



## **STEERING COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**HELD ON 28 MAY 2004**

### **Apologies; Introductions; Chairing and minutes; Matters arising; Agenda**

1. Present: Toby Mendel, Richard Calland, Vincent Lazatin, Issa Luna Pla, Jennifer Kalafut, Bruce Jenkins, Alex Wilks, Jeff Powell, Graham Saul, Toby McIntosh, Magda Stoczkiewicz, Ilse Toerien
2. All present were welcomed. TM was elected Chairperson for this meeting. It was agreed that IT would do the minutes.

### **Current Status of the Initiative**

3. It was noted that the budget has not been amended yet. TM explained that there was a January 2004 budget and then an amended budget dated April 2004. He indicated that Ford had allocated funds for the project over a 2-year time frame.
4. RC requested that the costs for the Secretariat, i.e. this conference call and possibly future conference calls, and the annual payments for the Steering Committee members, be accommodated in the budget. There was an initial discussion about the refinement of the budget that was concluded later in the meeting (see below).
5. MS wanted to know whether the Steering Committee will be appointed by the partners and whether it should be done officially.
6. TM explained that according to the Memorandum of Understanding, all present are formal partners and that the Steering Committee must be appointed at this meeting. Seconded by MS and RC.
7. TM asked all present to sign the Memorandum of Understanding. TM would email the document to all the Project Partners and once signed, it must be emailed to the Secretariat and IT will combine it electronically and send it to TM.
8. RC congratulated TM & GS for their hard work in finalising the successful funding proposal and developing the relationship with the Ford Foundation.
9. It was noted that all present received the Secretariat's Terms of Reference (TOR) from RC. They were accepted. It was agreed that the Secretariat would be responsible for internal and external communications.

10. The Chairperson wanted to know whether all present were in agreement that the Financial Report would be prepared by the Financial Manager and the Narrative Report by the Secretariat. Agreed by all present. It was also noted that the Secretariat would distribute the reports to the funders and the Steering Committee.
11. MS wanted to know whether RC had appointed an assistant coordinator yet. It was noted that someone would be appointed shortly, now that the final agreement has been confirmed with the Ford Foundation.
12. JK referred to the TOR and wanted to know how the database is going to be used and whether this would be the responsibility of the assistant coordinator. Richard Calland suggested that this be discussed via email once the person has been appointed.
13. TM suggested that extra funds be raised for the contact list. Seconded by JK.
14. JK proposed the idea of a big announcement to tell other organisation what the GTI is doing.

### **The Budget**

15. TM inquired whether all present received the final budget that went to the Ford Foundation. All present received the budget. TM confirmed that the January 2004 was sent to Lisa and after discussion they added funds for other things (Ford wanted to see an expanded budget with other funders contributing). After adding the additional amounts, like the ad hoc advocacy budget, the April 2004 budget was increased to \$597,000. The key figure was the \$304,000 in the "seeking funds" column. This was covered now by the \$300,000 grant; certainly it is very close to the original basic budget prepared last year of \$321,000. However, there are gaps that need to be filled, which may require either re-allocation within the current budget or specific fund-raising. GS suggested that the committee list the things they want to raise money for as an immediate priority. The Bankwatch network needs to be funded and should be funded out of the 'seeking funds' column of the most recent (April) budget.
16. The Chairperson wanted to know whether all present were satisfied with the working budget, assuming that this is the budget the committee is working with (the "seeking funds" column). He suggested that the committee look at what additional money should be raised.
17. RC noted that there is not a big difference between the January and April budgets. He suggested that the committee review the budget at the next meeting, having compared the working budget with their draft workplans (especially the Lead Organisations). The latter seconded by GS.
18. GS wanted to know what the Coordinator under the heading "Administration" meant. RC explained that the \$11,250 would be used for the Secretariat duties, including employing a new person, but he requested that the budget be revised as there are additional costs, for example, the cost of the conference calls.

19. TM suggested additional funds for administration costs for Idasa. It was agreed that RC would incorporate this in his budget submission.
20. The Chairperson noted that the committee should keep in mind the 3 funds that they would be overseeing. Which documentation will be provided? The Chairperson suggested that the documentation indicate what the fund is for and what we are going to do with it. Other suggestions were also recommended and discussed.
21. MS suggested criteria for allocating budget lines. She felt that the GTI needed a common agreement with the criteria.
22. TM mentioned that the GTI should not spend more than ½ of the budget in the first year. Agreed by all present. RC pointed out that the working budget, and the workplans, needed to take account of cash flow. Agreed. It was agreed that TM would disburse funds needed immediately: 50% of Co-ordinated Requests core budget (not including the sub-fund); All of the Charter Funds (need to be spent this year not next); 50% of Financial Management/Liaison; half of the SC payments (to LIMAC, ATIN, Art 19, Bank Watch, Bretton Woods; BIC and Freedominfo.org were ineligible for further direct Ford monies).
23. TM suggested that, from a cash flow perspective, the GTI need to identify things that must be paid immediately and have a discussion via email to finalise it. Agreed by all present. He also mentioned that there were three (3) groups involved with sub-funds. Jennifer Kalafut agreed to send the documentation to all the GTI Project Partners before the next meeting.
24. TM felt that it would be useful to circulate comments via email. He offered to do the same with the cash flow proposal and all present can discuss it and make a decision via email. Agreed by all present.
25. RC requested all the lead organisations to submit working plans, taking into account the cashflow, and circulate it via email to all the Project Partners by early July. Seconded by TM and all agreed that it would be discussed at the next meeting.

### **Small Grants**

26. AW felt that everybody should have a working understanding by when they must submit applications and when the first monies will be spent. He suggested that a provisional date be pencilled into everybody's diaries. It was also agreed that once this was clear, the Project Partners could start being ambassadors and have a working understanding with other organisations. Seconded by JP.
27. MS felt that other organisations would want to know what amount of money we are talking about. GS felt that it would differ from activity to activity. The average grant could be anything from \$500 - \$1500. TMc suggested using a Request for a Proposal (RFP) process. It was agreed by all that the Financial Manager, Toby Mendel, would liaise with everybody re this issue once the contact has been approved.

## **Component Parts**

28. **Case Studies and Audits:** The lead organisation (NSA - TMc) will put together a draft proposal/work plan.
29. **Coordinated Requests:** Idasa (RC) is the lead organisation. RC mentioned its involvement in the OSI monitoring project, co-ordinating and monitoring in 16 countries. He wanted to know from the Financial Manager what the \$5,000 already funded is. TM explained that it was a grant to IDASA from OSI for this. There had been a discussion about adding some IFI questions to the 2004 OSI international study. There was uncertainty about the detail and it was agreed that RC and GS would have a separate discussion on email on this. TM would contact OSI. IL reported that she had discussed matters with Helen Darbishire and sought clarification re the relationship between GTI and the OSI project. Richard Calland confirmed that it amounted to using the structure of the OSI project to add relevant requests re IFIs.
30. **Charter:** Article 19 (TM) is responsible for the Charter. TM mentioned that OSI offered to provide matching funds for the development of the Charter. TM suggested a meeting and broad consultations thereafter to discuss what should go on the charts and how it should look. It was agreed that the Project Partners would submit ideas to TM via email as soon as possible. TM mentioned that they are aiming to finalise the documentation before the end of 2004.
31. **Coordinated Advocacy:** It was agreed that various Project partners would be involved in this activity. For the DC advocacy trip, JK noted that they are ready to launch/finalise in September 2004 and that this would be an opportunity to do press work.
32. For the Manila advocacy trip, VL mentioned that the Asian Development Bank (ADB) disclosure policy review is ongoing and a draft policy will be going to the Board of the ADB this fall. He suggested that this may be a good time to have the Manila advocacy trip. JK to provide contact details for people at the ADB to do preparatory workshops. VL mentioned that he was going to meet with ADB after June 2004 to discuss its disclosure policy review (?).
33. Magda reported that in relation to the EIB meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> of June it is still not even known where they are meeting and the ministers doesn't know either. The Chairperson asked sub-groups to discuss this matter and to provide feedback via email to the rest of the Project Partners re coordinated advocacy.
34. **Ad hoc Advocacy:** Idasa would be responsible for co-ordinating these matters, but no issues were raised.
35. **Translation:** The Bank Information Centre (JK) will be responsible for Translation. It was agreed that it would be generated through various case studies, The Charter for example.

## **General Meeting**

36. No decision was taken on this. Held over to future discussion.

## **General Reporting**

37. It was agreed that the lead organisation must prepare a progress report every six (6) months. First such report in November 2004.

## **Project Management Issues**

38. It was agreed that TM would draft the contracts for the organisations that are going to be accepting funds as lead organisations (legally, these would be sub-contracts from Article 19 on behalf of the SC to the individual organisations).
39. Copy Right was discussed. It was agreed by all present that it would reside in the GTI.

## **Communications**

40. An agreement was reached that the GTI would be responsible for providing and creating:
  - a) GTI logo
  - b) Leaflet/brochure – a one page description of the project, soft in form because additional items would be added later (IDASA agreed to prepare a draft).
  - c) Website
41. It was also agreed by all present that the GTI would be conceived as a movement and not a project.
42. AW suggested that the minutes of the meeting be available on the website as well as standard text about what the GTI is and current cause of proposal(s). Agreed by all present. RC & IT must draft the minutes and send to the members for comments/amendments before adding it to the website.
43. Agreed that Bretton Woods Project and BIC (JP and BJ) would come up with web ideas at the next meeting for the website co-ordination etc.

## **Fundraising: Next Steps**

44. It was agreed that SC members should come with "aspirational vision" for the expansion of the GTI's work, for consideration in the context of developing a bigger proposal.

## **Appointment of the Steering Committee**

45. The Chairperson suggested that all eight (8) organisations be represented on the Steering Committee. Seconded by all present and so noted.
46. Electronic decision-making: The protocol would be that decisions can be made by the Steering Committee provided that each and all of the eight (8) organisations reply positively to any suggestions or recommendations. It was also agreed that email correspondence and teleconference decisions would be final, once accepted by all parties involved.
47. The Chairperson suggested that the Memorandum of Understanding document be predated to 27 May 2004. Agreed by all present.

### **The next meeting**

48. The Chairperson asked that the Secretariat include the item "Core Funding" on the next meetings agenda. It was so noted by the Secretariat.
49. RC suggested mid-August as the date for the next SC meeting. The Secretariat would contact all the Project Partners to finalise the date and time.