



Minutes

65th EITI Board meeting

OVERVIEW

These Minutes capture the discussion and agreed outcomes of the 65th EITI Board meeting.

Table of contents

265-1 Welcome and adoption of the agenda.....	2
65-2 Report from the Secretariat.....	2
Board paper 65-2-A Implementation Progress Report October 2025-January 2026– for information.	2
Board paper 65-2-B Outreach Progress Report October 2025-January 2026 – for information.....	4
65-3 Report from the Implementation Committee.....	4
Board paper 65-3-A Assessment of reporting extension requests – for decision.....	4
Board paper 65-3-B Strengthening EITI mechanisms for safeguarding civic space – for discussion ...	5
65-4 Report from the Validation Committee	6
Board paper 65-4-A Report from Validation Committee	6
Board paper 65-4-B Revised Validation schedule 2027-2030 – for decision	7
65-5 Report from the World Bank	7
65-6 Report from the Rapid Response Committee.....	8
Board paper 65-6 Recommendations from a high-level mission to Guyana.....	8
65-7 Report from the Finance Committee.....	10
Board paper 65-7 Draft 2025 EITI Annual Accounts – for decision.....	10
65-8 Report from the Governance and Oversight Committee.....	11
Board paper 65-8-A 2025 Audit report– for approval.....	11
Board paper 65-8-B 2025 KPI data– for information	12
Board paper 65-8-C Revisions to the EITI KPIs – for decision.....	12
Board paper 65-8-D Expectations for EITI supporting companies: Outcomes of assessment – for decision	13
65-9 Update on the 2026 Global Conference.....	14
Board paper 65-9 - 2026 EITI Global Conference: planning update – for information	14
AOB.....	14
Participant List – 65 th EITI Board meeting.....	15

Abbreviations

IPR – Implementation Progress Report	IC – Implementation Committee
DRC – Democratic Republic of the Congo	VC – Validation Committee
CSO – Civil Society organisations	EGPS
MSG – Multistakeholder group	RRC – Rapid Response Committee
OPR – Outreach Progress Report	FC – Finance Committee
CCMC - China Chamber of Commerce of Metals, Minerals & Chemicals Importers & Exporters	GOC – Governance and Oversight Committee
MoU – Memorandum of Understanding	KPI – Key Performance Indicator
	MEL – Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning

65-1 Welcome and adoption of the agenda

The **EITI Board Chair, Rt Hon. Helen Clark**, opened the meeting and highlighted the current geopolitical context amid escalating conflict in the Middle East and its impact on oil and gas prices.

The Chair outlined increasing global competition for critical minerals, including opaque bilateral resource deals and rising resource nationalism, and highlighted implications for EITI implementation, particularly on transparency in licensing, contracts and beneficial ownership. She indicated that these issues would inform future discussions on potential revisions to the EITI Standard. She also outlined updates on revised KPIs and the latest company expectations assessment, which showed overall progress with some gaps, including in project-level disclosure. Preparations for the 2026 Global Conference in Manila were reported to be well advanced, with strong host country support and measures in place to mitigate travel risks.

The agenda was approved.

The Chair welcomed the following new Board members:

- Ruth Gallagher, Global Head of Communities, Health and Safety, Environment, Security and Social Responsibility (CHESS), Trafigura
- Olivia Dombrowe, Vice President for Sustainability & ESG, Kosmos Energy
- Petra Yliportimo, Team Leader, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Finland
- Reinout Van Vaerenbergh, Strategic Advisor Natural Resources and Financial Management, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation, Belgium

The Chair noted that there were one vacant seat in the Implementing Countries constituency, two vacant seats in the Supporting Countries sub-constituency, and one vacant seat in the Supporting Companies constituency.

Apologies were received from the following Board members:

- Deborah Yu from Canada
- Paul Garaycochea from Germany

The Chair concluded by reminding Board members to complete the Board self-assessment survey.

65-2 Report from the Secretariat

Board paper 65-2-A Implementation Progress Report October 2025- January 2026 – for information

The International Secretariat presented the Implementation Progress Report (IPR), focusing on activities from October 2025 to January 2026.

Board members raised the following points:

- Implementing Countries representatives noted the work plan of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) appears in red in the presentation of the IPR despite there being a national work plan in place and stressed that Civil Society organisations (CSO) are responsible for renewing their multistakeholder group (MSG) representation and meeting deadlines, in line with Requirements 1.3 and 1.4. They further proposed to develop software to help implementing countries navigate different platforms and better understand and apply the EITI Standard.
- CSO representatives welcomed the gender section in the IPR but expressed concern about slow progress on gender equality in MSGs and in the disclosure of some of the gender-related

requirements. They called for clearer impact indicators and tangible gender outcomes. They noted that EITI reporting should go beyond reproducing available data and should address information gaps and public interest and cited Mauritania's risk-based reporting approach as good practice to increase the quality and public relevance of the report.

- CSO representatives raised concerns about shrinking civic space and regression on anti-corruption and environmental commitments. While acknowledging organisational and funding challenges, they underlined that the civil society constituency should organise and select its own representatives. They asked the Secretariat to reaffirm that each constituency independently manages its own selection processes and noted that delays in implementation are not limited to the civil society constituency. They noted that summary data files often do not reflect realities on the ground and suggested integrating transparency and Validation templates and providing supplemental information for countries with systematic disclosures but no summary data file. They further highlighted limited awareness among Norwegian CSOs of opportunities to engage in EITI and recommended deeper consultations with them. They also requested a stocktake of implementation of the 2023 Standard and progress against its requirements.
- Company representatives encouraged the International Secretariat to capture and communicate evidence of impact better, referencing the Burkina Faso example. They noted large regional and constituency variations in gender outcomes and recommended detailed analysis to identify areas with the least progress and to design targeted interventions.
- Supporting Countries representatives noted that the number of countries marked red for stalled implementation has increased from six to nine and requested clarification on next steps to restart implementation. They recognised gradual improvement in MSG gender diversity but expressed concern over uneven progress on gender-related requirements and asked how partners can best support the Secretariat's gender-related capacity-building plans.

The International Secretariat noted the following:

- On stalled implementation, high-level missions have been effective in securing renewed political commitment, and collaboration with development partners, the private sector and civil society is critical to restarting implementation. The Secretariat will report back to the Implementation Committee on cases such as Mexico and Ethiopia.
- On systematic disclosures, uneven progress reflects differences in government data systems and donor support. The Secretariat is implementing projects prioritising countries with the least progress and confirmed this remains a priority.
- On summary data templates, these are based on EITI Reports and may be up to two years old, but still provide a useful indication of systematic disclosures against EITI requirements.
- On gender, the request for gender-related impact indicators was noted. Internal and external capacity-building and the focus on gender in MSG engagement and regional trainings are currently being undertaken.
- On the 2023 Standard stocktake, the Secretariat recalled the update presented in Yerevan on reporting against new requirements and confirmed plans for a broader update (innovations, costs, new reporting actors, sectors, disaggregation and additional requirements). This stocktake will inform the forthcoming working group on revisions to the 2023 Standard after the Global Conference.
- On Norway and adapted implementation, the Secretariat noted that a review could consider the alternative multi-stakeholder governance model, follow-up on Validation recommendations and the scope of implementation, and proposed preparing a paper for the Implementation Committee.

Board paper 65-2-B Outreach Progress Report October 2025-January 2026 – for information

Mark Robinson presented the Outreach Progress Report (OPR), focusing on activities from October 2025 to January 2026.

Board members raised the following points:

- CSO representatives commended the International Secretariat's active outreach. They noted that the constituency had provided advice on how to proceed with engagement with the Government of Equatorial Guinea. The Government had indicated that actions are taking place, but the constituency highlighted that security and civic space concerns remain a major challenge and advised not to resume dialogue with the Government until a set of benchmarks was reached. The constituency welcomed further comments and proposed criteria after which discussions could continue.
- Supporting Countries representatives congratulated the International Secretariat on its outreach work. They requested that the International Secretariat share the China Chamber of Commerce of Metals, Minerals & Chemicals Importers & Exporters (CCC MC) workplan with the Board once finalised. They noted positively outreach to partners that have Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with CCC MC and relayed their expectation that the International Secretariat will ensure that the MoU does not lead to any weakening of the EITI Standard.
- Implementing Countries representatives emphasised the importance of the International Secretariat's participation in international events for outreach.

The International Secretariat acknowledged the concerns raised on Equatorial Guinea. It emphasised that engagement with CCC MC is proceeding cautiously, with particular attention to company interest and due diligence. It agreed on the importance of outreach at international events, noting it annually identifies and prioritises key events to attend.

Actions:

- The International Secretariat to share the CCC MC workplan once it is finalised.

65-3 Report from the Implementation Committee

Board paper 65-3-A Assessment of reporting extension requests – for decision

The Implementation Committee (IC) Chair presented the paper on reporting extension requests by implementing countries, namely Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Kazakhstan, Mozambique, Niger and Peru.

Board members raised the following points:

- Implementing Countries representatives noted that countries should not be penalised for undertaking systematic disclosures, which may contribute to the need for extension requests.
- CSO representatives did not object to the proposed extensions but requested that the Secretariat develop plans to identify and mitigate the causes of delays, with relevant MSGs endorsing these plans. They also sought clarification on why Niger is now considered for an extension, noting that established procedures regarding temporary suspension should be followed. They further cautioned

that not suspending could send the wrong signal to the government, while noting that any suspension would be temporary and automatically lifted on publication of the EITI Report.

The International Secretariat noted the following:

- Gabon published its EITI report the day before the Board so is no longer under consideration for an extension.
- It has considered countries' efforts to include systematic disclosures in considering extension requests.
- The International Secretariat had received a draft from Niger and would like to confer an extension to ensure the quality of the final report meets expectations. It is likely that Niger will be publishing its report shortly so is now considered for an extension.
- Until the Board meets implementing countries with delays have a de facto extension and the Board can consider new information

Board members agreed extension requests from Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Kazakhstan, Mozambique, and Peru to be approved; except for Niger's which will be reconsidered by the Implementation Committee at their next meeting.

Actions:

- The International Secretariat to publish the decision that Niger is to be reconsidered by the Implementation Committee at the meeting on 14 April.

Board paper 65-3-B Strengthening EITI mechanisms for safeguarding civic space – for discussion

The IC Chair presented the paper.

Board members raised the following points:

- Implementing Countries representatives noted that civic space is a broader issue affecting all citizens, not only civil society, and suggested that this be discussed at the Global Conference.
- Company representatives considered the tools outlined in the paper to be strong and supported the proposed actions, including joint approaches across constituencies and a focus on civil society at the Global Conference. For supporting companies, they suggested that the term "statement" may be more appropriate than "pledge," as the latter implies new commitments rather than reaffirmation of existing tools. Echoing CSO representatives' views, they noted that civic space should be taken seriously, especially with human rights challenges being faced, and acknowledged there is a need for stronger action.
- CSO representatives acknowledged the strong support from other constituencies for protecting and promoting civic space at the last Board meeting Armenia. They also emphasised that civic space should be taken seriously, particularly in light of increasing human rights challenges, and called for stronger concrete actions and decisions by the Board. They highlighted the idea of the Board pledge and changes to the EITI Articles of Association including ensuring that civil society is supported to participate in Board activities. They also recommended that the document, at least its actions and recommendations, be widely disseminated, published and used, where appropriate, to help induct new Board members.
- Supporting Countries representatives questioned the added value of a pledge, noting that the EITI Principles and Standard already provide a framework to support civil society participation.

The International Secretariat noted the following:

- Relevant papers may be published upon publication of the decision, hence once decision is taken by the Board.

- The second day of the Global Conference will have a focus on civil society, including several sessions focusing on civic space

Actions

- The International Secretariat to consider including the paper within its agenda for the induction of new members.
- The International Secretariat to refine the paper in light of the comments received.
- The Implementation Committee to further discuss the paper.

65-4 Report from the Validation Committee

Board paper 65-4-A Report from Validation Committee

Validation of Argentina (for decision)

Board member Tamika Halwiindi, stepping in for the Chair of the Validation Committee (VC), presented the VC's recommendation to the EITI Board and invited the EITI International Secretariat to present the paper.

Board members raised the following points:

- Company, Implementing Countries and CSO representatives congratulated Argentina for its progress in expanding the scope of implementation.
- CSO representatives welcomed the continued support for the EITI despite the changes in government leadership.
- Implementing Countries representatives noted the importance of allowing sufficient time for the countries to provide feedback on the International Secretariat mid-term monitoring, which is due for Argentina on three requirements after two years of the decision. They noted that despite the high score, the country had more than 20 corrective actions.

The International Secretariat noted the following:

- Most corrective actions were due to requirements under the transparency component, which had a smaller relative weight on the overall score. The one-third weighting of each component was retained in the latest changes to the Validation model, adopted in March 2025.

Board members approved the suggested recommendation that Argentina has achieved a 'Very good' overall score of 80 points in implementing the 2023 EITI Standard with 48 months to address 21 corrective actions.

Actions:

- The Board Chair to write to the Government of Argentina to communicate the Board decision on Argentina's Validation.
- The International Secretariat to publish the Board decision on Argentina's Validation.

Validation of Senegal (for decision)

Board member Tamika Halwiindi, stepping in for the Chair of the Validation Committee (VC), presented the VC's recommendation to the EITI Board and invited the EITI International Secretariat to present the paper.

Board members raised the following points:

- Company, Implementing Countries and CSO representatives congratulated Senegal for its leadership in implementing the 2023 EITI Standard.

Board members approved the suggested recommendation that Senegal has achieved a 'Very good' overall score of 89 points in implementing the 2023 EITI Standard with 54 months to address 11 corrective actions.

Actions:

- The Board Chair to write to the Government of Senegal to communicate the Board decision on Senegal's Validation.
- The International Secretariat to publish the Board decision on Senegal's Validation.

Board paper 65-4-B Revised Validation schedule 2027-2030 – for decision

Board member Tamika Halwiindi, stepping in for the Chair of the Validation Committee (VC), presented the VC's recommendation to the EITI Board and invited the EITI International Secretariat to present the paper.

Board members raised the following points:

- CSO representatives endorsed the recommendation but noted their reservation of further delaying Validations where constraints to civil society engaged on EITI issues had been observed in the previous Validation. They also noted the absence of a mid-term monitoring, which had been key to the compromise of adopting longer periods between Validations.

The International Secretariat noted that the mid term monitoring was introduced as a formal mechanism for countries being assessed under the 2023 Standard. Countries are continuously monitored through the implementation support teams and the paper on civil society engagement highlighted the available tools for civil society and the Board between Validations. Nonetheless, civic space considerations had been a key consideration in the determination of proposed dates, as highlighted in detail in the Annexe to this paper.

Board members approved the suggested recommendation.

Actions:

- The International Secretariat to inform countries where the commencement date has changed about the new date for the next Validation.

65-5 Report from the World Bank

Sven Renner, Programme Manager for EGPS, provided an update on the World Bank's support for EITI implementation. He indicated that activities are primarily delivered through the EGPS-2 trust fund, expected to close in October 2027. He reported generally satisfactory grant performance, with some disbursement challenges.

Sven outlined ongoing efforts to strengthen support, including a shift towards longer-term, larger grants, closer integration with broader World Bank programmes, increased regional engagement, and more flexible funding aligned with government demand.

He highlighted the use of country “roadmaps” to link EITI implementation to wider reform and investment priorities. Zambia was cited as an example, where EITI support is aligned with broader sector reforms and investment planning.

Sven concluded by highlighting recent donor contributions totalling USD 3.3 million for EITI-related support, to be included in the next annual work plan for EGPS-3 for approval in June 2026.

Board members raised the following points:

- CSO representatives welcomed cooperation under EGPS-2 and highlighted the need for more sustainable, less non-ad hoc funding for civil society, including through grants rather than contracts. They asked about expanding the EGPS-3 transparency window and low disbursement under EGPS-2 in Papua New Guinea. They also raised concerns about implementation timelines and risks related to Zambia funding and asked about measures to accelerate delivery.
- Implementing Countries representatives asked about opportunities for renewed EGPS-3 support to the DRC.
- Supporting Countries representatives asked about the outlook for EGPS-2 grants nearing closure, additional donor contributions, and coverage of other EGPS-3 pillars in future updates.

The International Secretariat emphasised maintaining focus on systematic disclosure and strengthening MSG data access and use as the core purpose of the transparency window, and called for further discussions on EGPS-3 design.

The World Bank representative acknowledged the need for more predictable CSO support, noting plans for longer-term funding under EGPS-3. Delays in Papua New Guinea were due to in-country coordination issues and that disbursement was expected to be completed. He noted that ongoing World Bank engagement in the DRC could provide a basis for renewed EITI support. He confirmed that EGPS-2 runs until October 2027 and that Zambia implementation was expected to progress following imminent approval. He stated that disbursement across most grants was on track, with lower rates in Iraq reflecting recent grant increases. He reported approximately USD 11 million in signed contributions to the transparency window, with additional funding under preparation, while noting that current planning is based on available funds (approximately USD 3 million). He confirmed that systematic disclosure remains a core focus of World Bank support in the transparency window.

Answering the request from CSO representatives, the World Bank welcome the possibility to host a dedicated EGPS-3 roundtable at the Spring Meetings.

65-6 Report from the Rapid Response Committee

Board paper 65-6 Recommendations from a high-level mission to Guyana

The Chair of the Rapid Response Committee (RRC) recalled that the Committee was tasked to provide immediate oversight of the civil society selection process for the MSG following a referral of the matter by the Validation Committee. The RRC mandated a mission by the International Secretariat and Board representatives to Guyana which had reported the findings to the RRC. He noted the exhaustive discussions of the RRC on the issue of the selection process and the lack of consensus on how to proceed with the case.

The International Secretariat presented the paper and set out two procedural options:

- Option 1: Proceed with a full Validation, which would provide a holistic assessment of Guyana’s implementation of the EITI Standard, including Requirement 1.4, and allow for timebound corrective actions across all areas. The Secretariat noted that the advantage of assessing Guyana’s entire

implementation is that it provides context for the assessment of the selection process for CSO representatives in the MSG. This option is also more cost-effective.

- Option 2: Conduct a targeted assessment focused on Requirement 1, which would be faster and more streamlined but narrower in scope. Targeted assessment is also duplicative of the previous missions and is therefore not cost-effective. The Secretariat explained that a targeted assessment would still entail engaging with the current MSG, and would therefore not necessarily avoid perceptions that the MSG was being legitimised, It would result in further delaying Guyana's next Validation.

The International Secretariat underscored that no final determination had yet been made on the merits of the civil society selection process itself and requested the Board to agree on the most appropriate procedure to investigate the issue further.

The Board Chair underlined that the Rapid Response Committee majority's position favoured a full Validation.

Board members raised the following points:

- CSO representatives recalled Requirement 1.4.a.2, emphasising that each stakeholder group must have the right to appoint its own representatives through an independent, non-coercive process, and that civil society participating in the EITI must be independent from government and companies. They considered these provisions to have been breached in Guyana, citing concerns over the appointment of Dr English as mediator and the overall legitimacy of the selection process. While noting that the civil society constituency had initially called for suspension, they indicated willingness to accept a targeted assessment as a compromise and opposed advancing Guyana to Validation. They stressed that EITI is a mechanism to assess implementation against the Standard, highlighted concerns over government interference in civil society representation, broader constraints on civic space, and limitations to inclusivity during the January 2026 mission.
- Implementing Countries representatives noted that the Guyana mission had fulfilled its purpose of clarifying the situation on the ground, including confirming that the election process had been adequate and that adjustments had been made within the MSG executive. They reiterated their opposition to suspension, emphasising that Requirement 1.4 is not a safeguard provision and should be assessed through a full Validation, which they considered more appropriate than a targeted assessment as it would allow all constituencies, including civil society, to build internal consensus. They highlighted that a mediator had supported dialogue among civil society platforms and underscored that the core issue relates to the perceived legitimacy of the civil society nominations process, including the appointment of the mediator. They noted that similar concerns had arisen in the past, demonstrating the need for clear, agreed, and codified procedures for the selection of civil society representatives within the Guyana EITI framework, endorsed by all MSG members, to avoid recurring disputes. They also pointed to the position of other civil society organisations currently represented on the MSG, who had previously felt marginalised but accepted the current process, and cautioned against rejecting the process without a clear and collectively agreed alternative.
- Companies' constituency representatives noted that, although they had not been able to join the mission, they supported the recommendation to proceed with Validation. They argued that a new national coordinator had been appointed and that, while not perfect, the civil society election process adequately met Requirement 1.4.a. Echoing the Implementing Countries' view, they added that a full Validation would enable engagement with a broader range of stakeholders and provide a structured opportunity to identify strengths and areas for improvement, which could be monitored over time.

The Board Chair reiterated that, according to the mission, the civil society nominations process had been publicly advertised and allowed Policy Forum Guyana to participate and define the rules and procedures. She further added that Policy Forum Guyana had chosen not to nominate its candidates on the second day and that views differed on whether this constituted a legitimate process.

To address the issue that proceeding with Validation might create an impression of legitimising the current MSG, the International Secretariat proposed a draft Board statement which recognises government efforts to renew the MSG, expresses concern over the lack of stakeholder confidence in the civil society selection process, and determines that the Board proceeds with a full Validation covering the period from May 2022 which will include a thorough review of MSG governance and the 2025 civil society selection process. The draft statement proposed Validation to commence on 1 July 2026, with broad consultations and the engagement of an external independent expert for Requirement 1.

The Board Chair noted that a majority of Board constituencies favoured proceeding to a full Validation but that there was no consensus on either option. In line with Board practice, she recommended that the matter is referred to the Validation Committee.

Board members approved the Chair's recommendation.

Actions:

- The Validation Committee to reconsider the procedural options for Guyana in light of the Board discussion.
- The Validation Committee to examine the draft Board statement, including the proposal to engage an external independent expert for the assessment of Requirement 1, and to report back to the Board at the next available opportunity.

65-7 Report from the Finance Committee

Board paper 65-7 Draft 2025 EITI Annual Accounts – for decision

The Finance Committee (FC) Chair presented the paper, noting that the draft 2025 Annual Accounts show a surplus of USD 992k, based on income of USD 11.3 million, expenditure of USD 10.2 million and a negative currency effect of USD 200k. The figures are in USD but aligned with the audited NOK accounts; an updated audit report including the NOK accounts was circulated together with the paper.

The Committee recommended approving the report and allocating the surplus as follows:

- USD 372k as savings towards the 2026 Global Conference
- USD 200k for long-term organisational development
- USD 420k as contingency for future funding uncertainties

There was also a proposal to reclassify the 2024 surplus to increase the Reserve Fund, and the Committee had discussed options to improve returns on the Reserve Fund. The report was approved by the Finance Committee on 23 February.

Board members raised the following points:

- Supporting Countries representatives encouraged the International Secretariat to continue exploring options to stabilise the financial situation and to adopt a more strategic approach in presenting the EITI to partners to ensure continued relevance. They recommended to use the 2026 Global Conference actively for this purpose. They also inquired whether there was a plan for further mitigation of the impact of currency fluctuations, and whether implementing countries' contributions were at the expected level.
- Company representatives endorsed the careful financial management and welcomed the surplus and expressed support for the recommendations.

The Board Chair asked whether implementing countries that have not paid their membership fees would be allowed to participate in the nomination process for the 2026 Members' Meeting. The Chair also noted that an initiative is planned to increase the systematic implementation of countries' contributions.

The International Secretariat answered the points as follows:

- In preparation for the Members' Meeting, the Secretariat has been in regular contact with implementing countries, reminding them of membership fee payments. There has been an increase in contributions from implementing countries over the last three years.
- Regarding currency fluctuations, a strategy is in place. It is noted that the main action point from the Board is for the International Secretariat to provide the Finance Committee with greater clarity on what constitutes a material effect. Additionally, the Secretariat maintains accounting in different currencies to help mitigate the impact.
- A country that has not paid its membership fee does not lose its voting rights. However, other members may question its eligibility in the Board nomination process.
- The Secretariat also reminded that the Board had previously requested an increase in contingency. Regarding the recommendation to allocate part of the 2025 surplus to the costs of the Global Conference, the Secretariat explained that this allocation would help offset the current funding gap. In light of uncertainties in the current geopolitical situation, the Secretariat may also face higher costs due to increased energy prices.

Board members approved the 2025 EITI Annual Accounts in principle.

Actions:

- The International Secretariat to clarify for the Finance Committee what counts as a material currency effect.

65-8 Report from the Governance and Oversight Committee

Board paper 65-8-A 2025 Audit report– for approval

The Board Chair noted that the paper, which is linked to Board paper 65-7, was initially incomplete and a corrected version of paper was circulated to Board members, including the two annexes with the accounts in NOK. She specified that the 2025 Annual Accounts would be circulated for formal approval for non-objection by Circular shortly after the Board meeting and requested the Board members to approve in principle.

The Auditor from KPMG presented a summary of the findings from the audit report. They noted on materiality thresholds that any mis-statements over USD 13,500 would have been reported by the auditors and that they applied an overall materiality threshold of USD 270,000. On the audit findings, they reported that no corrected or uncorrected mis-statements and no control deficiencies were identified.

No comments were received.

Board members approved the 2025 Audit report.

Actions:

- The International Secretariat to share the 2025 EITI Annual Accounts for formal approval via Circular.
- Full Board members to sign the approved 2025 EITI Annual Accounts via the digital signing system, eSign.

Board paper 65-8-B 2025 KPI data– for information

The Governance and Oversight Committee (GOC) Chair introduced the paper, noting 2025 is the third year of reporting under this framework.

The International Secretariat presented the key findings on secretariat effectiveness, country outcomes and implementation challenges and global performance.

Board members raised the following points:

- Supporting Countries representatives asked about fluctuations in the assessed quality of EITI Reports and work plans over the 2023–2025 period and asked the Secretariat to provide clarification on the observed decline in committee effectiveness.

The International Secretariat noted the following:

- On workplans, there has been an overall positive trend in improvements to the work plans, and that this is in part due to clear steer from the Board for the International Secretariat to provide support on translation of strategic priorities into a workplan.
- Reporting is being monitored to improve data timeliness, while recognising that further work is needed. There have also been efforts made to improve the meaningfulness of the reporting in terms of the types of reports produced.
- Committee effectiveness is measured by number of papers. The number remains high but this metric alone may not give a complete picture as to the quality of the actual work within Board committees. It is a Key Performance Indicator (KPI) currently under review, with the aim of improving efficiency and ensuring that Board and Committee activities remain cost and time effective.

Board paper 65-8-C Revisions to the EITI KPIs – for decision

The GOC Chair noted the Board had previously requested a revised KPI framework. The revised KPI framework presented in this paper is closely linked to the monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) framework approved by the Board in June 2025.

The International Secretariat made a short presentation summarising the proposed revisions.

Board members raised the following points:

- CSO representatives asked which measures are being implemented to prevent the Secretariat from artificially distorting KPI results, given the extensive use of internal data sources including Validation.
- Supporting Countries representatives asked about the comparability of the new KPIs with the previous framework, emphasising the importance of being able to track performance over time.
- A company representative expressed company's support for the new framework, particularly its alignment with the EITI's strategic priorities and its focus on outcomes. They noted their support for the new framework to be adopted and used in the next planning cycle.

The International Secretariat noted the following:

- Regarding measures to prevent conflicts of interest, Validation data is one of the internal data sources referenced and already forms part of the KPI assessment. The only change is the mapping of Validation outcomes to the outcomes in the revised framework. The Secretariat underlined that this concern is important and highlighted that Validation already incorporates substantial stakeholder feedback and is subject to scrutiny by the Validation Committee and various reviewers.

In terms of comparability, it was noted that it should be possible, for the 2026 calendar year, to produce a report that draws on both KPI data sets and, where possible and appropriate, shows how progress has been made on a comparable basis. As the new framework is a refinement of the previous one, this is not expected to pose significant difficulties.

Board members approved the suggested revisions to the KPI framework.

Actions:

- The International Secretariat to implement refined KPIs within the MEL framework from 2026.
- The International Secretariat to publish a clear and visual presentation of the KPI framework on the EITI website.

Board paper 65-8-D Expectations for EITI supporting companies: Outcomes of assessment – for decision

The GOC Chair noted that the paper presents the results of the third assessment of company progress against the Expectations for EITI supporting companies, and that this is the first year in which comparable results are available, as the Expectations remained unchanged from the 2023 assessment. It was noted that the GOC had discussed potential future refinements to the assessment process to create stronger linkages to EITI implementation at the country level, but that any such refinements would be considered during the 2026–2029 GOC term, based on a scoping paper to be produced by the International Secretariat.

The International Secretariat presented a summary of the aggregate findings from the assessment. It outlined the improved process for assessing Expectation 2, which introduced direct consultations with national secretariats regarding company reporting and disclosures at the national level.

Board members raised the following points:

- Supporting Countries representatives showed appreciation for the thorough assessment and presentation and welcomed the progress in company performance.
- CSO representatives congratulated the International Secretariat for completing the assessment in a timely manner and urged the Board to approve the paper so that it can inform the selection of company Board members. They encouraged colleagues from companies constituency to take the assessment seriously and stressed that companies represented on the Board should be leaders.
- Company representatives commended the International Secretariat for making the results available well in advance of the Global Conference and the nominations for the new Board. They noted that the company Expectations process has been strengthened and commended the significant efforts made by companies to report against these Expectations. They further observed that improvements in performance against the Expectations demonstrate the Board's ability to respond to feedback, as well as the influence of the EITI mechanism in driving improvements in the industry.
- An Implementing Country representative showed appreciation for the work carried out. They highlighted the unique relationship that implementing countries have with companies and stressed the need for the assessment to reflect the actions of companies at a country level, to ensure that the outcomes are meaningful for implementation. They clarified their support for the GOC's recommendations.

The GOC Chair noted that the question of country-level involvement in the assessment process is a prominent issue to be considered in the scoping paper.

The International Secretariat clarified that the individual assessments already include some information on how companies engage with the EITI at national level.

Board members approved recommended suggestion.

Actions:

- The International Secretariat to publish the individual and aggregate data from the 2025-2026 assessment on the EITI website in March 2026.

65-9 Update on the 2026 Global Conference

Board paper 65-9 - 2026 EITI Global Conference: planning update – for information

The International Secretariat presented the paper on preparations for the 2026 Global Conference, noting strong stakeholder support and that risks related to the situation in the Gulf are being monitored and managed within the existing budget.

The Board Chair noted uncertainty around the geopolitical situation, emphasised strong host country support and highlighted the need to avoid travel through the Gulf while managing potential cost implications.

Board members raised the following points:

- Implementing Countries representatives asked about logistical arrangements for self-funded participants, including hotel bookings and visa procedures.
- Supporting Countries representatives asked about the process for selecting speakers and whether the Board would have input.
- Company representatives encouraged stronger integration of civil society participation in the conference agenda. They also raised a practical concern regarding the timing of certain social events.

The International Secretariat indicated that logistical matters would be followed up bilaterally with Board members. While full Board approval of all session speakers was not envisaged, the Secretariat would engage further with members on input to the programme.

Actions:

- The International Secretariat to confirm if the timing of the Board dinner is reviewed in light of travel constraints.
- The International Secretariat to engage with interested Board members on input to the programme.

AOB

The International Secretariat reminded Board members of ongoing preparations for the 7th EITI Members' Meeting, scheduled for 23 June 2026 on the margins of the Global Conference in Manila.

The International Secretariat informed that the proposed timeline for the nomination process had been shared through Board Circular 371. Board members were encouraged to support timely coordination within their constituencies and to note the following key milestones:

- 10 April 2026: Constituency leads to verify membership lists
- 30 April 2026: Registered members to confirm attendance at the Members' Meeting
- 15 May 2026: Deadline for submission of Board member and alternate nominations
- 22 May 2026: Circulation of the full list of nominees and formal summon to the Members' Meeting

The meeting was closed.

Participant List – 65th EITI Board meeting

Red - Apologies

CHAIR

Rt Hon. Helen CLARK

COUNTRIES

Implementing Countries

Mr Mohamed Lemine AHMEDOU, EITI National Coordinator, Mauritania

Alt: **Mr Antoine Kocounseu MIMBA**, Chairman, EITI National Council Côte d'Ivoire

Ms Isabel CHUVAMBE, EITI National Coordinator, EITI Secretariat, Mozambique

Alt: **Ms Francesc ALGHALI**, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, Sierra Leone

Mr Bayani AGABIN, Undersecretary, Department of Finance, Philippines

Alt: TBC

Mr Jean-Jacques KAYEMBE, EITI National Coordinator, Democratic Republic of Congo

Alt: **Mr Florent Michel OKOKO**, EITI National Coordinator, Republic of the Congo

Mr Gregory McGUIRE, Chairman of TTEITI Steering Committee, Trinidad & Tobago

Alt: TBC

Ms Hasmik MANUKYAN, EITI National Coordinator, Armenia

Alt: TBC

Supporting Countries

Ms Deborah YU, Director General, Explosives, Regulatory and Business Services Branch, Natural Resources Canada

Alt: **Mr Reinout VAN VAERENBERGH**, Strategic Advisor Natural Resources and Financial Management, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation, Belgium

Mr Paul GARAYCOCHEA, Director, Sustainable Transformation of Supply Chains, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), Germany

Alt: **Ms Petra YLIORTIMO**, Team Leader, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Finland

TBC

Alt: TBC

CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS

Mr Aliou Ba COULIBALY, President, Publish What You Pay (PWYP) Coalition, Mauritania
Alt: **Mr Kossi KOUGBLENOU**, Executive Director, ACOMB, Togo

Ms Diana EL KAISSEY, Advisory board member at the Lebanese Oil and Gas Initiative-LOGI, Lebanon
Alt: **Mr Matthieu SALOMON**, Lead, Anti-corruption, Natural Resource Governance Institute, France

Ms Vanessa CUETO LA ROSA, Environmental Lawyer, Derecho Ambiente y Recursos Naturales, Peru
Alt: **Ms Yessica PRIETO RAMOS**, National Director, Projects & Research, Crudo Transparente, Colombia

Ms Mariya LOBACHEVA, Executive Director, Echo - Public Association, Kazakhstan
Alt: **Ms Olena PAVLENKO**, President, DiXi Group, Ukraine

Mr Clancy MOORE, Chief Executive Officer, Transparency International, Australia
Alt: **Ms Tamika HALWIINDI**, Climate Change and Environmental Sustainability Lead, Transparency International, Zambia

COMPANIES INCLUDING INVESTORS

Ms Kathryn CASSON, Chief Adviser, Civil Society and Outreach, Rio Tinto
Alt: **Mr Octavio BULCÃO**, Legal Director, Vale

Mr Chinonso EMEHELU, Senior Director, Public & Government Affairs, Exploration, Strategy & Business Development, ExxonMobil
Alt: **Ms Olivia DOMBROWE**, Vice President, Sustainability and ESG, Kosmos Energy

Mr James ENSOR, Vice President, External Affairs, BHP
Alt: **Ms Kirsten Margrethe HOVI**, VP & ESG Adviser, Norsk Hydro

Ms Nolwenn DELAUNAY, General Counsel, TotalEnergies
Alt: **Mr Roberto NARDI**, Head for Consolidated Financial Statements and Reporting, Eni

Ms Ruth GALLAGHER, Global Head of Communities, Health & Safety, Environment, Security & Social Responsibility and Responsible Sourcing, Trafigura
Alt: TBC

Mr Christopher RICE, Executive Vice President, Tax, Shell International Limited
Alt: **Ms Jaqui FREEMAN**, Vice President, Tax Policy, bp

BOARD SECRETARY

Mr Mark ROBINSON, Executive Director, EITI International Secretariat, Oslo

EITI INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT

(Please find the updated organogram for [EITI Staff at this link](#))

OBSERVERS

Mr Alex GORDY, Acting Deputy Director, Natural Resources Canada

Ms Anne-Laure PELCERF, Vice-President Company Legal Affairs, TotalEnergies

Mr Benjamin HALSTENBERG, Policy Advisor, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH, Germany

Ms Christina SAULICH, Senior Policy Officer, Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), Germany

Mr Dani MULE, Independent consultant

Mr Dorian MOUKETOU, Foreign Service Officer, Global Affairs Canada

Ms Emily NICKERSON, Deputy Director, Natural Resources Canada

Mr Emmanuel MATHIAS, Division Chief, Governance and Anti-Corruption Division, IMF

Ms Felicitas PAUL, Advisor, EITI Germany Secretariat (D-EITI)

Mr Fred KABANDA, Division Manager, Extractives, African Development Bank

Ms Hannah SAUNDERS, Critical Minerals Desk Officer, International Critical Minerals Team, FCDO

Ms Hannah WESTERHAUS, Policy Officer, European Commission

Mr Jan-Petter HOLTEDAHL, Senior Adviser, Norad, Norway

Ms Isabelle RAMDOO, Director, IGF

Mr Jan BOLLMANN, Extractives & Development, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH, Germany

Mr Jelle STERKEN, Policy Officer Trade & Development, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands

Ms Jillian SMITH, Policy Advisor, Natural Resources Canada

Mr Julien TINGUAIN, Technical Director, EITI, Cote d'Ivoire

Ms Klara GIESLER, Advisor, D-EITI Secretariat

Ms Laura NOTESS, Civic Space Lead, Transparency International

Ms Mareike GÖHLER-ROBUS, Head of D-EITI Secretariat, D-EITI Secretariat (Germany)

Ms Margarita BATLLE, Principal Advisor, Civil Society, Rio Tinto

Ms Maria van der HOEVEN, EITI Bord Chair Designate (2026–2029)

Ms Mariana PEREIRA, Legal Director of Regulatory, Intellectual Property, and Tax Litigation, Vale

Ms Marie-Christine SCHROEDER, Senior Legal Counsel Sustainability, Shell International B.V.

Ms Mary Ann RODOLFO, National Coordinator, Phils EITI

Ms Mathilde JEAN, Civil Society Dialogue Manager, Eramet

Ms Nina INAMAHORO, Operations Officer, Energy & Extractives, World Bank Group

Mr Oleksiy ORLOVSKY, Democracy and Good Governance Programme Director, International Renaissance Foundatio, Ukraine

Mr Luigi SAMPAOLO, Head of Strategic Sustainability Relations, Eni

Ms Sita DJELANTIK, Senior policy advisor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands

Ms Sophie DONSZELMANN, Manager, ICMM

Mr Sven RENNER, Programme Manager for EGPS, World Bank

Mr Thialy FAYE, MSG Chair, Senegal

Mr Torge BARTSCHT, Advisor, D-EITI Secretariat, Germany

Ms Victoria LECOMTE, Rédactrice, Gouvernance du secteur extractif, Direction des Affaires globales, Ministère de l'Europe et des Affaires Etrangères, France