

20TH EITI BOARD MEETING, LIMA, 27-28 JUNE 2012

Minutes

EITI International Secretariat

Oslo, 30 July 2012

Contents

Contents	2
Wednesday 27 June	3
20-2 EITI Strategy discussion	3
Actions.....	5
Thursday 28 June	5
20-1 Welcome by the Chair and adoption of agenda	5
20-2 Report from the Strategy discussion	6
Actions.....	6
20-3 Report from the Head of Secretariat	7
Actions.....	7
20-4 Implementation Progress Report	7
Actions.....	9
20-5 Report from the Validation Committee	9
20-6 Report from the Outreach and Candidacy Committee	9
Actions.....	10
20-7 Report from the Governance Committee	10
20-8 Report from the Finance Committee	10
Actions.....	10
20-9 Report from the Audit Committee	10
Actions.....	10
20-10 Report on preparation of 6th EITI Global Conference	11
Actions.....	11
20-11 2012-13 Board meetings	11
Actions.....	11
Other business	11
List of participants	12
Chair	12
Countries	12
Implementing Countries	12
Supporting Countries	12
Civil Society Organisations	12
Companies including Investors	12
Board Secretary	13
Observers	13
EITI International Secretariat	14

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE 20TH EITI BOARD MEETING

Lima, 27-28 June 2012

Wednesday 27 June

20-2 EITI Strategy discussion

Clare Short welcomed Board members to the meeting and proposed an agenda for the day. She proposed a roadmap ahead for the strategy review. It was suggested that based on the outcomes of the Board's discussions in Lima, the Secretariat in collaboration with the Strategy Working Group (SWG) be tasked with developing a paper outlining firmer policy proposals. The SWG would convene in late July to further discuss these proposals and subsequently seek agreement in principle by the Board on the policy proposals. The SWG would then proceed to turn policy ideas into EITI Rules changes with a view to presenting a first draft of revised EITI rules to the Board in Lusaka.

It was suggested that the Board consider delaying the meeting in Lusaka in order to allow sufficient time to prepare a first draft of revised EITI rules. Some Board members argued that it was important for the Board to meet soon so as to provide sufficient time between the Board meeting agreeing proposals and the conference, by which time a new edition of the rules would have to be ready. Others were in favour of delaying the meeting, ensuring enough time for a more detailed proposal to be developed. It was likely that there would be another Board meeting in February 2013 before final revisions to the EITI standard would be presented for adoption by the global conference. The Board members agreed to the proposed process, while it was concluded necessary to consult the members further before a final decision was taken on when the autumn meeting should take place.

Jonas Moberg introduced Board paper 20-2-A, noting that the paper sought to reflect the discussions, agreements and strategic options identified by the SWG in Henley in April 2012. The SWG had reached agreement in principle on a set of issues that ought to become minimum requirements, including:

- a recommendation that EITI reports must contain background information on the extractive sector;
- a proposal for tidying up the language in requirement 9(e) with regards to direct subnational payments;
- suggesting modifications to the requirements related to in kind revenues and state owned enterprises;
- a proposal for mandatory disclosure of licenses and license-holders, including beneficial ownership.
- a proposal for reporting by each company and each revenue stream as part of the minimum requirements (disaggregation).

The SWG had also identified a number of areas where further discussion was needed, including **local content**, **midstream payments**, **licensing** (elements beyond disclosure of licenses and beneficial ownership), **contracts**, **project-level reporting** and **social expenditures**.

In light of these proposed changes, the Secretariat suggested a restructuring of the EITI requirements in order to more clearly link the requirements to the objectives of the EITI, capturing desired outcomes emphasising 'what would be achieved' rather than 'how to achieve it'. The way the EITI will hopefully lead to change would become

clearer. The proposal was that the requirements be distilled into possibly six core criteria: i) the functioning of the MSG; ii) the timeliness of the data; iii) the comprehensiveness of the data; iv) the reliability of the data; v) the explanation of discrepancies and vi) the dissemination of the data. The proposed restructuring would enable multi-stakeholder groups to more clearly link EITI to own national objectives.

The second part of the paper was an elaboration of the SWG discussions regarding the redesign of the validation system. The proposal sought to i) address the weaknesses in the current validation model, including validators' conflict of interest; ii) improve the quality of the assessment of minimum requirements; iii) encourage and recognise efforts to go beyond the minimum requirements; iv) emphasise EITI reports and outcomes rather than process; and v) preserve country ownership.

Sarah Cooke provided an update from the working group on Theory of Change. The working group had reviewed case studies from Indonesia, Nigeria and Tanzania. While there was evidence of implicit theories of change at country level, there was little evidence that EITI outputs such as EITI reports had led to change. The working group proposed recommendations to the Board, including developing guidelines for MSG on defining objectives for their EITI processes, establishing a Board Committee responsible for monitoring impact and developing a menu of indicators to better measure the impact at the national level. It was noted that the restructuring of the EITI requirements into more outcome-oriented criteria would by implication encourage countries to articulate what they want to achieve with the EITI process and how to achieve this. A revised Validation system could assess whether the process had delivered on the desired objectives.

During the course of the plenary and breakout discussions, Board members made a number of observations and contributions including those listed below. The Secretariat was tasked to consider these as it compiles the policy proposals to be considered by the Board:

- agreeing a practically workable solution for license transparency, and the challenge of reconciling diverging views on issues such as project-by-project reporting, contract transparency and social expenditures;
- the issue of transparency in revenue allocations and the challenges with tracing expenditures and transfers of revenues from extractive industries;
- recognising that the EITI should seek to avoid country comparisons on efforts to go beyond;
- the need for linking up countries that are working on similar innovations to encourage peer learning;
- exploring in more detail on how innovations would be assessed;
- implications in terms costs and workload for multi-stakeholder groups to take on a more ambitious standard and Validation system based on self-assessment; and
- the need to elaborate on the details of the policy proposals and their implications in terms of changes to the EITI rules.

Based on the plenary and breakout session, the emerging consensus on the proposals in the paper was as follows, (noting that final approval by the Board would be subject to detailed and finalised proposals):

- **Background information on the extractive sector** (proposal 1) should be included in the EITI report. Further information regarding the details and how to assess would be required.
- **Company by company reporting** (proposal 2) should be required.
- Reporting on **direct subnational payments** would continue to be required where defined material by the multi-stakeholder group (proposal 4). There was no agreement on **subnational transfers** and further

discussions would be needed.

- **License transparency** should be further explored (proposal 6). Board members agreed to explore practical solutions to disclosures of licenses and beneficial ownership, including some kind of materiality test.
- Modifications to the current requirements on **in-kind revenues** and **state-owned enterprises** should be further explored, in particular with regards to implications for IOCs (proposals 7 and 8) and the need to avoid creating onerous requirements.
- **Local content** should not be part of the minimum requirements (proposal 9) but could be taken on voluntary by those countries that find it useful.
- More work would be required on disclosure of **midstream /transit payments** (proposal 10).
- Disclosure of **social expenditures** should remain encouraged (proposal 11).
- There was a need to enhance **data reliability** (proposal 12), including further discussion of CIPFA's findings and recommendations.
- The Secretariat should continue its work on developing an **EITI data standard** (proposal 13).
- With regards to the **redesign of the Validation system**, it was agreed that the Secretariat would develop a new proposal for consideration by the SWG in July. Board members recognised that the revised proposal would need to both assess minimum requirements and recognise efforts to go beyond. It was also noted that the requirements and associated Validation system should be more outcome oriented. Board members stressed the need for an impartial assessment. The idea of an independent expert panel and different options for procurement and financing of validation should be further explored in the revised proposal.
- There was no consensus on **project by project reporting** (proposal 3) and **contract transparency** (proposal 5). Board members agreed to continue discussions.

The Board agreed on the need for on-going external consultations with EITI stakeholders, particularly in implementing countries, to run in tandem with the Board's discussions.

Actions

The SWG to develop a policy paper for consideration by the Board, including firmer proposals and a revised Validation model.

The Secretariat to confirm dates for the autumn Board meeting in Lusaka and the Board meeting in February 2013.

Thursday 28 June

20-1 Welcome by the Chair and adoption of agenda

The Chair welcomed participants to the Board meeting. She thanked the Peruvian government and stakeholders for co-organising the events during the Lima week, enabling the Board and observers to not only visit but also experience Peru. She noted that the visit to Freeport McMoran's Cerro Verde mine in Arequipa was insightful, and that the LAC Conference of illustrated the growing profile of the EITI in the region.

Addressing observers, she underlined that the strategy consultations were an inclusive process. She noted that on

the previous day, Board members and alternates had met without observers in order to allow the Board to exchange views on a series of proposals developed by the Strategy Working Group (SWG). She invited Jonas Moberg to provide a summary of those discussions.

20-2 Report from the Strategy discussion

Jonas Moberg began by outlining the work undertaken to date and the roadmap to the next EITI Conference. There would be two more Board meetings before the Conference: the first scheduled for Lusaka in October 2012 and another in early 2013. The objective was to agree a new edition of the EITI Rules at the Board meeting in 2013, for presentation and adoption at the Conference. He summarised the issues where there was an emerging consensus regarding new or modified EITI requirements, and additional issues where further discussion was required (as described above). He noted that the Board had tasked the SWG with preparing a firmer policy proposal, and that the SWG would meet in Amsterdam in late July.

Dyveke Rogan introduced the Strategy consultation paper. Stakeholders had submitted a large number of comments and proposals, which had been made available on the EITI Website. The EITI Chair and Secretariat had visited a number of implementing countries to explain the process and seek contributions from stakeholders. Further consultations were planned for the second half of 2012, including further implementing country visits, regional consultations, and a national coordinators meeting scheduled to coincide with the Board Meeting in Lusaka. Other events (e.g., the PWYP conference, Indaba meetings, African Mining Vision) also provided an opportunity to engage stakeholders.

Eddie Rich introduced the summary of the **parallel session** to the Board meeting that had taken place on 27 June. He noted that 47 stakeholders from 24 organisations met in parallel to the main Board meeting. The reconcilers for the Peruvian report and the Peruvian stakeholders presented and discussed their last report. Moving from the case study to the general, the group then discussed the EITI report database and how the refreshed EITI website provides much more data, enabling year-on-year and country-by-country comparisons. The German technical cooperation agency, GIZ, then, on behalf of the Theory of Change (TOC) Working Group, presented how the TOC framework can help the EITI establish a more outcome focus at both the international and national level. The group then discussed the Board's Strategic Options Paper. The day ended with a discussion amongst stakeholders on capacity building, training and communications.

Sam Topkrah, Head of the Liberian EITI secretariat, then spoke in more detail on the strategy discussions. He noted that there had been full agreement on that the present EITI system could be improved both in content and in process. He noted that the group welcomed the need to recognise and encourage country efforts beyond the minimum, and spoke of the rich examples that were presented from participating implementing countries, especially Nigeria, Azerbaijan, the US, and Liberia. He spoke about the discussions of the specific proposals in the Options Paper, noting that the group welcomed the emerging consensus. Finally, he outlined the many views about the proposed validation model, emphasising that the agreement that the present model was not delivering. Amongst other questions he raised the concern about who would pay for a different validation process.

Eddie Rich concluded by noting that whatever model emerged, there would be a need for the system to draw more on the skills and expertise of organisations across the EITI family, be it the World Bank, the Revenue Watch Institute, the Natural Resource Charter, Norway's Oil for Development, Australia's Mining for Development Initiative, etc.

Actions

The SWG to meet in late July and with the support of the Secretariat develop more concrete proposals for the Board to consider at its meeting in the autumn.

20-3 Report from the Head of Secretariat

Jonas briefed the Board on the activities carried out by the Secretariat since the last Board meeting. He highlighted the launch of the new EITI website, which provided a clear introduction to the EITI for new users, more detailed information on EITI reporting, and links to media references to the EITI. Further work was needed to focus on the key product emerging from the EITI process – the EITI data – and encouraging stakeholders to consider “what the number say.” The Secretariat was encouraging implementing countries to make data files more accessible, and encouraging the development of applications that would draw on this data and make EITI data more accessible and useful.

The Secretariat had visited a number of implementing countries, as outlined in the implementation progress report, taking the opportunity to brief stakeholders on the strategy process. There was also a significant amount of outreach work. The Secretariat had received delegations from Uganda, Ethiopia, South Sudan and Myanmar that were visiting Norway. A further area of focus was strengthening EITI training, working together with the World Bank, GIZ, PWYP, RWI and others.

Jim Miller welcomed the efforts to make EITI data more accessible, but noted that simple comparisons between countries could be misleading. Jonas noted that the EITI reporting database included appropriate disclaimers, and encouraged stakeholders to refer to the original reports for more detailed information.

Jelte van Wieren asked about the status reports on action items from previous meetings. Jonas noted that the list had become long and very detailed, with almost all actions completed. It was agreed that the list should be updated, listing all actions from the previous meeting and action items from earlier meetings that were not yet complete.

Actions

The Secretariat to update the list of action points, listing all actions from the previous meeting and action items from earlier meetings that were not yet complete

20-4 Implementation Progress Report

Jonas introduced the Implementation Progress Report, which provided an overview of EITI implementation in 35 countries and a brief summary of outreach activities. He reminded Board members that more detailed IPR reports were available on the internal area of the EITI website. He noted that the number of EITI reports continued to increase rapidly as countries work to ensure compliance with the 2011 edition of the EITI Rules, including the requirement for regular and timely reporting. As required in the EITI Rules, compliant countries were also publishing annual reports detailing their activities. These reports had been made available on the EITI website. A growing number of implementing countries were providing information in their EITI reports that exceeded the minimum requirements as set out in the EITI Rules. The IPR also provided details on countries experiencing difficulties and delays in implementation, including a table where the Secretariat had indicated whether implementing countries were on-track (highlighted green), facing challenges (amber) and off-track (red).

Sam Bartlett provided an update on the regular and timely reporting (requirement 5(e)), which was an important feature of the assessment process and a key focus of the Secretariat’s work with implementing countries. He explained that countries were required to publish EITI Reports no later than two years after the end of the relevant financial period. Thus, an EITI report covering financial year 2010 should be published by 31 December 2012. He noted that the transitional arrangements agreed by the Board regarding the implementation of the 2011 edition of the EITI Rules required that countries meet this requirement by the end of 2012 or the end of their maximum candidacy period, whichever was later. Several countries were significantly delayed in meeting this requirement, and thus at risk of delisting at the end of their maximum candidacy period.

Jonas noted that the Secretariat and the World Bank had recently held a joint meeting in Washington to ensure strong collaboration on implementing country support and outreach.

The Board discussed challenges in:

- **Afghanistan** - where the MSG was unable to recruit a validator. The Secretariat, having briefed the Validation Committee, was exploring options for completing the validation;
- **Cameroon** - where there was disappointment at not achieving compliant status, and significantly delays the 2009 and 2010 reporting process. Jonas was planning to visit in July;
- **Chad** - which had not yet produced an EITI Report, and was required to complete validation in October. There have been delays with government entities completing reporting forms. The Secretariat was providing advice and support;
- **Gabon** – where there appeared to be insufficient support from stakeholders, and long delayed reports. Further efforts were needed to energise the process;
- **Guinea** – which had a significant backlog of EITI Reports, challenges in incorporating barter deals as required by the 2011 edition of the Rules, and deadline for validation in August;
- **Kazakhstan** – where there was also disappointment at not achieving compliant status, but renewed political commitment to take the steps necessary to achieve compliance following the publication of the next (2010) report;
- **Mali** – where there were concerns about whether the EITI could continue to function given the current political and security situation; and
- **Sierra Leone** – which had a challenging timetable to produce the next EITI Report and prepare for validation, especially given that campaigning for the November election would soon begin.

It was noted that several countries were experiencing difficulties in sustaining political support, and in ensuring that there was an enabling environment for civil society participation, particular in countries experiencing political crises and/or security concerns. It was suggested that the Secretariat should bring forward proposals for ensuring that EITI stakeholders are mobilised most effectively in countries where EITI processes are experiencing difficulties. This could be done for example through convening an ad hoc working group which would share issues in specific countries with a view to each of the constituencies then seeking to mobilise their in-country assets/members.

World Bank update

Javier Aguilar provided an overview of the support provided through the MDTF and the workplan FY12-FY14, highlighting the four pillars of the MDTF's core mandate: i) technical assistance and funding, ii) outreach to new countries, iii) support to civil society organisations, and iv) training and knowledge management. To date, US\$58.8 million had been pledged by 15 donors, with US\$53.5 million received. The work program for FY13-14 calls for a total budget of US\$50.9 million. Noting the on-going strategy review, he noted that WB/MDTF technical assistance and funding would very likely need to be adjusted.

Anthony Richter sought additional information about the support provided to EITI reporting initiatives in Ethiopia, Equatorial Guinea and Zimbabwe. It was noted that there were different circumstances in each case, that support was being provided in some cases through the MDTF and in others (e.g. Zimbabwe) via own means of the Bank, and that the Secretariat and World Bank shared information on each case.

It was agreed that a copy of the World Bank presentation would be distributed by Board Circular.

Actions

The Secretariat to distribute a copy of Javier's presentation of the MDTF Work Plan via Board Circular

20-5 Report from the Validation Committee

Julie McDowell noted that there were no papers or recommendations from the Committee for consideration. The Committee had met regularly since Wilton Park. The work included: (1) reviewing Afghanistan's difficulties in procuring a validator, (2) overseeing the Secretariat Review in Zambia, and (3) consideration of a validation waiver request from Mozambique. The Committee was also close to concluding a review of the validation system, and had agreed to put several recommendations to the Board via circular in the coming weeks.

The Committee had also considered the functioning of the Validation Committee, noting the heavy workload and the difficulties in convening a large committee across several different time zones and languages. The Committee had agreed to trial simultaneous translation for teleconferences, and had also agreed a procedure whereby two committee members would act as lead reviewers on each case under consideration.

Julie concluded by noting that Eelco de Groot had agreed to take over as Chair of the Validation Committee. Eelco welcomed the opportunity to chair the Committee. The Board thanked Julie for her commitment and dedication to overseeing the Committee's work.

20-6 Report from the Outreach and Candidacy Committee

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

He noted that the Committee had considered the candidacy application from the Solomon Islands. This was the first application to follow the new application procedure, including an application form previously agreed by the Board. The application had been made publically available on the EITI website. He noted that the Outreach and Candidature Committee had a limited time to consider the application and conduct due diligence in the lead up to the meeting. The Secretariat had assessed the application and concluded that the five sign-up indicators had been met. Committee members had sought additional information on three issues: (1) confirmation that the terms of reference for the MSG have been agreed, (2) verification that there is appropriate representation of CSOs on the MSG, particularly in relation to the status of land-owner associations, and (3) further clarification on the steps being undertaken to review the legal framework to identify any potential obstacles. Anthony Richter and Sam Bartlett presented additional information addressing these points. While there were some outstanding concerns regarding the status of land-owner associations on the MSG, it was agreed that:

The EITI Board admits the Solomon Islands as an EITI Candidate country on 28 June 2012. In accordance with the EITI Rules, the Solomon Islands is required to publish their first EITI Report within one year and six months of becoming a Candidate (by 29 December 2013) and to submit a final (MSG endorsed) Validation Report to the Board within two years and six months of becoming a Candidate (by 29 December 2014). Failure to meet either of these deadlines will result in delisting.

Anthony Richter presented the EITI Outreach Strategy for approval for the Board, noting that the strategy had been revised following feedback from Board members. Jelte van Wieren suggested additional emphasis on the role of implementing countries in supporting outreach. Stuart Brooks highlighted the importance and value in mentoring during preparations for candidacy. The Board agreed to amend the strategy accordingly and to approve the outreach strategy.

Anthony concluded by drawing Board member's attention to the Outreach Update for April-May 2012, which was available on the internal area of the EITI website. The Committee had refined the template to provide additional information on priority outreach countries. Anthony highlighted the work being undertaken in Brazil, Chile, Columbia, Mexico, the Philippines, São Tomé and Príncipe and Tunisia.

Actions

The Chair to write to EITI Champion in the Solomon Islands outlining the Board's decision.

20-7 Report from the Governance Committee

As the Chair of the Committee was not able to attend the meeting, Jonas Moberg provided an update. There were no papers or recommendations for consideration by the Board. Reflecting recent changes to the Board, Debra Valentine had agreed to join the Committee. Two issues had been identified to be on the agenda for the Committee. The first was the development of a code of conduct for all holders of an EITI office. This proposal had emerged from the Strategy Working Group. The Committee had reviewed a draft and the Secretariat was currently seeking legal advice. The second matter was a governance review, including reviewing the articles of association, which was closely linked to the strategy process and changes to the EITI Rules in the lead up to the next Conference and members' meeting.

20-8 Report from the Finance Committee

Board paper 20-8 included the audited accounts for the period 1 January to 31 December 2011. The Finance Committee, reporting through Eddie Rich, noted that the year was close to balance and that financial situation was healthy. In 2011 the Secretariat had a budget of \$3.8m, but spent \$4.7m (a 22% overspend) against an income of \$4.8m. \$0.7m of the overspending was related to two items – the 2011 Global Conference and Board meeting expenses. These were partly offset by \$0.3m special parallel funding not included in the 2011 budget forecast.

Dorjdari Namkhajantsan noted that the Committee has looked closely at the issue of parallel funding, which was needed for the conference but not included in the Board approved budget. While all parallel funding was included in the accounts, it was agreed that the Secretariat should provide early reporting on any parallel funding decisions in the future.

Julie McDowell noted that large percentage of expenditure related to board meetings and conferences. Clare highlighted the importance of these events for engaging with stakeholders directly, and for advancing EITI outreach in new countries as illustrated at the LAC conference. Jonas noted that a significant element of the cost related to translation services, and that the Secretariat would provide more disaggregated information so that these costs were clearer.

Actions

The Secretariat and the Finance Committee to provide more detailed information of costs relating to board meetings and conferences.

20-9 Report from the Audit Committee

Elodie Grant Goodey presented the report from the Audit Committee. The Committee confirmed its understanding that the auditor was satisfied that the audited accounts were a true statement of the financial position of the EITI Secretariat for 2011. It also confirmed its understanding that the auditor was satisfied with the financial probity and management of the Secretariat. The Board took note of the Committee's findings.

The Committee also recommended that the Finance and Audit Committees of the EITI are merged. Elodie noted that the tasks of the two Committees are closely related, and that the audit committee did not see any conflicts of interest in combining the two. Sarah Cooke noted that it was common practice to keep these two committees separate. It was agreed that the matter would be considered by the Governance Committee.

Actions

The Governance Committee to consider the possibility of combining the Finance and Audit committees.

20-10 Report on preparation of 6th EITI Global Conference

Sam Bartlett briefed the Board on the Secretariat's effort to explore options for the 2013 conference, in accordance with the criteria agreed by the Board in Wilton Park. He noted that the Chair had received a letter from the Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Senator Bob Carr, offering to host the Conference. The Board Agreed to hold the 6th Global Conference in Australia, with the dates to be confirmed through Board Circular soon as possible.

The Chair invited Andrew Schloeffel from AusAID to address the Board. He noted Australia's long standing support for the EITI, and that an EITI pilot was underway. He also noted the opportunities for the EITI Conference to tie in with the Australian Government's mining for development initiative.

Actions

The Chair to write to the Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs accepting the Australia Government's offer host the Conference

The Secretariat to make a recommendation to the Board on the venue and timing of the next Global Conference via Board Circular.

20-11 2012-13 Board meetings

Jonas Moberg noted the Board's decision to hold the global conference in the second quarter of 2013. That suggested two further Board meetings. The Board had previously agreed 2-3 October in Lusaka. It was suggested that the second meeting is held in Oslo in early 2013. Noting the challenging schedule for developing proposals as part of the strategy process, it was suggested that the Lusaka meeting be postponed. It was agreed that the Chair would circulate possible dates for the next two Board meetings and canvass Board members' availability as soon as possible.

Jelte van Wieren noted that this would be his last Board Meeting, and welcomed the strong collaboration between Board members and the growing ambition of the EITI as reflected in the strategy process. Clare thanked Jelte for his contribution to the Board, and his willingness to host the July meeting of the SWG.

Eelco de Groot noted that several Board members and EITI stakeholders had concerns about the cost of the venues and accommodation for EITI Board meetings, highlight the need to select venue that were in keeping with the EITI's principles and objectives. Jonas noted the efforts undertaken by the Secretariat to secure appropriate venues. In some cases, the venues were suggested by host governments, and there were often a limited number of choices with the necessary facilities. The Secretariat would continue to provide Board members and observers with a range of accommodation options, and would welcome feedback from and consult Board members regarding future venues.

Actions

The Secretariat to confirm dates and locations for the third Board meeting in 2012 and a further meeting in Oslo in early 2013.

Other business

Nick Birch from the Department of Resources, Energy and Tourism provided an update on the EITI pilot in Australia. The first stakeholder meetings were held 2011 and five MSG meetings had been held to date. The pilot had a multi-stage approach: (1) a gap analysis, (2) a data collection phase involving nine companies, (3) reconciliation and (4) evaluation. There were a number of challenges relating to providing disaggregated data due to privacy legislation, and engaging state and territory governments. The findings from the pilot would then inform a decision on whether to proceed with EITI implementation. Clare welcomed the update, which underlined the need for a principled approach that also provided some flexibility, and looked forward to an update on the pilot at the conference in 2013.

List of participants

Chair

The Rt. Hon. Clare SHORT

Countries

Implementing Countries

Mr Abdoul Aziz ASKIA, Permanent Secretary, EITI Niger

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

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

Alt: **Mr Robert MOÏDOKANA**, EITI National Coordinator, Central African Republic

Mr Ibrahim DANKWANBO, Accountant General, Nigeria

Alt: **Mr Roosevelt Gasolin JAYJAY**, Liberia

Supporting Countries

Mr Robert CEKUTA, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, State Dept., USA

Alt: **Mr Mark PEARSON**, Director General, External Relations, Natural Resources Canada

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

Alt: **Mr Harald TOLLAN**, Senior Advisor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway

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

Alt: **Mr Olivier BOVET**, Senior Programme Manager Trade Promotion, (SECO)

Civil Society Organisations

Mr Dorjdari NAMKHAJANTSAN, Manager, Open Society Forum, Mongolia

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

Ms Hannah OWUSU-KORANTENG, Wacam, Ghana

Mr Jean Claude KATENDE, Président National de l'ASADHO, Association Africaine de Défense des Droits de l'Homme, coordinateur PCQVP, Democratic Republic of Congo

Alt: **Mr Ali IDRISSE**, Coordinateur National du ROTAB PCQVP, Niger

Ms Corinna GILFILLAN, Head, Global Witness, USA

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

Mr Ignacio QUESADA MORALES, Chief Financial Officer, Pemex

Mr Stuart BROOKS, Manager, International Relations, Chevron

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

Mr Jim MILLER, Vice President, Environmental Affairs, Freeport-McMoRan, Copper&Gold Inc.
Alt: **Mr Edward BICKHAM, Advisor, International Council on Mining and Metals**

Ms Debra VALENTINE, Group executive, Legal & External Affairs, Rio Tinto, UK

Ms Elodie GRANT GOODEY, Head of Societal Issues and Relationships, BP

Ms Julie McDOWELL, Head of SRI, Standard Life Investments

Board Secretary

Mr Jonas MOBERG, Head of EITI Secretariat, Oslo

Observers

Mr Javier AGUILAR, Deputy Program Manager, World Bank

Mr ABUBAKAR MUSA ABDULLAHI, Nigeria Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (NEITI)

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

Mr Manpreet ANAND, Chevron

Ms Victoria AYER, USAID, USA

Ms Cateryn Vucina BANJANIN, Strategic Communications & Project Coordinator, Inter-American Development Bank (IADB)

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

Mr Nick BIRCH, Department of Resources, Energy and Tourism, Australia

Ms Angela Cassell BUSH, Deputy Minister of Finance, Ministry of Finance, Liberia

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, Infrastructure and Environment Dept., Inter-American Development Bank

Mr Daniel DORGENT, Government of Belgium

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

Ms Umesha De SILVA, Natural Resource Governance Analyst, Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)

Mr Farid FARZALIYEV, State Oil Fund, Azerbaijan

Ms Marti FLACKS, Department of State, USA

Mr Ian GARY, Oxfam-US

Ms Alexandra GILLIES, Head of Governance, Revenue Watch Institute (RWI)

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

Ms Elda GUTTERES, National Coordinator, Timor-Leste

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

Ms Caterina JOCHMANN, GIZ Peru

Ms Jana LEUTNER, GIZ Germany

Mr. Hideki MORIMOTO, Second Secretary, Embassy of Japan, Peru

Mr Carlo MERLA, Africa Regional Coordinator, Publish What You Pay (PWYP)

Ms Isabel MUNILLA, Director, Publish What You Pay (PWYP), USA

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

Mr Orji Ogbonnaya Orji, Nigeria Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (NEITI)

Ms Agnès Solange ONDIGUI OWONA, Coordinator of the Technical Secretariat, EITI Cameroon

Ms Verity OUTRAM, Coordinator, Natural Resource Charter

Ms Evelyn PARRA, Managing Director, Energy Welfare Training Ltd, University of Dundee, Sweden

Mr Walter C. RETZSCH, Senior Policy Advisor, Regulatory and Scientific Affairs Department, American Petroleum Institute, USA

Ms Marinke van RIET, International Director, Publish What You Pay (PWYP)

Mr Michael RÖSCH, Deputy Programme Manager - Public Finance, Administrative Reform and Transparency Initiatives, GIZ, Germany

Mr Paul SAMSON, Director General, Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), Multilateral Development Institutions Directorate (MDI), Canada

Mr Andrew Schloeffel, AusAID

Ms Kristina SVENSSON, Operations Officer, World Bank

Mr Sam TOKPAH, Head of Secretariat Liberian Extractive Industries (LEITI), Liberia

Ms Julia TORREBLANCA, Vice-president Corporate Affairs, Freeport McMoran, Peru

Mr Juan Cruz VIEYRA, Technical Advisor, Institutional Capacity of the State Division, Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), USA

Ms Erica WESTENBERG, EITI Policy Officer, Revenue Watch Institute (RWI)

Mr Joe WILLIAMS, International Secretariat, Publish What You Pay (PWYP)

Mr Carlos WENDORFF, Peruvian MSG

EITI International Secretariat

Ms Aida Peña AAMOT, Programme Coordinator

Mr Sam BARTLETT, Regional Director

Mr Tim BITTIGER, Regional Director

Mr Francisco PARIS, Regional Director

Mr Eddie RICH, Deputy Head of Secretariat

Ms Dyveke ROGAN, Country Manager