Publish What You Pay
Extracting The Truth

PWYP Global Steering Committee
Meeting 22nd – 23rd January 2014

Attendees

Africa Steering Committee[1] (attended 22nd January only)
Chair Gilbert Maoundonodji, Groupe de Recherche Alternatives et de Monitoring du Projet Pétrole Tchad, Chad (Central Africa representative)
Bubelwa Kaiza, PWYP Tanzania, Tanzania (Eastern and Southern Africa representative)
Jean Claude Katende, ASADHO, DRC (EITI Board Member)
Ali Idrissa, Réseau des Organisations pour la Transparence et l'Analyse Budgétaire, Niger (EITI Board Member)
Taran Diallo, Guinean Association for Transparency, Guinea (Francophone West Africa representative)

Global Steering Committee
Ali Al-Mahaweelee, Rafiday Al Iraq Al Jadeed Foundation, Iraq (Representative for Middle East & North Africa)
Cielo Magno, Bantay Kita, Philippines (Asia-Pacific representative)
Marc Ona, NGO Brainforest, Gabon (Francophone Africa representative)
Taran Diallo, Guinean Association for Transparency, Guinea (Africa Steering Committee representative)
Ian Gary, Oxfam America, USA (North America/Europe representative) (23rd only)
Suneeta Kaimal, Revenue Watch Institute, USA (Donor representative)
Brendan O'Donnell, Global Witness, UK (Donor representative)
Aziya Kurmanbayeva, Aikyndyk, Kazakhstan (Eurasia representative)

PWYP Secretariat
Alice Powell, Communications Coordinator
Carlo Merla, Africa Programme Manager
Marinke van Riet, International Director
Stephanie Rochford, Programme Assistant

Invitees:
Anne-Sophie Simpere, Oxfam France (22nd only)
Richard Bennett, independent consultant (23rd only)

Apologies (due to visa issues)
Cecilia Mattia, NACE-Sierra Leone (Global Steering Committee Anglophone Africa representative)
Faith Nwadishi, PWYP-Nigeria (Africa Steering Committee EITI Board Member)
Steve Manteaw, Integrated Social Development Centre, Ghana (Africa Steering Committee Anglophone West Africa Representative)

[1] The Africa Steering Committee held their own meeting on 21st of January; the objective of the joint meeting was to advance the governance standards and the capacity and operational assessment of the PWYP Secretariat.

Publish What You Pay
Extracting The Truth

1 Summary of Key Actions and Decisions

- Secretariat to add discussion on how to assess internet connectivity problems to agenda for Central Africa meeting.
- Suneeta Kaimal, Jean Claude Katende, Gilbert Maoundonodji and Ali Idrissa to form a working group (facilitated by Secretariat) to develop a draft of policies to incentivise and sanction coalitions for non-compliance with governance requirements to present at next GSC/ASC meeting.
- Secretariat to share the governance analysis with the GSC members in soft copy as well as share with the coalitions.
- Secretariat to develop definitions for categories of information in annual governance survey and to put survey online.
- New coalition applications accepted: RLIE Latin American Network on Extractive Industries; Transparency for Development (Tajikistan); Energotransparency Association (Ukraine).
- Aroa de la Fuente from RLIE Latin American Network on Extractive Industries accepted as the tenth member on the Global Steering Committee.
- Secretariat to develop a check-list of criteria against which new coalition applications are assessed.
- Secretariat to inform the coalitions of their successful application and develop appropriate country pages on the PYWP website.
- Marc Ona, Ali Neema, Cielo Magno and Carlo Merla to set up a working group to further develop the draft Global Protection Strategy document and present a draft policy at the next GSC/ASC meeting.
- Approval to provide financial support to the coalitions was given, with a prioritisation for the mandatory disclosures campaign as well as continuation of earmarked support to coalitions, based on the joint fundraising strategy proposed in the road map 2014-2015.
- The finance and grants officer (to be recruited) to further analyse the budgets and develop a functional and activity-based budget;
- Secretariat to produce quarterly income and expenditure reports for the management committee on the Global Steering Committee.

2 Welcome and introductions

Members were welcomed to this first joint meeting of the Africa and Global Steering Committees and the agenda was adopted.

3 Update, present and approve revised work plan

Based on the recommendations from the previous GSC meeting in Sydney, the work plan for 2014-2015 had been revised and distributed by email in December 2013. It was presented to the committee at the meeting for approval. It was noted that PWYP is making great strides in its professionalisation and participants were recommended to read the ODI assessment review (of which a summary report is available in Russian, French and English). With the new work plan, PWYP is on the right track but there is an overall ageing problem in

the coalition and work needs to be done to develop the next generation of transparency activists.

The secretariat was congratulated on advancing the governance structure and coming a long way in the last 18 months. Given this work, it was requested that there be more feedback from now on from both the regional coordinators and the advocacy officer (when hired) with more emphasis on the campaigning strategies and targets and how we are measuring progress on these fronts. This is very much in line with the road map 2014 /2015 including the work to develop impact and outcome indicators for Vision 20/20 using the Chain for Change approach. It was agreed that a shift towards advocacy would be appropriate given the progress made on governance, and that the Africa meeting provisionally confirmed for June 2014 would provide a good opportunity to look at how the strategy is progressing on both upstream and downstream issues. Work will continue in 2014 to bring all coalitions up to a good level of governance so that by 2015 this won't take more than 25% of secretariat effort.

Some queries were raised in relation to the organogram structure of the secretariat and more clarity was requested around lines of responsibility, the management versus the oversight roles and the extension of lines of accountability from the global to the national level. A suggestion was made to add the ASC to the organogram, which has not been done to date given the absence of financial accountability in the ASC terms of reference. The Secretariat is open to revision of these terms if that is wanted and the next Africa regional meeting may be an appropriate place to do so.

An overview of the key objectives of the communications strategy which was sent to the GSC in December 2013 was presented. It was suggested that PWYP focus on one major advocacy or media target this year, possibly the G20. It was noted how useful the communications work on the Niger/Areva case had been as a case study to use at the European level on contract transparency. The discussion on communications also covered new technologies and participants highlighted some of the challenges faced in particular by southern members in accessing the internet. It was clarified that this strategy is intended to be used at the level of coalition-coalition and secretariat-coalition communications, whereas communications at a national level are a matter for each individual coalition with limited capacity to support this from Secretariat level.

The applications from the Catalyse a Campaign project were presented. The secretariat thanked Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uganda for the work they had put in to their applications which were interesting and ambitious. At this stage it was agreed that Alice would work with the regional coordinators and the coalitions to develop these more so that they would truly benefit from the communications assistance that the project proposes.

A suggestion was made that individuals working on communications at the national level be identified and put in touch with larger organisations that have well-established communications in order to benefit from peer learning. It was also proposed that the Catalyse a Campaign project could further enhance peer-to-peer exchange though twinning a coalition with a particular advocacy target with another coalition that has had success in

that area. A final suggestion was made to further develop guidelines on the PWYP brand in order to elevate the coalition's profile.

Action:

- Secretariat to add discussion on how to assess internet connectivity problems to agenda for Central Africa meeting.

3.1 Governance information

As part of the fourth strategic pillar of the PWYP strategy, governance information on membership, finances and governance structure was requested from all coalitions in June 2013. The results of the analysis on the information provided were presented at the meeting. While most coalitions had sent most of the information, Norway and France had submitted nothing at all, and Ghana and Zambia had sent their information too late to be included. Participants were requested to take note of the figures for future reference. The secretariat proposed a series of incentives and sanctions for compliance with the governance standards around which the subsequent discussion was based. There was particular concern expressed that struggling coalitions should be assisted in the first instance in order to help them to meet the standards while maintaining the message that the standards are taken seriously. Other participants felt that a stronger line towards coalitions who do not submit their data was needed; in particular it was pointed out that another pillar of the new strategy is to practise what we preach, and we need to have integrity and legitimacy when asking other organisations to be transparent. It was agreed to set up a working group to develop further the sanctions and incentives for the next GSC meeting.

Other topics of discussion included membership of individuals and whether funding should be accepted from industry. It was agreed that these decisions currently lie with national level governance committees but that note should be taken in order to review at the 2015 Coalition strategy meeting.

Action:

- Suneeta Kaimal, Jean-Claude Katende, Gilbert Maoundonodji and Ali Idrissa to form a working group (facilitated by Secretariat) to develop a draft of policies to incentivise and sanction coalitions for non-compliance with governance requirements to present at next GSC/ASC meeting;
- Secretariat to share the governance analysis with the GSC members in soft copy as well as share with the coalitions;
- Secretariat to develop definitions for categories of information and to put governance survey online.

4 Sharing experiences with PWYP France

Anne-Sophie Simpere from Oxfam France joined the meeting to discuss how the coalition in France could be reinvigorated given that activity has slowed since the adoption of the EU reporting rules. The Areva case was highlighted as a very important collaboration between PWYP France and PWYP Niger which has been a successful first campaign under the new

coordination of the French coalition which has moved from Secours Catholique to Oxfam France. Points of discussion included whether PWYP could campaign more on corporate social responsibility issues; the difficulty of engaging with the environmental campaigns; how best to work in partnership with other countries; how best to manage the campaign given limited human and financial resources.

Suggestions included diversifying the coalition member base, particularly tax campaigners; introducing the gold standard of EITI behaviour, especially pushing for contract transparency as a requirement; and championing EU laws on registry of beneficial ownership, as well as pursuing the wider fight for fairness which has already been brought forward by the Areva campaign.

Aziya highlighted that uranium is also an important issue in Kazakhstan and Marinke suggested the importance of more 'twinning' approaches (in line with the road map) that can reinforce coalition campaigns. It was noted that once the advocacy officer has been hired the secretariat will be able to facilitate coordination for PWYP Europe more effectively. Anne-Sophie thanked the GSC and ASC for their input and ideas.

5 Operational and strategic needs of the secretariat

This session focussed on the request made at the previous GSC meeting for a consultancy to be undertaken into the operation and strategic needs of the secretariat given that OSF expressed a mid-term desire to no longer host it. The terms of reference for two pieces of work were adopted by the GSC previously and a consultant, Richard Bennett has been engaged to do the work. Richard Bennett will attend the Asia Pacific meeting and will be working until June/July 2014 on these assessments; he will present the findings at the next GSC/ASC meeting for decision-making. It was clarified that the assessment related specifically to the international secretariat rather than the wider coalition as a whole.

OSF has given a verbal three-year funding commitment but the GSC and secretariat recognise the need to diversify the funding base which it is already starting to do. A request was made that the consultant consider the impact of changing the organisational model of the secretariat on the advocacy and campaigning capability and effectiveness.

An exercise was carried out to look at the six roles and functions of the international secretariat and to gauge to what extent participants thought that role was being undertaken by the secretariat or by the coalition members currently; and where they would like to see responsibility for that role move to in the future. The exercise revealed that:

- *Knowledge management*: most participants thought this was currently undertaken by the secretariat, or was shared by the secretariat and the members; it was seen as a shared responsibility and in the future should therefore be done by both secretariat and members equally;
- *Coordination of coalition activities*: most people thought that this was currently undertaken by the secretariat but, for the future, opinions about whose responsibility it should be varied between shared, secretariat and members.
- *Putting into effect governance and membership standards*: there was an even split between those who thought this is currently done by the secretariat, by members

and is a shared responsibility; in the future it seemed that it should be more of a shared responsibility;

- *(International) advocacy*: again, there was an even split between those who thought this is currently done by the secretariat, by members and is a shared responsibility; in the future, there was a tendency towards having the members do more international advocacy, but still some who saw it as a role for the secretariat;
- *Strategy development and coalition building*: most people saw this as being done by the secretariat currently, particularly as there had not been the tools for coalitions to do this themselves previously; in the future there was a tendency to see this as a shared responsibility.
- *Fundraising*: the vast majority saw this as a role being undertaken by the secretariat currently, but that in the future this should be more of a shared responsibility.

The facilitator acknowledged that the definitions are very broad and therefore there was a chance for a difference of interpretation in how the exercise was read, but that this served as a useful first look at the perceptions of the GSC and ASC members. The responses will be fed back to the consultant for the purposes of his assessment, which will also include in-depth interviews with the ASC, GSC and secretariat.

In closing for the day, participants expressed their enjoyment in being able to meet their counterparts of the Global and Africa steering committees, and Global Witness expressed their willingness to attend the Africa meeting and particularly to work on beneficial ownership issues. Participants were thanked for their commitment and participation.

6 Operational needs assessment

This session was facilitated by Richard Bennett and focussed on the operational needs assessment which he has been engaged to undertake and which is complementary to the assessment of the roles and functions of the secretariat. There are two main objectives of the operational needs assessment: to explore options for the institutional set up of secretariat; and to analyse the legal and financial implications of each option.

Richard introduced himself and cited examples of the type of work he has previously done on evaluation, governance and management for other networks and coalitions. He welcomed the opportunity to work with PWYP and acknowledged the request to consider in his analysis the effect of an operational change on the campaigning effectiveness of the coalition.

An overview was given of the position of Revenue Watch Institute which has been an independent organisation since 2006 but is now also becoming administratively independent from OSF. The amount of work involved in arranging this transition was highlighted along with the advantages and disadvantages of the hosted and non-hosted options in the context of RWI's operations and objectives. RWI offered to share the operational assessment that was conducted to inform the separation from OSF. In addition, RWI will share two studies mapping the field of natural resource governance to inform an understanding of the comparative advantage and positioning of PWYP vis-à-vis other actors in the field.

During the discussion the issue of intellectual property rights was raised as a point for consideration in any independent set-up, as well whether the exercise would be a useful opportunity to map out more clearly the different territories and skill-sets of the member organisations and how they complement each other. It was noted that this is precisely why PWYP is seeking better governance information on its membership, so that expertise and skills can be leveraged more effectively. One participant also highlighted concerns about allowing PWYP to become simply a capacity building platform. Another participant highlighted concerns about an independent PWYP coming into competition with other NGO members.

Participants were invited to take part in an exercise to look at the both the technical and political aspects of two options: remaining as a hosted organisation or becoming an independent legal entity. It was acknowledged that the choice of operational set-up was not necessarily exclusively between these two polar opposites, and that we need to look at something 'in the middle' where PWYP is an independent organisation whose governing body approves the strategy and budget, but whose administrative requirements are thus far provided by a third party. For the purposes of the exercise, however, participants were asked to consider the two extremes first and then to look at the middle ground.

Carlo provided a summary of the discussion that had previously taken place on this topic with the ASC, the majority of whom had been in favour of becoming an independent entity for reasons including more freedom to make decisions and potential for members to have a greater influence on strategy. The risks highlighted had included the financial implications particularly around pre-financing requirements which are often necessary due to the nature of PWYP's activities.

Other participants asserted that the best option would be the one that facilitated the effectiveness of the campaign, and that the resources of the secretariat should be directed in such a way as to prioritise this. Following on from this it was suggested that the parameters of the basic principles that would guide a final decision should be agreed in order to find the right model. Another participant asked if PWYP was in a position to be hosted by another member, such as Global Witness or Oxfam. Participants highlighted that both the positive as well as negative implications of being hosted should be explored and it was acknowledged that OSF has been a fantastic and generous host, but that the time had come for PWYP to grow up and move out of home.

It was also noted that Julie McCarthy has expressed her willingness to answer any questions that the GSC may wish to ask in relation to this operational assessment and PWYP's future. The management committee have already had a conversation with her about this and will do so on an on-going basis. It was particularly stressed that the cost implications would be an important factor in any decision. Participants also wanted to know what would be the role of the GSC in a new set-up for PWYP and highlighted some sequencing issues with the current hiring process and the assessment of roles and functions in the secretariat. The secretariat pointed out that the hiring process was in line with the decision to implement

the requirements of Vision 20/20 and that ideally roles would be reviewed every three to four years as the campaign and priorities developed.

In summary, Richard thanked participants for their contribution and acknowledged the need to maintain a focus on the campaigning effectiveness of PWYP as well as to have a clear understanding of the governance structure, including veto powers, of each possible model.

7 New applications from coalitions

Three new applications were received from coalitions seeking to affiliate to PWYP. The GSC reviewed the sign-on process and forms which have been updated for coalitions and members and are available on the PWYP website. A request was made for clarity about the criteria on which applications are approved to ensure consistency. This is principally based on Vision 20/209 governance requirements and a check-list will be developed and shared with the GSC to review the application in advance.

Carlo presented the application from RLIE Latin American Network on Extractive Industries. An informal relationship has existed with the coalition for the past two years. The network comprises organisations in seven Latin American countries and their work is focussed on revenue transparency, legal and policy frameworks and social and environmental impact of extractives.

One participant noted that to date coalitions have normally been based in one country, whereas RLIE is across a number of countries. This is partly due to the size and complexity of the extractive industry in Latin America and the network had the support of the RWI coordinator in Peru to bring the organisations together. The application was welcomed by members of the GSC who know the coalition and who felt that they would bring a lot to the table, particularly in terms of academic content and also experience of post-extractive economies. The application was unanimously accepted and it was agreed that the coordinator of the coalition should become the tenth member of the GSC to represent the Latin American constituency.

Aziya presented the applications from Tajikistan and Ukraine. The Tajikistan coalition has 25 members and the country was accepted as an EITI candidate in 2013. It works principally on the EITI standard. They have a lot of connections in the region and are financially supported by the Soros foundation and the British Council. There are some concerns around the enabling environment but the previous EITI board concluded that there was still enough freedom to stimulate debate. It was suggested that the coalition be asked to provide their theory of change so that their political direction could be better understood. Concerns were also discussed about the extent to which civil society is independent in the country which led to a query about how the GSC could assess to their satisfaction the independence of coalitions applying for affiliation. Currently this assessment is done as PWYP gets to know the coalitions better and works with them through the regional coordinators as they make their application. It was suggested that a mechanism for raising concerns about independence should be developed. The application was unanimously approved.

The coalition in Ukraine was launched in 2009 and comprises 10 members. They have a sophisticated website in English, Russian and Ukrainian. They have been campaigning since 2009 for EITI candidature in which they were successful when Ukraine became part of the Open Government Partnership. The coalition receives funding from RWI and IRF. There are some issues around the enabling environment in Ukraine which the secretariat is monitoring closely. The application was unanimously accepted.

Action:

- Secretariat to develop a check-list of criteria against which coalition applications are assessed.
- Secretariat to inform the coalitions of their successful application and develop appropriate country pages on the PWYP website.

8 Global Protection Policy

At the last GSC meeting the secretariat agreed to develop a draft Global Protection Strategy but this proved to be too ambitious in the timescale. This session was used to focus on what elements of the Africa Protection Strategy could be maintained at a global level in order to feed into a forthcoming draft protection strategy document. Carlo offered an overview of the Africa Protection policy including prevention systems, rapid response, checklist before taking action, coordination with specialised human rights organisations; funding; and monitoring of the security situation.

During the discussion participants mentioned the high impact in Africa of press releases in the international media and the importance of having access to pro-bono solicitors. The discussion highlighted that specific cases couldn't be generalised to the global level and the specific risks from region to region needed to be understood in context. It was also noted that there are many organisations with expertise in this area and a suggestion was made to think about how to formalise PWYP's relationship with them. The linkage dilemma was also discussed, and participants talked about the need to be careful about how PWYP's profile was leveraged and how this could be managed most effectively.

One participant suggested making contact with OSF's Justice Initiative programme and the potential for setting up a legal fund for members, as well as possibly producing a background paper on particularly high risk countries. The issue of how PWYP can protect people on the ground is also of relevance to the operational needs assessment and a request was made that this also be considered by the consultant.

Given the resource constraints within the secretariat for producing this draft document a working group was set up comprising Marc Ona, Ali Neema, Cielo Magno and Carlo Merla who will seek input from other members to further develop the document and present a draft policy at the next GSC/ASC meeting.

9 Financial governance

The GSC reviewed the terms of reference in relation to the finances of the secretariat. Participants requested that draft minutes be circulated within two weeks of the meeting to

the GSC and the wider coalition and that the minutes of the previous meeting be circulated again before the next meeting. The secretariat would like to present a two-year strategy for approval as one-year priorities are difficult to identify with our campaign.

The secretariat presented a wish list budget and a realistic budget, the latter for approval by the GSC. A request was made by the GSC that funding be identified as restricted and non-restricted to help the GSC understand what decisions were being taken and why; and, in relation to personnel, to work out the cost of each position on a per capita basis for clarity. The GSC also requested that some of the expenses be broken out into a function and activity budget. It was acknowledged that capacity to do more in-depth financial reporting has been limited but that with the appointment of the finance and grants officer the secretariat will incorporate these suggestions. A further request was made to provide the financial documents in advance of the meeting and in other languages. The GSC also asked that if additional success in fundraising should lead to significant changes in the budget, a revised budget and the programmatic and strategic implications should be discussed and approved.

The discussion also covered the issue of financial support to the coalitions (in OSF terms 're-granting' which is a process that OSF will allow the secretariat to undertake formally with the approval of the GSC). Approval to provide financial support to the coalitions was given with an immediate prioritisation for the UK, Canada and Australia coalitions (minimum $20,000 each) due to the immediate and urgent need of these coalitions to help advance the mandatory disclosures campaign as they have a profound impact on PWYP's global advocacy goals. The GSC has recommended to more than double the mandatory disclosures budget and work with these coalitions to raise more funds jointly and in a coordinated fashion. In addition the GSC has approved financial support for those coalitions where we have earmarked funding (MDTF for Central Africa, DANIDA for East and Southern Africa, Cordaid). Criteria for financial support need to be developed further but should be linked to (1) compliance to the governance standard, (2) strategy development and (3) a joint fundraising approach.

The budget was approved on a non-objection basis on the provision of amendments as specified in the first action below.

Actions:

- Secretariat to allocate more resources to mandatory disclosures work via Work Stream 2 which should specifically cover costs of coordination for the G20 campaign
- It was also suggested to reduce the travel budget;
- The finance and grants officer (to be recruited) to further analyse the budgets and develop a functional and activity-based budget;
- Secretariat to produce quarterly income and expenditure reports for the management committee.

10 Conclusions

Participants were very positive about the progress made during the meeting and looked forward to continuing to work together to advance the campaign. In particular, they looked forward to the report on the operation and strategic needs assessment to be presented at

the next meeting. The objectives of the meeting, as set out in the agenda, were all achieved with the exception of the draft Global protection Strategy for which a working group has now been established.

It was also noted that we need to ensure that all GSC and ASC members should participate which due to visa problems wasn't possible. Therefore we should stick to the principle to have one meeting hosted by a coalition in the south and one in the north.

All participants were thanked for their contribution and we look forward to seeing everyone at the next GSC meeting (dates to be confirmed).