

19<sup>TH</sup> EITI BOARD MEETING, WISTON HOUSE, 14-15 FEBRUARY 2012

# Minutes

**EITI International Secretariat** Oslo, 22 March 2012

# Contents

<b>Contents</b> .....	2
14 February – Strategy session.....	3
Actions .....	3
15 February – 19 <sup>th</sup> EITI Board Meeting.....	3
19-1 Welcome by the Chair and adoption of agenda .....	3
19-2 Report from the Head of Secretariat.....	3
Actions .....	4
19-3 Implementation Progress Report .....	4
Actions .....	5
19-4 Report from the World Bank MDTF .....	5
19-5 Report from the Validation Committee .....	6
19-5-A Supplementary information on Cameroon .....	6
19-5-B Secretariat Review: Kazakhstan.....	6
19-5-C Secretariat Review: Mauritania.....	7
19-5-D Secretariat Review: Peru.....	7
19-10-C Proposed priority issues for the Validation model review .....	7
Actions .....	7
19-6 Report from the Outreach and Candidature Committee .....	8
Actions .....	9
19-7 Report from the Secretariat’s mission to Ethiopia .....	9
19-8 Report from the Finance Committee.....	9
19-9 Report on preparation of 6 <sup>th</sup> Global Conference .....	9
Actions .....	9
19-11 2012 Board meetings.....	9
Actions .....	10
Any other business.....	10
Summary of actions .....	10
List of participants.....	11
Summary of Board decisions on Validation.....	14

# MINUTES OF THE 19<sup>TH</sup> EITI BOARD MEETING

*Wiston House, 14-15 February 2012*

## *14 February – Strategy session*

The Board discussed the future strategy of the EITI, drawing on in particular Board Paper 19-10-B. There was wide agreement that the EITI standard needs to evolve, both by strengthening the EITI standard and by incentivising implementing countries to link EITI with other reform efforts and to go beyond the basic standard. The Board considered several options for refining the validation system beyond a pass / fail approach to compliance. It was agreed that two working groups would be set up to build on the work of the group that developed the options paper: one group will discuss improvements to the EITI within its current parameters and the other will discuss additions to the scope of the EITI. These groups were tasked with preparing proposals for consideration at the next Board meeting. All members are encouraged to make submissions to the two groups for the outcome to reflect the views of the house. An additional working group was formed to more clearly articulate the EITI's theory of change, with these findings to be fed into the strategy process.

The Board agreed on the need for ongoing external consultations with EITI stakeholders, particularly in implementing countries, to run in tandem with the Board's discussions. Board members considered the idea of "roadshows" or consultation visits to implementing countries.

## **Actions**

EITI Chair to convene two working groups, one on strengthening the EITI within its current scope and one on the options for expanding that scope, to develop strategy proposals for consideration at the next EITI Board Meeting.

Establishment of a working group to more clearly articulate the EITI's theory of change.

## *15 February – 19<sup>th</sup> EITI Board Meeting*

### **19-1 Welcome by the Chair and adoption of agenda**

Clare Short welcomed Board members and observers to the meeting. She proposed that agenda item 19-6 related to Ethiopia be withdrawn from the agenda. The agenda was adopted.

### **19-2 Report from the Head of Secretariat**

Jonas Moberg briefed the Board on the activities carried out by the Secretariat since the last Board meeting. He highlighted South Sudan's commitment to implementation and noted the publication of EITI reports from Congo, Iraq, Liberia, Mali and Peru. The Secretariat's publication "Extracting data: An overview of EITI Reports (2005-October 2011)", presented in Jakarta had been updated to reflect these developments. In January 2012, the Central African Republic became the first Compliant country to publish its annual progress report in accordance with the 2011 Rules. The Secretariat had completed four Secretariat Reviews and participated in several training events. In terms of improving its services to the Board, the Secretariat had developed internal Committee webpages and produced a draft Board manual. It had also been agreed to provide financial support to civil society Board members from implementing countries to cover communication costs and enable them to more effectively participate in Committee meetings. Jonas regretted that certain Board members were not able to attend the meeting due to difficulties in obtaining visas. The Secretariat would continue to work closely with hosting governments to ensure timely guidance on visa requirements and visa delivery. He also noted that PWYP had asked the Board to consider visa issues when determining locations of future meetings. Measures to strengthen the Secretariat included staff training, improvements to internal performance systems and on-going recruitment

of a resource director and a communications officer.

Jelte Van Wieren requested that in reviewing actions points from preceding Board meetings, the Secretariat more clearly articulate why certain action points were pending or no longer applicable. It was agreed that the Secretariat would add footnotes explaining non-completed actions in the future.

Sarah Cooke requested that Board members be given the opportunity to comment on the Secretariat's annual report. It was noted that in the future, the Governance Committee would consider the Secretariat's annual report before it was submitted to the Board, and that the Secretariat would invite comments from all Board members via Board Circular. Sarah asked whether the Secretariat had considered increasing its resources for Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) activities in 2012. It was noted that there had been extensive M&E activity in 2011 through the independent Evaluation, training events and measuring progress against Key Performance Indicators. The Board's work on theory of change would also include elements of M&E.

Florent Michel Okoko noted that there might be a gap between the EITI's ambition and realities on the ground and asked the Secretariat to more carefully consider the use of language in the annual report.

### Actions

The Secretariat to add footnotes explaining non-completed actions in future reviews of actions points.

The Secretariat to invite comments on future annual progress reports via Governance Committee and Board circular.

### 19-3 Implementation Progress Report

Jonas Moberg reminded the Board of the format of the Implementation Progress Report (IPR). It was now split into two parts: a summary version that was included in the Board papers and a more detailed version available on the internal area of the EITI website. He noted the introduction of a 'traffic light' assessment of progress aiming to more clearly distinguish countries on track from those falling behind schedule or experiencing challenges. It was emphasised that the assessment reflected the views of the Secretariat and that the paper should be kept confidential.

Anthony Richter raised a concern about progress in Afghanistan and the ability of civil society to operate in a challenging environment. Sam Bartlett noted that the multi-stakeholder group remained dominated by government representatives, and that there were numerous challenges related to communication and outreach outside Kabul. The process did however benefit from a strong national secretariat, extensive technical assistance and sufficient funding. Despite some difficulties with hiring a reconciler, the reporting process was now on track. The Secretariat did not foresee that Afghanistan would have difficulties in meeting its Validation deadline. Erry Riyana Hardjapamekas confirmed that he had seen encouraging evidence of communication efforts on his recent visit to Afghanistan.

David Diamond was concerned that Afghanistan and Chad had yet to produce their first EITI report whilst having Validation deadlines in August and October 2012 respectively. The Secretariat confirmed that these countries looked set to publish their EITI reports on time.

Diarmid O'Sullivan asked whether the Terms of Reference for the second reconciliation report for Mozambique included an assessment of the fiscal regime, as requested by local civil society. Eddie Rich explained that civil society in Mozambique remained divided over the question of whether the MSG had agreed for the fiscal regime to be included in the second report. The Secretariat was seeking to obtain the minutes from the MSG meeting where the ToRs were agreed.

Jim Miller asked whether the financial support provided by the companies in the Democratic Republic of Congo had helped bridge the funding gap. Tim Bittiger said that the funds had been helpful, but had not solved the

question of long-term funding. He noted that World Bank funds had now been disbursed.

Edward Bickham requested that the Secretariat add Validation deadlines to the assessment table in the summary IPR. He also questioned the Secretariat's assessment of Gabon. Jonas Moberg explained that Gabon was considered to be on track but that strong political commitment was lacking. Edward reiterated that it was important to track country progress in transitioning to the 2011 edition of the rules to avoid a crisis in the second half of 2012. He asked for an update on implementing country considerations of barter agreements. Jonas noted that deadlines had often led to increased activity and that the Secretariat had taken several steps to remind countries of the 2011 Rules through training events, letters from the Chair and daily communication with stakeholders. Sam Bartlett explained that the Secretariat had provided specific guidance to countries on how to incorporate barter arrangements into EITI reporting. He noted that barter deals would be covered in DRC's and Guinea's forthcoming reports.

Ibrahim Dankwanbo and Zainab Ahmed reported back from the NEITI Board Retreat which had considered the way forward beyond compliance, and from the NEITI National Conference. The events had increased public expectations of NEITI and led to calls for NEITI to address other issues such as environmental audits and subnational audits. NEITI had recently commissioned the 2009-2011 oil and gas audit to be completed by December 2012, and would begin a solid mineral audit this year. Jonas Moberg added that other implementing countries could benefit from learning from the NEITI experience. He noted that there was still work to do in Nigeria and other countries in terms of integrating EITI into other reporting mechanisms. Sarah Cooke requested that more be done to collate good practice examples from implementing countries.

Eddie Rich provided a briefing on Iraq noting that the Board's decision on accepting Iraq as a candidate left some ambiguity as to whether the coverage of just export oil sales would be sufficient to meet compliance. The minutes of the Oslo Board meeting at which Iraq was accepted as a Candidate noted that "the Board expects Iraq to strive towards the inclusion of all material revenue payments in its EITI reporting within two years, as required by the EITI rules on Compliance". The Board had therefore asked that the scope of reporting be widened, but did not explicitly make compliance conditional on that. IEITI's first EITI report covered export sales only and a second report would not be published before validation. IEITI was seeking clarity on this issue. It was agreed that a small working group would be established to consider this issue and make a recommendation to the Board on what coverage would be sufficient for Iraq to be declared Compliant.

## Actions

The Secretariat to convene a working group to consider Iraq's scope and make a recommendation to the Board on what coverage would be sufficient for Iraq to be declared Compliant.

## 19-4 Report from the World Bank MDTF

Anwar Ravat introduced the report from the World Bank MDTF, highlighting the four pillars of the MDTF's core mandate: i) technical assistance and funding, ii) outreach, iii) support to CSOs and iv) training. He noted that the Bank had grant arrangements with 31 out of 35 implementing countries, and is supporting many others who are considering implementation. The MDTF had received support of over US\$50m of which almost \$5m was being disbursed each year. Anwar also outlined the focus areas of MDTF technical assistance to Compliant countries and emphasised the need for deepening the understanding and use of EITI reports. Paulo de Sa added that the MDTF is collaborating with other MFIs and civil society organisations, also on the post-compliance agenda.

Tony Hodge asked for an update on the effectiveness of the technical assistance provided by the MDTF. The Chair reminded the meeting that this was an issue for the MDTF Management Committee. Jonas Moberg noted that while the World Bank remains the EITI's main technical assistance provider, the breadth of support provided by other institutions should be recognised. He mentioned the contributions of African Development Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, bilateral agencies such as AUSAID, DFID and GIZ, as well as Publish What You Pay and Revenue Watch Institute. Sarah Cooke requested that the span of existing technical assistance efforts be more

clearly captured. Anthony Richter noted that there appeared to be a divergence between the list of MDTF priority outreach countries and the EITI Outreach Strategy. Paulo de Sa clarified that the MDTF list only included countries that had already approached the World Bank for support, and was not representative of the total universe of MDTF outreach countries. Sarah Cooke asked for an update on the timeliness of MDTF grant disbursements. Alfredo Pires noted that the procedures were slow and complicated even for small grants and demanded considerable human resources. Anwar Ravat explained that there had been an internal review aiming to reduce the gap between actions and available resources. He further noted that the status of grant processes were now published online. The Chair requested that the supporting and implementing countries notify their representatives on the World Bank Board of the need to improve disbursement procedures, and asked Sarah Cooke to coordinate this effort.

## 19-5 Report from the Validation Committee

Mark Pearson presented the report from the Validation Committee. He began by delivering a report from four Secretariat Reviews conducted by the Secretariat before returning to the review of the Validation model (19-10-C), which had been deferred from the Strategy session the day before.

The final decisions from the Board on the status of countries are attached to these minutes. Key discussions and decisions are set out below.

### 19-5-A Supplementary information on Cameroon

The Board considered the information supplementing the Secretariat Review of Cameroon which had been presented to the Board at its meeting in Jakarta. It concluded that Cameroon had not completed all remedial actions requested by the Board and that indicators 14 and 15 remained unmet. The Board agreed that Cameroon had not reached compliance and would retain its status as a Candidate country, subject to a clearly defined and agreed work plan for achieving Compliant status, including a schedule for its next Validation. In accordance with the transition procedures for the 2011 edition of the EITI Rules, the Board agreed that Cameroon would have its candidacy renewed for 18 months (i.e. until 15 August 2013), by the end of which it must have completed a Validation that demonstrates compliance with the 2011 edition of the EITI Rules, including requirement 5(e) regarding regular and timely reporting. If Cameroon did not achieve Compliant status by this deadline it would be de-listed.

Tim Bittiger recalled the Board's decision in Jakarta to continue the secretariat review until it could be clarified whether all material payments and revenues had been covered in the 2006-2008 EITI report. This clarification was assisted by a World Bank financed compilation report, completed in January 2012. The compilation report demonstrated that while all material oil and gas payments had been captured, material payments and revenues from the mining sector were excluded from the 2006-2008 EITI report. The compilation report also highlighted systemic weaknesses in the reporting of government revenues. With regards to the Glencore payment, the compilation report had provided a satisfactory explanation confirming the size of the payment.

Jelte Van Wieren raised a concern about the quality of data in EITI reports. The Chair reminded the meeting that the Board had agreed to commission a review of requirements 12 and 13 to improve clarity and guidance related to data reliability. Florent Michel Okoko noted that in considering Cameroon's validation it was important to recognise progress and achievements so far. The Chair reminded the meeting of the need to protect the integrity of the EITI standard.

### 19-5-B Secretariat Review: Kazakhstan

The Board considered the Secretariat Review of the remedial actions in Kazakhstan. It concluded that Kazakhstan had not completed all remedial actions requested by the Board and that indicators 11, 13, 14 and 15 remained unmet. The Board agreed that Kazakhstan had not reached compliance and would retain its status as a Candidate country, subject to a clearly defined and agreed work plan for achieving Compliant status, including a schedule for its next Validation. In accordance with the transition procedures for the 2011 edition of the EITI Rules, the Board agreed that Kazakhstan would have its candidacy renewed for 18 months (i.e. until 15 August 2013), by the end of

which it must have completed a Validation that demonstrates compliance with the 2011 edition of the EITI Rules, including requirement 5(e) regarding regular and timely reporting. If Kazakhstan did not achieve Compliant status by this deadline it would be de-listed.

Olivier Loubière asked the Secretariat to clarify the nature of the challenges in Kazakhstan. Dyveke Rogan explained that in addition to the technical challenges highlighted in the secretariat review, implementation had slowed down due to a lack of clear political leadership. The multi-stakeholder group was not meeting regularly and there were coordination problems and distrust between the various stakeholder groups involved in the process. The Secretariat had developed a strategy for supporting the process in the coming months. Keith Ruddock asked that the strategy be considered in collaboration with companies active in Kazakhstan.

#### 19-5-C Secretariat Review: Mauritania

Sidi Ould Zeine recused himself from discussion of this matter.

The Board considered the Secretariat Review of the remedial actions in Mauritania. It concluded that Mauritania had completed all the remedial actions requested by the Board. The Board agreed that Mauritania be designated EITI Compliant. In accordance with the EITI Rules, Mauritania must be revalidated within five years (i.e. by 14 February 2017).

#### 19-5-D Secretariat Review: Peru

Epifanio Baca Tupayachi recused himself. The Board considered the Secretariat Review of the remedial actions in Peru. It concluded that Peru had completed all remedial actions requested by the Board. The Board agreed that Peru be designated EITI Compliant. In accordance with the EITI Rules, Peru must be revalidated within five years (i.e. by 14 February 2017).

#### 19-10-C Proposed priority issues for the Validation model review

Mark Pearson announced that the Validation Committee had identified priority issues for a review of the Validation model. The Validation Committee had decided to follow up on these issues with the view of proposing recommendations to the Board at its next meeting. This work would feed into the strategic work related to strengthening the EITI Standard: it was also noted that some issues with Validation would need to be addressed in the near future in order to ensure that countries' progress against the 2011 EITI Rules can be effectively Validated. The issues identified focused on capacity building, the validation process and administrative issues.

Mark Pearson explained that at its meeting of 13 February 2012, the Validation Committee had, in addition, adopted three recommendations for improving existing procedures for Secretariat Reviews. It was agreed that an endorsement would be sought via Board circular to allow time for thorough review and consultation. Upon the request of the Validation Committee, the Secretariat had prepared a paper with lessons learned from nine Secretariat Reviews conducted so far, and recommendations for future Secretariat Reviews. Sam Bartlett presented the recommendations. Edward Bickham commented that the recommendations would give rigour to the existing practices. Jelte Van Wieren recalled the agreement in Paris not to table papers at short notice.

#### Actions

The Secretariat to commission a review of requirements 12 and 13.

The Secretariat to convey the Board's decisions to the governments of Cameroon, Kazakhstan, Mauritania and Peru.

The Validation Committee to present recommendations for the Validation model review at the next Board meeting.

The Validation Committee to seek endorsement of the recommendations for improving the procedures for Secretariat Reviews via Board circular.

## 19-6 Report from the Outreach and Candidature Committee

Anthony Richter presented the report from the Outreach and Candidature Committee.

### 19-6-A Country Outreach Update – January 2012

Anthony Richter welcomed observers from Australia and the United States of America. He asked Jonas Moberg to introduce the country outreach update. Jonas encouraged Board members to make use of the Outreach Update, which is updated regularly and available on the internal part of the EITI website.

### 19-6-B EITI Candidature Application Form

Anthony Richter introduced the Candidature application form designed to guide potential candidates in their application process. The application form would also help the Committee in processing applications. It was agreed that the Outreach and Candidature Committee would invite comments on the application form via Board circular prior to endorsement by the Board.

Michel Okoko asked for a clarification regarding the contact point for the application. Anthony Richter explained that contact information was sought for practical purposes only and that this person was not to be confused with the senior official appointed by the government to lead on EITI implementation (EITI requirement 3). Olivier Loubière asked whether applicant countries would be required to provide documentation in support of their application. Anthony pointed to the sections in the form requesting applicant countries to attach supporting evidence. Olivier noted the importance of verifying any supporting evidence provided by applicant countries. Anthony suggested that a dedicated webpage for applicant countries be developed. The Chair asked that these comments be considered before Board endorsement of the application form.

### 19-6-C Draft EITI Outreach Strategy

Anthony Richter introduced the draft EITI Outreach Strategy. It was agreed that the Outreach and Candidature Committee would consider the points raised by Board members and refine the strategy prior to endorsement by the Board. Anthony noted that the strategy was an elaboration of the outreach approach outlined in the Secretariat Work plan. He thanked the World Bank, Revenue Watch Institute and the Secretariat for their contributions on developing the strategy. Jonas Moberg noted that the strategy was an EITI strategy and although several actors had been involved in the drafting, it should be recognised that they might have priorities beyond and different from those included in the paper. Jonas hoped that the strategy would contribute to add rigour and structure to outreach efforts, but emphasised the need to continue to act upon outreach opportunities as they come along. It was noted that the key criteria for outreach were meant to guide outreach priorities and efforts.

Stephen Gallogly highlighted some corrections to the strategy such as removing the reference that Canada is piloting EITI, removing the reference to Australia implementing the EITI, and placing Mexico in the OECD country category. Jelte Van Wieren questioned why the timeframe for the strategy was limited to one year. Anthony Richter noted that the strategy follows the one year budget cycle of the EITI Secretariat and the term of the Board. Jonas Moberg said that its life could be increased, as long as the Board could make revisions as necessary. Jelte asked about capacity to implement the strategy. Anthony said that several stakeholders had an interest and the capacity to help implement the strategy and that a budget increase of 20% for outreach efforts had been suggested. It was noted that the main implications in terms of resources were time and diplomatic efforts. Jelte questioned why the strategy was only directed at new implementing countries and not new supporting countries. Anthony answered that while the strategy was aimed at implementing countries, outreach to countries that would consider both implementing and supporting EITI was welcome. Jonas Moberg added that one of the biggest preventers of effective outreach were that there were two categories: supporting and implementing countries. Jelte emphasised the need to reach out to politically significant countries that might not consider implementation, such as China and Russia. Edward Bickham said that even if countries like China would not consider implementation, it was necessary to continue engagement and dialogue. Jelte questioned why no

countries in the Middle East figured in the strategy. Anthony commented that in accordance with the criteria for outreach, in particular criteria 4 on the likelihood of effective implementation, countries in the Middle East had not scored well. It was noted that the Board could consider adding Kuwait and Qatar. The strategy also focused on increasing regional diversity. Erry Riyana Hardjapamekas reported on-going efforts to promote the EITI within the ASEAN.

### Actions

The Outreach and Candidature Committee to invite comments from Board members on the EITI candidature application form.

The Outreach and Candidature Committee to make the proposed corrections and changes to the draft EITI Outreach Strategy paper.

### 19-7 Report from the Secretariat's mission to Ethiopia

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

### 19-8 Report from the Finance Committee

Tony Hodge introduced the report from the Finance Committee. He began by announcing the mining constituency's intention to have Deborah Valentine and Andrew Bone replacing Edward Bickham and himself. Tony noted that this was his last Board meeting and thanked his fellow Committee members and the Secretariat. Returning to the report from the Finance Committee, Tony introduced David Diamond as new members of the Committee and reported that Andrew Bone would also be willing to serve on this Committee. Dorjdari Namkhajantsan would continue to serve on the Committee, and Anwar Ravat had expressed willingness to advise the Committee on specific issues. Implementing country representation was to be confirmed. Tony highlighted the administrative and practical implications of the evolving work of the Board, and the need to strengthen the Secretariat accordingly. He invited Board members to suggest potential candidates for a resource director to be recruited by the Secretariat. The need to stabilise the EITI funding base was also emphasised. While the EITI continued to work on an annual budget sequence, one should consider developing a multi-year plan to forecast budgets and fundraising.

Eddie Rich called for volunteers to participate in the Audit Committee.

The Secretariat to invite Board members to participate in the Audit Committee.

### 19-9 Report on preparation of 6<sup>th</sup> Global Conference

It was agreed to aim to hold the 6<sup>th</sup> Global Conference between February and May 2013. Eddie Rich reminded the Board of the discussion in Jakarta related to the timing sequence of the global conference. The Secretariat recommended to the Board that the conference continues to be held every two years. In terms of location, Eddie Rich explained that discussions with potential host countries were on-going, and asked that the Secretariat come back with a recommendation to the Board. The Secretariat welcomed suggestions from Board members on location and format of the conference.

### Actions

The Secretariat to make a recommendation to the Board on the location of the next global conference.

### 19-11 2012 Board meetings

It was agreed that the Secretariat would circulate the suggested dates for the next two Board meetings and canvass Board members' availability as soon as possible. Jonas Moberg proposed that the 20<sup>th</sup> Board meeting be

held either 20-21 June or 27-28 June in Lima, Peru. The Government of Peru together with the Secretariat would seek to organise a regional conference back to back with the Board meeting.

## Actions

The Secretariat to confirm dates and locations for the second and third Board meetings in 2012.

## Any other business

Anthony Richter noted that the disagreement around section 1504 of the Dodd-Frank regulation might influence the broader working environment of the EITI. Some Board members noted a strong complementarity between EITI and Dodd Frank. Keith Ruddock emphasised that there would always be areas of disagreement and said that these should not interfere with the business of the EITI Board. Diarmid O'Sullivan noted for the Board's information that the consensus that underpins the EITI has been placed under some strain by recent events relating to Dodd Frank, and that this consensus needs continuous work from stakeholders. Jelte Van Wieren announced that the Netherlands would provide a two-year secondment to the Secretariat.

Stephen Gallogly announced that this was his last Board meeting, and that Robert Cekuta would be nominated to replace him. He thanked his fellow Board members and the Secretariat.

## Summary of actions

EITI Chair to convene two working groups, one on strengthening the EITI within its current scope and one on the options for expanding that scope, to develop strategy proposals for consideration at the next EITI Board Meeting.

Establishment of a working group to more clearly articulate the EITI's theory of change.

The Secretariat to add footnotes explaining non-completed actions in future reviews of actions points.

The Secretariat to invite comments on future annual progress reports via Governance Committee and Board circular.

The Secretariat to convene a working group to consider Iraq's scope and make a recommendation to the Board on what coverage would be sufficient for Iraq to be declared Compliant.

The Secretariat to commission a review of requirements 12 and 13.

The Secretariat to convey the Board's decisions to the governments of Cameroon, Kazakhstan, Mauritania and Peru.

The Validation Committee to present recommendations for the Validation model review at the next Board meeting.

The Validation Committee to seek endorsement of the recommendations for improving the procedures for Secretariat Reviews via Board circular.

The Outreach and Candidature Committee to invite comments from Board members on the EITI candidature application form.

The Outreach and Candidature Committee to make the proposed corrections and changes to the draft EITI Outreach Strategy paper.

The Secretariat to invite Board members to participate in the audit committee.

The Secretariat to make a recommendation to the Board on the location of the next global conference.

The Secretariat to confirm dates and locations for the second and third Board meetings in 2012.

## List of participants

### Board members

#### Chair

**The Rt. Hon. Clare SHORT**

### Countries

#### Implementing Countries

**Mr Sidi OULD ZEÏNE**, Chairman of National Committee, EITI Mauritania

**Mr Florent Michel OKOKO**, Chairman of the Executive Committee, EITI Congo

**Mr Ibrahim DANKWANBO**, Accountant General, Nigeria

**Mr Alfredo PIRES**, Secretary of State for Natural Resources, Timor-Leste

**Mr Erry Riyana HARDJAPAMEKAS**, Head of the Interim Secretariat, EITI Indonesia

Alt: **Mr Shahmar MOVSUMOV**, Executive Director, State Oil Fund, Azerbaijan

#### Supporting Countries

**Mr Stephen GALLOGLY**, Director for International Energy and Commodity Policy, State Dept., United States

Alt: **Mr Mark PEARSON**, Director General, External Relations, Science and Policy Integration, Natural Resources, Canada

**Ms Sarah COOKE**, Head of the Growth and Resilience Department, Department for International Development, United Kingdom

**Mr Jelte VAN WIEREN**, Head Good Governance Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands

### Civil Society Organisations

**Mr Dorjdari NAMKHAJANTSAN**, Manager, Open Society Forum, Mongolia

Alt: **Mr Mericio J. DOS REIS "Akara"**, Director, Luta Hamutuk Institute, Timor-Leste

**Ms Hannah OWUSU-KORANTENG**, Associate Executive Director, Wacam, Ghana

Alt: **Mr Sabit BAGIROV**, Director, Center for Economic and Political Research, Azerbaijan

**Mr Diarmid O'SULLIVAN**, Europe Advisor, Global Witness, United Kingdom

Alt: **Mr Eelco DE GROOT**, Senior Policy Officer, Cordaid, the Netherlands

**Mr Anthony RICHTER**, Associate Director, Open Society Foundations, USA

Alt: **Mr Epifanio BACA TUPAYACHI**, Grupo Propuesta Ciudadana, Peru

### Companies including Investors

**Ms Baiba RUBESA**, Manager of Corporate Social Responsibility, Statoil ASA

**Mr Stuart BROOKS**, Manager, International Relations, Chevron

Alt: **Guillermo GARCIA**, Transparency Manager, ExxonMobil Corporation

**Mr Olivier LOUBIÈRE**, Corporate Business Ethics Advisor, AREVA

Alt: **Mr Jim MILLER**, Vice President, Environmental Affairs, Freeport-McMoRan, Copper&Gold Inc.

**Mr R. Anthony HODGE**, President, International Council on Mining and Metals

Alt: **Mr Edward BICKHAM**, Advisor, International Council on Mining and Metals

**Mr Keith RUDDOCK**, General Counsel, Exploration & Production, Royal Dutch Shell  
Alt: **Ms Elodie Grant Goodey**, Head of Societal Issues and Relationships, BP

**Mr David DIAMOND**, Head of SRI, Allianz GI Europe

## Board Secretary

**Mr Jonas MOBERG**, Head of EITI Secretariat, Oslo

## Observers

**Ms Marta ABRANTES**, International Relations & Enlargement, Directorate-General for Energy, European Commission

**Mr Javier AGUILAR**, Deputy Program Manager, World Bank

**Ms Zainab AHMED**, EITI Nigeria (NEITI) National Coordinator, Nigeria

**Mr Manpreet ANAND**, Chevron

**Mr Michael BARRON**, BG-Group

**Mr Francisco BATALLER-MARTIN**, Head of Sector Public Finance, European Commission

**Mr Wouter BIESTERBOS**, Senior Policy Officer, Good Governance Division, the Netherlands

**Mr Andrew BONE**, De Beers

**Mr Olivier BOVET**, Programme Manager Trade Promotion, State Secretariat for Economic Affairs, SECO

**Ms Ambarsari Dwi CAHYANI**, Scoping Specialist of Interim Secretariat, EITI Indonesia

**Mr Robert CEKUTA**, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, USA

**Ms Diana CORBIN**, Operations Officer, Donor Relations EITI, World Bank

**Mr Hervé CRONEL**, Conseiller spécial, Chargé de l'Economie et du Développement Durable, International Organisation of the Francophonie

**Ms Malaika CULVERWELL**, Energy Division, Inter-American Development Bank

**Ms Aleksandra Fernandes Da COSTA**, PhD candidate in politics, University of Exeter, UK

**Mr Daniel DARGENT**, Conseiller d'Ambassade, Belgium

**Mr Paulo De SA**, Manager, Oil, Gas and Mining Policy Division, World Bank

**Ms Lisa ELLMAN**, Office of Management and Budget, Dept. of Interior, USA

**Mr Farid FARZALIYEV**, State Oil Fund, Azerbaijan

**Mr Jordi FERRARI**, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, France

**Mr Marti FLACKS**, Department of State, USA

**Ms Alexandra GILLIES**, Head of Governance, Revenue Watch Institute

**Mr Edward GONDWE**, African Development Bank, Tunisia

**Mr Greg GOULD**, Dep. Assistant, Secretary for Natural Resource Revenue, Dept. of Interior, USA

**Ms Elda GUTTERES**, National Coordinator, Timor-Leste

**Ms Sophia HARDING**, Programme Officer, Publish What You Pay (PYWP)

**Ms Saman HUSSAIN**, Office of Collaborative Action and Dispute Resolution, Dept. of Interior, USA

**Mr Rovshan ISMAYILOV**, Economist, Oil Contracts Department, State Oil Fund, Azerbaijan

**Mr James JUNKE**, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Canada

**Mr Faustin-Ange KOYASSE**, Senior Economist, World Bank, Cameroon

**Mr Jean-François LASSALLE**, Directeur Affaires Publiques, Total, France

**Ms Jana LEUTNER**, GIZ Germany

**Mr Drew MALCOMB**, Director of Communications for Policy, Management & Budget, Dept. of Interior, USA

**Mr Carlo MERLA**, PWYP Africa Regional Coordinator

**Ms Isabel MUNILLA**, Director, Publish What You Pay, USA

**Mr Auwal Ibrahim MUSA**, PWYP Nigeria

**Mr Paul MUSSENDEN**, Senior Advisor to the AS for Land and Minerals, Dept. of Interior, USA

**Mr Brendan O'DONNELL**, Head, Oil, gas and mining team, Global Witness

**Ms Tonaina NGORORANO**, African Development Bank

**Ms Verity OUTRAM**, Natural Resource Charter Coordinator, UK

**Mr Anwar RAVAT**, Program Manager, EITI, Oil, Gas and Operations Unit, World Bank

**Mr Jon RICHARDSON**, Director, Resources & Business Liaison Section, Dept. of Foreign Affairs & Trade, Australia

**Ms Marinke van RIET**, PWYP International Director

**Ms Hilde ROED**, Principal Consultant, Sustainability Reporting, Statoil

**Mr Michael ROESCH**, Deputy Programme Manager - Public Finance, Administrative Reform and Transparency Initiatives, GIZ

**Mr Andrew SCHLOEFFEL**, Director Mining Policy and Engagement, AusAID

**Mr Christopher SHELDON**, Lead Mining Specialist, World Bank

**Mr Johannes SAID SOUSSAN**, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Denmark

**Mr Harald TOLLAN**, Senior Advisor, Multilateral Bank and Finance Section, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway

**Mr Andrew VICKERS**, Vice President, Communications, Shell International

**Mr Juan Cruz VIEYRA**, Inter-American Development Bank

**Mr Agus WIBOWO**, Project Officer, EITI Indonesia

**Mr Lodewijk Gualtherie van WEEZEL**, Legal Counsel, Shell International BV

**Mr Johnny WEST**, Consultant, UNDP Iraq

**Ms Erica WESTENBERG**, EITI Policy Officer, Revenue Watch Institute

**Mr Joe WILLIAMS**, PWYP International Secretariat

### **EITI International Secretariat**

**Ms Kjerstin ANDREASEN**, Administrator

**Mr Sam BARTLETT**, Regional Director

**Mr Tim BITTIGER**, Regional Director

**Ms Marie-Ange KALENGA**, Regional Director

**Ms Leah KROGSUND**, Executive Secretary

**Mr Anders KRÅKENES**, Communications Manager

**Mr Francisco PARIS**, Regional Director

**Mr Jürgen REITMAIER**, Special Advisor

**Mr Eddie RICH**, Deputy Head of Secretariat

**Ms Dyveke ROGAN**, Country Manager

# ANNEX: SUMMARY OF BOARD DECISIONS ON VALIDATION, WISTON HOUSE 15 OCTOBER 2012

---

## Summary of Board decisions on Validation

### Board decision on Cameroon

The Board decides that Cameroon's EITI Candidate status is renewed for 18 months (until 15 August 2013), by which time Cameroon will be required to have completed an EITI Validation that demonstrates compliance with the 2011 edition of the EITI Rules. If Cameroon does not achieve Compliant status by 15 August 2013, it will be de-listed. The provisions of Requirement 5(e) in the 2011 edition of the EITI Rules regarding regular and timely reporting will be mandatory after 31 December 2012.

The Cameroon multi-stakeholder group should agree and publish a new work plan within three months (by 13 May 2012) that addresses the corrective actions agreed by the Board, sets out the actions needed to achieve compliance with the 2011 edition of the EITI Rules, and includes a schedule for a new validation to be completed by 15 August 2013.

In taking this decision the Board called on the government to renew its commitment to the EITI, and requested that the International Secretariat together with supporting organisations take steps to encourage stakeholders to continue their work towards achieving Compliance.

### Board decision on Kazakhstan

The Board concludes that Kazakhstan has not completed the remedial actions requested by the Board. The Board decides that Kazakhstan will retain its status as a Candidate country, subject to a clearly defined and agreed work plan for achieving Compliant status, including a schedule for its next Validation.

In accordance with the transition procedures for the 2011 Edition of the EITI Rules, the Board agrees that Kazakhstan will have its candidacy renewed for 18 months (i.e. until 15 August 2013), by which time it must have completed a Validation that demonstrates compliance with the 2011 edition of the EITI Rules, including requirement 5(e) regarding regular and timely reporting. If Kazakhstan does not achieve Compliant status by this deadline it will be de-listed.

It was agreed that the National Stakeholders Council (NSC) should agree and publish a new workplan that addresses the actions needed to achieve Compliance with the 2011 edition of the EITI Rules, including a schedule for a new Validation to be completed by 15 August 2013.

The Board also called on the government of Kazakhstan to renew its commitment to the EITI, and requests that the International Secretariat together with supporting organisations takes steps to encourage stakeholders to quickly resume their work towards achieving Compliance.

### Board decision on Mauritania

The EITI Board designates Mauritania as EITI Compliant as of 15 February 2012. In accordance with the EITI Rules:

- Mauritania must be revalidated within 5 years (i.e., by 14 February 2017);
- Stakeholders in the process may call for a new validation at any time within that period if they think the process needs reviewing;

- Where valid concerns exist that a country has become EITI Compliant, but its implementation of the EITI has subsequently fallen below the standard required for Compliance, then the Board reserves the right to require the country to undergo a new validation or face delisting from the EITI; and
- In accordance with the transition procedures for the 2011 edition of the EITI Rules agreed by the EITI Board on 9 June 2011, Mauritania is encouraged to make the transition to the 2011 edition of the EITI Rules as soon as possible. In particular, Mauritania is required to produce EITI reports annually. EITI Reports should cover data no older than the second to last complete accounting period (e.g. an EITI Report published in calendar/financial year 2013 should be based on data no later than calendar/financial year 2011);

The Board congratulates the government of Mauritania for its sustained commitment and leadership of the EITI process. The Board also congratulates the Comité National for its efforts and effective leadership in EITI implementation. The Board calls on the government and multi-stakeholder working group to ensure that the Board's recommendations are implemented in full, and tasks the EITI International Secretariat with providing regular progress reports to the EITI Board.

### **Board decision on Peru**

The EITI Board designates Peru as EITI Compliant as of 15 February 2012. In accordance with the EITI Rules:

- Peru must be revalidated within 5 years (i.e., by 14 February 2017);
- Stakeholders in the process may call for a new validation at any time within that period if they think the process needs reviewing; and
- Where valid concerns exist that a country has become EITI Compliant, but its implementation of the EITI has subsequently fallen below the standard required for Compliance, then the Board reserves the right to require the country to undergo a new validation or face delisting from the EITI;
- In accordance with the transition procedures for the 2011 edition of the EITI rules agreed by the EITI Board on 9 June 2011, Peru is encouraged to make the transition to the 2011 edition of the EITI rules as soon as possible. In particular, Peru is required to produce EITI reports annually. EITI reports should cover data no older than the second to last complete accounting period (e.g. an EITI report published in calendar/financial year 2013 should be based on data no later than calendar/financial year 2011);

The Board congratulates the government of Peru for its commitment to the EITI process. The Board also congratulates the Comisión Nacional of the EITI for its strong collaboration and effective oversight of EITI implementation, especially in the past few months to respond to the concerns of the Board. The Board also welcome the Government of Peru's commitment to further strengthen transparency in the Peruvian extractive sector and advancing transparency regionally.