

Consolidated responses - implementing country strategy consultations

Evaluating EITI Impact

1. How does the MSG define EITI impact in your country? What are your impact indicators?

Afghanistan:

Civil society (1)

Although the MSG has been heavily occupied with reconciliation reports and internal governance issues, publication of more information has been a major impact evaluator.

Civil society (2)

This is an issue – do not think there is adequate assessment linked to actual reduction in corruption/increase in transparency

Albania:

MSG measures the impact of EITI in Albania through transparency in declaring income derived from the use of Natural Resources through the Extractive Industries, publishing this data in a comprehensible format and overseeing it in order to enable the general public to have information on public revenues and expenditures.

- Our impact indicators are the Publication of the Register of Mining Licenses, Hydrocarbon Agreements and Hydropower Concession Contracts in EITI Albania website.
- Publication of Licensing Procedures in all three sectors. (via Public Procurement Agency)

Argentina:

Given the federal structure of Argentina, one important impact indicator is the accession of the provinces that are the owners of the natural resources in their territories. Argentina committed to presenting the first report in the second half of 2020. Since its acceptance as an implementing country, the MSG has conducted outreach and dissemination activities in various provinces and industry forums, in addition to establishing the scope and materiality of the EITI Report and the guidelines for data collection.

Armenia:

Government

During the previous 3 years traditionally close and conservative sector has become incomparably transparent and inclusive by of EITI.

Civil society

There are not specific KPIs impact indicators developed to evaluate the effectiveness of EITI.

Burkina Faso:

The impact of EITI implementation in Burkina Faso is perceived through public debate between local communities and mining companies. The MSG ensures that EITI data are comprehensible and publicly accessible and that they contribute to public debate.

Through EITI Report dissemination activities, the public has access to information relating to the shares of taxes and duties that comes back to their municipality. These activities enable the local population to also monitor the use of these funds.

Chad:

The Multi-Stakeholder Group has not done this yet, but one could draw on the six impact categories reported on in the impact study report on the EITI process in Chad in the new national 2020 Work Plan.

Civil society (1)

Strengthen the consistency between the objectives of Agenda 2030 and those of the 2017-2021 National Development Plan, with the support of partners to lead the process of contextualisation and analysis of the degree of integration of EITI activities and targets into the national planning framework. Strengthen the rapid integrated assessment tool for evaluating the degree of alignment between the 2017-2021 National Development Plan and the activities of the EITI.

Civil society (2)

Good knowledge of the situation of governance of public resources in the country.

Improvement of the living conditions of the population.

Proportion of resources invested in social sectors.

Industry

The public is becoming increasingly aware, including of the existence of EITI, even if much remains to be done for its visibility. Officials of the Finance Ministry know of EITI, having an EITI unit within the ministry.

National Secretariat

Participation of citizens in the debate, better understanding by citizens of the extractive sector. Opinion study.

Cote d'Ivoire:

The Multi-Stakeholder Group defines the impact of EITI in our country as being the results from implementation of the EITI Standard. The indicators usually presented are the data from the operation of extractive activities. In addition to these indicators, it is worth mentioning:

- The level of awareness of the EITI in the country;
- The quality of governance and the level of access to extractive sector data;
- The use of EITI data to produce statistics and raise debates;
- The level of involvement of citizens and communities;
- Access to data related to local development and environmental issues;

Democratic Republic of Congo:

Civil society

So far, it is unclear because apart from the publication of EITI reports, no activity is conducted to assess whether the EITI process has an impact on the transparency of public finances. The new Mining Code published in 2018 contains articles promoting transparency but these remain to be implemented. For example, the publication of contracts, amendments and annexes to mining contracts is not yet happening, despite this being a legal requirement.

Dominican Republic:

Civil society

Apart from the positive impact of the country's incorporation into the EITI process, CS believes that this impact has been very limited. So far, none of the impact-measurement tools has been put into operation, including opinion polls, surveys, impact studies, a user-visible automatic counter of visits to the EITI website, outcomes of the communication plan by activity type, and the number of participants, among the most important.

Government

We define it as an initiative that generates confidence in our country's extractive industry, through having gathered together in the same space for discussion the three sectors that affect the mining sector: Government, civil society and business.

Germany:

The common goals of the D-EITI define the desired impact of the EITI implementation in Germany. The annual workplan lists the activities and measures contributing to these goals. For every goal/impact the MSG agreed on output/outcome indicators to monitor the implementation. On the basis of these indicators the MSG is monitoring the impact.

Ghana:

In the Ghana context, EITI impact is defined as EITI findings and recommendations that lead to policy and practice change. The impact indicators include, new policies and laws introduced, number of policies and laws reviewed, how much more revenue has come through as a result EITI-related reforms; changes observed in revenue management practices; improvement in expenditure efficiency; how much trust has been built among stakeholders; reduction in the number of violent conflicts in resource host communities.

Guinea:

The impact of EITI is defined as the set of positive elements arising from its implementation. The indicators are divided into social, environmental, administrative, legal, etc.

Mauritania:

- The degree to which EITI data are used by journalists
- The degree to which EITI data are used by civil society activists
- The degree to which EITI data are used by ministers during parliamentary budget sessions

Niger:

The MSG defines the impact of EITI by:

- The establishment of responsible citizen debate. Indicators: Number of debates held
- Social calm in extractive areas. Indicator: Number of incidents of social unrest
- Positive impact on neighbouring populations. Indicator: Incomes of neighbouring populations

- Increased transparency in the management of natural resources. Indicator: Number of reforms

Philippines:

Civil society

Moderately well. Awareness level of the people on EITI concerns and Issues particularly among the people who were part of the EITI implementation at the subnational level.

Industry

- Government action on PH-EITI MSG recommendations
- Outreach to communities; public awareness of PH-EITI, its work, and its objectives

Republic of Congo:

- Implementation of report recommendations
- Communications, media
- Public reforms, laws and regulations
- Use of statistics from EITI reports

Senegal:

Impact is defined on the basis of the reforms that have been driven by the EITI: adoption of legislation, quality of public debate, improvement to the business climate, reform of administrations, etc.

An impact study is under way to identify indicators to evaluate the impact of EITI implementation in Senegal.

Sierra Leone:

Stakeholders define 'Impact' as long term change influenced largely by government and/or extractive companies as a result of increased transparency in the extractive industry processes facilitated by a multi stakeholder approach.

The following can be indicators of impact:

- Effective government policies that are in line with international best practices are fully implemented,
- Evidence of increased compliances and less cases of report of abuse in the extractive sector;
- Evidence of social accountability – where citizens are free to demand answers about extractive revenues and the activities of extractive industry companies, and stakeholders are providing answers - all as a result of increased public awareness;

Tanzania:

The outcome and impacts aims to determine whether the implementation of EITI in the country leads to increased accountability to citizens on resource revenues and their use for common benefit. The TEITI impacts indicators are;

- Increased Compliance in Disclosure of Payments and Revenues.
- Increased Understanding and Awareness of TEITI
- Enhanced legal and institutional framework for EITI implementation
- Increased capacity, skills and knowledge of TEITI Secretariat and Multi-Stakeholder Group.

Timor-Leste:

Industry

EITI have not had major impact in the country. There are limited understanding on the importance of EITI and the impact of the EITI Annual report.

Implementation of EITI have been limited to the oil & gas sector, specifically within one or two ministries.

Trinidad and Tobago:

The TTEITI 2019-2020 workplan broadly defines impact as progress towards mainstreaming EITI in Government systems. The Secretariat and MSG are in the process of defining what those indicators look like. However, the indicators will be defined to capture/measure the following:

- greater levels of high level stakeholder buy-in on mainstreaming
- legislative change to allow the Auditor General access and audit company tax data at the Board of Inland Revenue
- greater number of mining companies and smaller oil producers reporting to the EITI
- greater civil society debate/discourse on gaps in government data and the need for mainstreaming,
- EITI reporting that is online, more accessible and better integrated with existing Government systems, and;
- empowering the Secretariat to continue this work

Ukraine:

Ukraine is preparing EITI impact assessment study comparing 2013 (Ukraine joined EITI), 2018 and 2019 years using impact indicators (nearly 25) from different categories such as management and administration of the EITI, increasing of transparency level and data disclosure in extractive sector, dialog platform creation for strategic ideas and proposals, strengthen of partnership between Government, local government, companies and citizens, etc.

UK:

We do not currently define or have indicators. Although the MSG produces an Annual Progress Report, this is an area that the MSG need to look at in more detail in 2020 as one of the validation corrective actions recommends that the UK MSG reviews the impact of the first five years of EITI.

2. How is the MSG measuring the impact of EITI implementation in your country? Please mention tools that you are using, e.g. impact studies, annual progress reports, stakeholder surveys, etc. How often do you measure/discuss impact?

Afghanistan:

Civil society (1)

None

Civil society (2)

Annual report – not sure about other measures

Albania:

The MSG measures the impact of EITI on our country through annual progress reports as well as impact studies, stakeholders surveys. The impact is measured annually.

Argentina:

The MSG will be developing tools to measure impact, mainly after submission of the first report.

Armenia:

Civil society

MSG develops quarterly and annual reports, however it is mostly based on output/outcome indicators rather than impact. MSG does not measure EITI effectiveness against the objectives set forth in the workplan.

Burkina Faso:

The tool used by EITI-BF MSG is the Annual Progress Report. It is prepared each year further to a participative process. It reports on implementation of the Work Plan for the year in question and summarises all other stakeholder activities that contribute to implementation of the EITI Standard.

Studies are also carried out by EITI-BF stakeholders on issues related to mining activity, such as gender, the management of mining funds and the provision of local goods and services.

Chad:

The EITI-Chad High Committee carried out a measurement of EITI implementation in the country through an impact study conducted by an independent consultancy firm in 2016. This is the only impact study that exists so far in the documentation of EITI-Chad.

Civil society

Studies of stakeholder (civil society), through the EITI reports.

Industry

The dissemination of Annual Progress Reports and visits to the EITI-Chad website are indicators that can be used to measure impact.

National Secretariat

Impact assessments and Annual Progress Reports.

Cote d'Ivoire:

The Multi-Stakeholder Group measures the impact of EITI implementation in our country through:

- Annual Progress Reports;
- Impact assessments carried out each year to strengthen the Annual Report; these studies are often performed, discussed and validated in collaboration with civil society;
- Independent studies are conducted by civil society organisations.

Democratic Republic of Congo:

Civil society

To date, I have no knowledge of the Multi-Stakeholder Group measuring the impact of EITI implementation in DRC. Apart from the publication of reports by CSOs, the Multi-Stakeholder Group has never evaluated the impact of EITI implementation in DRC. Personally, I have never seen a report or study along these lines.

Dominican Republic:

Civil society

At the moment, the requirement for Annual Progress Reports is met, although rather than as a tool for the self-assessment of progress made, it has been used as a report on the execution of activities included in the work plan. And just as the impact of EITI in the country has not been discussed in the MPG, neither have the improvements and reforms needed nor the numerous recommendations received throughout the process of joining the Initiative. As the EITI-IS Evaluators stated in the Validation Report, the EITI-RD-NC has been focused on the very process of preparing the reports required by the Standard rather than on improvements, necessary reforms and the impacts of EITI. While this may well reflect the essential learning phase, there is no evidence of an assessment of this kind from the ES or of openness to a deeper and more relevant reflection on the introduction of changes in the industry and sphere of public institutions.

Government

It is measured through Annual Progress Reports, presidential targets, and institutions' work plans.

Germany:

The MSG is discussing impact twice a year. In addition to the drafting of a new annual workplan which includes the discussion the evaluation and monitoring (m&e) of the past workplan there is a midterm review. This allows the MSG to agree on changes of the actual workplan if needed. The annual progress report covers the main findings of the evaluation and the monitoring of the goals/the impact. The workplan is an annex to the progress report. The MSG commissioned studies and surveys e.g. on the work of the MSG, but not on an annual basis.

Ghana:

The Ghana MSG uses and M&E framework with Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound (S.M.A.R.T) indicators. These indicators serve as a guide in putting together an Annual Progress Report, where progress towards set goals are assessed.

The MSG has also commissioned a study, and published a whole report on the impact of Ghana EITI so far.

Guinea:

These tools are the impact studies and EITI Annual Progress Reports, which are produced annually.

Mauritania:

The Multi-Stakeholder Group measures the impact of EITI through:

- The conduct of impact and perception assessments of EITI implementation on two occasions since the creation of the EITI
- The organisation, every two years, of outreach events in the interior of the country to measure the degree of understanding and ownership on the part of communities
- Evaluation through Annual Progress Reports

Niger:

Niger has just rejoined the process and for this reason it is impossible to give an appropriate answer to this question. In the past, however, EITI Niger used Annual Progress Reports. Stakeholders, especially civil society, carried out specific studies that will be discussed in the MSG in the future.

Philippines:

Civil society

Research and scoping study. However, the detailed discussion on the research results are not yet thoroughly done. It should be more intentional.

Industry

Annual progress reports. In 2018, the MSG also commissioned an impact study

Republic of Congo:

Annual Progress Report

Senegal:

Through the drafting of Annual Progress Reports, various studies, the number and levels of participation in various working groups, the contribution to the drafting of legislation.

Sierra Leone:

Currently, the MSG uses the annual progress report (APR) This report captures gaps, lessons learnt and impacts of implementing the EITI. The MSG had once conducted a survey to assess its relevance and visibility. However, an impact assessment is strongly being considered, going forward.

Tanzania:

TEITI Annual workplan and annual progress report, the impacts is measured annually.

Timor-Leste:

Industry

MSG have not measured the impact of EITI implementation in Timor-Leste.

Trinidad and Tobago:

The Secretariat uses monitoring tools to assess *outputs* at the projects level. Though not very rigorous, monitoring tools (mainly feedback forms) are used to measure project outcomes which typically include an increase in participants' awareness and an increase in participants' willingness to engage further on the relevant projects. The TTEITI MSG also undertook a baseline assessment in December 2017 to gauge awareness of TTEITI, usefulness of report etc.

Tools: social media analytics, evaluation forms, surveys of MSG (for Validation), reflective practice and annual progress reports.

Ukraine:

UAEITI is now developing Monitoring and evaluation study to assess the EITI impact in Ukraine. The study was initially developed by NGO Dixi group with the support of Renaissance foundation in 2018. The paper will be discussed and updated on a yearly basis.

3. How effective are these tools in accurately documenting and measuring impact in your country?

Afghanistan:

Civil society (1)

N/A

Civil society (2)

Not very I think, but I am not closely involved.

Albania:

We think this tools are very effective and shows the progress made to meet the EITI standard and sets out corrective actions for the future.

Argentina:

N/A

Armenia:

Civil society

Those tools do not effectively measure the impact of EITI.

Burkina Faso:

The Annual Progress Report is available on the EITI-BF website. The wealth of information contained in this report offers the public data on activities to promote transparency in the Burkina Faso extractive sector.

Chad:

This impact study made many recommendations. Some of these have been implemented, including the recommendations on reducing the number of group members, removing the Steering Committee, which duplicated the work of the Permanent Technical Secretariat, and inviting Glencore to sit in the Multi-Stakeholder Group. There do remain recommendations that have not yet been implemented or are in the process of implementation.

Civil society

Not very effective. what is needed is an analysis of the revenues from the industry and the changes that these lead to in people's lives.

National secretariat

Evaluation of activities, drafting of Activity Plan.

Cote d'Ivoire:

This documentation can be used to assess the level of implementation of EITI actions and the level of awareness of the EITI by stakeholders in general and by the public in particular. These tools also help monitor and evaluate the overall process of EITI implementation, to take account of the concerns of the public and other stakeholders that are not members of the Multi-Stakeholder Group, and to provide appropriate guidance.

Democratic Republic of Congo:

Civil society

As there are no published reports or studies, we cannot consequently know if tools are effective or not. It may be that these need to start to be published so that their effectiveness can be evaluated in time.

Dominican Republic:

Civil society

An appropriate response is not possible due to the almost total lack of such tools being used.

Government

That any interested party has access to the information published in the Annual Progress Reports and there is also the Reconciliation Report published on the portal.

Germany:

In the past years the MSG adapted these tools to its needs. The workplan is the main tool for planning, evaluation and monitoring. It is an very effective tool that allows the MSG to identify challenges, needs for adjustment and needs for improvement. The workplan, including the indicators as well as the outcome of its m&e are publicly available. Formal m&e is completed by feedback from the stakeholders and their wider networks. For the case that a specific field of impact/ a specific goal needs further analysis and discussion, the D-EITI is ready to support/implement a respective analysis.

Ghana:

The tools have proven very accurate in identifying and documenting impact in the Ghana context.

Guinea:

They make it possible to state the contribution of EITI implementation and to make improvements in certain areas if necessary, through reforms.

Mauritania:

These tools have been very effective for making documentation publicly available. They have helped highlight some important challenges for improving implementation of the EITI.

Niger:

The inclusion in the Constitution of the key principles of EITI, namely the publication of contracts and earnings and the requirement of transparency.

Philippines:

Civil society

Effective enough to give recommendations that works.

Industry

The impact study needs to be widened.

Republic of Congo:

Consensus document

Senegal:

Collection of documentation ongoing.

Sierra Leone:

Annual Reporting system is fundamental as it follows an EITI set criteria backed by a guidance note.

In future SLEITI secretariat will consider other tools such as surveys, FDGs, specific case studies, quarterly assessments and collection of data from relevant ministries, department and agencies.

Tanzania:

TEITI workplan determine benchmarks for target setting within the EITI framework, and the indicators which are used to inform the progress. It is also used to validate whether or not the activities within the workplan are sufficient in scale and scope, in order to meet the given targets; and finally identify opportunities for sustainability of EITI implementation in Tanzania.

Trinidad and Tobago:

They are useful for measuring outputs but not outcomes. While these tools hint at our ability to appeal to audiences through projects, they do not help to assess progress on the outcomes listed in the approved workplan. The MSG is however, in the process of hiring a new Strategic Communications Agency that will assist in better measuring impact.

If possible, capacity building through webinars or visits from the EITI international would be useful.

Ukraine:

This tool clearly shows the development of EITI activities in Ukraine since 2013, increasing of stakeholders' engagement, level of the data disclosure in the energy sector, etc. However, its rather hard to evaluate the impact of EITI in economic growth of the country, increase in investments or the volumes of extraction.

UK:

This is an area that the UK MSG need to look at further.

4. Do you think it is advisable to have a single impact evaluation framework for all EITI countries? Why or why not?

Afghanistan:

Civil society (1)

We think that a generic impact evaluation framework could be useful that has space to be adopted for countries.

Civil society (2)

Not sure – interesting idea.

Albania:

No, I do not think it is advisable to have a single impact assessment framework for all EITI countries, because each country has its own specifics and problems in the extractive industry. Therefore is needed to design an impact assessment framework that best responds to the transparency of the extractive industry in each implementin country.

Argentina:

Yes. A single impact assessment framework would be useful to simplify the exercise and to be able to make comparisons with other implementing countries. Standardisation.

Armenia:

Civil society

It would be useful to have a general impact evaluation framework for all EITI countries with possibility for expansion based on the local agendas/priorities.

Burkina Faso:

It is appropriate to have a single policy framework for all countries that have joined the EITI. However, flexible mechanisms should be provided to allow each country to adapt it to its national evaluation tools.

Chad:

It would be desirable to have a single impact assessment framework for the EITI countries that belong, for example, to the same sub-regional unit, such as CEMAC for the EITI countries of Africa. As these countries have broadly similar economic and development issues, one could envisage a dual impact assessment system to be applied to them: Firstly, a national-level impact assessment and then a sub-regional assessment.

Civil society (1)

Yes, because it helps learn lessons about the various impacts and failures from one to the other.

Civil society (2)

No, each country has its specificity and therefore the evaluation must take into account the socio-economic and polticial context.

Industry

It is good to provide all the EITI countries with a single framework for impact assessments, in order to harmonise the process.

National secretariat

Yes, a single framework is needed for impact assessments, but it must take account of the specificities of each country.

Cote d'Ivoire:

We do not recommend a single evaluation framework. The reason is to do with the specificities of each country and stakeholders. Moreover, it would require several sources and a level of impact assessment.

Democratic Republic of Congo:

Civil society

Yes, this would be a good recommendation because after publication of reports, most countries stop right there. However, negative or positive lessons could be drawn from this publication and structural or institutional reforms put in place. Without evaluation of the impact of EITI, no change could happen in our countries. That is why I support the recommendation to evaluate the impact of the EITI process on the transparency of public finances by every EITI-implementing country.

Dominican Republic:

Civil society

Application of a single framework seems advisable, but it would be worth considering its cost-effectiveness in its design, so that it does not represent a potential restriction, obstacle or cost-increase to the Initiative for recently-joining countries or donors. It could support the member countries of the Initiative with simple and effective recommendations and tool designs, recommended professional profiles for members of the ESs and Technical Support Committees (TSAs) and, especially, the need for a technical/professional team with broad knowledge of the EI, its operation, institutional and regulatory framework and of current public policies.

Government

Yes, it is advisable to have a single impact-assessment framework for all the EITI countries, since as it is standardised there is less risk of subjectivity in the evaluation. Even so, not all should be measured with the same elements, since the EITI is a process and each country could be at a different level.

Germany:

It would be advisable to have single impact evaluation guidelines and support for particular fields of intervention and impact e.g. anticorruption. Taking into account the heterogeneity of the EITI countries a very narrow single evaluation framework for all countries is less advisable. If common guidelines would lead to comparable indicators for comparable fields of impact an analysis of a group of countries could be helpful. Such an approach would define potential fields of impact, the related indicators and m&e tools.

Ghana:

It will indeed be advisable to have a standard impact evaluation framework for all EITI implementing countries. This will enable an objective comparison of impacts across countries. A standard framework can also contribute to the Validation process.

Guinea:

Each country has its own realities and specificities. Therefore, there should not be a single framework for all countries' impact assessments.

Mauritania:

While contexts may differ from one country to another, it is important to have a single standard framework for impact assessments. This will enable benchmarking and an emulation effect for good practice.

Niger:

Each country works in a different context and impact assessment should take account of each country's specific context

Philippines:

Civil society

Yes given the same EITI standards. However, the evaluators should consider the uniqueness of each country as part of the additional parameters that support the impact of the EITI in specific country.

Industry

Yes, so we can better measure direction and speed of each country's progress.

Republic of Congo:

Yes, but this procedure should introduce an effective dose of flexibility due to the specificity of each country.

Senegal:

An evaluation framework per country is needed, taking specific account of the realities and needs of each country.

Sierra Leone:

YES!

Stakeholders recommended the use of a single framework for impact assessment. They believe it will promote the harmonization of approaches for all countries, however such frameworks should take into consideration the dynamics in country context.

Tanzania:

In order to allow more flexibility on reviewing the impact, its is not advisable to use single impact evaluation framework . Due to the reasons that, countries deffer in terms of the timeline, policies, EITI resources, EITI structure and so forth hence multiple evaluation frameworks would work. However, each implementing countries should be required to document the impact.

Timor-Leste:

Industry

It would be a disadvantage to have a single impact evaluation, as each country evolve in different phases and the conditions within each implementing countries are different.

Trinidad and Tobago:

Each country has different challenges and different areas of focus therefore a single impact evaluation framework would be inflexible and inadequate to guage how unique/local issues are treated.The Validation exercise highlights this incongruity.

Ukraine:

It would be useful to have a single impact evaluation framework however with the possibility to adapt it to the country's needs and priorities.

UK:

It is important that EITI has an effective way of measuring impact, but the framework doesn't need to be the same for each individual implementing country.

MSG members thought that, given the diversity of countries implementing the EITI Standard, it could be difficult to have a single evaluation framework, however they were open to receiving ideas and would be interested in exploring models used by different EITI implementing countries.

The measure of impact can be used as a tool to drive public understanding of the extractive industries.

Consolidated, from **Anglophone Africa** regional call¹:

- EITI needs to demonstrate how it is having an impact. In some cases, impact will be measurable, in others not.
- Standardised guidance is needed on how implementing countries can evaluate the impact of the EITI.
- Impact evaluation needs to consider the impact of implementing the EITI Standard, and the impacts of the broader process which goes beyond implementing the requirements.
- In addition to measuring impact, the EITI also needs to dedicate resources to support the 'impact creators' by building capacity of the MSGs.

Consolidated, from **Francophone Africa** regional call²:

- Impact is difficult to define and measure (tangible/measurable vs. intangible/non-measurable impact: legal reforms, civil society accessibility to information, access to social development on a subnational level)
- The availability of information on revenues from the extractive sector, which has led to national debate on sensitive issues, is already an impact of the EITI.
- Difficulty in documenting what impact to be attributed to the EITI, and which should be attributed to other organisations.
- APRs and Validation are some tools for identifying impact of the EITI. Requirement 7.4 needs to be reviewed and best practices need to be shared. It is a work in progress.

Consolidated, from **Southeast Asia** regional calls:

- The APR is still a valuable means of measuring impact
- EITI can be integrated into national sustainable development plans, and linked to the SDGs
- Impact is defined by the MSG as
 - o How government responds to MSG recommendations
 - o Public awareness through outreach to communities (subnational level)
- A single framework seems advisable, at least as a common framework (with a minimum number of shared indicators), but with room for flexibility for each country to tailor to the country specific context

¹ Representatives from Ghana, Nigeria and Zambia participated in the call

² Representatives from Senegal, Burkina Faso, Cameroun, DRC, Guinea, Mali, Niger, ROC and Togo participated in this call

³ Representatives from the Philippines and Myanmar participated in this call

Consolidated, from **Central Asia** regional call⁴:

- There is a request to have more structured KPIs that can be used by all countries. In addition, each country should be able to add more country-specific indicators if needed.

⁴ Representatives from Albania, Armenia, Kyrgyzstan and Ukraine