Consultation Questions

Should effort and progress in meeting the requirements over time be taken into account in validation?
- For countries who have made a notable effort to achieve results (beyond lip service), this should be recognised in the validation report. From an implementing country perspective, there might be a common view that efforts & progress should be taken into account.
- These efforts should not impact the final decision on validation however. This would introduce a subjective/qualitative aspect into the validation process.

Should validation encourage reporting that goes beyond the EITI requirements?
- Yes, because it introduces a degree of strategic guidance into the process – where a country might go when the minimum standards are met.
- However, this encouragement must be carefully managed not to distract from meeting the basic requirements, especially in countries suffering a lack of resource and capacity. It may also create an expectation that EITI is the key to solving all extractives related issues.

Should the timeframe for countries to achieve compliance be the same for all implementing countries? If so, should the timeframe be a fixed number of years as at present?
- Yes. To do otherwise would create significant confusion.

Should progress and direction of travel matter for how much time countries are given to achieve compliance?
- No, as above.

To what extent should the local context in which the EITI is being implemented be taken into account during validation?
- It should not.

Should EITI requirements continue to be assessed as met or unmet?
- Yes
Should there be more disaggregated assessments, showing which requirements are met and which requirements are unmet, including the level of progress in meeting each requirement?

- At this stage, there are a good number of disaggregated assessments.
- However, there is a case to disaggregate further, simply because of the very wide range of stakeholders; they all have different needs for information. The landowner with an area adjoining a mining operation has very different interests to say, a politician or planning specialist working in the national interest. This could be improved by publishing the assessment in a systematic format and allowing each interest group to carry out their appropriate level of drill down.
- Related, the validation assessment tables which appear in the validators TOR are confusing and do not appear in the validation guide. They introduce an extractives value chain approach but confuse the numbering system.

Should the consequences of not reaching compliance status be removed? I.e. countries are allowed to stay members of the EITI as long as they make progress towards meeting requirements?

- No. The EITI 2013 Standard is a stretch for many countries, and many countries who are currently compliant may have to go through a temporary downgrade (as with Azerbaijan), but to put the foot on the brake at this stage because there is likely to be several more downgrades would be a mistake. The EITI bar should always be raised, not lowered.

How can validation measure progress or direction of travel towards meeting a requirement?

- There can be a more explicit stipulation to the validator to assess progress in narrative form for each requirement.

Should validation take place more frequently to measure progress, for example at the end of each EITI reporting cycle, or is the current frequency of every 3 years adequate?

- 3 years is adequate.

Should the concept of “Candidate” and “Compliant” be replaced, and if so with what?

- It should not be replaced.
- From a technology perspective, it might be useful to have “Data Contributor” or “Data Working Group Member” and some other terms to show the target country has electronically published data in a standard form available for analysis or participation in other data publishing work. These are additional (not alternative) descriptors to ‘candidate’ and ‘compliant’.
What terminology could be suitable to indicate the various degrees of progress in meeting EITI Requirements? Are the current concepts of “limited progress” and “meaningful progress” appropriate?

- Yes they are appropriate.

How can Validation incentivize countries to continue to progress and innovate both before and after reaching compliance status?

- Annual achievement award competition – countries submit based on landmark achievements, with award assessed by validation committee.
- Produce case studies on innovative EITI practices

Should multi-stakeholder groups and/or local and international experts on extractive sector governance have a greater role in Validation?

- There should be a mandatory requirement of meeting the full MSG once and the local validation/technical committee once during validation missions.
- A post validation debrief would be useful

Should the International Secretariat have a greater role in carrying out Validation assessments? What are the risks and benefits of this approach? What should be done to mitigate conflicts of interest?

- No they shouldn’t. There needs to be a minimum level of independence to avoid a judge-and-jury syndrome.