**INTERNATIONAL AID TRANSPARENCY INITIATIVE**

**THIRD MEETING OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE**

**WEDNESDAY 30TH SEPTEMBER 2009, DFID, LONDON**

The third Steering Committee meeting of the International Aid Transparency Initiative was held in London on 30th September 2009. Members of the Steering Committee attended along with observers (see attached list.) The meeting was chaired by Sarah Cooke, DFID.

1. **Agenda**
	1. Update on progress since last meeting
	2. Plans for IATI Conference and Annual Meetings briefing
	3. Proposed decision making process on IATI standards
	4. Report on key findings from partner country consultations
	5. Report on key findings from CSO consultations
	6. Report on key findings from fact finding missions, cost benefit analysis and IATI pilots
	7. Presentation and discussion on draft proposals for what information will be published under IATI
	8. Discussion on draft proposals for IATI Code of Conduct
	9. IATI and links to DAC Cluster C
	10. IATI Steering Committee membership
	11. AOB
2. **Update on IATI progress to date**
	1. Romilly Greenhill, IATI Co-ordinator at DFID, presented the summary workplan and budget for IATI. She highlighted that IATI remains under-funded and that additional resources are required.
	2. The Netherlands requested a more output and outcome oriented budget in future. Germany expressed an interest in funding the technical work for IATI. UNDP noted that they had provided in-kind contributions through their support for the partner country consultations and UNDP Country Offices had funded the participation of additional representatives from partner countries.
3. **IATI Conference and Annual Meetings Lunch**
	1. Romilly Greenhill presented the latest draft of the IATI Conference programme. It was clarified that the conference is a consultation meeting rather than a decision making meeting, and that the final decision on the areas for inclusion in the IATI standards will be made by the Steering Committee. Steering Committee members requested more information on the participants. **Action: Secretariat to share information on participants.**
	2. Proposals made by the Steering Committee on the conference programme were: the need to have break out groups focused on the question of how IATI will be implemented and on how it will support partner country aid information management systems (AIMS); the need for more information on the costs and benefits of implementing IATI and on the synergies with existing initiatives; and the need to re-arrange the agenda for the morning of day 1 to avoid repetition, in particular by focusing the first part of the morning on transparency and development and the second part on transparency and aid effectiveness. **Action: Secretariat to update the programme in light of SC comments.**
	3. Romilly also informed SC members that there would be a high level lunch on IATI in the margins of the World Bank Annual Meetings in Istanbul. The lunch would be hosted by Minouche Shafik, DFID’s Permanent Secretary and a senior official from Rwanda. All IATI signatories had been invited.
4. **Proposed decision making process on the IATI standards**
	1. Romilly Greenhill presented the proposed decision making process, namely that: decisions on the IATI standards would be made by the IATI membership (signatories and endorsers) and the IATI Steering Committee; decisions would be made by consensus; and that all IATI signatories would be represented by one of the SC members.
	2. There was some discussion on whether the IATI proposals needed to be endorsed by the WP-EFF and whether IATI should also place obligations on partner countries.
5. **Report on key findings from the partner country consultations**
	1. Dasa Silovic of UNDP presented the report on the six regional partner country consultations conducted by UNDP. She noted that turn- out had been very high, with 74 countries participating. She reported that ahead of the consultations awareness of IATI had been low, but that a lot of interest in IATI had been expressed during the consultations. Partner countries are looking to IATI to ensure that they receive a more robust flow of information. Key concerns raised from partners included: what is new? Will this global mechanism replace national mechanisms? What is the role of partner countries? What is the value added of IATI in relation to other initiatives? There were also concerns about capacity to implement the proposed IATI standards. More communications and capacity building work is required to keep partner countries updated and engaged, and this has budget implications.
	2. Issues raised in the discussion included: the need for more clarity on the role of partner countries in IATI; the need for greater clarity that IATI will be flexible and tailored to country needs; the need to clarify the limits of IATI, in particular that it cannot be responsible for capacity building on aid management; the priority placed by partners on a strong code of conduct to ensure donor compliance. It was also highlighted that some information is owned by the partner countries; therefore both donors and partners will need to work together to increase transparency.
6. **Report on key findings from CSO consultations**
	1. Henri Valot from Civicus presented the key findings of the CSO consultations implemented by Reality of Aid. Reality of Aid have conducted 4 regional CSO consultations which have been supplemented by consultations in Europe and North America. Henri noted that the priority areas requested by NGOs were information on conditionality; assessments of impacts; and the relationship between aid and human rights. Henri also noted that discussion is taking place on NGOs’ own transparency.
	2. In the discussion, key points to emerge were: there is no one-size-fits-all – information needs to be tailored to country needs; capacity issues are key for both partners and CSOs; and that for donors, agreeing a more ambitious standard means meeting more of the needs of stakeholders.
7. **Report back from technical work conducted by the IATI Technical Advisory Group (TAG)**
	1. Brian Hammond, TAG chairperson, presented the results of the technical work conducted by the TAG. He noted that:
		1. Two **country pilots** have been conducted in Malawi and Burkina Faso. Key issues that have emerged have been the importance of scorecards in helping to increase donor compliance; the importance of monthly reporting and forward planning information; capacity needs; and the need to more clearly explain the value added of IATI to partners and ensure IATI builds on existing processes. Next steps will be to scale up the number of country pilots and to assess the feasibility of automatic reporting, whereby donors would be able to automatically populate country Aid Information Management Systems (AIMS.)
		2. **Fact finding missions** have been conducted with four donors. These missions have assessed the feasibility for donors of implementing the potential IATI standards. All four donors visited (World Bank, Netherlands, DFID, Germany) were found to be well placed to meet the standards at relatively low cost.
	2. In the discussion, several issues where raised. The World Bank representative felt that the costs of implementing the standards had been underestimated, but that these costs must be put into the context of huge benefits. It was also reiterated that IATI should make it clearer how the initiative will support country AIMS.
8. **Presentation of draft proposal on what is published.**
	1. Brian Hammond presented the draft proposal on what should be published under IATI, which is expected to be agreed by the end of 2009. He explained that this proposal has been developed by the IATI Technical Advisory Group. He explained that the core of phase 1 is identification data which is already included in the CRS so not difficult to provide.
	2. In the discussion, the following issues emerged:
		1. Some members felt that IATI should be more ambitious; some that it should be less ambitious; and some that it struck the right balance. Several reiterated that we need to keep the list focused on the needs identified by partner countries. The World Bank suggested that there should be less on aid effectiveness and Paris indications, and on agency effectiveness.
		2. It was suggested that exemptions should be based on countries’ own FoI exemptions. Quality control and accuracy of the data was raised as a concern by a number of donors. It was suggested that a glossary should be provided to define the terms used in the table and ensure a common understanding.
		3. Ireland and Australia requested support from the TAG to better understand the implications for their own systems of publishing the information.
	3. In the conclusion, it was agreed that the list appeared to be at about the right level of ambition and that it should be circulated to a wider group of stakeholders for comment. It was also agreed that: further donor assessments would be offered subject to budget constraints; a glossary would be added; exemptions would be based on national FoI legislation; silent partnership agreements were a new issue that needed to be tackled; and that policy markers on gender and the environment were important.
9. **Presentation and discussion on draft Code of Conduct**
	1. Henri Valot from Civicus and Alex Gerbrandij from the EC presented the draft code of conduct. They stressed the need for further comments from IATI signatories. Like the proposal on what is published, IATI hopes to agree the code of conduct by the end of 2009.
	2. In the discussion, some members expressed concern as to whether it was possible to reach agreement on the code before other areas of IATI are agreed. It was also agreed that a less legalistic code was required. There was also a discussion about how the IATI standards would be pushed down the supply chain – i.e. how NGOs or contractors spending ODA would be required to meet the IATI standards. More clarity was also requested on what is meant by the donor registry being proposed under IATI.
	3. In summary, Sarah Cooke noted that more work needed to be done on the Code before it is circulated more widely. She also requested further written comments on the code.
10. **IATI and links to the WP-EFF Cluster C**
	1. Barbara Lee from the World Bank explained that there is a task team on transparency and predictability under Cluster C of the WP-EFF on Transparent and Responsible Aid. Barbara co-chairs the task team with John Rwangombwa of Rwanda. She noted that there are five activities being carried out by the task team, one of which is around agreeing standards and reporting formats for sharing information. This part is being taken forward by IATI.
11. **IATI Steering Committee membership**
	1. It was agreed that **Burkina Faso, Malawi, Colombia** and the **Dominican Republic** would all join as members of the IATI Steering Committee.
12. **AOB**
	1. The next meeting will be held on **Monday 30th November, from 2p.m. – 6 p.m. at the OECD in Paris.**

**ATTENDEES**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name**  | **Organisation**  |
| Sarah Cooke (Chair)  | DFID  |
| Marijana Zivkovic  | Montenegro  |
| Owen Barder  | DIPR  |
| Ms. Alma Kanani | World Bank  |
| Ms Barbara Lee  | World Bank |
| Rachel Turner  | DFID  |
| Karin Christiansen  | Publish What You Fund  |
| Alex Gerbrandij  | EC  |
| Henri Valot  | Civicus  |
| Mette Gonggrijp  | Netherlands  |
| Adrian Aupperle | Transparency International  |
| Caitlin Wilson  | AusAid  |
| Dasa Silovic  | UNDP  |
| Danila Boneva  | UNDP  |
| Brian Hammond  | TAG Chairperson  |
| Jost Kadel  | Germany  |
| Romilly Greenhill  | DFID (secretary)  |
| **By phone/VC**  |  |
| Eric Swanson  | World Bank  |
| Mr Cuong  | Vietnam  |
| Jean Louis Sarbib  | Development Gateway  |
| **Observers**  |  |
| Kevin Colgan  | Irish Aid  |
| Roger Cornforth  | NZ Aid  |
| Naomi Ngwira  | Ministry of Finance, Malawi  |
| Arturo Gomez Juanita Olarte | Colombia  |
| Catherine Graf  | Switzerland  |