

Post-2015 Pre-Charette Call

Friday, January 24, 2014 | 9:00 AM – 11:00 AM EST

Participants: Johanna Chao Kreilick, Strategy Unit; Gunner (Allen Gunn), Aspiration; *Peter Chapman, Open Society Justice Initiative*; Julia Toffoli, Strategy Unit; Alex Sveikauskas, Strategy Unit; Amy Yenkin, Documentary Photography Project; Vonda Brown, Latin America Program; Jerry Fowler, OSF-DC; Madeleine Crohn, Open Society Justice Initiative; Elizabeth Eagen, HRI and Information Program; Aidan Harris, OSJI London; Tin Gazivoda, OSIFE; Martin Hala, NBI; Diarmid O'Sullivan, OSF Fellow; Louise Olivier, HRI, Johannesburg; Mary Miller Flowers, HRI, DC; Martin Schoenteich, OSJI, DC; Zaza Namoradze, OSJI; Kersty McCourt, OSJI; Dan Sershen, Strategy Unit; Will Cohen, OSF Communications; Lotta Teale, OSJI; Marta Martinelli OSEPI; Ralf Jürgens, PHP NY; Zuhra Halimova, OSF Tajikistan; David Amiryan, OSF Armenia; Irman Lanti, TIFA; Miodrag Milosavljevic OSF Serbia; Pedro Abramovay, OSF Latin America; Russell Pickard, Africa Regional Office; Erika Dailey, OSJI; Deprose Muchena, OSISA, Johannesburg; Heather Grabbe, OSEPI; Mburu Gitu, OSIEA; Mohamed Sultan, OSIWA; Bipasha Ray, Open Society Fellowship; Salimata Soumare, OSIWA; Ibrahima Aidara, OSIWA; Laura Guzman, Information Program, NYC; Afia Asantewa Asare-kyei, OSIWA; Marie Nguettia, OSIWA; Maryanne Olson, Youth Exchange; Gladys Onyango, Youth Exchange; Betsy Apple, OSJI; Dierdre Williams, Education Support Program; Stephen Hubbell, Open Society Fellowships; Caitlin Pierce, OSF Presidential Fellow

9:10 AM Welcome & Background

Pedro Abramovay and Johanna Chao Kreilick

Key Objectives:

- Generate a set of outputs in order to package a set of inputs for the charette, creating a road map
- Gather ideas, thinking, hopes about work around post-2015
- Generate criteria for country selection, indicators, and specific goals within Goals 10 & 11 of HLP Report
- Experiment with different ways of effective collaborations (i.e. etherpad)
- Increase understanding, alignment, coordination, and collaboration across the network

Pedro:

- Huge amount of knowledge in the network; how can we utilize our knowledge and work to further the Post-2015 goals & agenda?
- Main goal of SF: Having goals and indicators is a good way to mobilize civil society to achieve results in the areas in which we work.
- What are the countries, criteria, and areas that we can choose to focus our efforts on to create an outcome that is more than the sum of our parts?
- How do we choose what work on justice and governance is going to make it into the SF? What can we do to narrow and deepen our impact within the SF?
- How do we make the best use of the Charette? What do we need to do beforehand?
Before the charette, identify the key questions and design the work.
 - Criteria to choose countries, indicators?
 - Plurality of countries already engaged, not engaged
 - Work already being done

Vonda:

- LAP hosting SF

Johanna:

- Recap of SF development process and Review Committee process

- Review Committee Recommendation:
 - The outcome of the February Charette should be to clearly define a number of focus countries where OSF can do concrete on the ground work on goals 10 (governance and effective institutions) and 11 (stable and peaceful societies)
- CS and GB do not have any specific country recommendations; these should be determined during Charette

Relevant Reading/Docs:

- Original Shared Framework Proposal (from Souk)
- Post-2015 Charette Briefer

9:30 AM OSF's Current State of Play on Post-2015 in Justice, Safety, Governance & Rule of Law

Peter Chapman, Caitlin Pierce (for Julie McCarthy) with All Participants

- Peter Chapman - TOPIC (5 minutes)
 - OSF's Current State of Play
 - The Open Working Group's next steps: there is a final meeting in the first week of Feb.
 - OSJI's work to date has been narrowed around 5 inter-related themes around global justice and development: access/right to information, legal identity, land rights, legal participation/public participation.
 - They continue to work closely with local and regional foundations. Partnership with Namati. Much of the global discussions take on a global perspective...but many have potentially limited instruments on the ground.
 - TIFA's work plan looks at high level advocacy and concrete ways to measure access to justice. National foundations are in a great place to know what is feasible and most relevant.
 - Questions: Do the themes have resonance at a national level?
 - What are areas for intensive country level engagement for measurement?
- Caitlin Pierce (for Julie McCarthy) - TOPIC (5 minutes)
 - Governance in relation to Post-2015
 - 3 Key thematic areas: Reducing bribery & corruption, enhancing transparency, freedom of association and expression.
 - Many conversations about reform in governance have been at an international rather than national level. 4 areas of engagement: initiating country level pilots bringing together different stakeholders. What are most pressing governance concerns in each country and what are good indicators?
 - Stream 1: Focus on nexus of countries that are ripe for reform at national level and have salience at international level. Indonesia, Liberia, Tanzania, Mexico, and Brazil.
 - Stream 2: Looking to support African civil society foundations. *Governance as an enabling criteria rather than important in itself.*
 - Stream 3: Working through open gov't partnership
 - Stream 4: Hiring NY based consultant to follow moment by moment play at UN
 - What does OSF think in term of justice goals? To what extent do we need articulable concept of justice?
 - To what extent do we need to focus on governance and justice as standalone goals verses cross-cutting issues?

Discussion Question: What work is taking place or is being considered on Post-2015 in the network within Goals #10 and #11?

Work taking place in the network:

- Human Rights Initiative:
 - Mary Miller Flowers and Louise Ehlers, HRI are interested in exploring possible connections to criminal justice/pre-trial detention work and the baseline data that they have finalized in Mozambique, Malawi, Zambia and Brazil. They believe this is at a stage that they can start measuring specific change that can clarify justice indicators and the results of OSF's partners advocacy in these countries. Working closely with regional platforms in Africa and the InterAmerican Commission to establish regional guidelines. Potential to work country, region to global. Suggest criteria to select countries include political will, good partners, good research/data, and OSF niche resources. Concerned about the mention of Liberia as a possibility.
 - OSF's Human Rights data program works both with national organizations on strengthening human rights data capacity and 'intermediaries' who work with organizations to strengthen their capacities. This could be particularly relevant to the lack of data and associated problems. HRI has an interest in compelling states to collect certain data; HRI would be interested in the Shared Framework if there is a possibility for the Framework to contribute to that objective. The Human Rights Initiative is also very interested in seeing disability rights and inclusive education as post-2015 themes; HRI has much technical expertise and grantees in this area.
- * Information Program/HRI joint project on data
 - the Human Rights Data Initiative has also had an interest in indicators, but in the sense that we have concerns about the inclusiveness of calculation (ABA, MCC, FH) and the ability of those composite indices to act as sound measures of progress.
- Education Support Program (Hugh McLean)
 - Macro discussion versus micro discussion on governance indicators. What about governance through the lens of social justice and equality? Might want to select a particular policy area like education to help support the governance discussion and demonstrate why it is important and measurable for the MDG goals. ESP interested in presenting a possible case study as an example. High Level Panel Report was one of 3 framing documents, but focus is now on working groups. ESP has worked closely with representative in UN and can be a good resource on expanding access for advocacy. ESP will be in Jan. 24 call.
- FOKAL (Lorraine Mangones and Michelle Pierre Louis)
 - Michelle Pierre-Louis also participated. Michelle is the chair of the Least Developed Countries (LDC) working group that drafted a response to MDG High Level panel report and is working with International Institute for Environment and Development on LDC agenda for post 2015. She has privileged access to these country representatives through this work.
- OSPC - DC
 - (Mort Halperin) Not sure that the argument that goals 10 & 11 can't be measured is valid. Good indicators on governance already exist. Millenium Challenge Corporation, ABA Index on the Rule of Law, Freedom House. Suggest we discuss with Jamie Drummon of One and Bob Hermen of Freedom House, and contact at MCC.
 - (Lora Lompe) How to have indicators that also measure bilateral involvement in the peace, rule of law and justice in other countries. Accountability of the external assistance of developed countries on bilateral support to peace efforts, justice and security. See blog post on her ideas for the Souk.
- Public Health Program (Ralf Jurgens)
 - The Public Health Program's contribution would be to ensure that the proposed activities to increase access to justice (both on the ground work and national/international advocacy) include specific

attention to the needs of socially marginalized and criminalized populations (Roma, people living with HIV, people with mental disabilities, sex workers, people who use drugs).

- Latin America (Pedro Abramovay and Vonda Brown):
 - A focus on accountability, transparency, and security agencies in LAP resonates with the role of these issues with homicides in the region. The Latin America Program's discretionary budget will be used to focus on violence and homicides as a key area, so this will fit with post 2015 well. **Colombia, Mexico, and Brazil** are the three countries in Latin America, which are particularly focused on issues of open government and good governance. These could be three strategic countries for targeted effort. These three countries are keen on access to information and transparency, however, this has not translated into work in the security realm. Generally the countries believe they need work in the Justice sector, but not in governance. **Chile** may provide a useful case study for education.
- Youth Exchange (Gladys Onyango and Maryanne Olson)
 - We've been engaged in working groups organized by UN Habitat, USAID, Save the Children, Restless Development, and others on how to more effectively engage young people in the development of the post-2015 agenda. Our position has been that youth need to be included as active partners in identifying priorities and now in developing indicators of success. Youth were particularly involved in the "MyWorld 2015" survey (which is ongoing) as data collectors on the ground and through development of online tools. Our primary questions moving forward are how to sustain the involvement of youth in the remaining stages of the process, but also how to ensure that youth and youth-led organizations are invested and adequately prepared to serve as implementing partners in their respective communities. We wanted to join this pre-charette call to learn more about the developing shared framework and see whether there are possibilities moving forward to support direct youth-led engagement around fiscal governance and justice goals or to contribute to the development of youth-friendly tools and resources to support youth engagement around these issues.
 - OSF Serbia has a strong focus on accountability of judiciary and the independent bodies dealing with HR and anti-corruption in respective fields. They are entrusted important powers and often provided with considerable guaranties of independence. However, their accountability is seldom publicly questioned or put under public scrutiny, watch-dogging and the like. Leaving these issues outside our focus would mean renouncing potentially powerful instruments in HR protection and fight against corruption.
 - OSIEA (Mburu Gitu) - OSIEA civil society partners in Kenya already begun in Dec 2013 national level advocacy efforts directed at government officials on expanded post MDG goals. Our ambition is to work with these partners to expand this advocacy work. The opportunity is that Kenya is co-chair of the open working group. We also see possible openings in Tanzania.
 - OSISA (Deprese Muchea) - has two pieces of work it is engaged with. The first is the work we are doing as part of eight high level global think tanks where we are proposing policy briefs offering principles and approaches for integrating economic, social and environmental sustainability and equity in a new post 2015 development agenda. Our policy briefs will examine how the post 2015 goals and strategies can address development issue in a way that integrates their environmental, economic and social dimensions. I can share the first policy brief that we produced under the Independent Research Forum to which OSISA belongs. The second is a series of strategic engagements with national parliaments in our region designed to ensure that there is implementation capacity for the post 2015 goals at a national level, and that Parliaments are playing an oversight and monitoring role in bringing the executives to account in the manner public policy in general and the post 2015 agenda is/will be implemented. To this end we convened a large gathering of Parliamentarians from the continent in November last year, here in Johannesburg, working with UNDP and the Pan African Parliament, Southern Africa Trust and others. We have chosen DRC, Malawi, Zambia and Botswana as pilot countries. A key constituency we are involving is civil society.

- Diarmid O'Sullivan (OSF Fellow) - Some OSF grantees are signatories to a new CSO position on governance and Post-2015 which I've been facilitating (Diarmid). The document can be found at <https://www.globalintegrity.org/posts/governance-and-the-post-2015-development-framework-a-civil-society-proposal/> and we'll be taking it around UN member state missions in New York next week.
- Some OSF grantees have initiated the following - **Access to information and independent media are essential to United Nations Post-2015 Development Agenda**
 - Why access to information must be a central pillar in the future of development (ARTICLE 19/IFLA/DI/Civicus)

From Discussion:

- Irman Lanti-TIFA
 - We cannot decouple development issues (education, healthcare), from working on justice and governance side, everything is related. Especially re: budget and how to increase human development.
 - TIFA will be working on these issues anyway, part of strategy, but also related to MDGs and Post 2015 agenda.
 - Key question: What is the link between justice and governance and development goals?

Written Feedback on Etherpad in response to Irman:

- Pete - I think the point by Irman is excellent; it's hard to decouple justice and governance from development sectors. I hope that we can focus on justice and governance within sectors and think there can be opportunities to do so, e.g., using RTI for improving health or service delivery outcomes
- Lotta - I agree with Pete and Irman - there are important governance and justice aspects across different HLP goals
- Dierdre Williams ESP
 - Education is an essential concern when thinking in terms of issues of justice and governance, less educated people face great difficulties in accessing justice; these issues are inextricably linked
 - Now is an opportune moment to expand the gamut and include other concerns
 - What are the ways we can ensure the MDGs can reach the most marginalized people, consistent with OSF's philosophy and values? How can we produce evidence from our work on the ground and ensure it reaches the UN level?
 - One of the most effective ways to create a broad coalition of constituency-based organizations. New agenda should be led from the south. Blocks of countries vs individual countries.
 - Who are allies and partners that can identify existing evidence on the ground? Looking at grouping of countries where we have close alliances. Collecting data to improve education in those places.
 - ESP is engaging in higher-level advocacy and speaking with the same groups as justice and governance; should consider breadth of what we are working on.

- Written Response on Etherpad in response to Dierdre:

- Deprose- I want to agree with the point raised by the ESP colleagues about the links between accessing public goods for poor or marginalized groups- such as education/health and the centrality of governance in the access. The point is that it has now been noted that responsive and accountable institutions of governance are often the missing link between anti-poverty efforts and poverty reduction- for example. Even when a country seems to implement pro poor national policies and targets its interventions, faulty

governance can nullify the impact. So to get poverty reduction campaigns off the ground, access to education and health and other campaigns off the ground, reforms of governance institutions often need to be emphasized. We therefore must find ways of linking governance to some of the ongoing development work we are involved in.

- Heather from OSEPI: Raised two questions to participants about their previous and existing work on indicators, methodology, and practical experience.
 - Question 1: Who has experience using indicators, both in terms of measuring their own work and on the ground, especially in sectors where there are not well developed indicators? Governance is well-developed, but Security and Use of Data are more complicated.
 - Question 2: What existing and previous work has OSF done on using indicators in advocacy at the national level? What indicators are most effective in advocacy at the national level? And the local/municipal? Sensitive to comparative national indicators, less so for regional comparisons.
 - Should we give weight to indicators that may be more difficult to gauge, but may have a huge impact?

- Elizabeth - I would like to talk further on indicators in reply to Heather's question. If we have the opportunity to use this process to shape the way that data is collected and used (both in measuring and in forming indicators of progress) that would be quite interesting, and tap into our network of data experts, statisticians, etc. Happy to keep talking.

- Pedro: Issues raised by TIFA and ESP should be addressed before Charette. GB gave SF mandate to work around justice and governance.
 - It doesn't mean that the work being done on other 2015 areas has less value. But on those two areas OSF has a particular contribution to make through the SF process.
 - Integration: We cannot set this as a separate goal, because we have advocacy already being done; If OSF is seen as pushing this agenda as separate from development, it would create a polarized framework that would be disruptive. Integration is critical.
 - Governance: Always governing something, to produce specific policies. How much can we produce results and indicators around governance that are related to development issues like health and education? These issues would have an impact on the creation of indicators around governance. But main objective has to contribute to the debate around governance and not get around this process to get a different, polarized, agenda.

- Betsy Apple: Two Questions
 - Q1: Are we thinking about who is seeking to engage international organizations in post-2015 (as opposed to national level organizations)? OSJI has been doing some; this is a sphere of work that shouldn't be neglected.
 - Q2: Who and what work occupies the space between national level work and international level advocacy? Who bridges that space? National level data being gathered has implications for international level advocacy, and it's unclear who takes responsibility for that.

- Pedro: This is Post-2015 On the Ground SF. Energy and effort has to be focused on countries and on the ground work. OSJI is still responsible for international advocacy, and SF work must be integrated. But the focus of the SF is on the ground.

- **Key output of Charette**: specific countries and goals within 10 & 11. How do we coordinate, link, align national and international work to strengthen work on the ground?

- Jim Goldston: There are two parts to Charette Mandate:
 - Identifying ways to enhance on the ground work for its own sake and using this international process to influence work already being done.
 - Much longer timeline (at least 4 years)
 - Find ways to enhance international advocacy efforts on post-2015
 - 18-month timeline max (until end of 2015)
 - Think about these contrasting timelines to influence our thinking.

10:15 AM Inputs Needed for the February Charette

Discussion Questions:

What criteria should we apply to selecting countries for work in the three categories (existing work, extended work, new work)?

- Country Selection Criteria:
 - Where are our strongest allies, partners, working?
 - Do we want to select a plurality of countries (i.e. post-conflict, etc.)--what should the pastiche of countries look like?
 - Where do we have good relationship with governments
 - Credibility/relevance of countries to the UN advocacy process
 - Where are other donors working on similar work - do we want to look at countries where we have allies in the donor community or do we want to go for countries where other donors aren't working (and where OSF may have a niche) (Vonda Brown)
 - Whether Foundations or thematic programs have active, existing presence/initiatives on the ground.(Irman Lanti & Deprose agrees!)
 - What about mechanisms that are taking place at the regional level - southeast Asia - be mindful of regional initiatives
 - Come in with value add and not run risk of parallel
 - Strong regional economic communities are there working groups that are monitoring - Foundations ID where each of these countries are at - and civil society. Co-chairs to parliamentary working groups, Kenya, Liberia, Uganda, etc. find out what they are doing. Concern of Too Many Cooks in the Debate.
 - Is there a leadership by governments on the ground so that we can have a partner to work with
 - What gov't entities are open to reform?
 - Do we have strong civil society partners, viable, well informed?
 - Jim's dual criteria :
 - Where there is political opportunity?
 - Where is there work already happening? - Where we can take advantage and claim success quickly?, low hanging fruit
 - For advocacy purposes too: - element of representativity -geographically and with respect to income levels. (all are sharing responsibility and the burdens of advancing these
 - Zuhra: Level of development is an important consideration. What about the Global Middle? Middle Central Asia/ Middle East - beyond Global North and South.
 - Are we bringing a new idea into the regional so we don't gum up the works?
 - ID countries where problems are significant but have a reasonable chance of making some impact
 - Countries that are in position of influence by holding a chair of a particular group on the advocacy front (countries vote in blocks); Who can we reach by virtue of country connections?

- Kenya, Hungary - chairs of Open Working group
- Nature of engagement and the timeline of our goals - do we want our goals to bear fruit quickly or are we looking to break in to a more closed or challenging context? What are qualities of our goals/nature of engagement, and can these help us select criteria by which to choose countries?

What criteria should we apply to selecting specific goals (within Goals 10 and 11 of the High Level Panel Report) and related indicators?

- Peter Chapman: On goals and targets in 10 & 11: Focus on national priorities, same criteria as country selection.
 - Access to information and legal identity are particularly salient re: integrating into sectors.
 - When selecting indicators: think broadly about how indicators would be developed, and think about measurement of themes and diverse forces of information. Not just what but how?
 - Shouldn't pick indicators devoid of broader context.
- Caitlin: Process of coming up with indicators as a nationally grounded process. Broad brush sweep of indicator development isn't specific enough with regard to nationally grounded processes, what's feasible in a given country considering data collection capacities, logistics, infrastructure.

10:50 AM Closing and Next Steps

Johanna and Pedro

Closing notes/next steps

- **Johanna**
 - Review Committee → Working Group will continue to support SF process.
 - Will collect data collected during the pre-charette, cross-reference with existing work to determine potential countries/goals.
 - "Archeological dig"
 - Peter, Julie, Pedro: available as organizers within different streams of work.
 - We'll be reaching out based on emerging clusters and themes
 - Even if streams of work don't get pulled up into the SF, thinking on it is still extremely valuable for future work at OSF.
- **Pedro**
 - Encouraged participants to think about who to engage with and how: send us your ideas for countries, indicators, goals