

Concept Peer Review—Geoscience Australia’s government linkages program

Friday 23 December 2011

10:30am–12noon, GR1 (London Cct)

Chair: Daniel Woods, A/g ADG Governance Branch

Participants:

Andrew Schloeffel, Mining for Development

Tanya Morjanoff, Mining for Development

Tim Carlson, Pacific (moving to Mining for Development section)

Rebecca Lannin, PSS

Natashia Allitt, Program Strategy and Design

Phoebe Hardefeldt, Quality and performance systems

Daniel Simson, South Asia (PSLP manager)

Agenda

- | | |
|-------|---|
| 10:30 | Welcome, introductions |
| 10:45 | Overview of the concept (Andrew Schloeffel or Simon Cann-Evans) |
| | - Include the identified development need |
| 11:00 | Summary of comments received in advance and responses |
| 11:30 | Additional questions/comments |
| 11:45 | Conditions for progressing the concept to a design |

Introduction

Andrew Schloeffel introduced the context of the concept note, acknowledging the weakness (GA don’t have much development/AusAID experience and the concept is based on AusAID and other analysis) and absence of a theory of change. He provided an overview of M4D, thanks participants for attending and those who provided comments in advance.

The link between this proposal and sustainable mining was outlined (improved transparency and ability to plan) as was demand from partner governments (three main areas of demand were identified: financial and revenue management, regulatory and approval process support, and geotechnical information and precompetitive data).

Schloeffel emphasised that M4D is based on the assumption that mining will occur, our objective is to make it more sustainable and better planned. He also noted that trade and market access are not a focus of the initiative.

The similarities with the PSLP were noted. It was acknowledged that the existing PLSP is not an appropriate mechanism for this concept for several reasons, including:

- The existing PSLP is designed for much smaller activities (around \$300 000/year), this activity is larger and more targeted so no need to go through a competitive process (which risks alienating unsuccessful partners that we may want to collaborate with), also it would have to be compartmentalised under the current system (this would be inefficient and onerous).
- PSLP is currently under review, the M4D section will discuss possible linkages/harmonisation/inclusion once the PSLP is revised.

Summary of comments received

Comments on the concept paper were received from the following people:

- Greta Nielsen (Indonesia Section)
- Andrew Edge (Africa Section)
- Natasha Allitt (Capacity Development Team)
- John Morley (Afghanistan Section)
- Alex Marks (Vientiane)
- Graham Rady (Asia Programs, Quality and Development Advisor)

There were similarities in the comments received, these are summarised below.

- **Absence of a detailed theory of change and context for this component of the Government linkages program**

The concept note does not address the broader context of the proposal—there is no theory of change included and it wasn't clear (based on the concept note alone) why AusAID should engage in this sort of activity.

The document does not include details about other M4D activities (which will include other government linkages) and how it will link in with them. This will also influence the effectiveness of the activity.

This document does not include the specific desired/anticipated outcomes of the activity. This, and a strong Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, will need to be included in the design document.

Response:

This is contained in the draft Mining for Development Strategy. While the logic is not clear in the concept note, the Mining section and other groups (e.g., Natural Resource Charter, WB, IMF, and academics) have thought through the issues and approached GA to work in this space. The design document will include details about this that are missing for the current concept note.

- **Needs analysis is required for the concept to progress**

Several commenters suggested that the project begin with a desk based needs analysis, including literature review and phone based consultation through AusAID's existing networks. The initial countries for inclusion are based on GA's existing relationships, but not leveraging AusAID's networks is made.

Similarly, several people suggested that the priority countries for the activity should be consistent with the priorities of M4D.

Africa is not mentioned in the concept paper. As a major focus of M4D, it should be included in the design document—this should include some analysis about how to make an impact from what will be a small investment, for example working with the African Union Commission (AUC) in its African Mining Vision action plan, which includes geo mapping. GA could possibly make a useful 'regional' impact through supporting this work.

Clear selection criteria for priority countries is needed in the design document, as well as identification of the partners in each priority country.

Response:

A broader M4D needs analysis is being conducted—we will ensure that the results of this are included in the design document and that priorities of M4D are reflected in the GA activity. The initial set of countries identified by GA will be revised to reflect this in the design document.

Note: Andrew also provided an overview of the process and plan for partnership agreements with detailed long term work plans to be completed at the initiative level for each core country.

- **Sustainability of TA is not mentioned in the concept note**

The proposal needs to address the long term sustainability of the activity. This will partly be dependent on other governance activities and existing government capacity (analysis of this should form part of the selection process). One commenter suggested that long term/full time presence is required. There is also no mention of a partner government contribution.

Response:

Analysis to be conducted and included in design, along with details of exactly how advisors will work

The mining section will consult with the WoG advisor review about costing, more detail will be provided in the design document.

- **Risks are not identified**

Risks of this type of activity are numerous—it is a contentious policy space. The design document will need to address strategies for mitigating/managing these risks. The project may also encounter problems with national security and commercial-in-confidence information when data is made available.

Additionally, there is a perception that this is a supply driven activity—in selecting priority countries for TA, GA will need to ensure that demand is adequate. There have been many requests from partner government officials for support in this area, particularly in Africa.

Response:

The Mining Section has been inundated with requests for support, including in geo-data capabilities. While the proposal does seem supply drive, it is in response to strong demand from partners.

The choice for how to share data and to who will be made by the partner government, not GA and use of cloud computing will be encouraged. Much of the concerns are actually mitigated when data is freely available to all, rather than just a select group.

Risk analysis to be conducted—overarching risks to be identified at the program level (incl risk management plans) and activity specific risks (such as offending excluded countries) included in the design document.

Additional comment:

- The benefits of geomapping and pre-competitive data are greater where governance systems are better. Two commenters identified the need to link this work with governance capacity building programs and target activities where governance is stronger (so as to maximise the possible benefits).

Response:

The same could be said of most development activities, but we persist in poor governance environments, because these places generally have greater development needs.

Recommendation: that the concept proceeds to design, provided the concerns above are addressed and included in the design document.

Participants agreed with the recommendation above.

Outcome endorsed by the chair:

 23/12/11

Daniel Woods, A/g ADG GSDB (chairperson)