****

***Secretaría de Estado de Economía, Planificación y Desarrollo***

**Summary of IATI regional consultation for the Latin American and Caribbean region**

**16-18 September 2009, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic**

Representatives from ministries of finance, planning and international cooperation and other organizations from **Bolivia, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Haiti, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru and St. Vincent and the Grenadines** (see separate participants list) took part in the International Aid Transparency Initiative’s (IATI) consultation for the Latin America and Caribbean region in Santo Domingo, the Dominican Republic between 16-18 September 2009.

The purpose of the consultation was to inform countries about IATI, consult and solicit feedback on the 4-parts of the aid transparency standard, i.e. i) scope of information to be provided by donors, ii) common definitions, iii) the common data exchange format and iv) the Code of Conduct, as well as invite the governments to join the initiative and the future work on the standard.

**Opening Ceremony, 16th of September 2009**

The meeting was opened by **Eng. Temistocles Montas, Secretary of State for Economic Planning and Development of the Dominican Republic** who underlined the importance of transparency for political participation and accountability. In the context of the global financial crisis, international cooperation was an essential supplement to domestic resources in mitigating the effects of the crisis, fighting poverty and achieving the MDGs. The Government was mindful of the fact that the introduction of transparency mechanisms can produce a culture of accessible information, trust and social confidence that can become an important factor for good governance. The Dominican Republic had introduced a number of reforms to this end, such as the adoption of a Freedom of Information Act; the reform of the public financial sector with the promulgation of a Public Credit Act, a State Contracting and Procurement Act, a Budget Act and a new Statute on Internal Control. The Minister announced that the Dominican Republic subscribed to the principles of the Rome and Paris Declarations on Aid Effectiveness, the Accra Agenda for Action, the Monterrey Consensus and the outcome document of the Doha Summit and that his government was also endorsing the International Aid Transparency Initiative. He expressed hope that the regional workshop would allow participants to achieve agreement on a code of conduct, which would allow the information regarding official development assistance (ODA) to be received in a timely, transparent and efficient manner. This would facilitate the predictability of aid and assist with the objective evaluation on the part of the various actors committed to a positive impact of ODA.

**The UN Resident Coordinator and UNDP Resident Representative, Ms. Valerie Julliand** welcomed participants to the IATI consultation and urged them to actively share experiences and ideas on the role of ODA in the region, transparency, the setting up of information systems for the management of international cooperation and how initiatives such as IATI can be used to strengthen existing systems and mechanisms and national processes for transparency and accountability. UNDP was a strong promoter of IATI as it believed that developing countries should have the tools and information required to manage external and domestic resources effectively and efficiently. The lack of information on ODA undermined the capacity of countries to plan their long-term development. The consultation in the Dominican Republic was the last one in a series of regional consultations organized by UNDP and host governments to garner the challenges developing countries face in accessing information on international flows and in soliciting their input for how greater transparency can be achieved through IATI.

**Session 1: Introduction, 17th of September**

**América Bastidas, Sub-Secretary of State for Economic Planning and Development, Dominican Republic**

**Topic: Aid information in the broad context of ownership, alignment and mutual accountability.**

The Monterrey Consensus was the first agreement on how international cooperation should be conducted. This was followed by the Rome Declaration on Harmonization and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness with its monitoring framework and the Accra Agenda for Action. One of the key principles defined was national ownership. There cannot be a cooperation agenda until there was a National Development Strategy (NDS) in which the national priorities, approach and viewpoints of each country can be put forward. Alignment would follow on from the above, since donors would accommodate the strategies, plans and mechanisms of the recipient countries. Sharing information on international cooperation in a timely manner was vital since it would feed into the budgets of recipient countries. Most importantly, cooperation priorities should be aligned with the NDS and confirmed in the budget; anything that does not appear in the budget is not a priority, merely a list of good intentions. Countries that have defined strategies have to rely on multi-year planning, which can lead to multi-annual budgeting, and therefore the predictability of aid inflows was key. We must manage for results, by simplifying processes and developing indicators to measure impact. So far, we have employed the criteria of the donor countries, but this did not promote national capacity building. We needed to support reforms that encouraged transparency.

The Dominican Republic was drawing up its own NDS, which would be an instrument for directing activities through the design of a national multi-year plan. This NDS would be put before Parliament and made into law. It encouraged dialogue with donors, which would permit and encourage institutional development, especially of the Sub-Secretariat of State for International Cooperation (SSECI).

**German Arturo Shuster, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, Colombia**

**Topic: Aid information in the broad context of ownership, alignment and mutual accountability.**

In 2006, the Government of Colombia established an information management system for monitoring international cooperation in alignment with its NDS (2006-2010). It captures the assistance provided by donors and can produce a map of interventions. The system allowed information gathering in a moderately standardised form. However, it would require further standardization, so that the information could be presented with geo-referencing data and allow for impact assessments to be made. In terms of monitoring and evaluation, the greatest challenge was to have reliable information, which would lead to improved accountability not only of the government but also of the donors who will be accountable for what aid had achieved and its value added.

**Danila Boneva, UNDP/IATI Secretariat**

**Topic: Introduction of the aims and objectives of IATI in the context of the implementation of the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) at the country level. Scoping study on IATI: main messages and conclusions.**

The IATI consultation in the Dominican Republic was part of the series of regional consultations with partner countries leading to the global IATI Conference in The Hague in October 2010. The aim was to understand the partner countries' point of view; the challenges they face in obtaining information and how IATI would deal with those. IATI was a multi-stakeholder initiative and was established as a result of the Accra Agenda for Action and the commitments made by donors and providers of assistance to increased transparency. Better aid information would facilitate planning and decision-making in partner countries, while access to information would empower citizens to demand accountability. Better information would also help with donor coordination, avoiding duplication of efforts. IATI could be perceived as being technical, but transparency was about change of culture in governments, aid institutions, etc. IATI sought to work on both the political agreements needed to be reached and the technical ones. The main goal was to reach an agreement on what information donors and providers of assistance would publish proactively in addition to what was already held by the OECD and on a timelier basis.

Partner countries can join the initiative, as well as any donor organizations or providers of South-South Cooperation (SSC). IATI had 17 donor signatories, mainly OECD/DAC ones, but the Secretariat would welcome emerging donors to sign up.

In 2009, IATI would pursue agreements on the scope of the standard, analysis of common definitions and formats.

**Danila Boneva, UNDP/IATI Secretariat**

**Topic: Introduction of the aims and objectives of IATI in the context of the implementation of the AAA at the country level. Scoping study on IATI: main messages and conclusions.**

The Scoping Paper dealt with the limitations of existing information on aid, the problems encountered by various users to access it, in particular in developing countries, and how better transparency could be achieved. One of the main problems with current aid data was its timeliness. For example, Ministries of Finance require information in line with the national fiscal year. The lack of detailed definitions or the inconsistencies of their use lead to difficulties in interpreting the data from different donors and sources. Critical information that was missing was on donor projections for countries for 3-5 years. One of IATI's main objectives was to improve information available at the country level and ensure that this empowered recipient countries in their decision-making. Using a common format would allow for the exchange of information between donor and partner country information systems. In previous consultations, governments had underlined the importance of having information on flows originating from NGOs and providers of SSC.

**Discussion Round**

* ODA is a concept that does not capture all international cooperation, in particular SSC. Each country has different ways of reporting SSC flows and different institutions collect the Information (e.g. ministries of finance, foreign affairs, etc.). A number of countries in the LAC region are both recipients and providers of technical cooperation and other forms of support.
* Recipient countries need to be able to monitor the setting of conditionalities and have access to qualitative information. Another fundamental issue is that of capacity of national institutions to manage the information and statistics. These capacities need to be rebuilt in many countries. Information management systems that capture international cooperation do exist, but the real question is their value added.
* Often recipient countries are confronted with situations where grants are followed/accompanied with soft interest financing, which is not aligned with the country’s NDS, but rather with the objectives of the donor. How will IATI classify projects, which begin as grants, but then are transformed into loans?
* ODA provides an additional boost to national efforts, but it limits the concept of mutual responsibility, presenting aid as a favour rather than as a shared responsibility. IATI should cover technical cooperation, even if it is deemed to have no financial value. It is key to standardize methodologies to capture SSC flows at the global level.
* All OECD donors should sign up to IATI.
* Questions: What is the process for partner countries to join IATI?

**Responses**

* IATI was a concrete step towards assuming the transparency commitments made under the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action by donors. Progress made in international cooperation had to be measured on both sides. For example, IATI proposed to capture the delivery channels for assistance, which would allow countries to monitor the flows from donors, NGOs and other service providers.
* Partner countries can endorse IATI by expressing their interest in a letter to the Secretariat or a declaration.

**Session 2: Main challenges to the access and use of aid information**

Reflections on the Virtual Consultation

**Gert Danielsen, UNDP Regional Centre, Panama, Germán Arturo Shuster, Colombia and América Bastidas, Dominican Republic**

Participants in the virtual consultation on IATI, which preceded the workshop had stressed the importance of measuring the impact of SSC instead of the costs. Quality of the information was very essential both from the donor and recipient country perspectives. AIMS have duplicated or missing information entries regarding ODA. The provision of information and the information itself should conform to the requirements of the recipient countries. Ministries of finance, planning and cooperation had to inform not only donors and other government officials on the aid/SSC flows, but also citizens. Donors and recipient countries need to discuss and agree what information should be collected and how it could meet the requirements of governments, the budget, and the NDS. We also need to link transparency to accountability. A number of respondents had stressed the importance of the future IATI Code of Conduct.

**Thematic break-out groups:**

**Break-out Group 1: *“Current sources of aid information and the challenges associated with these”***

**1. How do you currently access information on aid for your country?**

* Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.
* National information systems which in some countries are fed by sectoral and donor agencies, in the majority of cases by donors.
* Donor web sites.
* In the case of NGO cooperation, in some countries information is gathered through sworn statements or reports from NGOs that reflect the global sums received.

**Access to information:** Information is accesible when citizens have access and not only government officials in their capacity. Information that donors provide to governments should be made public. For example, it should be evident from the budget which projects are funded by international cooperation. Even if this is known, it is only published 6 months after the budget itself is published to the public. The general user has access to international sources that publish data about the country. It is good to compare the agreements on fiscal transparency with IATI. Transparency should not be one-sided.

**2. What are the main challenges you find in using already existing aid information sources?**

* We first need to define what information, who is it for, why and how it will be obtained? Then we need to develop a standardized conceptual framework to enable statistical comparisons.
* The financial periods used by donors and recipients do not correspond, and this causes problems in the disbursement of ODA flows.
* Providers of assistance should establish internal coordination among their agencies regarding the gathering and provision of information.
* Fiscal transparency of recipient countries is also important.
* Donors should enable information to be integrated into their multi-year planning.
* Each country should have a regulatory framework for transparency, since the IATI Code of Conduct would not be binding.

**Bolivia:** has a system for recording agreements and projects, which are cross-referenced using project codes. Work is being carried out on a pilot system for collecting information. Donor information is entered.

**Colombia:** Within the Asesora Dirección Cooperación Internacional, each staff is responsible for the cooperation with several donors and collects information on projects, agreements, amounts agreed, and the geographical region. New agreements signed are entered into the system and are geo-referenced. Monitoring of South-South cooperation and non-traditional donors is being systematized. Data received from donors is compared with that of the OECD, but the latter is usually useful for past comparison. An NGO alliance provides information on how much aid is received, but gives no detail on the donor or the region.

**Mexico:** SIMEXCID (Information System of Mexico’s International Cooperation for Development) is a web platform, which has the complete record of Mexico’s international cooperation (inflows and outflows). Users can query the Information according to various criteria. The Government sees SIMEXCID as a powerful tool to plan ahead, evaluate the past and monitor ongoing projects and activities. The system captures not only ODA flows, but also SSC and triangular cooperation, including cost-sharing partnerships and the know-how of experts.

**Peru:** The Government relies on a dual system for gathering information. A matrix that allows providers of cooperation to register assistance, whether it is financial or technical. Information is recorded in the MIPCI system once assistance has been programmed or disbursed. It is accessible on-line to all. Another system tracks NGO assistance. Foreign NGOs working in Peru have access to tax concessions. They have to submit a report every two years along with the activities that they envisage carrying out to maintain up-to-date records regarding their work. This information is then entered into the system. Work is ongoing to incorporate projects managed by government entities, incl. disbursements made by the sectoral agencies. The Comptroller's Office takes action if sectoral agencies’ activities are not incorporated into the system. There are delays in the provision of information by donors to the MIPCI.

**Break-out Group 2: *“Priorities of partner countries for improving access to aid information”***

1. **What aid information do you need and which do you consider to be the most or least important?**

* All Information identified by the scoping study is needed. It is difficult to assign priority to the different Information ítems.
* Geographical location, origin and sector. How it aligns with the national development strategy?
* Supply of cooperation – programmes, amounts available as well as human resources, modality, eligibility and selection criteria, contacts, conditions attached
* The proposal and details of the intervention, priorities
* Project implementation – quantifying technical cooperation, local government contributions, decentralized cooperation, geographical information, implementation periods, sectors
* Beneficiaries, identification of target groups
* Whether aid is in kind or in cash.
* Physical and financial progress indicators.

1. **Are there any information needs that you consider important but which are not yet covered by the scoping study?**

* Standardized quantification of non-financial cooperation
* Duplicate accounting of fund sources
* Non-traditional cooperation: NGOs, decentralized cooperation, private sector flows.

**3. Within the broad categories proposed, are there any more specific information needs that need to be detailed?**

* Impact monitoring and evaluation
* Joint evaluation between governments and donors
* Systematized cataloguing and exchange of good practices and/or lessons learned.

**Standardization issues:** The OECD has classified the purpose of expenditures. There is no standardization of the results of ODA. How can we make comparisons across countries if there is no standardization of results? There is no classification of ODA expenditure (i.e. charts of accounts). We need a global standard for expenditure entries.

**Break-out Group 3: *“Potential impact of better aid information”***

**1a. Is it true that better aid information results in better decisions?**

* Better aid information actually contributed to better decision-making whenever it was framed within national planning processes and NDS. This was also the case when this information was used by those responsible for decision-making at political level and when this information was complete, accurate and timely.

**1.b. What type of information do donors and partner country governments require for strengthening planning, developing budgets and applying them?**

* Macroeconomic information on ODA.
* Evaluation of the results and impacts of programmes and projects funded with ODA going back 5 years.
* Principal lessons learned from the implementation of ODA in the country.
* Favourable and unfavourable factors surrounding the project.
* Projections on the amounts and types of ODA.
* Information on disbursement procedures and conditions attached to ODA.
* Emphasis on budgeting for results.

**2. How can improved aid information bolster national responsibility and strengthen mutual accountability systems?**

* Improved information enhanced budgeting for results which would lead to improved accountability processes.
* Improved information together with proper indicators on effectiveness produced more transparent and reliable reporting.
* Better information on ODA meant that Civil Society Organizations can request and oversee the results of ODA.

**3. How can improved aid information strengthen accountability at the national level?**

* Better information made a decisive contribution to the generation of better quality and more reliable monitoring and evaluation reporting on the performance of plans, strategies and projects relating to the national planning systems.
* Improved information on ODA allowed ODA performance indicators to be set up, providing a high predictive and analytical impact.
* Improved information allowed for the creation of ‘monitoring centres’ on ODA activities which make cooperation more transparent. These provide alternative accountability processes for the countries involved, which can be backed by non-governmental monitoring facilities possessing the technical capacity to interpret and utilize such ODA information.

**Break-out Group 4:** ***“Special needs and issues with respect to aid information in post-conflict situations”***

* One size does not fit all. Post-conflict countries have specific needs:
  1. The asymmetries of power with regard to obtaining Information are more exacerbated in those countries
  2. The needs for national capacity building are more urgent and prevalent
  3. The lack of aid predictability in such contexts is even greater
  4. Aid conditionalities are disruptive to the national development planning and priority setting.
  5. International cooperation should abide by the political agreements of the UN, OAS and other inter-governmental bodies.

**Thematic break-out groups, 18th of September**

**Break-out Group 1:  *IATI process: How should IATI be developed? How should partner countries be involved?***

1. ***How should IATI be developed?***

* Include as members of the Steering Committee[[1]](#footnote-1) one representative per region.
  + 1 Latin America
  + 1 Caribbean
  + 1 Eastern or Central Europe
  + 1 North Africa-Middle East
  + Decentralized cooperation.
* The manner in which the decisions of the Steering Committee are to be carried out should be made public.
* A mechanism allowing countries not involved in the consultations to participate should be established.
* Encourage the participation of countries not involved through UNDP.
* Establish a standardised evaluation system for partner countries to assess compliance with the IATI Code of Code (baseline for national information systems).
* Define who shall be responsible for the IATI information system. It should be representatives of partner countries and donors.

***2. How should partner countries be involved?***

* Establish a virtual network, forums and video-conferences with participants from regional consultations, which are open to others.
* Participants at the regional consultation to consult and capture needs of other ministries.

**Break-out Group 2: *What needs for support and capacity development arise in partner countries?***

***1.******What are the support and capacity development needs of aid recipient countries?***

***1.1. What are the obstacles and opportunities for the effective participation and influence of partner countries in the IATI process? How can these obstacles be overcome?***

**Obstacles:**

* There are weaknesses in the information systems belonging to governing or central bodies, and to sectoral agencies.
* The confusion of concepts, indicators, etc. used in the systems for registering, managing and monitoring aid.
* The lack of standards for regulating the reporting of sectoral agencies to the regulatory body, which supervises international co-operation at the country level.
* Administrative structures and their legal foundations need to be strengthened.

**Opportunities:**

* Countries that have various national ‘sub-systems’ to collect information can integrate them into an information system on co-operation.
* The instruments and tools IATI proposes can help to evaluate the impact of aid.

***1.2. How can these obstacles be overcome?***

* An information system applying IATI standards
* Re-structuring the national system for international co-operation
* Receiving technical assistance from IATI in order to implement best international practices
* Improve information at the country level through periodic reports from the sectoral agencies
* The institutions must assume their respective roles within the entire international co-operation framework.

**2. What type of capacity restrictions and bottlenecks do you currently face in the area of aid information management at country level?**

* The scattering of information due to the failings of the regulatory body in controlling co-operation
* There is no methodological coordination or uniformity amongst government bodies
* This lack of organization affects the provision of capacity building available within the SSC window
* We need to know exactly what the aid disbursements are and thereby make an appropriate record in accordance with their true value
* Accessing information on the resources channelled towards NGOs.

**3. What do you think are the principal needs for additional support in the implementation of the IATI standard and Code of Conduct in your country?**

* In order to comply with the standards and Code of Conduct, we need a firm conceptual base. It should adhere to the regulatory policies of each country and there should also be a forum where international cooperation is discussed.
* Donors should continue to join in supporting IATI
* IATI must persuade donors to comply with their transparency commitments in the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action as a minimum consensus
* The methods used by national accounting systems should be harmonized, e.g. the IMF's public finance system with the balance of payments manual.
* There is need for a process of awareness-raising in terms of understanding donor behaviour.

**Break-out Group 3 *Towards an IATI Code of Conduct: What are the key priorities for inclusion by partner countries?***

**1. What, in your opinion, are the main priorities to be dealt with in the IATI Code of Conduct?**

* Donors must be tasked to provide information regarding the sectors they prioritise and to negotiate with partner countries in order to dispel any doubts concerning their priorities. In other words, the flow of information concerning the priorities of both parties should be transparent and known to both.
* Deadlines should be established for providing information, incl. on future funding flows, and the mechanisms and instruments that are to be used.
* A means should be set up whereby, as a function of the level of aid management pertaining to each country's development, the stages at which the IATI protocol is to be adopted can be established.
* There should be flexibility in the implementation of the actions of the IATI initiative, according to the particular characteristics of the respective countries.
* In addition to the establishment of a Code of Conduct regarding information flows, there should also be one for actions linked to ODA programmes.
* The Code of Conduct needs to be widely disseminated, so that it is implemented in those countries that adhere to IATI.

**2. How do you see the implementation of a Code of Conduct at the country level?**

* This is an action whose implementation poses a high level of difficulty. However, as long as a country has an NDS and integrated planning mechanisms, this will ease the introduction of an integrated code of conduct, since the existence of multi-year plans and an NDS facilitates the ability to comply with standards agreed during this process.

**2.1 How would you monitor the implementation of a Code of Conduct of this kind and guarantee donor accountability?**

* Through integrated planning mechanisms and tools administered by those responsible for international co-operation at country level. Likewise, it is important that statutory tools are created to guarantee that donors are actually accountable to the countries they assist. Similarly, measurements can be made via a set of impact indicators, designed with the particular characteristics of each country in mind, in order to carry out an effective assessment of ODA performance.
* Through periodic reports monitoring the activities for implementing the Code of Conduct.

**Concluding remarks, 18th of September**

**América Bastidas, SEEPYD, Dominican Republic**, **Mauricio Ramirez, UNDP Dominican Republic** and **Danila Boneva, UNDP/IATI Secretariat** thanked participants for their rich contributions and active participation in the deliberations over the past days and expressed hope that they would continue to engage in the initiative and contribute to articulating a strong position of countries from the region in IATI and the global development cooperation fora. Further consultations will be held with countries on the posible establishment of a regional platform for coordination, exchange of experiences and peer learning. **Colombia** had offered to facilitate the setting up of a web platform to this end.

****

***Secretaría de Estado de Economía, Planificación y Desarrollo***

**CONSULTA REGIONAL PARA AMERICA LATINA Y EL CARIBE**

**SOBRE LA INICIATIVA INTERNACIONAL SOBRE**

**LA TRANSPARENCIA DE LA AYUDA AL DESARROLLO**

**AGENDA BORRADOR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Hora*** | ***Sesión*** | ***Orador(a)/facilitador(a)*** |
| **DÍA UNO – 16 DE SEPTIEMBRE** | | |
| *16.00* | *Traslado de los participantes al lugar donde se celebrará la Inauguración* | |
| **17.00-20.00 Gran Inauguración en el Salón Verde del Palacio Nacional** | | |
| 17.15-17.30 | Palabras de Bienvenida | **Ing. Juan Temístocles Montás**, República Dominicana |
| 17.30-17.45 | Palabras de PNUD República Dominicana | **Valerie Julliand,** Representante Residente |
| 17.45 | Palabras de IATI/PNUD | **Danila Boneva**, PNUD (Secretariado de IATI) |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Hora*** | | ***Sesión*** | ***Orador(a)/facilitador(a)*** |
| **DÍA DOS – 17 DE SEPTIEMBRE** | | | |
| **Sesión 1. Introducción: información sobre la ayuda en el contexto amplio de apoderamiento, rendición de cuentas e implementación de la Agenda para la Acción de Accra (AAA).** | | | |
| *7.00-8.00* | | *Desayuno en el hotel* | |
| 9.00 – 9.30 | | Bienvenida  Logística  Objetivos, programación  Presentaciones | **América Bastidas**, República Dominicana  **Gert Danielsen**, PNUD |
| Presidente de la siguiente sesión: German Arturo Shuster, Colombia (a confirmar) | | | |
| 9.30 – 10.00 | | Información sobre la ayuda en el contexto amplio de apropiación, alineamiento y rendición de cuentas mutua. | **América Bastidas**, República Dominicana |
| 10.00 – 10.30 | Ronda de Discusiones | | |
| 10.30 – 11.00 | | Introducción de metas y objetivos de la IATI en el contexto de implementación de la AAA a nivel de país. | **Danila Boneva**, PNUD (Secretariado de IATI) |
| 11.00 – 11.30 | Ronda de Discusiones | | |
| *11.30 – 11.45* | | *Intermedio/Café* | |
| Presidente de la siguiente sesión: German Arturo Shuster, Colombia (a confirmar) | | | |
| 11.45 – 12.15 | | Estudio de alcance sobre IATI: mensajes principales y conclusiones | **Danila Boneva**, PNUD (Secretariado de IATI) |
| 12.15 – 13.00 | Ronda de Discusiones | | |
| *13.00 – 14.00* | | *Intermedio/Almuerzo* | |
| Presidenta de la siguiente sesión: Neydi Cruz, México (a confirmar) | | | |
| **Sesión 2: Desafíos principales de acceso y uso de la información sobre la ayuda** | | | |
| 14.00 – 14.30 | | Reflexiones sobre la consulta virtual | **German Arturo Gomez Shuster**, Colombia  **América Bastidas**, República Dominicana |
| 14.30 – 14.45 | | Introducción a los grupos temáticos | **Danila Boneva**, PNUD (Secretariado de IATI) |
| 14.45 – 16.15 | | Los Grupos temáticos discutirán sobre:  1. Fuentes actuales de información sobre la ayuda  2. Desafíos de acceso y uso de esta información  3. Prioridades de los países socios para mejor acceso a la información de la ayuda  4. Impacto de una mejor información sobre la ayuda | Proponer 4 grupos; países socios para presidir / reportar |
| *16.15 – 16.30* | | *Intermedio/Café* | |
| Presidenta de la siguiente sesión: Neydi Cruz, México (a confirmar) | | | |
| 16.30-17.30 | Reportes de los grupos | | |
| *20.00* | | *Evento social (a confirmar)* | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Hora*** | | ***Sesión*** | ***Orador(a)/Facilitador(a)*** |
| **DÍA TRES – 18 DE SEPTIEMBRE** | | | |
| **Sesión 3: Soluciones: Sistemas de gestión de la información sobre la ayuda, IATI e iniciativas complementarias** | | | |
| *7.00-8.00* | | *Desayuno en el hotel* | |
| Presidente de la siguiente sesión: Felipe Sánchez C., Panamá | | | |
| 9.00 – 9.15 | | Introducción al tercer día | **Danila Boneva**, PNUD (Secretariado de IATI) |
| 9.15 – 9.45 | | Buenas prácticas en la gestión de la información de la ayuda: lecciones y desafíos | **Elizabeth Ascarrunz**, Bolivia (a confirmar) |
| 9.45 – 10.15 | | Experiencias en usar información sobre la ayuda para fortalecer la transparencia y la rendición de cuentas mutua | **Jaime Mariano Mosqueira López**, Perú (a confirmar)  **Dagoberto Alcides Torres Peña**, El Salvador (a confirmar) |
| 10.15 – 11.00 | Ronda de Discusiones | | |
| Presidente de la siguiente sesión: Felipe Sánchez C., Panamá (a confirmar) | | | |
| *11.00 – 11.30* | | *Intermedio/Café* | |
| 11.30 – 12.00 | | Cómo puede la IATI apoyar los sistemas nacionales de la gestión financiera pública y la gestión de la ayuda?    Discusión preeliminar e identificación de necesidades de desarrollo de capacidades. | Representante de la República Dominicana (a confirmar) |
| 12.00 – 13.00 | Ronda de Discusiones | | |
| *13.00 – 14.00* | | *Intermedio/Almuerzo* | |
| Presidenta de la siguiente sesión: Jeanette Garcia, Belice (a confirmar) | | | |
| **Sesión 4: Promoviendo la IATI: recomendaciones de países socios** | | | |
| 14.00 – 14.15 | | Introducción a sesiones de grupos temáticos sobre el proceso y código de conducta de IATI.  Presentación de un reporte sobre elaboración de normas en otras áreas. | **Danila Boneva**, PNUD (Secretariado de IATI) |
| 14.15 – 16.00 | | Los grupos temáticos discutirán sobre:  1. ¿Cómo debería la IATI ser desarrollada? ¿Como deberían los países socios involucrarse?  2. ¿Qué necesidades de apoyo y desarrollo de capacidades tienen los países socios?  3. Código de conducta: ¿cuáles son las principales prioridades para la inclusión de países socios? | Proponer 3-4 grupos; países socios para presidir / reportar |
| *16.00 – 16.15* | | *Intermedio/Café* | |
| Presidenta de la siguiente sesión: Jeanette Garcia, Belice (a confirmar) | | | |
| 16.15 – 17.00 | Reportes de los grupos | | |
| 17.00 – 17.30 | | Comentarios Finales | Gobierno de República Dominicana  PNUD |

1. At the time of the consultation, the IATI Steering Committee included partner countries from Asia (Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Viet Nam) and Africa (Ghana, Rwanda). Following the consultation, both the Dominican Republic and Colombia were invited and joined the Steering Committee as members. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)