

Key Topics:

- **Introduction:** Sophia, Sviatlana, Johann, and other participants discussed the agenda for the meeting, which included wrapping up the validation process, work planning for the next year, and a presentation on the critical mineral strategy paper by Tilly. 1
- **Validation Process:** Sviatlana provided an update on the main action points from the last meeting, including the process to appoint a new chair for the compliance subgroup and the review of vacancies on the MSG. The compliance subgroup was suggested to be stood down unless needed for validation.
- **Compliance Subgroup Chair:** Sophia and Sviatlana discussed the need for a non-government chair for the compliance subgroup. Chara suggested reviewing the current members and gaps in the subgroup and proposed a multi-stakeholder representative group for the follow-up from the validation.
- **Critical Mineral Strategy:** Tilly presented an update on the UKEITI renewable strategy, highlighting the research conducted on critical mineral companies in the UK. Two proposals were suggested: a workshop to socialise the EITI standard to companies and a project to leverage the EITI standard for the UK renewable sector.
- **UK Validation and Reporting:** Mark provided an overview of the UK's validation process and results, highlighting the strong performance and areas for improvement. The UK achieved a very good score, with recommendations for contributing to public debate, monitoring civic space, and disclosing export data and mining contracts. 5
- **Work Planning for Impact:** Trina discussed the importance of work planning for impact, emphasising the need for a results-based approach and alignment with national priorities. She suggested refining the work plan to be more strategic and outcomes-driven, with clear objectives and KPIs.

Action Items:

Compliance Subgroup Chair:

- Write to all members of the compliance subgroup to see if anyone wants to volunteer for the chair position. (Sviatlana)

Critical Mineral Strategy:

- Circulate the proposals for the workshop and the project to leverage the EITI standard for the UK renewable sector to MSG members and request support and resources. (Tilly)

Feedback on Templates:

- Circulate the email request for feedback on the templates to MSG members and identify participants for the survey. (Sviatlana)

Meeting Discussion Overview

1. Agenda and Opening

- The meeting began with a review of the agenda, including updates on action points from the previous meeting, the UK EITI Critical Minerals Strategy, validation and reporting, work planning for impact, and review of the 2024-2025 workplan. The "any other business" item was removed due to a presenter's absence.

2. Action Points and Compliance Subgroup

- Sviatlana updated on outstanding actions: the process to appoint a new chair for the compliance subgroup (following Mike's retirement) was discussed, with Anna coordinating feedback in the interim. The group debated whether the compliance subgroup should continue, concluding it is still needed, and agreed to seek volunteers for chair by correspondence. Chara and Martyn discussed representation, with Chara suggesting a multi-stakeholder approach.
- The group also noted the need to review MSG vacancies during work planning.

3. Approval of Minutes

- The minutes from the previous meeting were formally approved.

4. UK EITI Critical Minerals Strategy

- Tilly presented an update on the renewables strategy, including desk-based research on UK critical minerals extraction. Eleven companies were identified, none currently meeting the EITI reporting threshold, but the sector is growing. Two proposals were discussed: a workshop to socialize the EITI standard with SMEs and a gap analysis to see if EITI standards could be leveraged for the UK renewables sector.
- Johann offered Scottish Enterprise support for outreach. Martyn and Patrick raised supply chain and value chain issues, referencing the new UK critical minerals strategy and the need to consider domestic processing and battery production. Chara and Tilly discussed the potential for EITI data to support supply chain due diligence and the importance of aligning with UK responsible business strategies.
- The group supported both proposals, with next steps to circulate detailed proposals and clarify resource needs.

5. UK EITI Validation and Reporting

- Mark summarized the recent validation: the UK achieved a "very good" score (87.5), the first country validated under the 2023 EITI Standard. The process, scoring, and highlights (timely disclosures, beneficial ownership, project cost reporting, and systematic disclosures) were reviewed.
- Areas for improvement include: contributing more to public debate, monitoring civic space, comprehensively disclosing export data, mining contract disclosure, project cost monitoring, and clarifying subnational revenue distribution. Next validation is scheduled in 48 months.
- Discussion followed on project cost reporting (Mike, Mark), the challenge of aligning reconciled tax data with HMRC published data, and the implications for

mainstreaming and risk-based reporting. Leo and Mike explained the technical reasons for discrepancies, emphasizing the need for clear narrative rather than process changes.

6. Work Planning for Impact

- Trina presented on results-based work planning, emphasizing starting with governance problems, stakeholder priorities, and inclusive implementation. She outlined the five-step approach: organize, identify priorities, define objectives/activities, monitor/adapt, and review. The UK workplan was praised for structure but could be more strategic, with clearer links to national priorities and outcomes.

7. Other Items

- Joanne raised an EITI International Secretariat survey on the new templates, encouraging MSG participation. Sviatlana agreed to circulate the request to members.

12

8. Meeting Closure

- The meeting concluded with thanks and a transition to the next agenda item on work planning.

Minutes: Work Planning for Impact & 2026-2028 Work Planning Process

Work Planning for Impact – Trina Moa (International EITI Secretariat)

- Trina presented on making EITI work plans more results-oriented, emphasizing three principles: start with real governance problems, address stakeholder priorities, and ensure inclusive implementation.
- She outlined the importance of aligning work plans with national and sectoral priorities, referencing national development strategies, anti-corruption agendas, and stakeholder consultations.
- The EITI strategic priorities for 2024-2028 (anti-corruption, revenue mobilization, energy transition) should guide work plan objectives.
- Trina described a five-step approach for work planning: organize/prepare, identify priority issues, define objectives/activities/scope, monitor/review/adapt, and conduct annual progress review.
- She noted the UK's current work plan is strong but could be more strategic by better linking activities to national priorities and including clearer results frameworks and KPIs.
- Example provided: linking beneficial ownership transparency activities to the UK's economic crime and corporate transparency agenda, showing how EITI activities can support broader policy goals.
- Trina offered to share additional examples and her slides for further reference.

Discussion and Next Steps on Work Planning

- Sophia suggested circulating Trina's slides and using her examples to inform the 2026 work plan process.
- Sviatlana proposed merging the work planning discussion with the next agenda item, seeking feedback on the duration of the next work plan (suggested: three years, 2026-2028) and whether to approach planning as a full MSG or via a subgroup. She suggested a workshop in January to identify national priorities and align with global EITI priorities, aiming to finalize the plan by March/April.
- Mike questioned how many UK national priorities align directly with EITI, requesting more examples to clarify the approach.
- Trina provided further examples: improving transparency in licensing/contract disclosure and clarifying revenue flows to devolved governments, illustrating how EITI activities can be linked to UK policy frameworks.
- Sophia highlighted the need for a clear, shared definition of national priorities if this approach is adopted.
- General agreement to hold a workshop (online or hybrid) in January to start coalescing thinking on the new work plan, with details to be confirmed and circulated for further input.

Action Items

- Trina to share her slide pack/examples with the group.
- Secretariat to organize a January workshop (online/hybrid) for MSG to discuss national priorities and work plan approach.
- Secretariat to circulate a note to MSG for further suggestions or concerns about the workshop and planning process.

Meeting Minutes – Key Topics and Details

1. Work Plan Review and Update

- Anna led a discussion on reviewing and updating the 2024-2025 work plan, aiming to finalize updates before their placement ends. The plan is to add a new column for progress updates, copy over April updates, and have group members update their respective areas for a public report.
- Anna proposed using an external SharePoint site for collaborative updates, with a two-week turnaround for feedback. If not feasible, updates will be collected via email.
- The group discussed ownership of specific work plan actions, with Anna and Sviatlana seeking clarity on which subgroups or individuals are responsible for each section.
- There was agreement to review the RAG ratings and progress columns to ensure accuracy, as many items remain open or ongoing.
- Johann suggested using the validation templates as a source for progress summaries to avoid duplicating work. Sophia supported this approach and asked Anna to draft initial updates based on these templates and circulate for targeted input.

2. Independent Administrator (IA) Procurement

- Sviatlana and Mike discussed the need to appoint a new IA, noting the previous contract (BDO) has ended and cannot be extended. The group agreed that IA procurement is a priority, but the scope may depend on potential changes to the reconciliation process or delivery model.
- Mike expressed concern about delays, referencing past issues with timely renewal and the risk of not having an IA in place for upcoming reconciliation work. Sophia confirmed procurement is progressing and emphasized the need to clarify strategic parameters before finalizing the IA scope.

3. Subgroup Responsibilities and Membership

- The compliance subgroup was identified as responsible for several work plan actions. Anna and Sviatlana will reach out to subgroup members for updates.
- There was uncertainty about who authored the last detailed progress updates; Akinlosotu suggested Mike Nash may have done so. Sviatlana requested support from those with historical knowledge to ensure accurate reporting.

4. Membership Changes and AOB

- Sviatlana announced changes in MSG membership: Tilly is now a full member, and Cara is an alternate, with approval from the Civic Society network.
- Johann inquired about government constituency vacancies; Sviatlana confirmed this will be addressed as part of broader membership and work planning.
- Sophia closed the meeting, thanking participants for their contributions and outlining next steps: meeting notes will be circulated, and further input will be requested in writing.

Full Meeting Notes

1. Welcome and Introductions

- The meeting began with Anna and Sophia welcoming participants and confirming the agenda, which included reviewing the 2024-2025 work plan, discussing IA procurement, subgroup responsibilities, and membership changes.

2. 2024-2025 Work Plan Review

- Anna presented the current work plan and outlined the process for updating progress and outcomes. The plan is to add a new column for recent updates, copy over April's information, and have group members update their areas for a public report.
- Anna proposed using a SharePoint site for collaborative updates, aiming for a two-week turnaround. If not possible, updates will be collected via email.

- The group discussed the need to clarify which subgroups or individuals are responsible for specific actions. Anna and Sviatlana will reach out to subgroup members for updates.
- The RAG rating system was reviewed, with most items still open or ongoing. The group agreed to verify and update these ratings.
- Johann suggested using validation templates to summarize progress, which Sophia supported. Anna will draft initial updates based on these templates and circulate for targeted input.

3. Independent Administrator (IA) Procurement

- Sviatlana and Mike discussed the need to appoint a new IA, noting the previous contract (BDO) has ended and cannot be extended. The group agreed IA procurement is a priority, but the scope may depend on potential changes to the reconciliation process or delivery model.
- Mike expressed concern about delays and the risk of not having an IA in place for upcoming reconciliation work. Sophia confirmed procurement is progressing and emphasized the need to clarify strategic parameters before finalizing the IA scope.

4. Subgroup Responsibilities

- The compliance subgroup was identified as responsible for several work plan actions. Anna and Sviatlana will reach out to subgroup members for updates.
- There was uncertainty about who authored the last detailed progress updates; Akinlosotu suggested Mike Nash may have done so. Sviatlana requested support from those with historical knowledge to ensure accurate reporting.

5. Membership Changes and AOB

- Sviatlana announced changes in MSG membership: Tilly is now a full member, and Chara de Lacey is an alternate, with approval from the Civic Society network. 11
- Johann inquired about government constituency vacancies; Sviatlana confirmed this will be addressed as part of broader membership and work planning.
- Sophia closed the meeting, thanking participants for their contributions and outlining next steps: meeting notes will be circulated, and further input will be requested in writing.