

CMSI Consultation Response

Respondent Details

NAME

Mouna Wasef

COUNTRY

Indonesia

PERMISSION

Yes, CMSI can disclose my feedback, name, and organisation.

STAKEHOLDER

Non-governmental organisation (NGO) / civil society organization (CSO)

ORGANISATION

Publish What You Pay (PWYP) Indonesia/CSO Representative at EITI Indonesia MSG

COMMENTS & QUESTIONS BY DOCUMENT

QUESTION 1

Overall does the revised version of the Consolidated Standard system (including Standard, Assurance Process, Governance Model* and Claims Policy) meet your expectations for improvement relative to the original public consultation version?

Response: 3: Meets expectations

The final consultation draft of the Consolidated Standard shows clear improvements on the topic of transparency by strengthening requirements and expanding references to the EITI Standard. These references demonstrate a commitment to transparency of resources and good governance. However, some provisions could be further strengthened to align with other best-practice standards.

QUESTION 2

From your perspective, does the updated Consolidated Standard system, including Standard, Assurance Process, Governance Model* and Claims Policy meet expectations for driving performance improvement across the industry at a global scale?

Response: 3: Meets expectations

Document:
Assurance

QUESTION 1

From your perspective, does the Assurance Process meet your expectations of a robust, credible, replicable and transparent approach?

Response: 2: Below expectations

The current set-up has an overreliance on Facility-provided information. With annual self-assessments serving as the basis for Assurance Providers' initial review and stakeholder lists for interviews, as well as background information compiled by Facilities, there is a risk of a conflict of interest influencing the assurance process. Allowing the Assurance Provider to draw on EITI multi-stakeholder groups rather than National Panels in its assessment is one step that could be taken to address this issue.

QUESTION 1

Does the scope, content, and narrative style of the consolidated standard meet your individual expectations for responsible production practices?

Response: 3: Meets expectations

The main issue with the current content of the consolidated standard is linked to the introduction of National Panels. National and local contexts must be carefully considered, as many problems extend beyond a facility's control. However, for national multi-stakeholder groups to support meaningful dialogue and provide accountability in the assurance process, they need to be neutral platforms where all stakeholders participate on an equal footing. They should therefore not be assembled by Facilities or industry-led initiatives themselves. The lack of independence of the national panels remains a concern for EITI stakeholders.

The EITI has national multi-stakeholder groups in place in 54 member countries and a further 10 at the subnational level in countries such as the Democratic Republic of Congo, Ghana, and Peru. By drawing on existing EITI multi-stakeholder groups, the CSMI can avoid duplication and leverage

existing complementarities between standards in line with its core mandate by encouraging engagement with EITI national multi-stakeholder groups, where they exist, to function as the national panel. Drawing on EITI multi-stakeholder groups will also help to ensure the neutrality of

platforms and provide opportunities for engagement with stakeholders not yet involved with the CSMI process.

QUESTION 2

Do the requirements meet your expectations for being sufficiently clear to support consistent and practical implementation and to achieve necessary performance improvement?

Response: 2: Below expectations

Important improvements include requirements to disclose support for the responsible management of mineral revenues in line with the EITI principles and payments to the government at both the country and project levels, at the Towards Good Practice Level.

Requirements to publicly disclose new mineral development contracts at the Good Practice Level, with references to the EITI in the accompanying Glossary and Interpretive Guidance, are welcome.

Requirements to implement Expectations for EITI supporting companies, disclose beneficial owners of the Facility in line with the EITI Standard, and encourage Host governments to join the EITI at the Leading Practice Level is also positive. These references should be maintained in the finalized version of the Standard.

PA1 1.3 could be further strengthened by moving the provision for Facilities in an EITI implementing country to disclose the relevant information required by the national EITI publicly implementation beyond material payments from Towards Good Practice to Good Practice and including a requirement for Facilities in an EITI country to constructively engage with the EITI process in line with EITI multi-stakeholder processes in that country at the Good Practice Level, as

seen in the IRMA Standard.

QUESTION 3

From your perspective, does the three-level performance structure (Towards Good Practice, Good Practice, Leading Practice) of the consolidated Standard meet your expectations for providing an effective on ramp and clear articulation of good practice and effective path to continuous improvement?

Response: 2: Below expectations

Efforts should be made to ensure that the assurance process incentivises improved performance over time. While Facilities are currently required to share a Continual Improvement Plan (CIP) outlining the steps they will take to reach the Good Practice Level, the cycles between Assurance Processes are long and there are limited incentives from progress beyond this level.

Document:
Claims

QUESTION 1

Does the level of transparency provided by the Claims Policy (i.e. through disclosing scores for each Performance Area, aggregated scores to indicate overall progress towards Good Practice, and Performance Claims) meet your expectations to incentivise continuous performance improvement?

Response: 2: Below expectations

The use of 'Towards Good Practice' is an improvement on the first consultation draft and makes clear that this performance level should not be considered sufficient. However, greater clarity should be provided on the threshold for performance claims between "Towards Good Practice" , "Good Practice" , and "Leading Practice" .