

Comments and proposals of Musayeva R. with regard to an
Independent Validator's Report

1. With regard to civil society engagement I think validator's assessment can be upgraded to "satisfactory" level. Hence, it is necessary to attach an Address of the CSO "Transparency for Development" to the opinion of EITI Council on validator's report. I also suggest to use the following quotes from the Independent Validator's Report itself as the argument in favor of upgrading a level of progress:

Progress in the implementation of EITI

- Engagement of the government agencies was sustainable and consistent, ***while CSO members actively participated in the process***, despite the reported cases of limitation of freedom of speech in general. It is impossible to overstress the importance and value of maintaining such reliable platform as EITI Council with multi-stakeholder engagement in such environment (page 3 of the Report).

Impact of EITI Implementation

- It is still unclear to what extent EITI in Tajikistan promoted public debates on extractive sector. However, it is ***obvious that civil society organizations engaged in EITI distinguish themselves with good self-discipline and active participation in the EITI process. It appears that civil society de-facto had an information distribution role, which was perceived by civil society itself through public events held outside of Dushanbe. To this respect, strengthening a capacity of civil society organizations in Tajikistan for holding such events and expansion of the networks both within and outside of country borders was a significant EITI impact in Tajikistan.***

As it was mentioned before, institutionalization of EITI Council facilitated multi-stakeholder forum became another serious impact of EITI. ***In this forum civil society organizations are equal and are active members of it*** (page 4 of the Report).

Detailed findings

- ***CSO engaged in EITI process are clearly displaying commendable engagement***, despite the constraints faced by civil society (page 6 of the Report).

Conclusion: Considering overall activities of civil society in the EITI implementation process (see an Address of the SCO Coalition "Transparency for Development") and the evaluation in the Independent Validator's Report (see above text) we think ***engagement of the civil society in the EITI implementation process***

can be assessed as “satisfactory”. We ask you to assign a “*satisfactory*” mark on *MSG Governance*.

2. Comments on article 1.4, Section “Detailed findings”:

1.4 **MSG Governance**...It is a same case pertinent to the conflict of interests where the members of the Council are paid for the collection of information for EITI Report, which they have to afterwards check and evaluate (page 6 of the Report).

I’d like to stress that at the time of writing of the Report (July-August 2015), only one member of the EITI Council – Abdullayeva M. was engaged in the Report writing. There are altogether 19 members in EITI Council, that is to say, only one member out of 19 actually participated in the development of the contextual part of the Report. How one can see a conflict of interests in this case? Could numbers 19 and 1 be compared? Secondly, there are specialists in the Council who can bring a valuable contribution into the development of Report. What’s wrong with that? We have to use a consensus system on voting, i.e. consolidated assessment with consideration of votes, for example, representatives of 6 government agencies included into Council. Thus, it would be good to understand validators’ rationale in evaluation of conflict of interests in development of the EITI Report for 2014.

Conclusion: This comment has to be removed from the Report of Independent Validator and from the Initial Report too.

EITI Council Member

R. Musayeva