

## OGPAU multi-stakeholder forum submission

I would like to draw your attention to the recommendations made in the [OGPAU Engagement Report](#) prepared by engage2 (my business) also published by DPM&C in 2016 particularly recommendations 5 and 6.

Some comments in response to your questions - please feel free to call me if you want to discuss these further.

Question1 - These functions look good although I am concerned about the time commitment that will be required by CSO members and how much support they will get from government to facilitate broad community engagement.

The OGP's Practical Handbook about designing and managing OGP multi-stakeholder forums outlines two purposes for forums - decision-making and consulting. Personally I think something in between these two purposes is needed and I would encourage you to look at the involve and collaborate level of the IAP2 spectrum, the [deliberate and collaborate levels of the Ontario's engagement framework](#) and the collaborate for impact methodology (particularly for working with States and Local government and key groups that can raise awareness and build capability). Even with these functions defined it is unclear to me what level of influence this forum will have.

Question 2 & 3 & 4- I like the hub and spoke model.

I do not think that a single forum model as stated will be sufficient to attract the right people and organisations to help government deliver the actions outlined in the current plan and achieve all the functions outlined in this discussion paper. The topic of Open Government is broad and about principles, there are multiple interest areas within it – e.g. engagement; open data; open information; digital transformation; integrity.

I think it would be more effective to create working groups for each commitment area (the 5 at least) that would then feed into a forum. The working groups could then focus on the delivery of actions; and the forum would focus on convening, reporting and engaging.

- Working groups would be made up of people with deep understanding of subject matter so they could help government implement the actions already stated. Members could be nominated and elected based on their subjective matter expertise, experience and networks and ability to act as delivery teams to co-deliver and report against actions (and they would become co-design teams for the next plan).

After engaging stakeholders about open government for many years, I can confidentially say that if the subject matter was more tailored to stakeholders interests and involvement / their existing work supporting the delivery of the actions - for example stakeholders in local, state government; data scientists, economic and social advisors and academics advising government and delivering social and environmental services etc – that these stakeholders would be more interested in being involved. They would also feel as though involvement would help them to achieve what they are already interested in / working toward – e.g. smart cities, social outcomes, sustainable development, social justice and human rights etc.

Local government, State government asked for this kind of forum during engagement on the first NAP and many stakeholders engaged in the process can and would offer this kind of support if there was greater recognition of what they could bring to the table and support for their initiatives, even encouragement. Ideally involvement, the time invested by everyone, would have a collective impact/ benefit for all parties – CSO stakeholders and representatives of government(s) – and open government is a relatively easy (and obvious) area to deliver that kind of openness and collaboration.

- The forum could be used to consult and focus on engagement and representation - geographical and demographic (because discursive / topic / interest based representation would already be represented - at least in the key areas of open government).

To help raise awareness working group and forum members could invite their networks to observe forums, and promote video footage, minutes, agendas of the forum to their networks to raise awareness. This would help make the process more transparent, open and accessible to others who become interested along the way (rather than having to stagger membership of the forum). It would also help take some pressure off forum members to engage and give them specific opportunities to promote engagement when talking about the subject with their networks. And it would also be the most cost efficient way to expand the reach of existing investments into webcasting and events.

In my experience engaging around open government in various geographies, networks and through a variety of mediums this kind of referral, word of mouth style of engagement is the most effective way to increase reach and raise awareness through a ripple effect.

Question 5, 6 & 7– I think working group participants should be invited and that forum participants should be invited and nominated then elected. The election process should be open to anyone who wants to participate, online easily, not just IWG members. Some demographics and geographic stratification should be sought and used as a guide for this process and be included in all communications introducing voting / and inviting specific nominees.

Question 8 – no, this should be too disruptive in my opinion. I think observers should be welcome at some if not all forum events.

Question 9 – I think membership should be a periodic commitment. See response to Q8.

Question 10 – observation, and suggestions of agenda items is a good start. I would also provide the forum with tools to engage online openly and transparently beyond meetings. See recommendations 6 in the engagement report about features that may be included in this online environment.

Finally, I would like to:

- Thank the work of DPM&C for their continued efforts to engage stakeholders about open government, deliver the commitments and invite input into this process. I look forward to seeing how you and the IWG consider my views and understand you need to balance them among others.
- Thank the IWG who have contributed to and been the custodians of the forum to date and their work supporting government to deliver the commitments.
- Recognise the work of the OGPAN who have been contributed their time, energy and resources for more than a year to support the development and delivery of the NAP and raise awareness about OGP and open government more generally across Australia. In particular, I would like to commend them for their efforts to increase representation among their membership, leveraging their own networks, and engaging beyond them and for the work they have done to keep those, like me, interested in this process.