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2015.08.14 – Validation call with NCs in East Asia (+Albania)

Comments from Albania

1. The first challenge is that the current validation model does not recognize the diversity among all of the 48 implementing countries.

Validation should take into account progress over time. The process is different in different countries, who have different starting points. The current Validation system is not indicative of differences in circumstances. The most important elements in any country EITI process assessment are the efforts and the progress made. The start point for different countries is different. There are countries that have face opacity and internal resistance at the start of their EITI process as there are other countries that have some degree of regulation and some transparency standards. To measure them against the same meter, it is completely not indicative of an internal EITI process.

2. The second challenge is that the pass/fail approach of validation fails to recognise progress. It only measures if a requirement is met or not. In other words, the current validation system does not distinguish between a country that has fulfilled 90% of a requirement and a country that has only completed 20% of the work. The consequence is the same – both countries would fail - without giving any recognition to the country that has put in the greater effort and is making progress.

We propose to set a scoring system. Each requirement should be given a ranking of 1 to a maximum of 5. For each requirement, clear KPI –s should characterize each grade. At the end of the grading, the summary of all the grades will show whether the country stays compliant or not and at what position. In this way countries also know their position in the EITI global implementation based on the same assessment. This is a way to motivate a country to move forward in the ranking.

3. A third issue is the current use of the term “candidate and compliant” as well as other terminology used in validation.

There needs to be a fixed number of years, the timeframe for EITI implementation and Validation because that helps countries to put objectives, resources and milestones for the aspiring countries. We propose to keep the candidate status, and changing of the term Compliant to EITI Member, and this would be assessed according to the total score of a country.
4. The final issue that I wanted to highlight is whether the current use of validators is appropriate. Many stakeholders have pointed out that validators are expensive, and the quality of the work remains poor.

The local MSG and local consultants and experts could play a role in Validation as interviewees, but not in undertaking the work. Also in this process the International Secretariat should take greater role, because they follow and sense the activity of each country very closely and constantly. They know the issue and frictions. The risks here may be impartial judgement due to human sympathies. But with clear assessment systems this is not an issue. A rigid validation process cannot tell the story.