



Meeting of the IATI Governing Board

Date: September 19 2017 (continued Sept 22)

Minutes

Attending: PWYF (Rupert Simons), Canada (Stephen Potter, Yohanna Loucheur), Secretariat (Carolyn Culey, Argjira Belegu-Shuku, Katrin Lichtenberg, Annelise Parr,), Bond (Sarah Johns), Bangladesh (Aftab Ahmed).

1 – Board members accepted the agenda and previous minutes: [September 12th 2017](#) No other items of AOB.

2. MA Papers

MA Agenda – minor adjustments are required to accommodate the DAC Chair's availability on Thursday not Wednesday. The Secretariat will make those changes and re-upload.

The Board provided feedback on the papers from the Secretariat, drawing attention to some inconsistencies of language. The Secretariat will update accordingly and recirculate via Yammer. These should be circulated on Friday of this week to members. In relation to the data use strategy, the Board requested a substantive reworking of the strategy and agreed that the Secretariat should focus on the presentation that would be given to members at the MA. The revision should include higher level strategic aims and include key result areas associated with user groups, and actions tailored to those. No paper would be circulated in advance, other than the costed workplan which will be aligned with the updated strategy presentation. The presentation should also include commitments of members, and should be presented for discussion at the MA.

Action: Secretariat to update and finalise all papers for review by the board at a follow-up call on Friday 22nd.

5. Institutional Review

There will be one Board paper with Table 1 being recommendations the board has already made decisions on (and follow up actions). Table 2 relates to PC fees, in which board has made decisions but MA needs to approve. Category B items are to be covered in the second MA session, mostly around hosting. Final part is transition plan which needs to be strengthened.

Board members had no issues with the structure of the paper but felt that the transition plan was too ambitious and that there is currently no capacity in the team to work on this. Redrawing constituencies is likely to be controversial. The Board made some comments on Category A recommendations and agreed to update its paper and its presentation at the MA.

Specific comments on Category B (13, 11 and 14)

Not all members felt the Board was at a point to make a recommendation, and many members have indicated in consultations that more information is needed on the pros/cons for each of the options. On 13, The Board agreed to go to the MA with acknowledgement of what's been put forward, and

propose to have a smaller working group to come back to members at a later point for a final decision.

ED

On the ED recommendation, there is support for this in principle when combined with Option 3 or 4 but it's not possible to approve it before a decision is made on hosting; it's unclear whether an ED can be employed based on which hosting decision is made, and this would need further exploration, along with the potential major cost implications. UNOPS and UNDP both have experience as hosts of initiatives with external boards, and can contribute to work around costing and accountability frameworks among other things.

Fee structure

This comes to an end in Aug '18. The Board proposes to extend it for a further year into the new arrangement and table a recommendation for amendment in following MA or at an extraordinary MA.

Size of the Board

There was only mixed support for a private sector seat and the definition of Private Sector would need to be clarified (3 possible definitions: Private contractors publishing; small firms of consultants providing services to IATI members or Sec; organisations that can do both. There is no clear board consensus on this and it should be decided by members. Board enlargement is in conjunction with 3 and 4, and therefore this can be parked until there is a clearer position on future hosting.

General comments

It was pointed out that the partner country constituency views were not yet incorporated. This constituency did not wish to consult via webinar and has instead agreed to discuss and formulate a position at the caucus meeting face to face. Several on the Board were not comfortable putting forth a recommendation without incorporating the views of all constituencies. Although not opposed to direction of travel, some felt that members need to know the basis on which the options are made and what the future management might look like; this had come up time and again in member consultations particularly among donors. A better approach at the MA would be to outline a clear pathway and timeline for this decision to be made; this need not wait until another MA, this can be done online.

Actions:

Canada will update the Board paper to add much more information to the transition process to include a fuller costing or consideration of costs of each of the hosting arrangements. Be realistic on what we can achieve on this and take care not to let this bog down entire schedule.

Secretariat will work on SOP segment around fee waivers.

Meeting ends

The Chair requested discussion of items not covered today (3 MDB fee issue and 6 re-election process for the Board) to take place on Yammer. A brief follow up call on September 22nd was held to confirm final approval of MA papers for circulation.