

The Board agreed that Ukraine has made meaningful progress in implementing the 2016 Standard

Decision reference: 2018-37/BM-40/BP-40-6-G

Table of contents

News	3
The Board's decision	4
Scorecard	5
Recommendations	7

EITI as an 'entry point' for in-depth reforms in Ukraine

29 June 2018 - The EITI Board today decided that Ukraine has made meaningful progress in implementing the EITI Standard. In making its decision, the Board highlighted how the Government of Ukraine and the Multi-Stakeholder Group (MSG) have made progress "in strengthening the governance of the extractive industries by providing timely and publicly accessible information on the revenues from mining, oil and gas, including from transportation and creating a platform for public debate and informing policy-making". The Board also welcomed the extension of EITI implementation to a larger group of companies and to new sectors including coal, iron, manganese, titanium, clay mining and hydrocarbons transportation.

Fredrik Reinfeldt, Chair of the EITI, said: *"I am pleased to see how EITI implementation in Ukraine helped drive broader economic, financial and institutional reforms. I urge the government and the Multi-Stakeholder Group to implement the recommendations from Validation and to move towards systematic disclosures of EITI data through government and company systems"*.

Natalya Boyko, Deputy Minister of Energy and Coal Industry and MSG Chair, said: *"The EITI has shed light on Ukraine's extractive sector for the first time. EITI implementation has set up a transparency trend in the extractives and continued to inform government and companies on how systematic disclosures are beneficial to all stakeholders. The progress we have made is encouraging, but we need to go further, Ukraine is already disclosing some information online. Support from international partners will be essential in getting all extractives data systematically disclosed online - so that it can be used by stakeholders to better understand and manage the growing Ukrainian extractive sector"*.

The EITI Board commended Ukraine for the strong engagement of civil society, which played a central role in driving reforms and improving accountability in the government's management of the extractive industries. The EITI has also provided a mechanism for civil society to raise concerns with government and industry stakeholders

Olena Pavlenko, President of Dixi Group and Deputy MSG Chair, highlighted: *"The EITI has become an 'entry point' for in-depth reforms in the energy sector of Ukraine. The EITI reports provide a systematic assessment of extractive industries; the multi-stakeholder dialogue helps the various parties to hear each other and to work together to achieve common goals; and the knowledge exchange with other EITI countries contributes to implementation of the best practices in the country. We very much hope, that the progress Ukraine has made, implementing the EITI, will be an additional impetus for the rapid reforms of extractive industries"*.

The EITI Board acknowledged Ukraine's efforts to go beyond the EITI requirements on beneficial ownership transparency, distribution of revenues, revenue management and expenditures, social expenditures and public debate. The Board also made a series of recommendations to strengthen governance. Firstly, to discuss options for contract transparency and project-level reporting. Secondly, to improve the transparency of state-owned enterprises, as well as data reliability. The Board welcomes the Government's commitment to build the EITI implementation into Ukraine's legislation and supports the MSG's efforts to move towards systematic disclosures of EITI data.

The Board has determined that Ukraine will have 18 months, i.e. until **29 December 2019**, before a second Validation to address its corrective actions.

Scorecard

Notes

- [Validation](#) is the EITI's independent evaluation mechanism. It assesses countries against progress made in meeting the 2016 Standard.
- See [here](#) for a full explanation of the various levels of progress under the EITI Standard.
- See the interactive scorecard for Ukraine [here](#).
- The documentation of Ukraine's Validation can be found [here](#).
- For further information about the EITI in Ukraine, please visit the [country page on the EITI website](#).

Following the conclusion of Ukraine's Validation, the EITI Board decided that Ukraine has made meaningful progress overall in implementing the EITI Standard.

The Board congratulated the Government of Ukraine and the Multi-Stakeholder Group (MSG) on the progress made in strengthening the governance of the extractive industries. The EITI has helped ensure timely information on the revenues from mining, oil and gas, including from transportation, is provided to the public, most notably civil society, media and affected communities. The Board welcomed the extension of EITI implementation to a larger group of companies and to new sectors including coal, manganese, titanium mining and hydrocarbons transportation. Ukraine's EITI implementation has helped drive broader economic, financial and institutional reforms by supporting the adoption of a law on "Transparency in the Extractive Industries", and amendments to the laws on "State Registration of Legal Entities and Individual Entrepreneurs" and on the "Budget Code".

The EITI has also provided a mechanism for civil society to raise concerns with government and industry stakeholders, leveraging active dissemination and outreach efforts and by providing a platform for public debate and informing policy-making. Civil society has played a central role in driving EITI follow-up on reforms and by building its own capacity to improve accountability in the government's management of the extractive industries. The Board encourages the government and MSG to pursue discussions on transparency in contracts and project-level reporting, and to enhance efforts to improve the transparency of the state-owned enterprises.

The Board recognised Ukraine's efforts to go beyond the requirements of the EITI Standard related to the engagement of civil society (1.3), beneficial ownership transparency (2.5), distribution of revenues (5.1), revenue management and expenditures (5.3), social expenditures (6.1) and public debate (7.1). The Board welcomes the government's commitment to entrench an enabling environment for EITI implementation in sector policies and legislations, and encourages the MSG's efforts to move towards systematic disclosures of EITI data through government and company systems.

The Board has determined that Ukraine will have **18 months, i.e. until 29 December 2019**, before a second Validation to carry out corrective actions regarding the requirements relating to state-participation (2.6), production data (3.2), comprehensiveness (4.1), transportation (4.4), SOE transactions (4.5), data quality (4.9), SOE quasi-fiscal expenditures (6.2) and economic contribution (6.3). Failure to achieve meaningful progress with considerable improvements across several

individual requirements in the second Validation will result in suspension in accordance with the EITI Standard. In accordance with the EITI Standard, Ukraine’s MSG 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 2017. In accordance with the 2016 EITI Standard, an initial assessment was undertaken by the International Secretariat. The findings were reviewed by an Independent Validator, who submitted a draft Validation report to the MSG for comment. The MSG’s comments on the report were taken into consideration by the independent Validator in finalising the Validation report and the independent Validator responded to the MSG’s comments. The final decision was taken by the EITI Board.

EITI Requirements		Level of Progress				
Categories	Requirements	No Progress	Inadequate	Meaningful	Satisfactory	Beyond
MSG oversight	Government engagement (#1.1) 				█	
	Industry engagement (#1.2) 				█	
	Civil society engagement (#1.3) 					█
	MSG governance (#1.4) 				█	
	Workplan (#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) 				█	

EITI Requirements		Level of Progress				
Categories	Requirements	No Progress	Inadequate	Meaningful	Satisfactory	Beyond
Revenue collection	Comprehensiveness (#4.1)			Meaningful		
	In-kind revenues (#4.2)	No Progress				
	Barter agreements (#4.3)	No Progress				
	Transportation revenues (#4.4)			Meaningful		
	SOE transactions (#4.5)		Inadequate			
	Direct subnational payments (#4.6)	No Progress				
	Disaggregation (#4.7)				Satisfactory	
	Data timeliness (#4.8)				Satisfactory	
	Data quality (#4.9)			Meaningful		
Revenue allocation	Revenue management and expenditures (#5.1)					Beyond
	Subnational transfers (#5.2)				Satisfactory	
	Distribution of revenues (#5.3)					Beyond
Socio-economic contribution	Mandatory social expenditures (#6.1)					Beyond
	SOE quasi-fiscal expenditures (#6.2)		Inadequate			
	Economic contribution (#6.3)			Meaningful		
Outcomes and impact	Public debate (#7.1)					Beyond
	Data accessibility (#7.2)	No Progress				
	Follow up on recommendations (#7.3)				Satisfactory	
	Outcomes and impact of implementation (#7.4)				Satisfactory	
Overall Progress			Meaningful			

No progress. All or nearly all aspects of the requirement remain outstanding and the broader objective of the requirement is not fulfilled.

Inadequate progress. Significant aspects of the requirement have not been implemented and the broader objective of the requirement is far from fulfilled.

Meaningful progress. Significant aspects of the requirement have been implemented and the broader objective of the requirement is being fulfilled.

Satisfactory progress. All aspects of the requirement have been implemented and the broader objective of the requirement has been fulfilled.

Beyond. The country has gone beyond the requirements.

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.

The EITI Board agreed the following corrective actions to be undertaken by Ukraine. Progress in addressing these corrective actions will be assessed in a second Validation commencing on **29 December 2019**:

1. In accordance with requirement 2.6.a, the MSG should provide a comprehensive overview of state-owned enterprises, including an explanation of the prevailing rules and practices related to SOEs' retained earnings, reinvestment and third-party funding. The government should also ensure annual disclosure of any changes in government ownership in SOEs or their subsidiaries, and provide a comprehensive account of any loans or loan guarantees extended by the state or SOEs to mining, oil, and gas companies in line with requirement 2.6.b.
2. In accordance with Requirement 3.2, the MSG should ensure that future reports disclose the production values for every extractives commodity produced, including crude oil, natural gas and every mineral covered by reports. To strengthen implementation, the MSG may wish to comment on parallel reporting systems for production volumes including regular publication and verification procedures, to ensure consistent, regular and reliable data.
3. In accordance with Requirement 4.1.c, the MSG should ensure that the materiality of payments from each non-reporting entity and the nature of discrepancies are clearly assessed to support the IA's overall assessment of the comprehensiveness of reconciliation. In accordance with Requirement 4.1.d, unless there are significant practical barriers, the government is additionally required to provide full disclosure of material revenues from non-material companies, disaggregated by revenue stream.
4. In accordance with Requirement 4.4, the MSG should ensure that the next EITI Report disaggregates the transportation revenues by pipeline/route and by paying company.
5. In accordance with Requirement 4.5, the MSG should engage relevant government entities and SOEs with the view to ensure that the reporting process comprehensively addresses the role of state-owned enterprises (SOEs), including material payments to SOEs from oil, gas and mining companies, and transfers between SOEs and other government agencies.
6. In accordance with Requirement 4.9.a, the EITI requires an assessment of whether the payments and revenues are subject to credible, independent audit, applying international auditing standards. In accordance with requirement 4.9.b.iii and the standard Terms of Reference for the Independent Administrator agreed by the EITI Board, the MSG and Independent Administrator should:
 1. examine the audit and assurance procedures in companies and government entities participating in the EITI reporting process, and based on this examination, agree what information participating companies and government entities are required to provide to the Independent Administrator in order to assure the credibility of the data in accordance with Requirement 4.9. The Independent Administrator should exercise judgement and apply appropriate international professional standards in developing a procedure that provide a sufficient basis for a comprehensive and reliable EITI Report. The Independent Administrator should employ his/her professional judgement to determine the extent to which reliance can be placed on the existing controls and audit

frameworks of the companies and governments. The Independent Administrator's inception report should document the options considered and the rationale for the assurances to be provided.

2. ensure that the Independent Administrator provides an assessment of comprehensiveness and reliability of the (financial) data presented, including an informative summary of the work performed by the Independent Administrator and the limitations of the assessment provided.
3. ensure that the Independent Administrator provides an assessment of whether all companies and government entities within the agreed scope of the EITI reporting process provided the requested information. Any gaps or weaknesses in reporting to the Independent Administrator must be disclosed in the EITI Report, including naming any entities that failed to comply with the agreed procedures, and an assessment of whether this is likely to have had material impact on the comprehensiveness and reliability of the report.
7. In accordance with Requirement 6.2, the MSG should clarify a definition of materiality with regards to quasi-fiscal expenditures by SOEs, including SOE subsidiaries and joint ventures. The MSG should ensure disclosure of quasi-fiscal expenditures are in accordance with requirement 6.2. This includes the nature of the subsidy scheme for household utility-payments, and the role of state-owned enterprises. It also includes the financial relationship between the SOE and its subsidiaries, including joint ventures, especially pertaining to coverage of losses. To ensure disclosure is comprehensive, the MSG may wish to define which expenditures are of a quasi-fiscal nature using national laws and regulations.
8. In accordance with Requirement 6.3, the MSG should clarify the public availability of estimates of informal extractives activities, including but not limited to artisanal and small-scale mining.

The government and the MSG are 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.