Third meeting of the IATI Governing Board
Wednesday 18 May, 2016

Attendees:

(Governing Board) Monowar Ahmed (Bangladesh); Sarah Johns (Bond); Yohanna Loucheur (Canada); Rupert Simons (Publish What You Fund); Timothy Takona (UNICEF); John Adams (DfID, TAG Chair);

(IATI Secretariat) Carolyn Culey (Development Initiatives); Annelise Parr (UNDP), Katrin Lichtenberg, Argjira Belegu-Shuku (UNOPS)

Minutes:

1. Minutes of the previous Board meeting (3 May, 2016) were accepted and will be published on the IATI website.

2. **Draft Vision and Mission Paper:**
   - **Action:** Agree that with the addition of a sentence in the preamble setting out the process for consultation and finalising clearly, this should go out to members on Thursday 19th May, allowing them two weeks to comment. The Secretariat will then update the statements if required on the basis of feedback and present them to the Board to formulate a recommendation to members ahead of the Members' Assembly (MA). The final paper, with the Board recommendation, will be included in the papers circulated for the Members' Assembly. The target date for circulation of MA papers is **15th June**.

3. **Strategy paper**
   - **Action:** The same process will apply to the strategy paper, which will go out to members at the same time. UNICEF had a couple of comments on strengthening the language on what members get for their fee and agreed to provide a sentence or two on this via Yammer.Other Board members agreed to provide feedback rapidly to enable the paper to go out on Thursday May 19.

4. **Proposals on membership fee**
   Points raised in the discussion included:
   - Could/should we include plans to increase paying members? (and what about the risk of losing some existing members if the fee is doubled ?)
   - Could we look at more of a sliding scale, like OGP? Costs and membership arrangements of other comparable initiatives (EITI, Open Contracting Partnership, Global Partnership for Sustainable Development Data) were also considered and found to be generally higher in costs; fees where applicable (OGP, EITI) were also higher.

- o What is the tolerance of members for a significant increase? Could Board members take soundings within their own constituencies? Bond agreed to do so for CSOs.
- o The three current scenarios are too similar.
- o We should look at broadening the base of paying members (eg asking publishers to pay a small fee).
- o The scenarios should link back to the budget and work plan - although it was noted that we cannot to this in a linear way.
- o Care must be taken to present members with a realistic budget to approve (it has been clear in the past that members will not approve a budget showing a deficit). This would require to show clearly the impact of the planned funds not coming forth.
- o Increase in fees should be linked to service received.
- o Cost of contribution agreements is high, so perhaps not cost-effective for partner countries and CSOs (but nevertheless important in terms of co-ownership).
- o Significant changes in the funding structure will have to wait for the consultancy on new institutional arrangements - the focus for the MA must be to make a recommendation based on the existing fee-based funding model.

- **Action:** Agreed that further work is required by the Board and Secretariat to finalise three options for consideration by members by the end of next week (27th May). These might be based on:
  - Option one - fee increase supplemented by additional voluntary contributions; This option would not be recommended by the Board but should be shown with information on what could <u>not</u> be achieved without proper funding;
  - Option two - flat rate fee increase for each constituency to cover the whole budget;
  - Option three - a sliding scale of fees.
- **Action:** The budget sub-group (Publish What You Fund, Bangladesh and Canada) will work on this with the Secretariat and Bond to prepare a revised note for the Board consideration, with a view for the Board to recommend a scenario ahead of the Members' Assembly. The need for all Board members to engage in the process and agree the final recommendation was noted.

5. **Agenda for Members' Assembly**

There was support for the creation of reference groups drawn from the membership on specific issues eg input into HLM2. It was also proposed that workshops on the first day of the MA could be led by members of the reference group(s) and used to get members' feedback on:
- Actions arising from the strategy paper, plus priorities and interlinkages between the different elements.
- Co-creation of the outreach and comms plan.
- **Agreed** that it would be helpful to start by securing members' agreement to the vision and mission on day one, and move forward from that. A workshop format could be used to discuss key issues before moving to formal approval.

- **Action:** Board members to send further comments on the draft agenda today. This can then be shared for consultation with members next week, along with a call for members to indicate their interest in joining reference groups to prepare to lead those workshops.

6. **Logistics for Members' Assembly**
   - **Action:** Strong support for layout to be based on the small tables we used on day one last time (but a plea for the tables themselves to be a bit bigger if possible so less cramped!) We need to consider what's feasible in terms of moving from this format to more formal sessions.
   - **Action:** UNDP will talk to Madagascar further about organising the Partner Country Caucus for the morning of **Tues 28th June**. A message has already gone out to partner countries who are supportive of having this meeting. Bond also asked for space for a CSO caucus (probably best at the same time?). We agreed that the Board would meet in UN City at **2-4.30pm on Tuesday 28th.**

7. **Process for Board sign-off on policy papers**
   - **Action:** The model of posting papers on Yammer so that everyone can read them whilst nominating two Board members with specific expertise to provide feedback was accepted. The Secretariat will draw up a list of topics and invite Board members to indicate where their expertise and interest lie. In this way a roster will be created (Yammer)**.**

The most immediate priority is to identify volunteers to help with input into the zero draft of the HLM2 outcome document, deadline May 25th. Canada volunteered and Bangladesh agreed to support also, to ensure the partner country perspective. It was also suggested that we should reach out to members with relevant expertise eg UK and US.

8. **Draft TORs for hosting consultancy**

Board members were asked to provide feedback on the draft via Yammer. The process is to have Board comfortable with the TORs so that it could go out directly to one or two members and seek funding for the work.

9. **Next meeting**

The next meeting was confirmed for 28 June, face to face in Copenhagen.