**UK EITI Compliance subgroup meeting, Thursday 13th March 2025**

**Attendees**

Mike Earp Martyn Gordon Leo Kellaway

Helmi Ben Rhouma Hedi Zaghouani Mike Nash (Chair)

**Updates on agreed actions for requirements from 18th February meeting**

* Emailed Companies House regarding Beneficial Ownership disclosures. ***Still awaiting a response from Companies House, will chase if required.***
* Leo Kellaway kindly agreed to provide the initial draft for the UK’s response to requirement 4.10. It will then be circulated to the wider subgroup for input/comment before uploading onto the UK EITI website. ***Leo agreed to pride the first draft by the end of March 2025.***
* UK EITI Secretariat to re-circulate the paper documenting environmental and social impact of extractive activities across the UK extractive sector and chase any responses. ***This has been actioned and chased – still awaiting responses.***

**Stakeholder Engagement Templates**

**Civil Society template covering requirements 1.4 and 1.3**

Text required on the following **(Action: Mike Nash)**

Have MSG civil society members sought input from the broader constituency on the following:

* The latest EITI work plan, including priorities for EITI implementation
* Review of progress in EITI implementation

Text required on the following **(Action: CS constituency)**

* Does the broader civil society constituency consider that the nominations procedure was adhered to in the period under review?
* Was the nominations process open and transparent?

It was agreed to arrange a meeting of the civil society constituency on 20th March to look at gaps in the template and to provide any examples you can of usage of the data and engagement with CS more broadly (including teaching/publications). Also to make any comments, assuming you have any, about barriers for CS to participate in EITI (per Annexe 1). **(Action: Mike Nash).**

**Government template covering requirements 1.4 and 1.1**

**Recommendation from last validation**

*To strengthen implementation and the multi-stakeholder oversight of EITI implementation, all constituencies on the MSG are encouraged to continue efforts to ensure that all MSG seats are filled by members that are proactively engaged in all aspects of EITI implementation.*

* The MSG are well represented across each constituency, but efforts are currently in place seeking nominations to fill the current vacant posts across each constituency.
* Still more work to do on this and discuss further at MSG next week. This includes engagement with OEUK – work with Jacqui Akinlosotu on this. Worth raising next week at the MSG.

**MSG Gender Balance**

* add results of the MSG gender survey to template, **(Action: Mike Nash)**
* discussion needed on improving gender balance on the MSG – added to agenda for 19th March MSG meeting. **(Action: Mike Nash)**
* invite Women in Mining UK to future meeting to discuss their work. **(Action: Mike Nash)**

**Terms of Reference**

* add a reference to the possibility of MSG members being able to table agenda items – in practice this happens but needs to be referenced in the current ToRs. **(Action: Mike Nash)**

**Requirement 1.4**

*The objective of requirement 1.4 is to ensure that there is an independent multi-stakeholder group that can exercise active and meaningful oversight of all aspects of EITI implementation in a way that balances the interests of the three main constituencies (government, industry and civil society) and that it arrives at decisions in a consensual manner.*

* Questions 1-12 *–* need input from industry and civil society in this section. Ensure that each set of comments is attributable to the individual constituency.
* List of stakeholders outside MSG members for validation consultation purposes. Need to ask MSG for suggestions. **(Action: Mike Nash)**

**Requirement 1.1**

* Need to complete questions covering establishment and representation of the government constituency.
* Need to complete questions 1-9 relating to a full, active and effective government lead for EITI implementation, through both high-level political leadership and operational engagement, as a means of facilitating all aspects of EITI implementation.

**Outcomes and impact template covering requirements 1.5, 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3**

**Requirement 1.5**

*The objective of this requirement is to establish a consultative work planning and monitoring cycle that ensures the relevance and accountability of EITI implementation to national stakeholders, helping the EITI to achieve relevant outcomes and impacts.*

The following sections need to be completed:

* What is the MSG’s overall assessment on progress on the following:
* implementation of work plan activities
* addressing corrective actions
* addressing recommendations from implementation
* Do the monitoring and progress reporting support the MSG’s deliberations in updating the work plan and its objectives? Does that process allow the EITI to remain relevant to the country context?
* Does the work plan, monitoring or review of progress include any innovative aspects that go beyond the EITI Standard?

**Requirement 7.1**

This requirement needs input on the following questions:

* Building on EITI disclosures (both data and diagnostic), have outreach events (whether organised by government, civil society or companies) been undertaken to spread awareness of, and facilitate dialogue about, governance of extractive resources?
* Is the MSG aware if the capacity building led to an improved understanding of the information and data from the reports and online disclosures?
* Is the MSG aware if the capacity building has led to an increase in the use of the information by citizens, the media and others?

*The objective of this requirement is to enable evidence-based public debate on extractive industry governance – including on corruption risks, energy transition, gender and revenue collection – through active communication of relevant data to key stakeholders in ways that are accessible and reflect stakeholders’ needs.*

* Has the EITI’s outreach and communications efforts targeted specific issues of public debate?
* Has MSG sought feedback from key audiences on the accessibility and style? For example, if the EITI Report is too technical and hard to understand?
* Has MSG considered tailoring EITI disclosures to communities, by providing information on project level that take place in their region, and comparing those to total revenues?
* Has the MSG tried out new communications channels or formats in the period under review, to tailor to the needs of key audiences or to respond to shifts in sharing and accessing information?
* Is the MSG aware of any tangible impacts that the outreach efforts have had on changing behaviour or inspiring reform?

**Requirement 7.2**

This requirement needs input on the following questions:

* Have they made users aware that the information can be reused without prior consent? Not currently. Add a note on website?
* Is the MSG aware if open data sets from EITI implementation are being used for analysis?
* Is there better appreciation of publication of data through open and inter-operable formats as a result of EITI implementation?
* Have any activities been undertaken to strengthen the capacity of stakeholders to use data sets that are published as part of EITI implementation?