Effective Institutions Platform

DRAFT SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 5th ANNUAL MEETING OF THE EFFECTIVE INSTITUTIONS PLATFORM (EIP)

www.effectiveinstitutions.org

Paris, France 25-26 April 2019

A. SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

1. On **25-26 April 2019,** 43 representatives from Government, CSOs, bilateral and multilateral organisations came together for the Annual Meeting of the Effective Institutions Platform in Paris. The meeting constituted the final step in the EIP revisioning process initiated in 2018, and was designed to ensure that the EIP is 'fit for purpose' in the current development landscape.

2. The main purpose of the meeting was fourfold:

i. to discuss the EIP's strategic focus for the coming years;
ii. to discuss the EIP's approach to monitoring and evaluation for P2P;
iii. to discuss the EIP membership and governance arrangements; and
iv. to showcase P2P learning experiences in the area of Public Sector Reform.

3. Discussions were structured around 11 sessions that convened over two days (see final agenda attached).

4. As an outcome of the 5th Annual Meeting of the EIP, the following actions were agreed:

a. The EIP's strategic focus, methods of work and partnerships:

- The Secretariat will work with the Co-Chairs to define the EIP's strategic focus (problem statement, goals, methods of work and mechanism of engagement with various partners) based on the discussions and options presented during the meeting. The strategic note will also outline the value add of having the EIP within the OECD and seek to consolidate the EIP within the context of broader OECD-DAC partnerships and networks. The strategic note will be shared with members of the Advisory Group for inputs by **31 May 2019**.
- The Secretariat will map existing P2P networks for a clearer sense of who is doing what in peer-to-peer support and identify prospective partners, by **30 June 2019**.

b. On Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning:

The Secretariat will conclude the process to engage expert support to design an MEL framework in order to record the EIP's results in a way that facilitates learning on approaches on building effective institutions by **31 May 2019**.

c. **<u>On Governance Arrangements</u>**

- In consultation with the joint EIP Co-Chairs, the Secretariat will propose *Terms of Reference* (ToRs) detailing the criteria to become an EIP member, and any specific roles and responsibilities or expectations that membership might entail. These ToRs will be circulated by the Secretariat to members **by 31 May 2019**.
- The Secretariat will send out a call for expressions of interest in the role of EIP joint Co-Chair and as a member of the *EIP Advisory Group* by **15 May COB**. Potential Co-Chairs and Advisory Group members will be given one month to respond.

d. **<u>Website and communications</u>**

- The Secretariat will continue work to update and improve the EIP website in ways that reflect the current state of play and results of the revisioning process, including by progressively uploading the presentations and summary notes from the meeting on the EIP website and Twitter account starting from **30 April 2019.**
- The Secretariat will finalise the minutes of the meeting for circulation **by 31 May 2019.**

B. SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSIONS

Opening Session: Joint Welcome of GovNet and EIP Participants

5. EIP Co-Chair, Per Nordlund, opened the meeting and welcomed EIP and GovNet members. The Co-Chair emphasised during this annual meeting how the EIP is at a critical juncture, and called on members to use the annual meeting to reinvigorate the EIP. Given their history and their place within the OECD, the EIP and GovNet are well placed to work for effective institutions for sustainable development. Nordlund noted that he would be stepping down as Co-Chair due to a change in role, and Karin Metell Cueva would take over as Sida Co-Chair moving forward.

6. Georgette Bruchez, the GovNet Co-Chair, welcomed participants and recapped the GovNet meeting. Bruchez noted that this joint session would help to highlight synergies so that members can collaborate to mutually reinforce each other's work.

7. Bruchez introduced Rose Wanjiru, who was acting for Margaret Kobia, Co-Chair of the EIP. Wanjiru noted that it was important to take time to reflect on how the EIP can be more sustainable, highlighting this meeting as a make or break moment for the EIP.

8. The Secretariat introduced the EIP Staff, followed by a round of introductions by participants. The Secretariat underscored that the EIP and GovNet share the same mission of supporting institutional change processes, and that the EIP can serve to inform GovNet Members about effective strategies for institutional change, based on their peer-to-peer experiences.

Session I: New Approaches to Support Institutional Change

9. This Session was designed to explore current knowledge and learning on how institutional change happens, and how peer-to-peer innovations and approaches can best support these changes.

10. The Session began with the theoretical perspective on approaches to support institutional change. Dr. Derrick Brinkerhoff, Distinguished Fellow Emeritus, Research Triangle Institute International, observed that institutions can be both formal and informal and can reflect beliefs, rules, and norms. Drivers of change are often functional deficiencies such as incompatibilities among different institutions levels, unresponsiveness to varying needs and demands, unresponsiveness to changing circumstances, or competition between institutions due to diverging interests.

11. Dr. Brinkerhoff noted that change occurs when institutions and social arrangements lose their functionality either gradually or due to systemic shocks. He went on to present some traditional models for institutional change, laying out three basic principles that need to be part of any change process:

i. Acceptance that there is a problem that needs solving,
ii. Authority to make decisions for resource allocation for the purpose of solving the problems
iii. Identifying or building the right capacities and skill sets to tackle the problem.

12. In thinking about inclusive institutions, and SDG 16 more broadly, Brinkerhoff encouraged members to examine historical evidence of inclusive features of institutions and to incorporate those elements in future programming.

13. Members raised queries surrounding the role of peer-to-peer in effecting institutional change, how to facilitate credible commitments by donors, and how to incentivise individuals to enable effective institutions. One member specifically responded to Dr. Brinkerhoff with an iceberg analogy for institutions; noting that it is often the factors that lie below the surface that sink or reform institutions. Brinkerhoff remarked that ultimately incentives are what drive behaviour and drive those hidden factors, and it is important to identify those incentives in order to understand institutional processes. Then in terms of commitments, donors need to make it easier for actors to work in their own interest, thus creating drivers in their own right.

14. Overall, Session I laid out the drivers of institutional change, the necessity of aligning and enabling local change agents and working through local systems, the need to have an understanding of the context and finally, the need to better document and learn, taking into account all the sources of information that can give a sense of progress achieved.

Session II: CABRI - A New Approach to Building PFM Capabilities

15. In the second session of the day, Mr. Neil Cole, Executive Secretary of the Collaborative Africa Budget Reform Initiative (CABRI) and Former EIP Co-Chair and Ms. Awa Touray, CABRI Programme Officer, presented CABRI's work on building PFM capabilities. CABRI works to build PFM Capabilities through 15 teams from 9 African countries by applying Problem-Driven Iterative Adaptation (PDIA) as an alternative approach to institutional reform.

16. Cole introduced CABRI as an intergovernmental organisation which focuses on value for money, public spending, and sustainable public debt. There are many common features of PFM reform in Africa, in that best practices that have succeeded elsewhere have often been applied to African institutions without understanding local dynamics, as part of a donor-driven agenda. Many reforms to date have been about improving legitimacy and signalling to development partners that change is afoot, although at times, the improved functionality of the programming is limited. That in mind, it is important for members to consider the necessary factors that improve institutional functionality, which includes understanding both what is working and what is not. Practitioners are best placed to identify the context of specific challenges. This places the practitioner at the front, centre, and back of the programme with a view to develop their capabilities while solving complex problems.

17. CABRI's approach is demand driven, and the PDIA helps practitioners articulate their problem statement. PDIA allows for experimentation, iteration and adaption in problem solving. To support the PDIA, CABRI uses SearchFrames rather than LogFrames as they allow for experimentation and learning. This approach rests on three factors: authority, acceptance, and ability. There is also need to move beyond the log frame, to identify the real change the development practitioner(s) wants enacted, and the PDIA approach allows for more flexibility towards this end goal. Finally, the PDIA approach allows for P2P learning within teams during each stage of the approach.

18. Touray addressed members from the perspective of someone who is both a practitioner and facilitator of the Building PFM Capability programme. The BPFMC consists of: identifying the core problem and the other issues around it, an online course with coaches where the participants are introduced to the PDIA approach, a framing workshop that seeks to deconstruct the problem into its root causes, the action push stage where teams experiment with solutions, adapt and iterate. Lastly, there is a progress review where participants report on next steps towards solving problems. A core component of the programme is a local agency to maintain high levels of practitioner engagement.

19. Touray then presented a case study from the Gambia where PDIA approach was used to solve the problem of resource misallocation. PDIA is not the only approach to institutional capacity development, and different approaches can work in parallel. Nevertheless, more attention needs to be drawn to how the process is enacted and thenecessary steps towards impact.

20. Members raised specific questions about the problem identification and monitoring and evaluation of the CABRI programming through the PDIA approach. CABRI noted the importance of focusing on process, and how different stepping-stones can lead to maximum impact. Thus, the factors of change and modes of assessment can vary depending on the problem identification and methods of work that are adopted and tailored to each individual project.

Session III: EIP Welcome

21. Opening the session, EIP Co-Chair Per Nordlund, welcomed participants in particular Rose Wanjiru, representing Co-Chair Prof. Margaret Kobia, and outlined the main purpose and objectives of the meeting.

22. A video message from Prof. Margaret Kobia was screened in which she gave a brief outline of the EIP's history. She underscored the importance of the EIP from a developing country's perspective, and highlighted the EIP's achievements. She encouraged participants to examine all opportunities regarding the EIP's performance and future prospects.

23. The Secretariat presented the agenda of the meeting, including its focus on the EIPs value add, its future strategy, methods of work and partnerships; a proposed discussion on the design of a framework for tracking change resulting from peer-to-peer approaches; and a discussion on EIP governance arrangements.

Session IV: Stocktake of the EIP's Journey from Busan 2011 to Date

24. The purpose of the fourth session was to put participants on the same page regarding the status of the EIP revisioning process. A short summary of antecedents (how the EIP evolved since its inception) and overview of the main achievements and challenges was outlined during the session.

25. Sara Fyson from the OECD Directorate for Public Governance, and former member of the EIP Secretariat, provided a short summary of how the EIP has evolved since its inception, with an overview of its main challenges and achievements. The EIP was created to implement the "New Consensus on More Effective Institutions" adopted in Busan in 2011. The consensus sought to support partner countries in strengthening their institutional frameworks and budgetary systems, to facilitate the use of country systems for aid flows. With the advent of Agenda 2030 and the SDGs, the scope of work of the EIP broadened, including:

I. Supporting opportunities to experiment and innovate by providing small grants to kick-start new P2P learning alliances.

II. Working at country-level to strengthen and promote the use of country systems (examples include Senegal and Bangladesh).

III. Facilitating the formation of peer-to-peer partnerships including civil society organisations, which fostered learning across and within countries.

26. Fyson suggested that the EIP might be interested in the OECD-Governance Directorate's Global Hub on the Governance of the SDGs. The hub is intended to showcase how Governments are integrating the SDGs into their development plans and will provide knowledge as well as technical expertise support to countries in developing their SDG governance frameworks.

27. Participants raised several issues in response to Fyson's presentation:

- The universal nature of Agenda 2030 and its emphasis on mutual accountability, challenges the EIP to reflect on how to develop partnerships and deliver on its objectives.
- The value add of the EIP is its use of P2P learning as a modality for capacity development. The P2P learning guide developed by the EIP is a particularly useful tool in this regard.
- Some participants emphasised the importance of the EIP *maintaining a focus on the aid effectiveness agenda* alongside Agenda 2030, as the former is an entry point for CSOs to contribute towards effective public institutions through P2P mechanisms.
- Participants suggested that the EIP needs to *align with target 16.6 of Agenda 2030*, and also consider the accountable and inclusive dimensions of institutions.
- Participants stated that the EIP should consider the way *technology is transforming the relationship between citizens and states* and (re)shaping people's engagement in institutional reform processes.
- Participants also noted the EIP's potential to serve as a *mechanism for knowledge and learning.* The EIP can focus on peer learning as a specific modality for institutional change, researching the different ways in which peer-learning can work, but it can also build and disseminate the evidence on alternative mechanisms for institutional support and engagement.
- Donors suggested that the EIP could also facilitate knowledge sharing among technical experts from OECD countries seeking to engage more coherently across government – i.e. "whole of government approach". Partner countries could contribute by sharing their experiences on what works and what does not.
- Some participants wondered how the EIP would support country-level institutions to deliver both on their mandate and on the SDGs. They expressed the need for the EIP to add a country-level dimension to its role as global convenor of stakeholders engaged in P2P learning, to which the Secretariat responded asking, what can the OECD (a Paris-based organisation) do to assist country level processes?

28. The Secretariat noted that there are various approaches to peer-to-peer learning that can be assessed by the EIP. Given that change happens differently across different institutions, and given the diversity of peer-learning approaches, the EIP could seek to synthesise and distil the different types of peer-learning, their benefits, and their shortcomings.

29. The Secretariat emphasised the comparative advantage of the EIP in convening a conversation on 'effective institutions' for the SDGs, given that it can convene DAC countries, recipient countries and implementers of institutional reform.

30. Sara Fyson closed the session, noting the importance of having a global space to discuss approaches to effective institution-building, where stakeholders can be brought together (from across the developmental spectrum) to learn from one another. The EIP can work as an honest broker to heighten accountability and transparency. She cautioned however that discussing objectives cannot be distinct from discussing resources, if one wants to achieve its objectives.

Session V: P2P Showcases

31. This session aimed to showcase recent or current inspiring peer-to-peer learning processes. The panel consisted of representatives of the Centre for Economic Governance in Kenya (CEG), LOGIN Asia (featuring both The Hunger Project India & the Bhutan Network for Empowering Women), and the Government Partnerships International (formerly the NSGI) and was moderated by Emily Hayter from INASP.

32. Rose Wanjiru of the CEG described how six Kenyan counties used the P2P methodology to build learning alliances to enhance county revenue generation and administration.

33. Preeta Lall of LOGIN Asia explained the processes and tools that her organisation has put in place to identify, build and monitor P2P learning partnerships in South and East Asia. Phuntshok Chhoden Tshering of the Bhutan Network for Empowering Women and Ruchi Yadav of the India Hunger Project went on to describe how a peer-to-peer learning partnership involving both organisations, with facilitation and support from LoginAsia helped increase the participation and representation of Bhutanese women in local government elections by increasing their literacy levels.

34. Jessica Wallis of GPI spoke to a north-south peer project where the UK HM Revenue and Customs department ('HMRC') partnered with the Pakistani Federal Bureau of Revenue (FBR), to share experience on pre-identified tax-related issues. Though the outcome of this partnership was largely successful (the FBR become a tax reform trailblazer in Pakistan and was appreciative of the safe space afforded by the P2P partnership for open and honest conversations), the HRMC experienced difficulties in establishing an impactful partnership with the FBR. Such difficulties were resolved by using adaptive and iterative programme methodologies that were context sensitive. GPI supported the HMRC integrating these methodologies, and thinking through how to effectively share their expertise. This example demonstrated to GPI the need to work beyond pairing peers, towards training and preparing

UK domestic departments to deliver internationally, realistically assessing the resources needed to conduct such partnerships and facilitating appropriate methods of collaboration to enhance peer learning.

35. Among the highlights of this exchange, participants noted that *consistency/continuity in stakeholders was crucial for successful programming.* For example, Wallis of GPI commented that *programming was more effective where there was no turnover in leadership or turnover among those engaged with the project,* as change takes time, and maintaining investments from the same set of stakeholders throughout the project helps with the retention of institutional knowledge at the individual and institutional level. Wanjiru added that *real change happened when there was both consistency of participants and highlevel representation*, so change could simultaneously occur from the bottom-up and from the top-down.

36. Additionally, it was noted that ownership of the peer alliance was crucial for change to happen. Wanjiru (CEG) noted that *success usually followed when peer alliances were clearly demand driven*. They learned to reach out to interested counties and have them identify local challenges to be tackled. Then CEG helps to facilitate meetings with a coach where these locally identified issues were discussed, and priorities were set. Wanjiru noted that the success of the programme was derived from listening to the demands of the peer-learners themselves.

37. Lastly, panellists noted that supporting peer-learning with the right staffing, and technical expertise leads to programme success. Lall noted that LOGIN had seen failure in projects when there had been low staff engagement, or the wrong technical expertise. LOGIN noted that from their experience, *successful peer-to-peer partnerships need to (i) have a clear framing, (ii) a safe space to effectively operate, and (iii) partners who have enough commonalities.*

38. Participants concluded by highlighting that the session had reinforced the need for good communication among donors and that the EIP might provide a good place for that dialogue.

DAY II

Opening Address by DAC Chair

39. The DAC Chair, Susanna Moorhead, welcomed participants to the EIP meeting, and noted the value of having both recipients and donors sitting at the table. Moorhead highlighted that development challenges, specifically governance challenges, are increasingly complicated and yet, their resolution is central to achieving the SDGs. The DAC Chair acknowledged that the EIP provides a good space to examine how effective institutions can contribute directly to sustainable development, by allowing members to move beyond generalities, and develop concrete answers to difficult questions.

Session VI: Strategic Focus, Methods of Work and Partners

40. The objective of this session was to shape the future strategic focus of the EIP.

41. The Secretariat presented three options:

i. ***Option I*** is for the EIP to become a global knowledge platform on how peer-to-peer learning can make institutions more effective, hence contributing to SDG 16 and Agenda 2030 more broadly.

ii. ***Option II*** constitutes a more ambitious approach and involves supporting existing peer learning alliances in one or more sectors of common interest to EIP members and donors. This approach could build on existing partnerships such CABRI or ATAF and on accumulated experience and progress made over the past few years in several peer-to-peer partner countries.

iii. ***Option III represents the most costly and ambitious option for the EIP, and involves*** the expansion of existing south-south or triangular (north-south-south) peer-to- peer partnerships, or the creation of new south-south or north-south learning alliances, to support SDG 16 implementation.

42. The Secretariat suggested that in considering the options, thought should be given not only to the relative merits of each option, but also to their resource implications, and the benefit or constraint of the EIP being situated within the OECD.

43. Participants were divided into three working groups. The conclusions of their respective decisions can be summarised in two points:

i. Participants signalled the need for **definitional clarity, rigour, and consistency** on the meaning of "effective institutions" as a basis for a vision for the EIP. That would help to establish a clear direction and to reinforce the EIP brand.

ii. Participants' preferences regarding the **vision of the EIP** converged around a combination of options I and III. This means an EIP that focuses on knowledge sharing and learning from and between existing peer-to-peer partnerships/networks (North-South, South-South, and intra-country), combined with support for innovative and experimental initiatives on institutional reform, going beyond peer-to-peer approaches to other (innovative) approaches such as problem-driven iterative adaptation (PDIA).

44. Participants further observed that ***the location of the EIP within the OECD was beneficial for networking, advocacy, showcasing of best practices and influencing the DAC***.

Having the EIP anchored at the OECD can facilitate dialogue with and between donors. It would also enable the EIP to reach out or make links to other initiatives within the OECD.

45. Further unpacking the "hybrid option", participants converged on the idea that the EIP has ***to identify, review and document good practices around successful institutional reform, including but not limited to P2P learning***. To that end, the EIP should be a platform that (a) facilitates access to bodies of evidence on institutional development and (b) enables collaboration and access to other platforms working on P2P learning for institutional growth. The EIP can offer a monitoring, evaluation and learning framework suitable to tracking progress and gathering evidence on the effectiveness of P2P and related initiatives, in support of institutional change. The EIP can also broker partnerships and facilitate dialogue and networking between alliances and regional institutions (AFROSAI, AFROPAC, CABRI etc.) to expand their efficacy and reach. The EIP can also facilitate relationships between a variety of non-traditional stakeholders such as the private sector, parliaments, trade unions, local governments, CSO etc., and partner countries.

46. Participants noted that the EIP has a specific value add in that its membership includes both northern and southern institutions, both state and non-state. Participants further emphasised the need to continue to build partnerships with southern institutions, and to pay particular attention to reaching out to partners with field presence.

Session VII: P2P Showcases

47. The second showcase on successful experiences of P2P supporting institutional change, was hosted by participants from Astana Civil Service Hub, IBON International, and United Cities and Local Governments Africa (UCLG) and moderated by Charlotte Ornemark.

48. Each of these initiatives are South-South peer-learning platforms. The Astana Civil Service Hub and UCLG work at the country-level on civil service and governance reform. IBON international works with a broad range of CSO networks to build consensus on how to address locally identified development challenges.

49. After providing brief introductions, the panellists provided some background on the organisational projects, peer-to-peer methods, and critical junctures in institutional reform and funding strategies.

50. Amy Padilla of IBON International, a capacity development institution, aimed at supporting capacity building in CSOs, explained how P2P learning occurred during thematic training workshops where participants shared experiences. A training needs analysis tool is used to identify CSO training needs. After the training workshop, government officials and

CSOs meet in a safe space to discuss issues related to the thematic focus of the workshop, and to identify their respective roles in responding.

51. Charles Patsika of UCLG shared a recent experience of how UCLG Africa supported the establishment of the Lesotho Association of Local Authorities by partnering leaders of local government associations in Lesotho with the Botswana Association of Local Authorities in a peer-to-peer learning alliance.

52. Representatives of the Astana Civil Service hub described how they used the EIP P2P learning guide to establish two successful P2P learning alliances. A first alliance on improving public service delivery (PSD) led to the establishment of "One-Stop Shops" for PSD in Azerbaijan (ASAN Service), Georgia (Public Service Halls) and Kazakhstan (State Corporation "Government for Citizens). A second alliance was created, involving six central Asia countries to work on the challenges related to the development and deployment of innovative e-government solutions and best practices.

53. Participants suggested that the EIP should participate in events organised by other P2P platforms such as Delog and Afrocities which deal with inclusive governance issues. Participants further interrogated the financial viability of P2P partnership given their resource-intensive nature. Panellists responded to this by sharing their experiences on how peers are often willing to take up the costs of running a P2P partnership when the outcome of this is perceived as beneficial.

Session VIII: Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning

54. The purpose of this session was to present and discuss options for MEL that will allow the EIP to gather evidence on the efficacy of peer-to-peer as an approach to institutional change. The session was moderated by Verena Knippel, Senior Advisor for Capacity Development at SIDA, and included presentations from LOGIN Asia and CABRI.

55. The moderator started the session by stressing the distinction between monitoring, evaluation and learning, noting that although each one has a learning focus, they are each different in what they aim to achieve. She also drew attention to the difference between more traditional results frameworks (focused on activities and outcomes) and more innovative approaches (focused on lasting change).

56. LOGIN began its work by using a traditional LogFrame to assess results, but noticed that it failed to accurately capture institutional change processes as they occurred. It also neglected to account for the degree to which any perceived change could be attributed to a particular change agent. LOGIN now uses a value creation framework in combination with a LogFrame to capture change processes and the potential value created by change agents. This also serves to bring more nuance to the stories and vast experience of their 120 members. For LOGIN, MEL is constantly evolving to capture the breadth of factors that play a role in their work and to enable continuous learning.

57. CABRI noted that although related, monitoring, evaluation and learning each serve distinct functions. Monitoring and evaluation encompass the broad scope of organisational activities, with a focus not only on outputs and outcomes but also on processes. This requires an analysis of the activities that have been included in the M&E framework in combination with participant perception of the relevance and applicability of such activities, and the knowledge they have acquired. Monitoring processes need to take into account pedagogy and methodology as well as quantitative and qualitative outputs, while learning can be captured qualitatively by sharing participants' stories. Evaluation, however should be independent, involving evaluators from the beginning of the project so the results of evaluations can be retrofitted into monitoring data.

58. In addressing attribution problems in monitoring and evaluation, LOGIN noted that interviews can help to draw out different causal links and detail the outcomes of the alliance. CABRI also highlighted the need to understand both attribution and contribution in monitoring and evaluation.

59. Participants closed the session by emphasising the importance of the MEL method, and requested that the Secretariat work to ensure that its MEL methodology remains simple so that it can be adapted to a variety of contexts. The EIP MEL framework should also look beyond outcomes to include processes as well. The Secretariat concluded by noting that it will shortly engage expert support to design a framework to record the EIP's results in a way that facilitates learning on good practices approaches towards supporting institutional change and development by 31 May 2019.

Session IX: Membership and Governance

60. The purpose of this Session was to discuss the EIP's current governance arrangements and the possible need to update its criteria for membership, Advisory Group participation, and Co-Chairmanship.

61. Many existing members are no longer responsive to EIP communications, and for some institutions the EIP focal point is no longer known. The Secretariat explained that some members may no longer be interested in the EIP, while others may like to join. The criteria and procedures for membership and participation need to be updated and confirmed. It was also observed that EIP membership should somehow be related to the EIP's future strategic focus, and should remain at the institutional (and not individual) level in order to effectively support the EIP's objectives and ensure long-term buy-in.

62. Participants acknowledged that incentives to become an EIP member will vary. For peer-to-peer alliances, the incentive for joining the EIP is to learn and share P2P experiences; for countries, it may be to solve particular public sector reform problems; and for donors, it may be to make their institutional development assistance more effective. Participants added that a Secretariat based in the OECD can serve to bridge these diverse interests and incentives.

63. Concluding the session, participants requested that the Secretariat update the EIP's existing governance arrangements, seek recommitment from existing members, introduce new members, reconstitute an Advisory Group and appoint two new Co-Chairs, based on expressions of interest from the membership. ToRs for membership, Advisory Group and Co-Chair will be circulated by the Secretariat by 31 May 2019.

64. Finally, participants noted that EIP members are keen to actively participate, but this implies regular or systematic communication with and between members. The Secretariat agreed to explore effective means to guarantee regular communication through an interactive and updated website, community space, and targeted messages to keep members informed and to stimulate discussion and engagement.

Session X: Forward Looking

65. To close the meeting the Co-Chairs shared last observations and summarised the next steps (as in the action points under par. 4).

66. The Secretariat will work with the Co-Chairs to define the EIP's strategic focus (problem statement, goals, methods of work and mechanism of engagement with various partners) based on the discussions and options presented during the meeting. The strategic note will particularly explore the value add of having the EIP within the OECD. The strategy note will be shared with members.

67. After finalising the minutes and the strategy note, the Secretariat will reconfirm the membership and actively seek new members. The Secretariat will also map existing peer-to-peer networks to get a clearer sense of who is doing what in peer-to-peer learning. This will help to identify prospective partners for the network moving forward.

68. The Secretariat will continue to update and improve the EIP website, including by progressively uploading the presentations and summary notes from the annual meeting on the EIP website and Twitter account starting from 30 April 2019.