

Subject: **FW: Development of project proposals for 3 new GUIDs**

From: subramanianks@cag.gov.in

To: atoorvas@cag.gov.in; ngowrishankar@yahoo.com

Date: Tuesday, 1 May, 2018, 6:56:22 PM IST

From: Kristoffer Blegvad [mailto:kb@rigsrevisionen.dk]
Sent: 09 April 2018 15:08
To: subhu66@gmail.com; subramanianks@cag.gov.in
Cc: Vareille, Lionel; shefali.shrivastava@gmail.com; Rasmus Hyll Bruun
Subject: Development of project proposals for 3 new GUIDs

Dear Subhu,

We managed to have a good and productive FIPP meeting in Paris even though Ganga was badly missed.

We are now busily trying to tie-up all the ends after the meeting. One of them is the recommendations resulting from the review on the two SDP projects 2.7 (consolidated guidance on privatization) and 2.10 (consolidated guidance on disasters):

FIPP's conclusion

The recommendations from the review group included suggestions on a total of 7 potential GUIDs. The recommendations also reflected a number of underlying considerations and assessments on priorities. This has been very helpful for FIPP-members in making up a clear view on the matter.

At the meeting, I encouraged each individual FIPP member to express a view on the 7 potential GUIDs. Based on the discussion we were able to conclude that there are 3 of the 7 suggestions, which FIPP believes should be pursued:

1. A GUID on privatization (drawing on the pre-existing ISSAI 5210) – cf. SDP 2.7
2. A GUID on public-private partnerships (drawing on the pre-existing ISSAI 5240) – cf. SDP 2.7
3. A GUID on disaster-management (Drawing on and consolidating the pre-existing ISSAIs 5500, 5510 and 5520) – cf. SDP 2.10.

For your information I have attached the feed-back which I will send to the project group. This provides a more thorough summary of the points made by FIPP members in relation to the scope of these three projects.

The issue of timing of the 3 projects

In the forward process, the main focus of FIPP will obviously be on ensuring the quality of the three GUIDs. We are well aware that it may not be possible to finalize the GUIDs before the next INCOSAI in September 2019.

In addition, it was to some extent a concern in FIPP that we may be overstressing the available resources if all three projects run in parallel. It is clearly the view that 'privatisation' and 'public-private partnerships' are separate subjects and warrants two different projects resulting in two separate GUIDs. There was however, no clear common view in FIPP as to which of these two GUIDs should be given preference and there was also a clear interest in pursuing a GUID on disaster-management. It will thus be up to the KSC and the future project groups to consider this issue of timing when developing a proposed timeline for the three projects.

My thoughts on the next step

The next step is now to find a way to develop the three project proposals. We need to ensure that we live up to the requirements to the 'initial assessment' and the content of a 'project proposal' in stage 1 of the due process. We also need to find a way to move from the current review group to a situation with three solid project groups who are able to take on the drafting work.

I do not know how you intend to go about with these next steps and whether you have perhaps already planned for it. However – for what they are worth – here are my thoughts and observations after having followed the work of the review group as project liaison:

Given the limited number of members, we have tried to treat the group as one team rather than two, three or (potentially) seven teams. It is however very clear that the persons involved have strong individual preferences as to which of the suggested GUIDs they are interested in. There are also clear differences as to how active they are in contributing (given that we did not call a physical meeting).

To the best of my judgement, we have at this stage only one or two capable and active persons for each of the three GUIDs projects. On the other hand, these persons are in fact rather dedicated and could well turn out to be very valuable for the future projects. In the past months, I have taken initiative to a few phone conferences and have also at some point (when asked) provided a template with a suggested structure of the report to FIPP. I have however not taken any part in the development of the recommendations or the drafting of the group's report to FIPP. So all credit for the progress achieved so far goes to these few committed individuals.

I would therefore tend to think the most straightforward way to proceed would be to kindly ask three of the existing review group members whether each of them would be willing to act as lead-drafters in providing:

- A draft project proposal
- A very initial outline of the draft GUID (roughly indicating how the existing text of the ISSAIs can be used)
- A simple plan that explains how any outstanding steps in carrying out an initial assessment and finalizing the project proposal can be carried through.

The draft project proposal and the accompanying draft outline and plan could then serve as a good basis for inviting any other interested SAIs to come forward and take part in the project (including the last finalization of the project proposal).

I think it is much easier to attract the additional resources needed for all three projects if there is a clear scope and plan for each project first. I also think it would be important to clearly convey that we are not re-establishing the old working groups on disaster-related aid and privatization: The three project groups will have the very specific drafting task based on the content already developed in the preexisting ISSAIs and by applying the new drafting conventions for GUIDs. We are also clearly aiming at reducing and consolidating the pre-existing text into fewer documents. So we need to ensure

that is clear and transparent for any interested SAIs that some parts of the ISSAIs and INTOSAI GOVs from the two old working groups will fall away in the process.

If you wish, I could provide you with some suggestions as to whom in the review group you might approach in order to find the three lead drafters. I assume you prefer at this stage to take this contact yourself – rather than go through the project liaison (you may need to make up your own judgement as to whether or not these persons could also be a potential project chair). However, let me know if you think otherwise.

Once the three lead drafters have been found, a natural next step would be to let other review group members know that they are welcome to contact the lead drafter, if they wish to take part in the development of the project proposal. There has already been a good deal of email work going on so I think this will evolve quite naturally.

All of this was just to share my thoughts. It is very much up to you, how you prefer to proceed in order to get the project groups established. There may well be additional considerations I am not aware of.

I hope this little report is helpful. Do not hesitate to revert or call if there is more I can do on this matter (+45 40 98 04 70).

Warm greetings and best wishes from Copenhagen

Kristoffer



Feedback to review group on Privatization and Disaster related aid.docx
22.1kB