**Mozambique 2017 EITI Validation - Comparison table**

| **Requirement** | **International Secretariat’s initial assessment** ([source](https://eiti.org/sites/default/files/documents/validation_of_mozambique_-_report_on_initial_data_collection_and_stakeholder_consultation.pdf)) | **Draft Validation report (**[source](https://eiti.org/sites/default/files/documents/draft_validation_report_-_mozambique.pdf)**)** | **CSO comments** ([source](https://eiti.org/sites/default/files/documents/asi_validation_report_mozambique_first_draft_v1_with_cip_comments_in_en.docx)) | **Final Validation report** ([source](https://eiti.org/sites/default/files/documents/asi_validation_report_mozambique_final_13_08_17.docx)) | **Next steps / notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [7.3 Discrepancies and recommendations from EITI Reports.](https://eiti.org/document/standard#r7-3)With a view to strengthen the impact of EITI implementation on natural resource governance, as per Requirement 7.4, the multi-stakeholder group is required to take steps to act upon lessons learnt; to identify, investigate and address the causes of any discrepancies; and to consider the recommendations resulting from EITI reporting. | The International Secretariat’s initial assessment is that Mozambique has made **satisfactory progress** in meeting this requirement. The MSG has considered the recommendations from the EITI reporting and followed up and addressed most of the recommendations. More systematic follow-up by the MSG on the EITI Report recommendations and ensuring that these highlight gaps identified through the reporting process could help ensure that the EITI could serve as a tool for improved extractive sector governance. | *No disagreement with International Secretariat’s initial assessment.* | “Satisfactory? What is the indicator?It is true that, a yearly evaluation of progress takes place, not of natural resource governance but rather of the implementation of the initiative in the country. This is currently only the production and publication of reports, and is less with regards to structured reforms discussions, although this perspective was brought by civil society, which in the end did not prevail.”“The main problem is that the EITI MSG is decorative when it comes to discussing governance. The real discussions take place elsewhere, between government and industry only. It is necessary to make the MSG a place of discussion par excellence” | Based on comments by civil society on the draft report, the Validator decided to “recommend that requirement 7.3 be downgraded to meaningful progress. More systematic follow-up by the MSG on the EITI Report recommendations is required.” | The Committee needs to make a recommendation on whether the Board’s assessment of requirement 7.3 should be “meaningful progress” or “satisfactory progress”. If “meaningful progress”, the Committee should specify which provisions it considers to be breached, and recommend corrective actions. |