clear means of managing and making all inputs public would be put in place from the beginning of the process.
- SU, IRM and SC will have to play a role to disseminate the standards. SU is planning outreach using webinars, blogposts, updating the point of contact manual. A full handbook on participation techniques is likely to be developed next year. IRM will be working with researchers to ensure they are well-placed to assess and answer any questions on the standards.

CS will have one week for final signoff. The SU will then incorporate any final comments and share with the full Steering Committee before publishing on February 6. These steps are in line with the decisions taken at the SC meeting in New York. During February the SU will prepare the updated POC Manual with the new requirements and host two webinars to further raise awareness regarding the new Guidelines. It will also start developing a fuller guidance handbook. It is important to note that the IRM/IEP will have time to develop a fuller monitoring protocol the next few months and that CS will have an opportunity to review initial experiences with the new guidelines in the second half of the year.

Action items:

- a. CS to approve the final version of the Co-Creation Guidelines by January 24.
- b. The SU will share for information with the Steering Committee on January 27.
- c. The new co-creation guidelines will be published on February 6.

2. Update on country performance: NAPs and SARs received

In 2016, 10 countries out of the 51 that were due to deliver a NAP in 2016 failed to do so (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cape Verde, Croatia, Denmark, Moldova, Montenegro, Papua New Guinea, Spain, Tanzania, and Trinidad and Tobago). All of them have been informed that they have shifted to the odd year cohort. Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Tanzania and Trinidad and Tobago remain under review. All 15 subnational government delivered their Action Plans on time.

In 2016, the SU expected 56 Self-assessment reports (16 mid-term reports and 44 End of term reports), 41 of which were delivered (14 mid-term and 27 end of term). This means that if the SU does not receive the remaining ones, 16 countries would have been found acting contrary to process (2 for failure to deliver midterm and 14 for end of term). That would mean four more countries are under review (Denmark, Moldova and Sweden), one of which delivered a new NAP in 2016.

Proposed action items:

- a. Review of this process during the rules of the game discussion.

3. Montenegro letter

During our November 9 call, the subcommittee agreed for Australia and Montenegro that “if a NAP is not submitted to the Support Unit by the end of 2016, the subcommittee will automatically recommend that the full Steering Committee should then consider designating both countries as inactive in OGP at its next in person meeting in 2017. The Support Unit should communicate this to those countries.”

Australia has delivered their Action Plan and are now officially no longer under review. Montenegro failed to deliver their NAP.

The Support Unit proposes the following steps:

- An update from CS to the full SC, announcing that if no NAP is received before the next in-person SC meeting that CS will recommend making Montenegro inactive directly (no further delay).
- An appeal to all members to reach out to the government of Montenegro so they re-engage with OGP, as soon as possible to develop a new NAP

Action items:

- a. Australia case to be closed and removed from the list of countries under review. **Completed.**
- b. SU to prepare an ‘at-a-glance’ chart of all countries currently being discussed by CS, with essential details of each case and progress. **Completed.**
- c. SU will prepare and CS chairs will approve a letter to the Steering Committee that outlines the Montenegro case and informs them of the proposed CS recommendation to make Montenegro inactive at the July Steering Committee Meeting. That letter will also include a request to all members to reach out to the government of Montenegro so they re-engage with OGP, as soon as possible to develop a new NAP.
- d. SU will prepare and CS will approve a letter to the Government of Montenegro informing them of the planned decision per July and urge them to re-engage in order to avoid inactivity.

4. Hungary debrief

On December 7, 2016, the OGP Steering Committee received a [letter](#) from the Government of Hungary announcing its immediate withdrawal from the partnership. The floor was opened for comments, reflections, lessons from the subcommittee.

The government representatives of the Steering Committee have produced and co-signed an open letter of response to the Hungarian government to be sent this week. An ensuing discussion raised concerns about the importance of the Steering Committee speaking with one voice vs. the difficulty of reaching a consensus on messaging and the need to remain nimble. Additional points were raised with regards to choosing the right political moment for sending such a letter, the strength of messaging, and the impact of the letter on OGP’s reputation.

Action items:

- a. The GL civil society co-chairs will be requested to raise the letter and the concerns discussed by CS with GL.
- b. The concerns discussed should be widened to the rest of the Steering Committee with a view to improving any similar processes in the future.

- c. Peter Varga, Europe Civil Society coordinator, will visit Budapest next week and debrief with Civil Society (filers) and staff from the actively engaged embassies. The CS will get a brief from this trip.

5. Azerbaijan summit meeting report back

During the Summit, the Azerbaijan taskforce met with representatives from the Government of Azerbaijan. The next step is for the taskforce will visit Baku in order to assess the way in which they are addressing the concerns raised by civil society and offer support. The taskforce will meet with a diverse group of stakeholders.

During the Summit SU and civil society members of the taskforce met with a broad group of civil society representatives from Azerbaijan. Nathaniel Heller and Suneeta Kaimal reported the following takeaways:

- There has been surface level progress on the enabling environment in Azerbaijan, e.g. unfreezing of bank accounts, consensus on draft regulations designed to simplify grant registration. However, it is too early to see the real impact of this progress.
- Azeri civil society has different approaches to working, with different organisations for and against engagement with the government.
- Suneeta Kaimal highlighted that NRG1 is working with the Ukrainian government to host a Eurasia event in Kiev next month, and Azeri civil society is invited to attend.
- Also highlighted that EITI is also reviewing participation of Azerbaijan.

Action items:

- a. SU to clarify the composition of the taskforce with the French and Georgian governments.
- b. SU will confirm the date of the Baku visit and make the necessary arrangements.
- c. Next steps regarding Azerbaijan OGP participation should be proposed at the CS meeting taking place in April. Will then be able to make decision at the next full SC meeting in the 3rd week of July.

6. General updates

On Response Policy Review: SU contacted ICNL to lead the review of the Response policy, including proposing revisions. If they agree, they will work closely with the SU and CS (chairs).

On Australia Response policy case: review team will assess if the [Australian Government response](#) indicate that the issue is being addressed domestically. If so, as per the [Response Policy Procedure and Protocols](#), “no further action would be needed” and the review process would be finalized. Otherwise, the review will carry on with the support of a consultant.

Action items:

- a. Secure another government representative to join the review team (currently Helen Darbshire,

Suneeta Kaimal and the Government of Chile).