

REPORT OF THE CIVIL SOCIETY NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE ON THE SELECTION OF CIVIL SOCIETY REPRESENTATIVES TO THE EITI BOARD, 16th FEBRUARY, 2016

PROCESS

Over the course of 2015, the Publish What You Pay (PWYP) Global Council tasked the PWYP Secretariat to review the civil society constituency guidelines. Extensive consultations were undertaken with MSI Integrity, the EITI Secretariat, individual Global Council members as well as current civil society representatives to the EITI Board in order to collect views on strength and weaknesses of the guidelines used in 2013 and to follow up on recommendations from the previous Nominations Committee. Based on those consultations, the PWYP Global Council formulated the criteria for the selection of the civil society representatives to the EITI Board and decided to adjust the Nomination process. Major adjustments include introducing interviews and adding external experts to the Nominations Committee to improve the integrity of the process. In this sense, the Global Council invited the following people to form the Nominations Committee Ms. Aroa de la Fuente Lopez (Fundar and a member of the PWYP Global Council and PWYP Board), Mr. Jean-Claude Katende (ASADHO and a current civil society representative on the EITI Board), Mr. Anton Artemyev (Open Society Foundation Kazakhstan and former civil society representative on the EITI Board) and Mr. Emerson Sykes (civil society expert from the International Center for Not-for-Profit Law - ICNL). Mr. Artemyev and Mr. Sykes are the two experts selected by the Global Council from outside the PWYP coalition.

A call for nominations of civil society representatives on the EITI Board was issued by PWYP and widely circulated through the PWYP Lists, the EITI website and individual emails to EITI national coordinators, the World Bank facilitated online platform "EITI Community of Practice", the Open Government Partnership – OGP blog, and the Global Partnership for Social Accountability – GPSA knowledge Platform. Following a suggestion by the Governance Committee of the EITI Board, to allow more people to send in their application, the Governance Committee of the EITI Board, the initial deadline of January 10th was extended to the 31st of January: <http://www.publishwhatyoupay.org/selection-criteria-and-process-of-civil-society-representatives-to-the-eiti-international-board-2016-2019/>

The PWYP Secretariat received 27 applications of which 11 came from non-PWYP members. The applications and supporting materials were shared with the Nominations Committee. The list of applicants is available in Annex 1.

In a first stage, Nomination Committee members reviewed all the applications against the selection criteria to establish a short list. For that purpose, they used a unified scoring system, in order to assess the relative strength of each applicant, looking at the resume and cover letter but also taking into account the letters of support applicants had submitted. The criteria for assessment were:

- Knowledge of the extractive industry value chain
- Engagement in the EITI
- Knowledge of EITI Standard and policies
- Ability to reach agreements/compromises within groups at different levels
- Ability to serve wider interests than own allegiances
- Time and willingness to consult
- Time and willingness to report regularly
- Ability to represent others with authority
- Ability working with a variety of stakeholders
- Respect of the EITI Code of Conduct.

In a second stage, the Nominations Committee interviewed the short listed candidates. A set of four questions (available in annex 2) was prepared and a unified scoring system was agreed to assess the

candidates' performance. Due to challenges relating to language, juggling different time zones but also time constraints caused by the extended deadline, Committee members interviewed candidates either in language pairs or on an individual basis. Notes and scores were subsequently shared with the other Committee members.

There are 10 seats for civil society on the EITI Board, yet the number of strong candidates as assessed by the Committee surpassed this number. The Committee discussed that the individuals who are selected to serve on the Board should be effective as a group, and therefore have a diverse collective skill set and experiences relevant to the EITI, e.g. some individuals may have specific areas of technical and policy expertise whereas other individuals may be experienced working with different types of constituencies at local levels. The Committee also appreciated the need to strive for regional, language and gender balance.

In addition to considering the scores obtained by shortlisted candidates during the interview, Committee members very seriously took into account the feedback they received from regional civil society, given that the ability and willingness to consult and report back to wider civil society is a key performance indicator for civil society representatives on the EITI Board.

SELECTION

The Nominations Committee made the following selection:

Full Board member	Alternate Board member
Dani Kaufmann (NRGI)	Wendy Tyrrell (Transparency International - Australia)
Gubad Ibadoghlu (Economic Research Center - Azerbaijan)	Oleksyi Orlovsky (International Renaissance Foundation - Ukraine)
Faith Nwadishi (Koyenum Immalah Foundation - Nigeria)	Brice Mackosso (Commission Justice et Paix - Congo Brazzaville)
Cielo Magno (Bantay Kita - Philippines)	Moses Kulaba (Governance and Economic Policy Forum - Tanzania)
Ana Carolina Espinosa González (Universidad Externado de Colombia - Colombia)	Cesar Gamboa (Derecho, Ambiente y Recursos naturales - Peru)

Please note that the Nominations Committee decided to follow the recommendation from the previous Nominations Committee indicating that priority should be given to Southern civil society representatives from implementing countries. This is why the Committee decided to reduce the number of seats allocated to INGOs to two, which were chosen on the basis of previous performance (Mr. Kaufmann, NRGI) and the need for organisational renewal (Ms. Tyrrell, Transparency International).

Please also note that for this Board term, Committee members decided to give Latin America two seats. The first reason for that was the strength of the candidates presented, who were not only deemed very competent by the Committee but who had also received full regional endorsement. The second reason that motivated this choice was the fact that Latin America had been absent from the previous selection of CSO Board members. Thirdly, Committee members agreed that with more and more Latin American countries joining the EITI, and with the 7th Global Conference hosted in Lima, it

was crucial for civil society to ensure strong representation from that region.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- The Committee would like to stress that it is individual persons – and not organisations – that are selected to serve on the EITI Board and that Board Members are expected to consult widely with other civil society organisations and partners at a national and regional level. It is of, course, expected that the individual's organisation will support their work as Board members, and that organisations that have the resources and wider geographic links will use them as effectively as possible for consultations, information sharing etc. If an individual moves on from his/her position, the Nominations Committee will assess whether the individual can keep his/her seat and if not, will handle the replacement process. This is why the Nominations Committee will remain in place throughout the 2016-2019 term.
- Following guidance provided by the PWYP Global Council that, at this stage, term limits for organisations were not wishful due to the limited availability of well-resourced organisations, the Committee has tried to strike a balance between continuity and renewal. However, this question of term limits for organisations might be reviewed again in 2019 and the Committee recommends to do further outreach to interested organisations in order to expand the pool of organisations willing to contribute resources to the EITI by presenting a candidate
- The Committee welcomes the efforts undertaken by the PWYP Secretariat to circulate the call for applications beyond the PWYP networks, which allowed the Committee to select 3 non-PWYP candidates, out of the 10. It therefore recommends pursuing and strengthening those efforts, also by circulating the call for applications with longer notice period.
- The Committee has made an important effort to select a group of individuals that, working together, will be an effective voice for the civil society constituency in the EITI. It is therefore important that all the members, whether they are Full or Alternate, engage actively in the work of the Board and share responsibilities.
- The information presented in this report shows that the Committee went to great length to ensure the integrity, transparency, independence and inclusiveness of the civil society nomination process. The Committee paid attention to selecting strong representatives, who together form a diverse group that will ensure a comprehensive, substantive and independent representation of civil society on the EITI Board over the next three years. The Committee therefore calls on the EITI Chair (outgoing and elect), the international EITI Board and EITI Secretariat of the initiative to honour this achievement by respecting the principle of self-selection as guaranteed by the EITI rules and procedures.

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

Aroa de la Fuente Lopez

Anton Artemyev

Jean-Claude Katende

Emerson Sykes

ANNEX 1. List of received applications

Mange Ram Adana	Association for Promotion Sustainable Development	India
Moses Kulaba	Governance and Economic Policy Centre	Tanzania
Oleksiy Orlovsky	International Renaissance Foundation	Ukraine
Cielo Magno	Bantay Kita	Philippines
Albert Kabuya	CENADEP	DRC
Jean-Jacques Mathamale	Centre pour l'Information Environnementale et le Développement Durable (CIEDD)	CAR
Ana Carolina Gonzalez Espinosa	Universidad Externado de Colombia	Colombia
Wendy Tyrell	Transparency International Australia	Australia/INGO
Gubad Ibadoghlu	Economic Research Center	Azerbaijan
Camilo Nhancale	Youth Development and Environmental Advocacy	Mozambique
Faith Nwadishi	Koyenum Immalah Foundation	Nigeria
Mariatou Amadou	ROTAB - PWYP Niger	Niger
Sombo Chunda	Diakonia Sweden- Zambia Country Office	Zambia
Maryati Abdullah	PWYP Indonesia	Indonesia
Illir Aliaj	Centre for Development and Democratisation of Institutions	Albania
Souleymane Sampebgo	Attac-CADTM	Burkina Faso
Anila Hajnaj	Albanian Centre for Development and Integration	Albania
Brice Mackosso	Commission Justice et Paix (Pointe Noire)	Congo Brazzaville
Daniel Kaufmann	Natural Resource Governance Institute	INGO
Elly Rijnierse	Cordaid	INGO
Issa Garba Tahirou	ROTAB - PWYP Niger	Niger
Johnny West	Open Oil	INGO
Simo Ribaj	Social Education and Environmental Protection	Albania
Cesar Gamboa	Derecho, Ambiente y Recursos Naturales	Peru

Ali Neema	Rafiday Al Iraq Al Jadeed Foundation	Iraq
Natalya Yantsen	"The Formation of Tax Culture"	Kazakhstan
Maria Lobacheva	"Echo"	Kazakhstan

Annex 2. List of interview questions

- 1) What is your experience with multi-stakeholder settings? Would you be able to give us examples of past situations where you had to handle negotiations with different actors involved?
- 2) As representatives of civil society, EITI Board members have a duty to consult and to feedback to their wider constituency. How are you planning to carry out those duties and to find the time for doing so?
- 3) The question of the enabling environment is key for civil society actors participating in the EITI. Yet, other constituencies on the Board only touch upon the issue with reluctance and insist that the EITI is not a human rights initiative. What is your take on the EITI's potential to contribute to better civil society protection in resource rich countries?
- 4) Three years after Sydney, where the EITI adopted a new Standard, most implementing countries are having a hard time properly implementing the new reporting requirements. Hence, for this mandate do you foresee that the Board should refrain from introducing new policy innovations in order to focus on supporting implementation at country level or do you think that civil society should be ambitious and push the frontiers of transparency in the EI sector further? In the latter case, what reforms would you want to aim for?