

**Attendance**

<p><u>Chair</u>          Maureen Beresford- Department for Business Innovation &amp; Skills</p> <p><u>Secretariat</u>          Margaret Sutherland- Department for Business Innovation &amp; Skills          Vina Krishnarajah - Department for Business Innovation &amp; Skills          Joe Turtle - Department for Business Innovation &amp; Skills</p> <p><u>International Secretariat</u>          Eddie Rich-International Secretariat- <i>Teleconference</i></p> <p><u>Industry</u>          Dr Patrick Foster- Mining Association of the UK /Camborne School of Mines-University of Exeter-          John Bowater- Aggregate Industries          Stephen Blythe- Independent Consultant          Andrew Enever- Shell</p> <p><u>Civil society</u>          Miles Litvinoff-Publish What You Pay UK          Joe Williams- Natural Resource Governance Institute          Eric Joyce- UK Civil Society Representative          Martin Brown- UK Civil society Representative</p>	<p><u>Government</u>          Mike Earp- Oil &amp; Gas Authority          Alan Tume- HMRC          Victoria Molho- Department for Business Innovation &amp; Skills          Stephen Martin- Scottish Government</p> <p><u>Observers</u>          Claire Ralph-Oil &amp; Gas UK          Jerry McLaughlin-Mineral Products Association          Colin Tinto- Global Witness          Eddie Holmes- UK Civil Society Representative- <i>Teleconference</i>          Paul Sozi- HMRC          Natalie Reeder- HM Treasury</p> <p><u>Nominated People</u>          Roger Salomone- Exxon Mobil          Robert Le Clerc- CBI Minerals Group          Lena Link- Germany EITI          Sylvia Schwab- Germany EITI</p> <p><u>Experts</u>          Tim Woodward-Moore Stephens          Dora Chamber- Moore Stephens          Radhouane Bouzaiane-Moore Stephens</p> <p><u>Apologies</u>          Marie-Anne Mackenzie- Department for Business Innovation &amp; Skills          Danielle Foe- UK Civil Society Representative</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Summary of proceedings**

1. Following introductions the minutes for the September MSG meeting were agreed.

2. The Chair welcomed representatives from the MSG in Germany and a new member from the Scottish Government.

### **Update from Moore Stephens**

3. Representatives from Moore Stephens explained that the core reconciliation work was underway and that data had been received from all of the Government agencies including HMRC, the Oil & Gas Authority, the Crown Estate and the Coal Authority.
4. They explained that where there were discrepancies, queries were made with the company first and only once all enquiries were exhausted would they go to the Government agencies.
5. Moore Stephens provided the following summary of the compliance rates Of 220 companies in total, 181 were oil and gas and 39 were mining and quarrying. 65 templates had been received for oil & gas and 12 for mining and quarrying.

77 templates had been received

48 out of scope

82 failed to submit reporting templates

8 had no contact details

1 company had chosen not to engage

4 companies had explained that they were out of scope

6. Government representatives queried what classification had been used for companies who were out of scope. Moore Stephens explained that out of scope companies were those who were below the materiality threshold.
7. They went on to explain that out of the 48 companies who were out of scope 46 were oil and gas and 2 were mining and quarrying.
8. There were also 4 companies who had explained that they were non extractive.
9. Government representatives asked Moore Stephens to look into the reasons provided by the companies who believed they were out of scope, especially those who had stated they were non extractive. This was because the list of oil & gas companies had been devised using the licence register.
10. Moore Stephens agreed to keep a log of reasons detailing why companies were out of scope.
11. Civil society representatives explained that at the most recent international EITI Board meeting in Berne a reputational issue was discussed. In an implementing country, companies represented on their MSG had failed to

participate under EITI in that country. Civil Society asked whether any of the companies participating on the UK's MSG or involved in the various sub-groups had not provided data to the independent administrator.

12. The International Secretariat highlighted that this was an issue which would have an impact on validation. They went on to explain that if a company was an international supporter of EITI and failed to participate under UK EITI, the International Secretariat were happy to offer a gentle reminder.
13. Moore Stephens stated that this could be pursued once the total receipts from HMRC had been reconciled. At that point it would be clear if the payments from missing companies accounted to a large percentage.
14. Moore Stephens went on to explain that they had chased outstanding companies three times and were due to chase a final time at the end of the week. They also acknowledged the efforts made by MSG members to chase outstanding companies.
15. Secretariat confirmed that Moore Stephens were due to circulate the initial reconciliation report by the end of the week. This report would be sent to the reconciliation sub group to analyse and make recommendations to the MSG. This was due to be discussed in the next agenda item.

#### Discrepancies

16. Moore Stephens highlighted that the discrepancies to date were coming to 10%. There were approximately £2 billion of payments and £200 million worth of differences. It was made clear that these were draft figures and that Moore Stephens had not got to the end of checking discrepancies.
17. Moore Stephens explained that there was an issue with reporting templates as although they asked for figures in thousands, not all companies were reporting in thousands. This meant that in many instances Moore Stephens had to go back to companies and check the figures.
18. Civil society representatives asked if Moore Stephens had gone back to every company to confirm their payments.
19. Moore Stephens explained that they didn't go back to every company except where there was a big difference between payments and receipts.
20. Government representatives questioned the total value of discrepancies which appeared to be very high.
21. Moore Stephens explained that they could only look at the data which they had received. To date, total government receipts were £2.69 billion and total company payments totalled £2.96 billion, leaving a difference of £267 million.

#### Non-compliance & margin of error

22. Government representatives pointed out that companies who had not participated could therefore be very significant to the UK EITI process. Moore Stephens reiterated that at this stage the figures were draft.
23. Oil & gas representatives believed that there was a commitment to have the figures from Moore Stephens for this MSG meeting. The delay in receiving this information had a direct impact on communications with companies. Secretariat asked if this could be discussed further in the next agenda item.
24. Moore Stephens explained that as the MSG had not agreed a margin of error for further investigation of discrepancies, they proposed that all discrepancies exceeding £10,000 would be investigated further.
25. There was some confusion about whether company names would be published in the first report.
26. Secretariat confirmed companies who had participated in EITI would be named in the report. This was a different issue to the earlier MSG decision not to name the companies who had failed to participate in the first report.
27. Secretariat went on to explain there could be a competitiveness issue for discussion at a future MSG as only one of the coal mining companies contacted had responded.
28. Civil society representatives explained that if some big players had failed to participate under UK EITI in year one it would not be difficult for these companies to be identified.

#### Outstanding companies

29. Moore Stephens confirmed that there were 57 companies outstanding for oil & gas and 25 outstanding for mining and quarrying. The deadline for receiving templates was 30 November.
30. Mining & quarrying representatives highlighted that three rounds of phone calls were made to outstanding companies asking them to engage.
31. HMRC representatives explained that they held payment data for upstream oil & gas taxes.
32. The secretariat could request HMRC to provide details of how many companies above the materiality threshold had failed to respond and what the value of their payments were. HMRC would need to pass this query by their lawyers.
33. HMRC explained that company names could not be disclosed under any circumstances.
34. HMRC highlighted that in some cases waivers had been received which were not completed correctly. This was because sometimes companies had been missed off the waiver in which case HMRC went back to the company to correct errors.

35. Additionally in some cases companies were listed on the waivers which were non extractive. This was fine where they were part of a Group Payment Arrangement but data disclosed to Moore Stephens could be in error if not.
36. With mining HMRC confirmed that there was no separate tax system for the mining and quarrying sector unlike oil & gas.
37. A group payment arrangement could also exist in the mining sector.
38. HMRC confirmed that they were happy to start contacting the oil and gas companies who had made material payments for EITI but failed to return waivers. This would be a gentle reminder.
39. Secretariat highlighted that the majority of companies were aware of EITI therefore it was likely that non respondents had made a choice not to engage.
40. Oil & gas representatives stressed that the MSG was still unaware of what material payments were yet to be reported. This is what the UK would be judged on for validation. The MSG needed to be given this information so they could have a better idea of who to chase.
41. Oil & Gas UK (OGUK) expressed concern that the Government's tax collecting agency (HMRC) would be contacting companies in a targeted way to increase participation when many of the companies seem to have made a conscious decision to not participate. OGUK felt this was an opportunity to apply inappropriate pressure onto Industry, inconsistent with the Initiative's voluntary nature.
42. Secretariat explained that the MSG had agreed that it was content for HMRC to begin chasing companies who were above the materiality threshold but failed to return a waiver. Secretariat was under the impression that this piece of work had already commenced.
43. OGUK asserted that there was no data to warrant this and also that this was the role for the independent administrator.
44. HMRC explained that this was a unique problem to the UK as in most other EITI implementing countries the independent administrator would be given a list of material companies whom they could chase.
45. Due to confidentiality provisions in the UK, this was not possible.
46. This meant that Moore Stephens may have spent time chasing companies who had not made material payments as they were not aware of who to prioritise.
47. As HMRC knew which companies had made material payments and not returned waivers they were happy to give them a reminder as they had been requested to do so by the MSG. HMRC stressed that this information could not be given to a third party, therefore they were best placed to perform this role.

48. Oil & gas representatives confirmed that companies had been given every opportunity to respond and if material payments were missing they were happy for HMRC to send a gentle reminder with the right tone. The International Secretariat also confirmed that this was not unusual in EITI processes. There were lessons to learn from year one and getting the communications strategy correct for year two would be essential.
49. Secretariat explained that the end of November would be the cut off for receiving templates, after that with final numbers on compliance; a lessons learned exercise would need to be conducted with targeted communications in year two.

*Oil & Gas Authority licence register*

50. Secretariat confirmed that other sources of information could also be used to chase companies. Using information from the Oil & Gas Authority (OGA) on licence payments it was clear that eight companies had made material payments and not engaged in EITI. The MSG discussed whether representatives from the OGA could chase these companies.
51. Civil society representatives highlighted that they were content for HMRC and OGA to give companies a gentle reminder as long as no numbers were discussed.
52. Oil & gas representatives explained the importance of not contacting the same people continuously.
53. The International Secretariat asserted that there was no harm in companies receiving a reminder more than once.
54. After some further discussion the MSG agreed that both HMRC and OGA could give gentle reminders to outstanding companies who had made material payments.

*Outstanding mining & quarrying companies*

55. The MSG then discussed the outstanding mining and quarrying companies and who could issue the outstanding companies with gentle reminders.
56. HMRC explained that mining and quarrying companies under EITI disclosed all corporation tax; there was no distinction between extractive and non-extractive activities in corporation tax payments.
57. Civil society questioned why HMRC could not issue reminders to mining and quarrying companies as they should know how much tax mining & quarrying companies had paid.
58. HMRC explained that they had not been provided with unique tax references for mining & quarrying companies who had paid corporation tax. They highlighted that all 39 mining & quarrying companies would have paid

something, so they all needed to be chased which is what MSG representatives were doing.

59. Some oil & gas companies were not making material payments of tax and as HMRC held this information, they could prioritise who to issue reminders to.
60. Mining & quarrying representatives explained that they had chased outstanding companies on more than one occasion but it had failed to increase compliance.
61. Civil society representatives felt that HMRC could be doing more with mining & quarrying companies especially as receiving a reminder from HMRC could persuade them to engage.
62. The International Secretariat explained there was a risk that in year two the majority of time could be spent on chasing companies.
63. Mining & quarrying representatives explained that in year two the mandatory reporting provisions would also be in place so this could drive up UK compliance.
64. Civil society representatives stressed that around the same time as the publication of the first report, the data from UK-listed companies would also be published under mandatory reporting. This information would cover the 2015 calendar year whereas EITI data in the first report would cover the 2014 calendar year. The communications sub group would need to consider the messaging around this.
65. Moore Stephens explained that the UK could benefit from having a scoping study on the mining & quarrying sector.
66. Mining and quarrying MSG representatives explained that a methodology had been agreed for this sector where those companies who made up 80% of production in the UK were invited to participate in UK EITI and sent templates.
67. This was done using production data from the British Geological Survey.
68. The Chair thanked Moore Stephens for their update.

#### **Sharing confidential data in advance of the publication of the EITI report**

69. The Secretariat confirmed that Moore Stephens were due to submit the initial reconciliation to the MSG by the end of the week. Therefore they wanted to take this opportunity to remind MSG members about confidentiality provisions and propose a process to share the information.
70. The Secretariat recommended that once the initial reconciliation was received, it could be passed to the Chair of the reconciliation sub group to share the data with the wider sub-group and convene a meeting to formulate recommendations to the MSG.

71. These recommendations would then be circulated to full members and alternates with an invitation for further comment. Comments could be made in writing, or if requested, the Secretariat would call an extraordinary meeting of the MSG.
72. The alternative process was for Secretariat to circulate the initial reconciliation report to everyone on the MSG.
73. The MSG was asked for their views on this process.
74. Oil & gas representatives asked for clarification about what the role of the reconciliation sub group would be. From their understanding they would be responsible for explaining the data to the MSG.
75. Civil society representatives were happy for the initial reconciliation report to go to the reconciliation sub group.
76. The MSG discussed confidentiality provisions and there was a general agreement that these applied to everyone on the MSG distribution list.
77. The MSG agreed that full members and alternates on the reconciliation sub group will be sent a copy of the initial reconciliation report.
78. HMRC expressed concern that the data in the EITI report contained highly confidential information therefore it would be essential to ensure this data was handled effectively until publication. The initial reconciliation report was due to be circulated at the end of the week; therefore there was a risk with this data sitting in several inboxes for five months.
79. Oil & gas representatives suggested anonymising the data so that company names were not listed.
80. Civil society questioned how long anonymity would be used as unless the reconciliation sub group could see the data it would be hard to make recommendations.
81. The process for sharing the initial reconciliation report was agreed as:
  - Moore Stephens to send the initial reconciliation report to Secretariat by the end of the week. The report will be anonymised and password protected.
  - Secretariat to send a password protected copy of the report to the reconciliation sub group who will organise a meeting the w/c 23 November to make recommendations and submit a paper back the Secretariat.
  - Secretariat to then email the paper to the full MSG asking for comments and offer an extraordinary meeting if necessary.
82. Oil & Gas UK explained that the reconciliation sub group would only be making a recommendation to the MSG; it would be up to the MSG to make any final decision.



Confidentiality provisions in the Terms of Reference

83. Secretariat reiterated the confidentiality provisions set out in the Terms of Reference as until the EITI Report is published, company data remains confidential to MSG participants and should not be shared or discussed with anyone that does not attend the MSG. This also applied to the UK Secretariat.
84. It was also possible that MSG members may see data that will not be published in the final report – and that information will remain confidential.
85. “The Terms of Reference state that EITI Office Holders should not use any information that in his or her role as EITI Office Holder and which is not already in the public domain in any manner other than in the furtherance of his or her duties.” The Terms of Reference also cross-reference to the EITI’s Openness Policy.

Contextual Information

86. The Chair of the sub group began by thanking all who had contributed to the chapter, and also extended thanks to Moore Stephens for their help.
87. Initial comments were to be taken at the MSG meeting.
88. The Chair confirmed that he was stepping down from chairing this sub group, but retaining membership of the group. A member of the Secretariat is replacing him in this capacity effective immediately. The Chair will continue to collate civil society comments.
89. Recently two versions of the chapter have been circulated, MSG members were asked to disregard the first and use the most recent as the most up to date version.

Timings

90. The embedding of links is to be finished by 20th November by BIS and sent to the Chair.
91. The Chair explained that the chapter is in a near-final version. Everyone is welcome to comment, with a deadline of comments being the 30th of November.
92. The final version of the contextual chapter is due to be sent to Moore Stephens in mid-February.

Issues

93. The Chair mentioned that there is an outstanding content issue around the fact that older oil and gas licenses aren’t available online.

94. The Chair brought to the attention of the MSG the fact that that the Crown Estate does not publish contracts due to reasons of confidentiality. The Secretariat agreed to discuss this with the Crown Estate.
95. A civil society member thought that some of the text on fracking was not as balanced as it could be.
96. A government member echoed feelings that fracking is different for some of the devolved administrations.
97. An industry member believed that there is a tension between trying to describe what the oil and gas industry was like in its heyday, what the industry is going to turn into, and the most important information: what it is like at the time we are interested in (2014).
98. An industry member was concerned that there were elements of “propaganda” and overly political sentiments in some parts of the chapter, which needs to only state what currently happens.
99. A civil society member suggested whether other government agencies could be approached to share the workload on the contextual chapter.

#### Readability

100. Following a civil society constituency meeting there was a suggestion that enhancing the readability of the chapter could be achieved through the use of infographics and questioned whether there was a government budget for this suggesting DfID may be able to assist.
101. The Secretariat explained that there was no budget from BIS for this, but that they would liaise with colleagues in DfID.
102. An industry member suggested that the chapter isn't yet in a publishable format, and that there is a need for industry involvement to make the chapter appear more professional.

#### Communications

103. Secretariat as chair of the communications sub group gave a summary of what was discussed at the last meeting.

#### Civil society communications strategy

104. There was a need for a communications strategy for raising awareness of the first report among civil society. The secretariat thanked members from civil society for agreeing to take this work forward.

#### University outreach

105. Secretariat explained that academics could have an interest in the data that will be produced under the UK's EITI and that over time; it will provide a valuable data-set for research.
106. They confirmed that talks had been delivered at Dundee, Aberdeen and Durham University to date. There was also a commitment to give a workshop in Durham to take them through the first report and get their feedback in May 2016.
107. However, due to travel costs and shrinking Government budgets, at the last sub group meeting there was a discussion about prioritising universities where travel was involved.
108. For universities out of London, the sub group suggested prioritising Heriot Watt, Strathclyde and Derby as these universities offer courses directed towards the extractive industries.
109. In addition it was confirmed that a civil society MSG member was due to speak at the Camborne School of Mines and Surrey University and was happy to include EITI within his talks.
110. For London universities, Secretariat was happy to use a targeted approach.
111. The MSG was asked if they were content with this approach.
112. Civil society suggested adding Sussex University to the list of priority universities especially the Department of Politics and Law as one of them was studying there.
113. The Chair confirmed that talks didn't always have to be delivered by BIS colleagues as MSG members could also talk about UK implementation as long as they made clear they were representing their constituency and not the government. The Secretariat explained that that they could provide a core script of factual information which could be used by any member of the MSG.
114. Mining representatives explained that Derby University could benefit from an awareness raising session especially as the location was central to the quarrying sector.

#### Raising company compliance

115. There was general consensus at the last communication sub group meeting that one of our biggest challenges for next year is to increase company compliance.
116. A 100% compliance from companies in scope of EITI is necessary to pass validation.
117. Secretariat confirmed that oil and gas compliance is just below 50% and mining and quarrying around 30%.

118. Therefore a targeted communications approach was essential for year two.
119. Secretariat explained there were many lessons to learn from year one such as the impact of sending templates out over the summer and in some cases sending templates to generic emails. Therefore it would be a good idea to review the lessons learned ahead of the templates being issued for year two.
120. Oil & gas MSG representatives explained that they had discussed lessons learned to better understand why companies had chosen not to respond.
121. Mining & quarrying representatives suggested using a questionnaire to gather feedback on year 1 reporting from companies. They also explained that with mandatory reporting coming into force next year this would focus company's minds and align reporting under EITI.
122. Secretariat suggested having a separate communications sub group meeting in early 2016 with mining and quarrying representatives to discuss lessons learned and feedback from companies.

#### EITI request

123. Secretariat explained that they had received a request from a company asking whether companies who have participated under UK EITI can be sent a copy of the 2014 UK EITI report in advance of its publication.
124. After a brief discussion the MSG agreed that companies who have provided figures for the 2014 report will be given an embargoed copy of the report 24 hours ahead of publication.

#### Lima Conference

125. Secretariat confirmed that they were exploring whether UKTI colleagues based in Lima would be able to attend the Lima conference.
126. Secretariat also explained that they were drafting some hand-outs for the conference which will be discussed at the next communications sub group meeting. This included pictures of MSG members, details of the key decisions made by the MSG and an update on UK implementation.
127. The hand-outs would be used at the national expo where each implementing country would have a stand.
128. As Secretariat was unable to attend Lima it was important that MSG members representing the UK in Lima, speak with one voice and a core script was under development.

129. Moore Stephens explained that they will be attending the Lima conference (but not as UK representatives) and would like to be sent any UK hand-outs.
130. Secretariat confirmed that they would aim to circulate the hand-outs and core script ahead of the next MSG which was due to take place on the 26th January 2016.

### Communications Strategy

131. Finally, Secretariat pointed out that the communications strategy had been updated and welcomed any comments from the MSG.
132. Civil Society representatives highlighted the importance of content and methods for collaboration.
133. They went on to explain that a social media strategy should be developed looking at different platforms and how they can be used specifically for EITI messaging.
134. Civil society representatives explained that a range of experts should be included in the communications strategy from the various constituencies, this included press departments. This was important ahead of the publication of the report in April 2016.
135. The Chair asked everyone to feed in comments on the communications strategy to Secretariat.
136. Finally, Secretariat was thanked for the talk on EITI they gave at Dundee University and the MSG was asked whether they were happy for eight postgraduate students to observe an MSG meeting in 2016. The MSG agreed that a meeting after April 2016 would be best.

### Open Data

137. The civil society chair of the sub group summarised that industry was not present at the last meeting but the group looked at some types of visualisations to make the information in the EITI report interactive.
138. This was significant as through EITI, new data would be put into the public domain.
139. The US data portal was mentioned which was an interactive portal which included contextual information, but it was clear that the UK had no budget for a full portal.

140. The Chair of the sub group explained that data dashboards were also discussed, as well as the data which was already available on the Oil & Gas Authority's webpages covering licence data.
141. The sub group proposed forming a mini site for stakeholders to access the data in the first report in an interactive way.
142. Oil & Gas representatives questioned whether this was doable in terms of capacity and who would host the mini site. There were only three MSG meetings remaining until the publication of the first report and there was still a lot of work to do on the contextual information, communications and the reconciliation.
143. Questions were also asked about who would pay for the hosting.
144. The chair of the sub group explained that they had asked the International Secretariat if they were willing to host but they were unable to. Additionally the Government agency designing the US portal had provided the code used, therefore it would just be a case of inputting the UK figures which would not be too resource intensive.
145. It was also highlighted that there were products which could be used which were free of charge. The benefit would be that the data would be user friendly and allow users to filter the data.
146. Some Government representatives questioned what value would be added from a mini site, especially as licence geographic maps were already fully accessible.
147. The international secretariat confirmed that the more data which could be presented in a visual manner the better. This was important to condense the information in future reports.
148. The MSG agreed that the chair of the sub group could produce a mock-up of a mini site for UK EITI data for the MSG.
149. Moore Stephens explained that the Sharepoint system could also have some interactive functionality in year two which they would look further into.

**The MSG agreed:**

- Full members and alternates on the reconciliation sub group will be sent a copy of the draft reconciliation report.
- Industry members who are not listed as full members or alternates but wish to take alternate status to confirm names to Secretariat by Friday 20th November. (Full members and alternates are listed on UK EITI website).
- Jerry McLaughlin to represent mining and quarrying representatives on the reconciliation sub group.
- The reconciliation sub group will make a recommendation on thresholds once the initial reconciliation report has been reviewed.

UK Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative Multi-Stakeholder Group  
 Minutes of the 14<sup>th</sup> Meeting- 17 November 2015 – BIS Conference Centre,  
 SW1H 0ET (10-2pm)

- The data to be circulated in the initial reconciliation report is confidential until the first report is published in April 2016.
- Companies who have provided figures for the 2014 report to be given an advance copy of the report, on request, in line with the normal media timelines e.g. 24 hours. Secretariat to check the timelines.
- Students from Dundee University can observe an MSG meeting after April 2016.

23rd October 2015-electronically

- The MSG agreed for HMRC to send information electronically to Moore Stephens that is both encrypted and password protected. Due to the data sensitivity this is the process HMRC need to go through before releasing the information electronically.

28th October 2015-electronically

- The MSG agreed for HMRC to begin chasing up outstanding companies which they knew had made material payments to remind them that the template and waiver are outstanding and that we are reliant on their participation.

Next meeting- Tuesday 26 January 2016- BIS Conference Centre

Action	Status
Secretariat to publish the minutes from the 13th MSG meeting in September.	Complete
Secretariat to request HMRC to provide details of how many companies above the materiality threshold have failed to respond and what is the value of their payments	Complete
Secretariat to send OGA the list of companies who have made material licence payments to allow OGA to issue reminders.	Complete
HMRC to issue reminders to oil and gas companies who have made material payments.	Ongoing
Process for sharing initial reconciliation was agreed as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moore Stephens to send the initial reconciliation report to Secretariat by the end of the</li> </ul>	

UK Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative Multi-Stakeholder Group  
 Minutes of the 14<sup>th</sup> Meeting- 17 November 2015 – BIS Conference Centre,  
 SW1H 0ET (10-2pm)

<p>week. The report will be anonymised and password protected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secretariat to send a password protected copy of the report to the reconciliation sub group who will organise a meeting the w/c 23 November to make recommendations and submit a paper back the Secretariat.</li> <li>• Secretariat to then email the paper to the full MSG asking for comments and offer an extraordinary meeting if necessary.</li> </ul>	
<p>Civil society representatives to send Secretariat the list of companies who have been involved in UK EITI sub groups so they can confirm whether these companies have returned a template.</p>	Complete
<p>All MSG members to circulate the context chapter to their constituencies and ask for comments by the 30 November. All comments should be sent to Secretariat.</p>	Complete
<p>OGA colleagues to do some further work on section 2.6 North Sea Oil &amp; Gas Licensing.</p>	Complete
<p>Secretariat to check whether Dfid have any budget for the contextual chapter for year 2.</p>	Ongoing
<p>Secretariat to liaise with the Crown Estates about the future of contract disclosure for the contextual information.</p>	Ongoing
<p>Secretariat to set up a context sub group meeting at the end of the first week of December.</p>	Complete
<p>Mining MSG representatives to look further into an awareness raising session in Derby.</p>	Ongoing
<p>Secretariat to set up a comms meeting in the new year with representation from mining and</p>	Complete



UK Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative Multi-Stakeholder Group  
 Minutes of the 14<sup>th</sup> Meeting- 17 November 2015 – BIS Conference Centre,  
 SW1H 0ET (10-2pm)

quarrying sub-group to discuss messaging going forward.	
Comms sub group to provide an update on papers for the Peru meeting at the January MSG meeting.	Complete
All MSG members to provide comments on the communications strategy and feed in contacts for their press offices to Secretariat by Tuesday 1 December.	Complete
Chair of the open data sub group to send through a mock-up of a mini site for UK EITI data for year 1.	Ongoing