

REPORT OF THE CIVIL SOCIETY NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE ON THE SELECTION OF AN ALTERNATE CIVIL SOCIETY REPRESENTATIVE TO THE EITI BOARD, DECEMBER 2017

PROCESS

At the end of August 2017, the alternate civil society Board member Wendy Tyrrell from Transparency International announced her intention to step down from her EITI Board position. As described in the [civil society constituency guidelines](#) for the 2016-2019 Board, the Nominations Committee was tasked to find a replacement for Mrs Tyrrell.

Established in December 2015, the Nominations Committee was responsible for the initial selection of CSO Board members in early 2016 and agreed to remain in place for the whole duration of the term in order to cater for instances in which a civil society Board member needs to be replaced or changes affiliation. The Global Council of the Publish What You Pay (PWYP) coalition invited the following people to form the Nominations Committee: Ms. Aroa de la Fuente Lopez (Fundar and a member of the PWYP Global Council and PWYP Board), Mr. Jean-Claude Katende (ASADHO and a former civil society representative on the EITI Board), Mr. Anton Artemyev (Open Society Foundation Kazakhstan and former civil society representative on the EITI Board) and Mr. Emerson Sykes (civil society expert from the International Center for Not-for-Profit Law - ICNL). Mr Artemyev and Mr Sykes are the two experts selected by the Global Council from outside the PWYP coalition. Please note however that due to time constraints, Mr. Artemyev recused himself from the Nominations Committee for this selection round. He will remain involved for future proceedings, until the end of the term in 2019.

An open call for applications was organised between the 6th and 27th of September 2017. The PWYP Secretariat was tasked with disseminating the call in French, English, Spanish, Russian and Arabic via its email lists and [website](#), the EITI channels (website + national coordinators), the OGP blog and civil society listserv, and the Goxi blog.

The PWYP Secretariat received 8 applications. The full list of applicants is available in annex 1.

In a first stage, Nomination Committee members reviewed all the applications against the selection criteria to establish a short list. For that purpose, they used a unified scoring system, in order to assess the relative strength of each applicant, looking at the resume and cover letter but also taking into account the letters of support applicants had submitted. The criteria for assessment were:

- Knowledge of the extractive industry value chain
- Engagement in the EITI
- Knowledge of EITI Standard and policies
- Ability to reach agreements/compromises within groups at different levels
- Ability to serve wider interests than own allegiances
- Time and willingness to consult
- Time and willingness to report regularly
- Ability to represent others with authority
- Ability working with a variety of stakeholders

- Respect of the EITI Code of Conduct.

In a second stage, the Nominations Committee interviewed three short listed candidates. A set of four questions (available in annex 2) was prepared and a unified scoring system was agreed to assess the candidates' performance. Committee members talked to all three candidates, albeit at different times in one instance due to technical challenges.

SELECTION

The Nominations Committee selected Jana Morgan as alternate to Daniel Kaufmann for the remainder of the 2016-2019 term. Jana Morgan is Director of Advocacy and Campaigns at the International Corporate Accountability Roundtable (ICAR), an organization based in Washington D.C. Mrs. Morgan will have the possibility to run for a second term after 2019, provided that her performance will be deemed satisfactory.

The three short-listed candidates all had a very strong profile but Mrs Morgan performed best during the interview by demonstrating a thorough understanding of the critical issues at stake with the implementation of the EITI Standard and in particular of the challenges it brings for civil society. Mrs Morgan also brings a long experience working with multi-stakeholder settings and convinced the Committee of her strong negotiation skills which will allow her to effectively defend civil society interests on the EITI Board. Last but not least, Mrs Morgan brings the necessary contacts, stakeholder knowledge and commitment to regularly inform her constituency about ongoing developments at the Board level and make herself accountable to wider civil society.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- The Nominations Committee supports ongoing efforts to review and strengthen the constituency guidelines for civil society in the EITI and welcomes the decision to work with the Consensus Building Institute to foster an inclusive and transparent review process which will lead to the adoption of revised and strengthened constituency guidelines, including to a new selection process for the nomination of the civil society Board members.

ANNEX 1. List of received applications

Name	Organisation	Country
Abakhon Sultonazarov	Institute for War and Peace Reporting	Kyrgyzstan
Aziya Kurmanbayeva	Committee on public control over execution of state programs at local level	Kazakhstan
Diana Kaissy	Lebanese Oil and Gas Initiative	Lebanon
Elisabeth Caesens	Resource Matters	Belgium
Jana Morgan	International Corporate Accountability Roundtable	USA
Kossi Blaise Ayegnon	L'Oeil de l'Afrique	Togo
Munkhsoyol Baartajav	Institute of National Strategy	Mongolia
Nina Kilbride	NCFunder	USA

ANNEX 2. List of interview questions

- 1) What is your experience with multi-stakeholder settings? Would you be able to give us examples of past situations where you had to handle negotiations with different actors involved?
- 2) As representatives of civil society, EITI Board members have a duty to consult and to feedback to their wider constituency. How are you planning to carry out those duties and to find the time for doing so?
- 3) The question of the enabling environment is key for civil society actors participating in the EITI. Yet, other constituencies on the Board only touch upon the issue with reluctance and insist that the EITI is not a human rights initiative. What is your take on the EITI's potential to contribute to better civil society protection in resource rich countries?
- 4) Four years after Sydney, where the EITI adopted a new Standard, most implementing countries are having a hard time properly implementing the new reporting requirements as demonstrated by the results of recent Validations. Hence, for this mandate do you foresee that the Board should refrain from introducing new policy innovations in order to focus on supporting implementation at country level or do you think that civil society should be ambitious and push the frontiers of transparency in the EI sector further? In the latter case, what reforms would you want to aim for?