

Minutes

EITI International Secretariat

Oslo, 5 December 2016

Table of Contents

35-1 Welcome by the Chair and adoption of the agenda.....	2
35-2 Report from the Secretariat.....	3
35-3 Report from the World Bank.....	4
35-4 Report from the Implementation Committee.....	5
35-7 Report from the Outreach & Candidature Committee.....	9
35-5 Report from the Validation Committee	9
35-6 Head of Secretariat – closed session	12
35-9 Report from the Finance Committee.....	12
35-8 2017 EITI Work plan.....	15
35-10 Report from the Governance and Oversight Committee	16
35-11 Next Board meeting	18
Any other business.....	18
35th Board meeting ended.....	18
Annex A – Board decisions on country status and extension requests.....	19
Board decision on Azerbaijan	19
Board decision on Niger	22
Board decision on Ukraine	22
Annex C – Participant list.....	23

MINUTES OF THE 35TH EITI BOARD MEETING

35-1 Welcome by the Chair and adoption of the agenda

The Chair Fredrik Reinfeldt opened by welcoming Board members to Astana and thanked Bazarbay Nurabayev and the Government of Kazakhstan on behalf of the Board.

The Chair welcomed Montty Girianna, Bent Graff and Sören Dengg to their first Board meeting. Apologies were noted from Olga Bielkova, Enkhbayar Nemekhbayar, Zainab Ahmed, Prof. Ismaila Fall, Victor Hart and Ian Wood. The Chair informed the Board that Ian Wood had resigned and that the constituency of companies had nominated James Ensor, also from BHP Billiton, to succeed Ian as Jim Miller’s alternate. The Board approved the nomination, thanked Ian for his contribution and welcomed James.

The statement by African National Coordinators’ meeting in Brazzaville included in Board Circular 219 was noted.

The Board agreed to revise the agenda to discuss the update from the Finance Committee prior to the 2017 Workplan. The Board approved the revised agenda.

Decision

- The Board agreed to the nomination of James Ensor, from BHP Billiton, as the replacement of Ian Wood as alternate to Jim Miller on the EITI Board.

Actions:

- The International Secretariat to revise EITI Board member details on the EITI website.

35-2 Report from the Secretariat

Jonas Moberg welcomed participants and thanked the Government of Kazakhstan for hosting the meeting. Board members were reminded of the week's programme, which included meetings with the First Deputy Prime Minister Askar Mamin, CEO of Kazmunaigaz Kurmangazy Iskaziev, a beneficial ownership roundtable, a field visit to the Altyntau-Kokshetaul mine and Kazakhstan's national EITI conference.

Jonas highlighted the work undertaken since the Board's last meeting in Oslo, with close to 900 pages of Validation information gathering on Azerbaijan, Mongolia, Nigeria, Peru and Timor-Leste presented to the Board, with similar reports on Ghana, Kyrgyzstan, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Tajikistan, Sao Tome, Solomon Islands to follow. This work was in addition to the usual support to the Board and supporting implementing countries. Jonas noted that the overall workload had been too much for the International Secretariat. The Validation timetable agreed in Oslo had been too optimistic, in part due to delays with procurement of the Validator. He noted that further delays in processing Validation reports risked undermining implementation efforts. The information gathering had been a valuable learning experience for the International Secretariat. While the Validation system appeared to be a significant improvement, Jonas warned that the Validation process did not sufficiently encourage and capture impact.

Jonas highlighted the need to strike an appropriate balance between the technical issues related to Validation and a number of strategic issues, including mainstreaming, beneficial ownership reporting and the relevance of the EITI to national challenges.

Jonas provided an update of notable activities since the last Board meeting, including:

- Capacity building and trainings, including a peer learning seminar in Abidjan for 40 persons from 15 francophone countries, with Belgian support, as well as an upcoming beneficial ownership workshop in Abuja for nine Anglophone and Lusophone African countries, supported by UK Department for International Development. Jonas emphasised the importance of training, together with partners like Publish What You Pay (PWYP), the Natural Resource Governance Initiative (NRGI), World Bank (WB), German Development Cooperation (GIZ) and others.
- Country visits by the EITI Chair to Cote d'Ivoire, Guinea and Sierra Leone as well as meetings in London and elsewhere.
- An upcoming meeting of the working group on commodity trading reporting.
- A concurrent three-day beneficial ownership reporting workshop with 35 persons from countries in Central Asia and the Middle East, partly self-financed and partly thanks to DFID.
- Facilitation of Board activities including committee calls and meetings.

Jonas thanked the European Commission for a EUR 750,000 grant over the next two years. Gubad Ibadoglu highlighted the International Secretariat's facilitation of a pre-Validation workshop in Iraq during the week of 17 October, together with PWYP and NRGI.

35-2-A Discussion of Board Paper 35-2-A Implementation Progress Report June-September 2016

Jonas highlighted the significant challenges faced by 11 implementing countries, including Azerbaijan, the Central African Republic (CAR), Honduras, Indonesia, Nigeria, Kyrgyz Republic, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Tajikistan, Timor-Leste and Yemen. Six of these countries were marked in red given that their Validation initial assessments indicated the safeguards provisions were not met.

The Board was alerted to the deteriorating political situation and state of emergency in Ethiopia, although EITI implementation had not yet been directly impacted. Members of the Rapid Response Committee had expressed concern over the situation at its 24 October meeting and would closely monitor the situation and report back to the Board. Jonas highlighted the focus in the Implementation Progress Report on Ethiopia's artisanal and small-scale mining, noting efforts in an increasing number of countries to look at how EITI related to informal mining.

Actions

- The Rapid Response Committee to closely monitor the situation in Ethiopia and report back to the Board as needed.

35-2-B Discussion of Board Paper 35-2-B Outreach Progress Report May-August 2016

Jonas introduced the Outreach Progress Report by noting the limited activities undertaken given funding constraints and the priority of Validations. He noted his recent meeting with the Minister of Resources and Northern Australia, Senator Matthew Canavan. The Board was updated on Guyana and Suriname's progress in preparing for EITI Candidature. Jonas related the replacement of the EITI Champion in Mexico, Lourdes Melgar, by the new sub-Secretary of Hydrocarbons, Aldo Flores, who was the former Secretary General of the International Energy Forum. He noted the complex nature of the process and urged Board members to support in appropriate ways, given many Board members' interests in Mexico.

Ana Carolina Gonzáles Espinosa emphasised the importance of raising awareness amongst countries considering implementing the EITI of preparing a beneficial ownership roadmap as part of the candidature application documents. Jeremy Mack Dumba noted that African implementing countries were assisting the International Secretariat with outreach, notably in Angola, Equatorial Guinea and Gabon. The Chair noted that interest in the EITI kept growing despite lower outreach efforts, highlighting that the number of implementing countries could grow to 60-70 in the medium term.

Actions:

- Board members to continue contributing to outreach efforts where appropriate, in particular in Mexico.

35-3 Report from the World Bank

The Board welcomed Christopher Sheldon, Manager at the World Bank's Energy and Extractives Global Practice. Christopher noted Paulo de Sa's retirement and provided an update on the World Bank's support for EITI. He underscored that the EITI and Extractive Industries Technical Assistance Fund (EI-TAF) Multi-Donor Trust Funds had closed at the end of 2015, with around USD 10 million in likely transfers from the EITI MDTF to the new Extractives Global Programmatic Support (EGPS) MDTF. The United States continued to support two countries through the EITI Single-Donor Trust Fund. The World Bank also continued to provide support for EITI implementation embedded within IDA-financed technical

assistance projects, for instance in Afghanistan, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Mozambique and Togo.

The Board was updated on the transition to EGPS, which was almost complete with seven donors (Australia, Canada, European Union, Finland, Germany, Norway and Switzerland) having contributed a total of USD 25 million to the EGPS. Christopher thanked the donors and noted the recent signing of an initial USD 2 million agreement with DFID. He also noted the additional USD 5 million in reflows from the EITI and EI-TAF MDTFs to EGPS under consideration by other donors, with the expectation of reaching a total of USD 35 million in the EGPS by end 2016.

The Board was informed of the first two rounds of grant approvals under EGPS for 15 country-level projects, seven global projects and rapid response, worth a total of USD 9 million, of which USD 6.8 million was committed to EITI and transparency under the EGPS' Pillar 1. The Board was briefed that donors had indicated more clarity on the financing model for the International Secretariat was required before donors could take a decision on the type of contributions to International Secretariat through EGPS in future. This issue would be discussed at the EGPS Steering Committee's 27 October meeting.

Faith Nwadishi asked for clarification of World Bank support for civil society capacity development, noting the importance of funding both the supply and demand side of extractive industry transparency. Christopher explained that civil society support was an integral part of the first rounds of grants, but that the World Bank was considering providing support to more civil society organisations directly.

35-4 Report from the Implementation Committee

Board paper 35-4-H Early findings and options related to the EITI safeguards provisions in 8.3.c.i.

The Chair highlighted the International Secretariat's findings that nearly all countries undergoing Validation faced challenges with certain safeguard requirements, noting that the Board should discuss this issue. Although the first six Validations were not yet completed, it appeared that five would be suspended on the basis of the safeguard requirements if the Board confirmed the Validator's findings. The Board was reminded that Board paper 35-4-H was not for decision. Jonas noted that the six options presented in the paper were not comprehensive and invited Board members to suggest other options.

Cielo Magno asked for clarification about the decision process for this issue, asking for the Governance and Oversight Committee to agree guidelines for presenting papers to the Board. While the Chair was ultimately responsible for deciding on the presentation of papers to the Board, Fredrik explained that the Board paper on safeguards would be referred to the Implementation Committee to take forward.

Actions:

- The Implementation Committee to consider the safeguards paper and make a recommendation to the Board.

Board paper 35-4-A Beneficial ownership update.

Daniel Kaufmann introduced Board paper 35-4-A for information only, noting significant progress with

most countries expected to submit their beneficial ownership roadmaps by the 1 January 2017 deadline. He noted the technical and financial assistance required to implement the roadmaps, highlighting several countries that intended to enact beneficial ownership legislation. The Board was invited to consider the scenario of countries that would not meet the deadline, or produce roadmaps that fell significantly below the desired quality. Dyveke Rogan noted that the EITI Standard did not specify procedures for countries missing the deadline or seeking an extension, but that the Board could be guided by existing procedures for other documents such as EITI reports or annual progress reports. She highlighted estimates that at least GBP 14 million would be required during the coming three years for implementation of all roadmaps. Implementing country representatives noted that while most countries were expected to meet the deadline for producing roadmaps, practical challenges to implementation of the roadmaps needed to be recognised. The Chair highlighted the importance of outreach to political leaders, given the need in many countries to revise national legislation, and noted that the Board would discuss any instances of non-compliance with the roadmap deadline at its next meeting based on roadmap analysis and suggestions developed by the Implementation Committee.

Actions:

- The Board to discuss any instances of non-compliance with the 1 January 2017 deadline for producing beneficial ownership roadmaps at its 36th meeting.

Board paper 35-4-B Update on the commodity trading.

Daniel introduced Board paper 35-4-B by noting progress in advancing commodity trading transparency in targeted countries, supported by Switzerland's State Secretariat for Economic Affairs and the UK's Department for International Development. Recalling the effort's launch at the Board's 34th meeting in Oslo and the need for project specific funding to support this work, Dyveke noted that thanks to recently confirmed funding work had finally begun in Indonesia, Ghana and Nigeria, and that Albania and Colombia had also expressed interests. Initial results were expected in Q3-2017. The commodity trading meeting in London on 31 October 2016, bringing together government representatives from some participating countries, was noted. Faith emphasised the importance of Trafigura's payments to government report for Nigeria's efforts in the area, calling on other crude oil buyers to follow this example.

Board paper 35-4-C Towards mainstreaming action plan.

Daniel presented the Implementation Committee's recommendation that the Board agree the action plan to encourage countries to work towards mainstreaming EITI implementation. Noting the EITI Standard's several provisions encouraging this approach, he explained that the action plan focused on low-cost activities to promote mainstreaming and open data and highlighted the need for additional technical and financial assistance to accelerate mainstreaming efforts. Sam Bartlett noted the example of Kazakhstan's mainstreaming efforts. He explained that the size of Validation files was due to the fact that countries were increasingly mainstreaming their EITI disclosures, meaning that data collection required reference to third-party sources. Sam noted that the action plan focused on supporting mainstreaming by adapting and refining existing support to implementing countries. Stuart highlighted the importance of investing time and resources in mainstreaming to facilitate EITI reporting in future. Faith emphasised the importance of linking mainstreaming to other relevant initiatives in-country, while Mack noted that in countries like the DRC the EITI process yielded more reliable information than existing government systems.

The Chair noted the level of demand from implementing countries for this type of support. There was a short discussion about the level of resource commitments for the action plan, given the challenges presented by Validations. Sam noted that the International Secretariat support for the mainstreaming action plan was consistent with the draft 2017 workplan, with low-cost activities related to supporting peer learning and working with partners like the World Bank.

Decision

- The Board agreed to the proposals in paper 35-4-C and agreed the mainstreaming action plan.

Actions:

- The International Secretariat to implement the mainstreaming action plan as part of the 2017 workplan.

Board paper 35-4-D Validation schedule.

Daniel introduced Board paper 35-4-D and presented the Implementation Committee's recommendation that the Board agree the proposed Validation schedule in Annex A. The Board was reminded of its discussion of the Validation schedule at its 34th Board meeting in Oslo, where it agreed the timing of the first 21 Validations and left open the question of the remaining 30 Validations. There was a discussion on the procedures for requesting early Validation. Sam explained that it was unprecedented for a country to request early Validation and that the International Secretariat would provide guidance on appropriate procedures. He highlighted pre-Validation exercises as opportunities to work collaboratively with the MSG to test compliance with the Standard prior to Validation. While acknowledging the importance of procedures for such requests, the Chair noted the balance between country demands for early Validation and the International Secretariat's capacity, emphasising the schedule of 17 Validations in 2017 agreed by the Board. Ana Carolina underlined the need to make the 17 Validations scheduled for 2017 a priority even in the face of funding constraints.

Decision

- The Board agreed to the proposals in paper 35-4-D and agreed the schedule for the 30 outstanding Validations.

Actions:

- The Chair to write to all remaining 30 countries to announce the schedule for their Validations.
- The International Secretariat to provide guidance to implementing countries considering applying for an early Validation.

Board paper 35-4-E Project level reporting.

Daniel introduced Board paper 35-4-E for information only, noting that it followed the US Securities and Exchange Commission's issuance of rules implementing Dodd-Frank Section 1504 on project-level reporting. He explained that the Implementation Committee was expected to continue working on the issue with a view to making a recommendation to the Board on implementing project-level reporting. The Board was informed that the paper presented an outline of issues it may need to consider. Cielo recommended that existing policies in EITI implementing countries be reviewed, given that certain jurisdictions already ring-fenced reporting by project. Ana Carolina noted the importance of progress of project-level reporting within the EITI, referring to strong interest from civil society organisations and

local communities in Latin America. The Board agreed that the Implementation Committee should continue working on the issue of project-level reporting and that the Board would return to the discussion in future meetings.

Actions:

- The Implementation Committee to present a recommendation to the Board on options for implementing project-level reporting under the EITI Standard.

Board paper 35-4-F Adapted implementation request: Ukraine.

Daniel presented Board paper 35-4-F including the Implementation Committee's recommendation that the Board agree to Ukraine's request for adapted implementation with respect to coverage of extractive industries in the Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts of Ukraine and Crimea. Daniel explained that the MSG's application was submitted because the Government of Ukraine was not able to compel companies and local government agencies in these areas to participate in the EITI process. The government and MSG had committed to ongoing efforts to ensure that EITI Reports were as comprehensive as possible. Oliana Valigura explained that the government had made all possible efforts to source data from Eastern Ukraine but was unsuccessful due to the military situation. The Board agreed to grant Ukraine's request for adapted implementation.

Decision

- The Board agreed to the proposal in Board paper 35-4-F and approved Ukraine's request for adapted implementation. [See Annex A]

Actions:

- The Chair to write to the Ukraine MSG Chair announcing the Board's approval of Ukraine's adapted implementation request.

Board paper 35-4-G Validation deadline extension request: Niger.

Daniel presented Board paper 35-4-G, including the Implementation Committee's recommendation that the Board agree that Niger's Validation commence. Eddie Rich noted that Niger was expected to publish its 2014 EITI Report on 28 October 2016. Mack noted that Niger was expected to formally inform the International Secretariat of its readiness to undertake Validation in the coming days, which was welcomed by the Chair. The Board agreed that Niger's Validation commence.

Decision

- The Board agreed to the proposal in Board paper 35-4-G that Niger's Validation commence immediately and take account of progress since 1 July 2016. [See Annex A]

Actions:

- The Chair to write to the Niger MSG Chair announcing that Niger's Validation should commence immediately.
- The International Secretariat to undertake the initial assessment for Niger's Validation, starting from 1 November 2016.

35-7 Report from the Outreach & Candidature Committee

Board paper 35-7 EITI Outreach Strategy 2017

Noting the lack of volunteers to chair the Outreach and Candidature Committee to date, Jonas introduced Board paper 35-7. The Board noted that the outreach strategy was similar to previous years, with some revisions in the geographic spread. Jonas emphasised that the Outreach Strategy provided a useful triaging tool for assessing potential outreach opportunities in different countries and for advising the Chair on accepting speaking engagements. Sam noted the outreach strategy's flexibility to seize opportunities as they arose, highlighting the strategy's role in coordinating outreach undertaken by all stakeholders, not only the Secretariat.

Supporting country Board members emphasised the importance of undertaking outreach both to prospective implementing countries as well as to supporting countries, leveraging the Chair to undertake outreach to authorities on issues such as funding.

Upon request from Stuart for an update on the discussion related to "affiliated" members, Jonas noted that a paper on limited engagement had been drafted, but would require committee consultations before being presented to the Board.

Decision

- The Board approved the 2017 Outreach Strategy.

Actions:

- The International Secretariat to post the 2017 Outreach Strategy on the Board's internal site.

35-5 Report from the Validation Committee

Mark Pearson reported on the work of the Validation Committee, including its discussions on 24 October on safeguard requirements, the Azerbaijan Validation and next steps in processing outstanding Validations. He noted that the Validation Committee had had an initial discussion of the options on revising the safeguard provisions and noted the Committee's feedback that the paper's language on penalising government rather than civil society and industry should be revised. Mark noted the diversity of views expressed during the Committee's discussion, with some momentum behind Options 3 and 6, but no final views or consensus.

Board paper 35-5-A Azerbaijan

The Chair highlighted that Azerbaijan had undergone the first Validation under the EITI Standard and that the Board was now considering the results of its second Validation. Mark presented the outcomes of the Validation Committee's 24 October discussion of Azerbaijan's Validation. Upon the Validation Committee's recommendation, the Board focused on differences between the International Secretariat's and the Validator's assessments, taking into accounts comments from the MSG.

On civil society participation (#1.3), the majority of the Committee supported "meaningful progress",

while CSOs supported “inadequate progress”. With the Committee united that “satisfactory progress” had not been achieved, the safeguard policy implied that Azerbaijan should be suspended.

Overall there was a sense that corrective actions could be undertaken within 9 months. However, while the majority of Committee members supported option D for the overall assessment, CSOs supported option C including on the grounds that option D was not viable under the EITI Standard unless satisfactory progress had been achieved on requirement 1.3.

Option C - The Board agrees that Azerbaijan has made meaningful progress in implementing the 2016 EITI Standard but with no improvements on individual requirements compared to the first Validation in 2015. Accordingly, Azerbaijan is suspended and requested to undertake corrective actions to be assessed in a third Validation to commence on <+9 months>.

Option D - The Board agrees that Azerbaijan has made meaningful progress in implementing the 2016 EITI Standard, and with considerable improvements across several individual requirements compared to the first Validation in 2015. Azerbaijan requested to undertake corrective actions to be assessed in a third Validation to commence on <+9 months>.

Gubad Ibadoglu and Shahmar Movsumov were invited to present views before leaving the meeting. Gubad presented a statement from members of Azerbaijan’s Coalition Council of NGOs “Improving Transparency in Extractive Industries”. He noted the improvements in line with the Corrective Actions Plan agreed on 15 April 2015, despite being late, the very recent resolution of the additional practical problems and the need to pursue efforts to improve the situation of local civil society. He disclosed a split among the members of the Coalition Council, which explained why the EITI Board received two letters, one recommending for Azerbaijan to retain its candidate status and one asking the Board to restore compliance for Azerbaijan. He noted that outstanding problems related to general civil society remained as before including the blocking of access to bank accounts, screening at borders and travel bans. He also mentioned that the sustainable development of CSOs depended on improvements in existing legislation and the environment related to NGOs and their regulatory bodies. [See Annex B]. Shahmar highlighted the impact of the 2015 downgrade in Azerbaijan’s EITI status and the significant government efforts to improve the situation. Noting that technical and legal reforms had been initiated but took time, he emphasised efforts to resolve problems on a case-by-case basis in the interim. Highlighting the initial assessment that Azerbaijan had achieved meaningful progress, Shahmar noted the pace of reforms in previous weeks that had addressed all constraints on civil society identified during Azerbaijan’s Validation. The Board was informed of a two-month deadline for the relevant ministries to enact implementing regulations for NGO registrations. Noting that the initial assessment and Validation report had not taken such recent developments into account, Shahmar noted that the momentum behind recent reforms could weaken if such improvements were not taken into account.

Gubad and Shahmar were asked to leave the meeting. The Chair noted that the Validation Committee did not have a clear recommendation for the Board. He proposed that the Board hold an initial discussion of Azerbaijan’s Validation and elaborate overnight before reconvening for decision on 26 October. The Chair opened the floor for discussion, with 19 of the Board’s 21 members intervening.

Several implementing country Board members expressed support for the concerns in Board Circular 219 over the potential for many countries being suspended due to the safeguard provisions, noting the example of the DRC’s response to its suspension in 2014. Some board members favoured Option D. Azerbaijan’s early global leadership in EITI implementation and the need for a timeframe for

implementing corrective actions before suspension were emphasised.

Civil society Board members supported Option C, noting the importance of safeguards in protecting civil society space and opposed changing of the rules before they were tested. They raised concerns over diverting from established procedures and disregard the work of the International Secretariat and Validator. Whilst recognising that important efforts had been made in Azerbaijan in terms of overall implementation, civil society members considered that progress was insufficient in terms of civil society requirements. Among others, they referred to a letter sent by 29 Azerbaijani civil society representatives not pertaining to the EITI coalition but working on issues relating to government oversight and requesting substantial changes to restore an enabling environment for civil society in Azerbaijan. The need to enact legislative amendments in order to implement reforms was noted. Several members noted that recent improvements should be highlighted in the messaging around Azerbaijan's Validation and that the MSG should be encouraged to re-Validate as soon as possible.

There was a diversity of views within the supporting countries constituency. Emphasising the need for the Validation process to be credible and for rules not to be changed before their first application, Dirk-Jan Koch noted that accepting last minute additional information could lead to a disorderly process. Reminding the Board of Azerbaijan's similar suspension from the Open Government Partnership (OGP), Dirk-Jan expressed his sub-constituency's support for Option C. While sharing concerns over civil society challenges, Mary noted that the US Embassy in Baku had confirmed recent steps. In light of the views presented by Azeri civil society and to continue encouraging Azerbaijan to make progress, some supporting country representatives supported Option D and underlined the importance of corrective actions.

While civil society Board members recalled provisions of the Validation procedures that barred consideration of events post 1 July, Sam and Jim reminded the Board that the Validation procedures also provided the Board with the discretion to consider more recent events. Upon request from the Board, Dyveke noted that the International Secretariat's initial assessment was that Azerbaijan had completed some corrective actions but not all, and that the Secretariat had not been provided sufficient information to revise this assessment.

The Board reconvened on 26 October to continue the discussion on Azerbaijan's Validation. A revised version of Board paper 35-5-A was presented, drawing on Options C and D.

Following an initial discussion of the revised proposal, the Chair asked representatives from the three constituencies to revise the proposal. The Board agreed to the revised proposal:

The Board agrees that Azerbaijan has made meaningful progress in implementing the 2016 EITI Standard, and with considerable improvements across several individual requirements compared to the first Validation in 2015. Azerbaijan retains its Candidate status, taking into consideration recent developments.

The EITI Board agreed that Azerbaijan had not made satisfactory progress on requirement 1.3 on civil society engagement. Accordingly, Azerbaijan will need to take corrective actions. Failure to take corrective actions to the satisfaction of the Board will result in suspension in accordance with the EITI Standard. The Board tasked the International Secretariat with preparing an assessment in advance of the next Board meeting. On the basis of this assessment and in accordance with the EITI Standard, the

Board will take a decision at its next meeting.

In addition, the Board agreed corrective actions related to requirements 1.4, 2.6, 6.2, 7.1 and 7.4 to be assessed in a third validation commencing on 26 July 2017.

Actions:

- The Secretariat to circulate amended corrective actions as part of the minutes (attached in Annex A).
- The Chair to write to the Government of Azerbaijan to inform them of the Board's decision.
- The International Secretariat to undertake an initial assessment of progress in undertaking corrective actions related to Requirement 1.3 before the 36th Board meeting.

Board paper 35-5-B Mongolia.

Board paper 35-5-C Nigeria.

Board paper 35-5-D Peru.

Board paper 35-5-E Timor-Leste.

Mark provided an update to the Board on the four other Validations that had been presented to the Board for discussion, noting that comments on the initial assessments had been received from the MSGs in Mongolia, Nigeria, Peru and Timor-Leste. Draft Validation reports were available for these countries and the final Validation reports were expected in the coming weeks. Sam noted that the International Secretariat would follow the same procedures for the Azerbaijan Validation, drafting a table of requirements where assessments of the International Secretariat and Validator differed and highlighting the MSG's comments for the Board's consideration.

Actions:

- The International Secretariat to prepare tables comparing assessments of the International Secretariat and Validator for requirements where the assessments differ, for Mongolia, Nigeria, Peru and Timor-Leste.

35-6 Head of Secretariat – closed session

Fredrik invited all observers and the Board Secretary (Jonas) to leave the room.

Decision

- The Board approved a two-year contract for the Head of Secretariat, Jonas Moberg.

35-9 Report from the Finance Committee

Moses Kulaba reported to the Board as Chair of the Finance Committee, thanking members for their close collaboration with the International Secretariat.

Board paper 35-9-A Draft Q3 Financial Update

Moses introduced Board paper 35-9-A for information only, noting that the EITI International management was due to breakeven in 2016. Noting the deep cuts in expenditure undertaken in 2016, he noted that in the first nine months of 2016, the EITI International Management's revenue was USD 4.1m and its expenditure was USD 4.0 million. These figures included USD 0.7 million project-specific revenue and USD 0.9m expenditure in connection with the Global Conference. These 2016 figures compared with revenues of USD 3.6m, expenditure of USD 3.5m and a surplus of USD 0.1m in the same period in 2015. Moses thanked supporting companies and countries for their contributions, including new funding from the European Union, Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom (through DFID). The Finance Committee also proposed to the Audit Committee to review the Terms of Reference for the auditors and develop a finance manual.

Board paper 35-9-B Funding Review 2016

Moses introduced Board paper 35-9-B for decision, based on the ideas of different constituencies, and noted that it formed the basis for the 2017 workplan and budget. He noted the additional information contained in annexes to the paper.

Referring to the Board's previous discussion of funding at its 34th meeting in Oslo, the Chair noted the unsustainable long-term financing situation. The Board was reminded of the growing and more complex workload on a small staff with a modest budget of USD 5.5 million, while national-level implementation cost tenfold. Thanking stakeholders on the Board for their contributions, in particular industry, the Chair noted that the problem was partly due to the decreasing number of contributors. The Board was informed of a teleconference call held by the Chair and Sasja Beslik with financial institutions, which should lead to supporting institutional investors contributing financially. The Chair also welcomed the language in the funding review on implementing countries, while recognising it was sometimes challenging. Noting the differences in views between supporting countries, the Chair highlighted the differences in levels of contributions between countries and stated the importance of an agreed position on funding to apply across all countries. While the Board should always monitor expenditures, he noted that the main challenge with the organisation was not that it was bureaucratic and costly, but rather in the funding structure.

Upon request from Faith, Eddie explained that funding from implementing countries was required, but that there would not be any sanctions for non-compliance. The Board would take stock of the situation after a year.

Mary noted that supporting countries have been the major financial contributors to the EITI since it was established and remained committed to supporting the initiative. The Board was reminded that some supporting countries had contributed well over USD 10 million over the years. Mary raised concerns about the proposal to introduce mandatory minimum contributions, including the proposed linkage to Board participation, as inequitable given supporting countries' long-standing significant support for the EITI both directly and through multilateral and bilateral programs. She also noted that a minimum contribution formula would not adequately address the EITI Secretariat's budget requirements as outlined in the 2017 draft workplan. She suggested a more strategic approach to fundraising and welcomed the language on the Chair's leadership in outreach to supporting countries and philanthropic organisations in a strategic way. She also reminded the Board of OGP's success in raising over USD 20

million from private foundations. She also called for progress on the expenditure review to align spending and policy priorities. Catarina noted the importance of developing a funding model for supporting countries along the same lines as supporting companies. Catarina noted the importance of developing a funding model for supporting countries along the same lines as supporting companies.

Laurel noted that the industry constituency welcomed the funding review and supported the 'pay-to-play' approach, while recognising the many contributions companies made beyond this minimum floor. Industry Board members welcomed new language on institutional investors and emphasised a light approach to outreach to foundations. Dominic noted the important progress in securing 2016 funding and making 2017 forecasts more secure. While challenges remained, the funding review would continue indefinitely as the EITI sought to engage new sources of funding.

Eddie clarified that consensus on a funding model was in place and that the new model could be implemented for most constituencies. Mary highlighted the lack of consensus on the Finance Committee regarding the Funding Review's proposal for mandatory minimum contributions including the proposed linkage to Board participation. The Chair reminded the Board of its responsibilities for ensuring a sufficient funding for the Secretariat to carry out its workplan. Dirk-Jan proposed to provisionally accept the funding review with a provision to review following clarification of supporting countries' position at the 36th Board meeting.

Decision

The Board approved the funding review in Board paper 35-9-B and agreed to revisit the issue upon clarification of supporting countries' position at its 36th meeting.

Actions:

Funding requests for 2017 would be in line with the funding review conclusions on supporting companies and implementing countries.

Work would begin on a light review of potential funding from foundations.

Supporting countries to finalise discussions on a common position on the EITI funding review, ahead of the 36th Board meeting.

Investors to agree a funding model.

Board paper 35-9-C Draft Terms of Reference - Secretariat Expenditure Review

Moses introduced Board paper 35-9-C by noting the proposal was for a light expenditure review that would not be resource-intensive. He highlighted the Finance Committee's recommendation that the review be undertaken in-house, by the committee supported by the International Secretariat, for cost savings. Ana Carolina noted civil society's interest in an external review and questioned whether the USD 20,000 allocated to internal costs would be sufficient to cover consultancy costs. Eddie clarified that the USD 20,000 in cost estimates for the review were based only on staff time, which would remain even if outsourced to a consultant. The option of allocating USD 50,000 to an external review conducted by a

consultant, or roughly 1% of budget, was highlighted. The Chair noted the transparency of the current budget's cost structure and suggested an in-house review as a first step. Faith supported the establishment of a working group of Board members to work on the expenditure review, which the Chair noted was already partly being done by the Finance Committee in its oversight of expenditures.

Decision

- The Board approved the Terms of Reference for an expenditure review in Board paper 35-9-C.

Actions:

- The Finance Committee to establish a working group to conduct the expenditure review with assistance from the International Secretariat.

35-8 2017 EITI Work plan

Board paper 35-8 Draft 2017 EITI Work plan

Moses noted that the 2017 draft workplan was based on consultations for the funding review. Eddie introduced Board paper 35-8 as a secretariat paper considered both by the Finance Committee and by a joint meeting of the Finance and Governance and Oversight Committees with the chairs of the of the Implementation and Validation Committees. The Board was reminded of the procedure followed in previous years, which involved Board discussion of the draft workplan in person before final approval of the revised version by circular.

Eddie noted that the Secretariat staffing levels were the same in 2016 as in 2015 and had managed to deliver, in addition, a Global Conference, 15 validations, support to about 50 beneficial ownership roadmaps and implementation support to new EITI implementing countries. In 2016, the International Secretariat expected about half a trillion dollars of revenues to be disclosed in EITI reports, equating to almost USD 25bn for every single staff member, in addition to other information and reforms derived from the EITI process. The Board was reminded that present staffing levels were unsustainable. Eddie presented the workplan's five key areas of mainstreaming, 17 Validations, frontier issues such as beneficial ownership disclosure roadmap roll-out and commodity trading transparency work, governance reforms and funding. The three scenarios were outlined, including a minimum-case scenario of USD 5.5m in which support to implementing countries would be squeezed out, a medium-case scenario of USD 5.9m in which implementation did not suffer as a result of the priorities on validation and beneficial ownership, and a high-case scenario of USD6.3m in which important additional support such as regional capacity building workshops, commodity trading pilots and targeted mainstreaming efforts were included. Eddie noted that the International Secretariat's role was to draft a costed workplan reflecting activities agreed by the Board. While the funding review had helped raise more funding pledges, it had not yet guaranteed more predictability in funding but provided an estimate of the number of contributors and average contributions per constituency required to achieve the minimum USD 5.5 million revenue in the 2017 workplan. The Board was solicited for guidance on the priorities in the 2017 workplan.

Laurel noted references in the Board paper 35-8 to high risks of funding shortfalls for the minimum-case scenario, and called for contingency plans in the case of funding short-falls. Dirk-Jan noted that the minimum-case scenario still appeared ambitious, given its requirement for 12 supporting countries to

contribute USD 250,000 each, and supported calls for contingency planning. Dominic called for more explicit disaggregation of core and project-specific activities and funding, but noted that the International Secretariat should be provided the space to make decisions within the agreed framework once the Board approved the workplan. Eddie noted the challenges in clearly segregating core and project-specific activities, referring to the example of project-specific funding provided by the World Bank for Validations but associated staff costs for Validations covered under core funding. The Board was reminded that core funding was a fluid category that evolved in line with countries' activities. Mary noted the importance of closing the existing funding gap before expanding staffing. Wendy Tyrrell emphasised the importance of reaching consensus on the long-term future of the EITI as a framework for workplan and funding discussions. The Chair noted that discussions of the long-term future should be balanced with daily work and responsibilities, but that the Board would return to these discussions in 2017. Jim noted that an expanded focus on the EITI's impact could help secure funding from entities that had not historically funded the EITI. The Board approved the draft 2017 workplan in principle, pending revisions to be circulated by circular.

Decision

- The Board approved the 2017 workplan in Board paper 35-8 in principle, pending final approval of the revised workplan by circular before 1 January 2017.

Actions:

- The International Secretariat to circulate a revised 2017 workplan to the Board via circular for approval, before 1 January 2017.
- The Board to consider a strategic retreat in 2017 to discuss the long-term future of the EITI.

35-10 Report from the Governance and Oversight Committee

Mary noted that the Governance and Oversight Committee (GOC) had worked on three workstreams and invited the committee leads for each workstream to present their papers.

Board paper 35-10-A Proposed governance reforms

Mary noted that the Governance and Oversight Committee had looked at a number of issues where additional clarification through the Board manual or modifications to the Articles of Association would be welcome, including the Board's decision-making procedures, voting rules, voting by proxy and role of the International Secretariat. The Chair confirmed that the EITI would continue to be a consensus-based organisation and that as a rule he would not resort to voting, but that it could nevertheless be useful to clarify the procedures for voting. The industry constituency expressed strong concern about the recommendation in Board paper 35-10-A that any three Board members could demand a vote. They also expressed concerns about the viability of secret-ballot voting and of formalising the use of proxies. Mary explained that the Committee's aim was not to undermine consensus, but rather to clarify procedures in the event it was not possible to reach it. The Board agreed to adopt the paper with the removal of recommendation 2.2.2, concerning the possibility of three Board members calling for a vote, and the section in 2.2.1 concerning secret voting. The Board also agreed to look at the wording on proxies in greater detail before any decision be made to include this in the Board manual.

Decision

- The Board approved the proposed governance reforms in Board paper 35-10-A with the removal of recommendations 2.2.1 and 2.2.2.
- The Board agreed to review the wording on proxies in greater detail before making any decision to include this in the Board manual.

Actions:

- The International Secretariat to remove recommendations 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 in the revised governance reforms in Board paper 35-10-A and circulate to the Board via circular.
- The Board to review the wording on proxies in greater detail before making any decision to include this in the Board manual.

Board paper 35-10-B 2015 Governance Review Follow-up

Oleksiy Orlovsky noted that Board paper 35-10-B sought to identify any outstanding issues and remaining gaps following the 2015 Governance Review. He highlighted that the working group had come to the conclusion that most of the recommendations in the review were at different stages of implementation, with five exceptions identified in the paper. The Board decided that the five recommendations in the paper would be added to the Governance and Oversight Committee workplan.

Decision

- The Board decided that the five recommendations in Board paper 35-10-B be included in the Governance and Oversight Committee workplan.

Actions:

- The Governance and Oversight Committee to add the five recommendations in Board paper 35-10-B to its workplan.

Board paper 35-10-C 2015 Constituency consultations

Carine Smith Ihenacho noted that the working group was still at the early stages of its work. The Governance and Oversight Committee would propose a constituency consultation paper for approval by the Board before sending it out to the constituencies. The paper would cover six priority issues: constituency nomination procedures, Board member term limits, naming constituency coordinators, participation requirements by Board members, what to do in the event of Board member vacancies and dispute resolution. The Governance and Oversight Committee expected that a draft consultations paper would be submitted to the Board within the coming two to three weeks. The Board briefly discussed the challenge posed by lack of participation from implementing country representatives. The paper was approved by the Board.

Decision

- The Board approved Board paper 35-10-C.

Actions:

- The Governance and Oversight Committee to draft a consultations paper to be submitted to the Board in November 2016, before commencing consultations with constituencies.

Board paper 35-10 D Draft Procedures for Performance Appraisal of the Head of Secretariat

Mary noted that the Governance and Oversight Committee had consulted with the Chair and reached a consensus on the framework of the approach, which would include an annual appraisal based on feedback from consultations with stakeholders and an annual appraisal session. The paper was approved by the Board.

Decision

- The Board approved Board paper 35-10-D.

Actions:

- The Chair to undertake an annual performance appraisal of the Head of Secretariat.

35-11 Next Board meeting

The Board was informed of proposals to hold the first Board meeting in 2017 on 8-9 March, with a fall-back option of 28 February-3 March, the second on 23-25 May and the third on 24-26 October. The International secretariat had been in contact with several governments but finding a suitable location had been challenging. Jonas presented the possibility of holding the 36th Board meeting in Bogota, subject to an invitation from the government, and the 37th in Europe.

Any other business

Dirk-Jan announced that France would be hosting the OGP Summit on 7-9 December 2016 and encouraged participation from EITI Board members, noting the sessions on extractive industries and the linkages between EITI and OGP. Mary reported feedback from Canada that the proposed dates for the 36th Board meeting clashed with the Prospectors & Developers Association of Canada (PDAC) conference on 7-8 March and asked that the Board takes this into account, which was noted by the Chair.

Jim noted his appreciation for the scheduling of the third Board meeting of the year on dates adjacent to the London Metals Exchange (LME) Week in London, which allowed Board members to attend the two events on a single trip. Maria Isabel Ulloa noted she would follow up with the Government of Colombia on the issue of hosting the 36th Board meeting.

Actions:

- The International Secretariat to follow up with Maria Isabel Ulloa to confirm the Government of Colombia's hosting of the 36th Board meeting.

35th Board meeting ended

Annex A – Board decisions on country status and extension requests

Board decision on Azerbaijan

The Board agrees that Azerbaijan has made meaningful progress in implementing the 2016 EITI Standard, and with considerable improvements across several individual requirements compared to the first Validation in 2015. Azerbaijan retains its Candidate status, taking into consideration recent developments.

The EITI Board agreed that Azerbaijan had not made satisfactory progress on requirement 1.3 on civil society engagement. Accordingly, Azerbaijan will need to take corrective actions. Failure to take corrective actions to the satisfaction of the Board will result in suspension in accordance with the EITI Standard. The Board tasked the International Secretariat with preparing an assessment in advance of the next Board meeting. On the basis of this assessment and in accordance with the EITI Standard, the Board will take a decision at its next meeting.

In addition, the Board agreed corrective actions related to requirements 1.4, 2.6, 6.2, 7.1 and 7.4 to be assessed in a third validation commencing on 26 July 2017.

The Board welcomed Azerbaijan's sustained commitment to timely reporting and focus on EITI mainstreaming. However, these positive aspects are undermined by challenges related to civil society engagement, which limits the potential for the EITI to contribute to a greater public understanding of revenues and to encourage high standards of transparency and accountability. The Board was encouraged to hear reports of recent developments and looked forward to evaluate these in the near future.

The Board's determination of Azerbaijan's progress with the EITI's requirements is outlined in the assessment card, below, together with corrective actions with respect to requirements 1.3, 1.4, 2.6, 6.2, 7.1 and 7.4. The major areas of concern relate to civil society participation (#1.3), the independence of civil society members of the multi-stakeholder group (#1.4), reporting on state participation (#2.6) including quasi-fiscal expenditures (#6.2), public debate (#7.1) and documentation of impact (#7.4). The EITI Board disagreed with the validator on the following requirements: work plan (#1.5), license registers (#2.3) and comprehensiveness (#4.1).¹ The Board also agreed additional recommendations aimed at further strengthening EITI implementation.

The Board agreed that progress in addressing these corrective actions will be assessed in a third Validation commencing on 26 July 2017. In accordance with the EITI Standard, the Azerbaijan's Multi-Stakeholder Group may request an extension of this timeframe, or request that Validation commences earlier than scheduled.

The Board's decision followed a Validation that commenced on 1 July 2016. In accordance with the 2016 EITI Standard, an initial assessment was undertaken by the International Secretariat. The findings were reviewed an Independent Validator, who submitted a Validation Report to the EITI Board. Azerbaijan's Multi-Stakeholder Working Group were invited to comment throughout the process. The final decision was taken by the EITI Board.

¹ As per the VC minutes of 24 October 2016, available from [\[link\]](#).

Assessment card

The EITI Board agreed the following assessment card:

		LEVEL OF PROGRESS					DIRECTION OF PROGRESS*
		No Progress	Inadequate	Meaningful	Satisfactory	Beyond	
Categories	Requirements						
MSG oversight	Government engagement (#1.1)				■		-
	Industry engagement (#1.2)				■		-
	Civil society engagement (#1.3)		■	■			-
	MSG governance (#1.4)			■			
	Work plan (#1.5)				■		→
Licenses and contracts	Legal framework (#2.1)				■		
	License allocations (#2.2)	■	■	■	■	■	
	License register (#2.3)				■		
	Policy on contract disclosure (#2.4)				■		
	Beneficial ownership (#2.5)	■	■	■	■	■	
	State participation (#2.6)			■			
Monitoring production	Exploration data (#3.1)				■		
	Production data (#3.2)				■		
	Export data (#3.3)				■		
Revenue collection	Comprehensiveness (#4.1)				■		
	In-kind revenues (#4.2)				■		
	Barter agreements (#4.3)	■	■	■	■	■	
	Transportation revenues (#4.4)				■		
	SOE transactions (#4.5)				■		
	Direct subnational payments (#4.6)	■	■	■	■	■	
	Disaggregation (#4.7)				■		
	Data timeliness (#4.8)				■		
	Data quality (#4.9)				■		
Revenue allocation	Distribution of revenues (#5.1)				■		
	Subnational transfers (#5.2)	■	■	■	■	■	
	Revenue management & expenditures (#5.3)	■	■	■	■	■	
Socio-economic contribution	Mandatory social expenditures (#6.1.a)	■	■	■	■	■	
	Discretionary social expenditures (#6.1.b)	■	■	■	■	■	
	SOE quasi-fiscal expenditures (#6.2)			■			
	Economic contribution (#6.3)				■		
Outcomes and impact	Public debate (#7.1)			■			-
	Data accessibility (#7.2)	■	■	■	■	■	
	Follow up on recommendations (#7.3)				■		-
	Outcomes & impact of implementation (#7.4)			■			-

* Direction of progress is only indicated for the requirements that were assessed in Azerbaijan's first Validation.

	The country has made no progress in addressing the requirement. The broader objective of the requirement is in no way fulfilled.
	The country has made inadequate progress in meeting the requirement. Significant elements of the requirement are outstanding and the broader objective of the requirement is far from being fulfilled.
	The country has made progress in meeting the requirement. Significant elements of the requirement are being implemented and the broader objective of the requirement is being fulfilled.
	The country is compliant with the EITI requirement.
	The country has gone beyond the requirement.
	This requirement is only encouraged or recommended and should not be taken into account in assessing compliance.
	The MSG has demonstrated that this requirement is not applicable in the country.
-	No change in performance since the last Validation.
←	The country is performing worse than in the last Validation.
→	The country is performing better than in the last Validation.

Corrective Actions

The following corrective action will be evaluated in accordance with the EITI Standard at the next meeting of the EITI Board:

1. The government should take further steps to ensure satisfactory progress with the requirements related to civil society engagement 1.3.b-d. Specifically, the government should in accordance with 2.2 of the civil society protocol, ensure that there is an enabling legal and operational environment for civil society substantively involved in the EITI process. Specifically, this should include legal and regulatory amendments eliminating:
 - i. The need for civil society to obtain an extract every two years confirming their registration.
 - ii. The need for civil society to register grants with the Ministry of Justice.
 - iii. The need for foreign donors to register individual grants with the authorities, and obtain an opinion on the purposefulness of the grant.

The following corrective actions will be assessed in a third Validation commencing on 26 July 2017.

2. In accordance with 2.5 of the civil society protocol, ensure that there are opportunities for civil society to engage in debate on natural resource governance issues. The government should remove any barriers preventing civil society from arranging free and independent public events related to the EITI process, or engage in advocacy related to natural resource governance.
3. In accordance with 2.1 of the civil society protocol, ensure that civil society are able to engage in public debate related to the EITI process and express opinions about the EITI process without restraint, coercion or reprisal.
4. In accordance with requirement 1.4.a.ii, the civil society MSG members should demonstrate that they are operationally and in policy terms independent of government and companies.
5. In accordance with requirement 2.6.b, the government and SOE(s) should ensure that the level of government ownership in all oil, gas and mining licenses and contracts, including ownership held by SOE subsidiaries and joint ventures, and any changes in ownership during the financial year covered by the EITI Report, is disclosed in the 2015 EITI Report. This information should also include details regarding the terms attached to the equity stake, including the level of responsibility to cover expenses at the various phases of the project cycle. Where there have been changes in the level of government/SOE ownership during the EITI reporting period, the government and SOEs are expected to disclose the terms of the transaction, including details regarding valuation and revenues.
6. In accordance with requirement 6.2, the MSG should agree a definition of quasi-fiscal expenditures and a disclosure mechanism for ensuring full transparency in quasi-fiscal expenditures by any SOEs,

SOE subsidiaries or joint ventures. The MSG should ensure that any quasi-fiscal expenditures are comprehensively disclosed in the 2015 EITI Report.

7. *In accordance with requirement 7.1, the MSG should ensure that the EITI Report is presented to key audiences such as government, parliamentarians, civil society, companies and the media. The MSG is also encouraged to ensure that all stakeholders participate in dissemination activities.*
8. *In accordance with requirement 7.4, the annual progress report should include an assessment of the impact and outcomes of the implementation of the work plan objectives.*

The MSG is encouraged to consider the other recommendations in the Validator's Report and the International Secretariat's initial assessment, and to document the MSG's responses to these recommendations in the next annual progress report.

Board decision on Niger

Niger has sought an extension of the Validation commencement date (1 July 2016). Having assessed the extension request in accordance with requirement 8.5, the EITI Board concludes that Niger is not eligible for an extension of its Validation. In accordance with the EITI Standard, Validation will begin immediately. The Validation report will reflect progress made since 1 July 2016.

Board decision on Ukraine

The EITI Board accepts the Ukrainian multi-stakeholder group's request for adapted implementation with respect to coverage of extractive industries in the Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts and in Crimea. The request is accepted for the 2014 and 2015 EITI Reports.

The EITI Standard allows for adapted implementation "where the country faces exceptional circumstances that necessitate deviation from the implementation requirements" (Requirement 8.1). In taking this decision, the EITI Board notes the ongoing conflict in the region, and that the government is currently not able to compel companies and local government agencies in these regions to participate in the EITI process.

The EITI Board welcomes the commitment from the government and the multi-stakeholder group to continue to engage with companies and government agencies with activities in these regions with a view to ensuring full disclosure of information required by the EITI Standard.

Where comprehensive information is not obtained from these entities, the multi-stakeholder group is expected to include links to other publicly available sources of information.

It is a requirement that there continues to be full unilateral disclosure of any revenues received by the Government of Ukraine from companies and local government agencies in these regions. The 2014 and 2015 EITI Reports should include an assessment of the comprehensiveness of the information, highlighting any gaps in the information available. "

Annex C – Participant list

Participant List (not participating – in grey)

Chair

Mr Fredrik REINFELDT

Countries

Implementing Countries

Ms Olga BIELKOVA, Member of Parliament, Ukraine

Alt: **Mr Bazarbay Nurabayev**, Chairman, Committee of Geology and Subsoil Use, Ministry of Investment and Development, Republic of Kazakhstan

Mr Montty GIRI ANNA, President, EITI National Committee, Indonesia

Alt: **Mr Enkhbayar NEMEKHBAYAR**, Director-General, Strategic Policy and Planning Department, Ministry of Mining, Mongolia

Ms Zainab AHMED, Federal Minister of State Ministry of Budget and National Planning, Nigeria

Alt: **Mr José Fernandes ROSA CARDOSO**, National Coordinator, São Tomé e Príncipe

Mr Didier Vincent Kokou AGBEMADON, National Coordinator, Togo

Alt: **Mr Ismaila Madior FALL**, Minister, Legal Adviser to the President and Chair of the EITI National Committee, Senegal

Mr Jeremy Mack DUMBA, National Coordinator, Democratic Republic of Congo

Alt: **Ms Agnès Solange ONDIGUI OWONA**, National Coordinator, Cameroon

Mr Victor HART, Chair of TTEITI, Trinidad and Tobago

Alt: **Ms Maria Isabel ULLOA**, Representative of the Government of Colombia, Colombia

Supporting Countries

Ms Mary WARLICK, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Energy Resources, State Department, USA

Alt: **Mr Mark PEARSON**, Director General, External Relations & Partnerships Branch, Strategic Policy & Results Sector, Natural Resources Canada, Canada

Ms Catarina HEDLUND, Deputy Director at the Department for International Trade Policy, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Sweden

Alt: **Mr Bent GRAFF**, Senior Policy Advisor, Development Policy and Financing, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Denmark

Mr Dirk-Jan KOCH, Special Envoy for Natural Resources, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands

Alt: **Mr Sören DENGK**, Head of Division "Energy, Infrastructure, Raw Materials", Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), Germany

Civil Society Organisations

Mr Daniel KAUFMANN, President, Natural Resource Governance Institute (NRGI)
Alt: **Ms Wendy TYRRELL**, Transparency International, Australia

Mr Gubad IBADOGLU, Senior Researcher, Economic Research Center, Azerbaijan
Alt: **Mr Oleksiy ORLOVSKY**, International Renaissance Foundation, Ukraine

Ms Faith NWADISHI, Executive Director, Koyenum Immalah Foundation/National Coordinator Publish What You Pay, Nigeria
Alt: **Mr Brice MACKOSSO**, Commission Justice et Paix, Republic of Congo

Ms Ana Carolina GONZÁLEZ ESPINOSA, Universidad Externado de Colombia, Colombia
Alt: **Mr César GAMBOA**, Derecho, Ambiente y Recursos naturales, Perú

Ms Cielo MAGNO, Bantay Kita, Philippines
Alt: **Mr Moses KULABA**, Governance and Economic Policy Forum, Tanzania

Companies including Investors

Mr Stuart BROOKS, Manager, International Relations, Chevron
Alt: **Mr John HARRINGTON**, Upstream Issues manager, Exxon Mobil Corporation

Mr Dominic EMERY, Vice-President, Long-Term Planning, BP
Alt: **Mr Alan McLEAN**, Executive Vice President, Tax and Corporate Structure, Royal Dutch Shell

Ms Laurel GREEN, Group Executive, Legal & External Affairs, Rio Tinto
Alt: **Mr Carlos ARANDA**, Manager Technical Services, Southern Peru Copper Corporation

Ms Carine Smith IHENACHO, Vice President Legal, Statoil
Alt: **Mr Jean-François LASSALLE**, Directeur Affaires Publiques, Total, France

Mr Jim MILLER, Vice President, Environmental Affairs, Freeport-McMoRan, Copper&Gold
Alt: **Mr Ian WOOD**, VP Sustainable Development, BHP Billiton

Mr Sasja BESLIK, Head of Responsible Investments at Nordea Asset Management

Board Secretary

Mr Jonas MOBERG, Head of EITI Secretariat, Oslo

Observers

Mr Yerlan AKISHEV, Senior Operations Officer, World Bank, Kazakhstan

Mr. Pertti ANTTINEN, Senior Adviser, Steering and coordination of development cooperation, Department for Africa and the Middle East, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Finland

Ms Laurence ARNOULD, Spécialiste de programme, Organisation internationale de la Francophonie, France

Mr Anton ARTEMYEV, Executive Director, Soros Foundation, Kazakhstan

Mr Ruslan BAIMISHEV, EITI Secretariat, Kazakhstan

Mr Luke BALLENY, EITI Co-ordinator, President's Office, International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM), UK

Mr Ilir BEJTJA, Deputy Minister of Energy, Albania

Mr Thomas BENNINGER, Programme Manager, Federal Department of Economic Affairs, Education and Research EAER, State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (SECO), Switzerland

Mr Kassongo BIN NASSOR, General Manager, External Relations, Freeport McMoRan/Tenke Fungurume, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)

Mr Boubacar BOCOUM, Lead Mining Specialist, World Bank, USA

Mr Francis Ato BROWN, Country Manager, World Bank, Kazakhstan

Ms Dorina ÇINARI, National Coordinator, Albania

Mr Ben COLLINS, MSI Integrity

Ms Diana CORBIN, Senior Operations Officer (Donor Relations), Energy and Extractives Global Practice, World Bank, USA

Mr Simon CRAMP, Director, Private Sector Development, Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), Australia

Mr Baibakpaev EKMETKUL, Parliamentarian at Jogorku Kenesh, Kyrgyz Republic

Mr Enver ESTEMESOV, Industry Representative at the MSG, Kyrgyz Republic

Ms Sonja EISENBERG, Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy and MSG member, Germany

Ms Amelia EVANS, MSI Integrity

Mr Farid FARZALIYEV, Head, EITI Secretariat, Azerbaijan

Mr Arnim FISCHER, Head of Projects, Academic Mining Education in Afghanistan (AMEA), Promoting Good Governance in the Extractive Sector in Afghanistan (MinGov), Afghanistan

Ms Andrea FORABOSCO, Senior legal Counsel - Shell Companies EU Liaison Office, Belgian Shell, Belgium

Mr Dylan GÉLARD, Policy officer, Extractive Industries Transparency, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Development, France

Mr Gregory GOULD, Director, Office of Natural Resources Revenue, Department of the Interior, USA

Mr Foster GULTOM, Ambassador, Embassy of Indonesia, Kazakhstan

Mr Agus HARYANTO, Deputy Director, Mineral Enterprises, Indonesia

Ms Franziska KILLICHES, Advisor, D-EITI Secretariat, Germany

Mr Davlat KHABIBOV, Head of Investment Department at the State Investment Committee and State Property Management Tajikistan

Ms Asmara KLEIN, EITI Programme Coordinator, Publish What You Pay (PWYP), UK

Mr Victor KOVALENKO, Cleantech and Sustainability Services Leader in Central Asia, Ukraine and Belarus

Ms Anna KRAVTŠENKO, Advisor, Extractives for Development – X4D, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH, Germany

Mr Askar KUSHKUNBAYEV, Local Budget Initiative Coordinator, Soros Foundation, Kazakhstan

Ms Jennifer LEWIS, Governance and Rule of Law Advisor, Agency for International Development, USA

Mr Ghulam MAHMOOD ANWARI, National Coordinator, Afghanistan

Ms Ekaterina MIKHAYLOVA, Lead Strategy Officer, Energy & Extractives Global Practice, World Bank, USA

Ms Maria Inmaculada MONTERO-LUQUE, Policy Officer, European Commission, Belgium

Mr Christian MOUNZEO, Coordinator PWYP Congo/President Rencontre Pour la Paix et les Droits de l'Homme, Republic of the Congo

Mr Eldiia MUKANOV, Head of the Legal Department of the State Agency for Industry, Energy and Subsoil Use, Kyrgyz Republic

Mr Ainur MUSSABEKOVA, Government Relations Advisor, Public & Government Affairs, ExxonMobil Kazakhstan Inc.

Ms Rafika MUSOEVA, MSG member with expertise on beneficial ownership Tajikistan

Mr Shuhrat MIRZOEV, Economic Adviser, DFID, Central Asia

Mr Shahmar MOVSUMOV, Executive Director, State Oil Fund, Azerbaijan

Mr Paul MUSSENDEN, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Natural Resources Revenue Management Policy, Management and Budget, Department of the Interior, USA

Ms Dina NAREZHNEVA, National Coordinator, EITI, Ukraine

Mr Lutz NEUMANN, Consultant, LBN-Strategies, Germany

Mr Jahongir NIGMATOV, Technical Manager, EITI national secretariat, Tajikistan

Mr Nkongo Budina NZAU, Senator and EITI DRC MSG Member, Democratic Republic of Congo

Mr François NZEKUYE, National Deputy and EITI DRC MSG Member, Democratic Republic of Congo

Mr Michel OKOKO, National coordinator, EITI, Republic of Congo

Mrs Garidgai OYUNTUYA, Legal Officer, Mineral Resources and Petroleum Authority, Mongolia

Ms Lidia PECI, Policy Analyst, Natural Resource and Governance Division, Economic Development

Bureau (MED), Natural Resources, Canada

Mr Torang PAKPAHAN, Economic Consellor, Embassy of Indonesia, Kazakhstan

Ms Elisa PETER, Executive Director, PWYP

Mr Matteo PETRINI, Deputy Head of Mission, Embassy of Italy, Kazakhstan

Mr Boris RAEDER, EITI Secretariat, Germany

Mr Stefano RAVAGNAN, Ambassador, Embassy of Italy, Kazakhstan

Mr Omer VAN RENTERGHEM, Theme expert Land, water and ecosystems, Inclusive Green Growth Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands

Ms Tatiana SEDOVA, Consultant, World Bank, Kazakhstan

Mr Christopher SHELDON, Practice Manager, Energy and Extractives Global Practice, World Bank

Mr Octavian STAMATE, Energy Policy Officer, Delegation of the European Union to the Republic of Kazakhstan

Mr Mario Vinicius Claussen SPINELLI, General Ombudsman, Petrobras, Brazil

Ms Altynai SYDYKOVA, Acting Head of the EITI national secretariat, Kyrgyz Republic

Mr Einar STEENSNÆS, Senior Advisor, The Oslo Center for Peace and Human Rights, Norway

Mr Cheikh Tidiane TOURE, Permanent Secretary, EITI, Senegal

Mr Edi Effendi TEDJAKUSUMA, Team Leader, EITI Secretariat, Indonesia

Mr Karel TOUSSEYN, Deputy Director, Office of Economic Interests

Mr Simon TUMAWAKU, EITI DRC MSG Member and Chamber of Mines, Democratic Republic of Congo

Mr Zhanbolat USSENOV, Deputy Manager, Public, Government and Policy Affairs, Chevron, Kazakhstan

Mr Azamat UTEGENOV, EITI Kazakhstan

Mr Paul VALLELY, Program Leader, World Bank, Central Asia

Mr Micah WATSON, Transparency and Governance Officer, U.S. State Department, USA

Ms Erica WESTENBERG, Senior Governance Officer, Natural Resource Governance Institute (NRGI), USA

Mr Yerkin ZIKBAYEV, Manager Public, Government and Policy Affairs, Chevron, Kazakhstan

Mr Bahtiyor ZUHUROV, National Coordinator, Tajikistan

EITI Secretariat

Mr Sam BARTLETT, Technical Director

Mr Alex GORDY, Country Manager

Ms Shemshat KASIMOVA, Country Officer

Ms Leah KROGSUND, HR & Admin Manager

Mr Eddie RICH, Deputy Head of Secretariat

Ms Dyveke ROGAN, Policy Director

Ms Oliana VALIGURA, Country Manager

Mr Pablo VALVERDE, Country Manager

Mr Brynjar WIERSHOLM, Finance & HR Manager