MINUTES OF THE CONSULTATION MEETING ON FOLLOW UP ACTIONS ON VALIDATION CORRECTIVE ACTIONS HELD WITH THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT ON WEDNESDAY, 4TH FEBRUARY 2026 AT THE SECRETARIAT BOARDROOM ON 1ST FLOOR, CRESTED TOWERS – TALL TOWER, KAMPALA(ONLINE)

Attendance List

No.	Name	Institution/Country
	INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT	
1.	Ms. Tatiana Alvarenga	EITI International Secretariat **(Chairperson)**
2.	Mr. Z.Williams Noah	EITI International Secretariat
3.	Mr. Gilbert Makore	EITI International Secretariat
	UGANDA EITI	
4.	Ms. Gloria Mugambe	Head of Secretariat
5.	Mr. Patrick Epulu	Research Officer
6.	Ms. Jackline Ensekiriyo	Research Officer
7.	Mr. Francis Garvin Okello	Administration Officer
8.	Mr. Kanakulya Edwin Kavuma	Compliance Officer
9.	Mr. Dan Denis Agaba	Statistician
10.	Mr. Edgar Mutungi	Finance Officer
11.	Ms. Linda Stacy Nalumu	Communications Assistant
12.	Mr. Ignatius Ariho	Information Technology Assistant
13.	Mr. Stephen Etyang	Field Assistant
14.	Mr. Gordon Muhereza	Office Assistant
15.	Ms. Susan Acom	Office Assistant
16.	Mr. Paul Anapa	Research Assistant
17.	Ms. Gloria Nakimwero	Administrative Assistant
18.	Ms. Gertrude Angom	Monitoring & Evaluation Officer
19.	Ms. Ruth Mutonyi	Data Management Assistant **(Secretary)**
20.	Ms. Hellen Ninsiima	Research Officer
21.	Ms. Jackline Ensekiriyo	Research Officer

22.	Ms. Kisaakye	Uganda (CSO)
23.	Ms. Rose Nakawuma	Uganda (CSO)
24.	Mr. Sam Mucunguzi	Uganda (CSO)
25.	Mr. Aloysious Kittengo	Uganda (CSO)
26.	Mr. Henry Mugisha Bazira	Uganda (CSO)
	NIGERIA EITI	
27.	Dr. Erisa Danladi	Nigeria
28.	Mr. M.Buba	Nigeria

AGENDA

The agenda of the meeting was as follows:

1) Introduction of Members Present
2) Remarks from the IS and National Secretariats (UGEITI and NEITI)
3) Discussions (Break out Meetings)
    - National Coordinators and Government
    - Civil Society Organisations
4) Final Remarks from Representatives

MIN 1.0: INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS PRESENT

1.1 The meeting began with the IS Representative welcoming members and asking them to introduce themselves. The Members Present introduced themselves.

MIN 2.0: REMARKS FROM THE IS AND NATIONAL SECRETARIATS (UGEITI & NEITI)

2.1 The Chair thanked members for making the time to attend the meeting and said the engagement was particularly important in preparation for validation. She informed the meeting that the purpose was to evaluate how countries were implementing Corrective Actions and how the IS could improve the formulation of these Corrective Actions in relation to Civil Society engagements during validation.

2.2 She further informed the meeting that the discussions would centre on three major questions, that is to say:

- How to improve the formulation of corrective actions?

- Challenges in addressing Requirement 1.3; Corrective Actions?
- Do the corrective actions align with the national civic space issues in the country?

2.3 She mentioned that the results and feedback from these discussions would be used to strengthen the implementation of Requirement 1.3 and that the insights would be included in the Validation Committee paper to be presented to the Board in April 2026 for discussion.

2.3 She said that in order to deepen the discussions, members would be divided into breakout rooms: one with National Coordinators and Government, and the other with Civil Society Organisations for forty-five minutes and then members would reconvene into the main meeting.

MIN 3.0: DISCUSSIONS (BREAKOUT MEETINGS)

3.1 The Chair guided that the breakout discussions would be based on the Interview Questions-Corrective Actions (**Attached as Annexe A**). These questions were shared prior to the meeting. Members would have to respond to the Interview questions on Corrective Actions, specifically on Requirement 1.3 regarding Civil Society engagement.

3.2 Clarity on Corrective Actions

3.21 The Chair asked the Secretariats to provide responses to the questions in this section, and the Secretariats responded as follows:

3.22 Reactions from the Secretariats

a) The NEITI responded and said the current formulation of the corrective actions was clear and easy to understand. The National Stakeholders Working Group (NSWG) actually understood the recommendations and corrective actions. Meetings were being held quarterly to address the gaps in accordance with the NEITI Act.

b) The Secretariat further explained that the current formulation of the corrective actions generally needed to be improved to reflect realities in terms of civic space engagement in the country. The scope should be narrowed down to focus specifically on engagements in the extractive sector, rather than requiring action in the broader civic space.

c) The UGEITI Secretariat said that, although the corrective actions were clear and easy to understand, their formulation did not seem fair to the CSOs, given that they were the most vibrant in the MSG. The CSOs were the original advocates for the country to join EITI. The assessment did not

reflect realities on the ground regarding civic space engagement in the extractives sector. They seemed to reflect the broader civic space environment nationwide, which was unfair. There was a need for improvement in the formulation of the corrective actions. Some of the interview questions on Expression, Operation, and Association were outside the MSG's mandate. They were related to specific mandates of some Government institutions, including the political arm of Government.

d) The MSG indeed had a common understanding of the Corrective Actions and how they could be addressed. The level of Civil Society engagement in the MSG was effective, with CSOs being the most active. The civic environment was vibrant, and there was a need to narrow the scope to reflect engagements in the extractives sector. This would provide a positive picture of the country.

3.3 Effectiveness of Current Corrective Actions

3.31 Reactions from the Secretariats

a) The UGEITI Secretariat mentioned that the Corrective Actions clearly defined the respective responsibilities and expected improvements needed to be undertaken by the Government and MSG. To some extent, they were sufficiently specific, measurable, and achievable, except for the scope.

b) They were not difficult to implement. The Civil Society Organisations were able to express opinions freely and engage positively in the EITI process. This was notable with the healthy civic space environment in the extractive sector before and after validation.

c) The CSOs continued to operate freely. At the MSG level, when a specific assignment was to be undertaken, committees would be formed that included CSO participation. This was a testament to the level of CSOs' engagement in the country. Because of the EITI process, there was notable collaboration between CSOs and Government which wasn't the case before.

d) The CSOs actively participated in public debate. They were registered as the most active of all the MSG constituencies in the EITI implementation process. Being part of UGEITI has given these organisations a platform to air out their views and influence decisions at higher levels.

e) In terms of capacity and resources, most CSOs required funding due to the limited available resources to support their operations. There was still a need for capacity-building to improve understanding of the EITI process.

f) The Secretariat concluded by saying that the corrective actions on Requirement 1.3 were essentially not adequately formulated to address the challenges in civil society engagement, specifically in the extractive sector.

3.4 Progress since the Corrective Actions

3.41 Reactions from the Secretariats

a) The UGEITI Secretariat explained that the corrective actions were presented to MSG after the validation process. During the discussions, it was noted that the actions to be taken exceeded the MSG's powers. They were difficult to implement because they required improving the entire civic space environment in the country, rather than just the extractive sector.
b) The MSG was rather shocked with the outcome of the validation assessment, as reflected in the low score on Requirement 1.3. The MSG noted that substantial evidence was provided during validation to demonstrate an enabling environment, including increased engagement with Government, active participation in the EITI process, and a platform for public debate, among others. They therefore did not perceive the need to undertake corrective measures in that regard.
c) The reactions from the MSG meeting were documented in the 33rd MSG Meeting Minutes. They could be found on the UGEITI website. They could be reviewed together with the Work plan and APR following the validation process.
d) The Secretariat further stated that it did not encounter any challenges in implementing the corrective actions and the Requirement generally. The question was, “What more could be done since everything necessary had already been done?”
e) There were enabling factors, and they included; CSOs’ engagement in the MSG, participation in the EITI process, including dissemination, work planning and annual progress review, etc. Within the Government, the factors were improved cooperation and coherence among institutions to address sectoral challenges. There were engagements at all levels, namely national, regional, and sub-regional.
f) There was a need for support through capacity building because there was a new cohort of MSG members. The IS needed to provide evidence and case studies from countries with similar issues regarding Corrective Actions on Requirement 1.3, including the corrective measures undertaken by the MSG. The Secretariat further requested the IS to source funding for support to CSOs operations because they were under funded.

g) The NEITI responded and said the Corrective Actions were presented to the MSG after validation and discussed. The discussions centred on the assessment not reflecting the level of civic space engagement in the extractive sector. There was documented evidence to that effect.

h) CSOs engaged freely in the extractive sector, and there was no challenge faced in implementing the Corrective Actions. The Corrective Actions needed to be formulated to reflect engagements in the extractives sector, but not the entire civic space environment in the country.

i) The Secretariat further said that the notable improvement in CSO engagement was because of political will through the NEITI Act 2010. The Government had provided adequate funding to support EITI implementation. These interventions helped address the failure to unify CSOs in the EITI implementation process as it had been noted previously.

j) It requested the EITI IS to lobby for funding from development partners, such as the European Union, to support EITI activities in the country. It further requested for technical support towards capacity building for its staff. It said this would support the operationalisation of the data centre.

3.42 Because of time, the Chair ended the breakout sessions and suggested that the remaining questions would be handled some other time.

MIN 4.0: FINAL REMARKS FROM REPRESENTATIVES

4.1 The Chair reconvened the breakout sessions back into the main meeting and welcomed any final remarks from the Secretariats.

a) The UGEITI Secretariat said the meeting was timely, and it provided positive feedback. In conclusion, it stated that the relationship between the Government and CSOs had improved significantly. This had enabled the successful implementation of EITI in the country. This was observed from the submissions of the MSG members present. There was a need for regular engagements with the IS for implementation support rather than waiting for validation. The Secretariat was looking forward to another similar meeting.

b) The NEITI thanked the IS for organising such an informative and constructive meeting. It said the Secretariat was preparing a Memorandum of Understanding to further strengthen civic space engagement. It requested for a meeting with the IS to resolve more specific implementation challenges.

c) The IS thanked the Secretariats for taking the time to attend the meeting. It said the discussions were meaningful, and they provided positive feedback that would support the formulation of Corrective Actions.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

ACTION MATRIX

Min No.	**Action Point**	**Resp. Inst./Individual**	**Timeline**	**Action Update**
3.31(e)	Provide capacity building to UGEITI.	International Secretariat		
3.41(f)	Provide evidence and case studies from countries with similar issues regarding Corrective Actions on Requirement 1.3.	International Secretariat		
(f)	Source for funding for CSOs' activities in UGEITI.	International Secretariat		
3.41(j)	Source for funding to support NEITI.	International Secretariat		
4.1 (b)	Organise meeting with NEITI.	International Secretariat		

Signed:

Chair: _____ Date: _____

Secretary _____ Date: _____

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS - CORRECTIVE ACTIONS

1. Clarity on Corrective Actions

1.1. Do you think the current formulations of corrective actions are clear?

1.2. What could be improved in the current formulations of corrective actions?

1.3. Does the MSG have a common understanding of the corrective action and how to address it?

2. Effectiveness of Current Corrective Actions

2.1 Do the current corrective actions clearly define the respective responsibilities and expected improvements for the government and the MSG?

2.2 Is the formulation of corrective actions sufficiently specific, measurable, and achievable?

2.3 Which aspects of the corrective actions are difficult to implement, and why? (choose the aspects that's relevant in your case)

- Expression – Ensuring civil society can express opinions freely
- Operation – Ensuring civil society can form, operate, and communicate freely
- Association – Ensuring civil society can associate, collaborate, and engage without restriction
- Engagement – Ensuring civil society can actively participate in public debate and EITI processes
- Access to decision-making – Ensuring civil society has meaningful opportunities to influence decisions
- Capacity and resources – Ensuring civil society has sufficient capacity and resources to participate effectively

2.4 In your view, are the corrective actions adequately formulated to address the challenges in civil society engagement in the EITI?

3. Progress Since the Corrective Actions

3.1 How has the MSG responded to the corrective actions identified under Requirement 1.3?

3.2 What specific actions has the MSG taken to follow up on the corrective actions related to Requirement 1.3?

3.3 How were these actions documented and communicated within the MSG?

3.4 What are the challenges you have encountered in implementing the corrective actions?

3.5 What are the enabling factors that helped you in implementing the corrective actions?

3.6 Do you think the corrective actions have resulted in improvements in CSO engagement in EITI? How?

3.7 Have there been any changes in the broader enabling environment for civil society since the corrective actions were issued? How?

4. Alignment With Country Priorities and Context

4.1 Are there areas where the corrective actions could be better tailored to your national context?

5. Support and Capacity Needs

5.1 What kind of support (technical, political, financial) would help your country address the corrective actions more effectively? Where should support come from?

5.2 How can the EITI Secretariat and Board support you better in addressing the corrective actions?

6. Strengthening the Corrective Action Framework

6.1 How could EITI improve the formulation of corrective actions to make them clearer and more actionable?

6.2 Would you recommend changes in how corrective actions are monitored or followed up?

Anglo African Countries

Uganda/Board decision 2024-28 / BC-348

In accordance with Requirement 1.3 the government is required to ensure that all civil society organisations can operate, freely express opinions and meaningful engage in the EITI process in an environment where they do not feel vulnerable to reprisals or sanctions derived from the discretionary application of restrictive norms affecting their operations. The multi-stakeholder group should monitor how CSO engagement in the EITI process occurs and identify any circumstances or incidents that affect CSOs capacity to freely operate and participate in public debate. In the event of these breaches, the government should address these concerns to guarantee the conditions for civil society participation established in the EITI protocol for civil society. The MSG and the government are encouraged to ensure that CSOs engagement is made possible through adequate capacitation and access to available funding.

Nigeria/Board decision: 2023-52 / BM-58

In accordance with Requirement 1.3 and the EITI protocol: Participation of civil society, Nigeria should ensure that civil society is fully, actively and effectively engaged in all aspects of the EITI process. Civil society stakeholders, including but not limited to members of the National Stakeholders Working Group (NSWG), must be substantially engaged in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the EITI process, and ensure that it contributes to public debate. The Federal Government of Nigeria is required to ensure that there are no obstacles to civil society participation in the EITI process and to ensure that there is adequate civil society representation in the oversight of Nigeria EITI to represent the constituency's diversity. The government should undertake measures to prevent civil society actors from being harassed, intimidated, or persecuted for expressing views related to oil, gas or mining governance. In the event that civil society actors engaged in the EITI experience threats or harassment for expressing views about the extractive industries or engaging in other EITI-related activities, the government is expected to undertake measures to protect these actors and their freedom of expression. The government, in collaboration with the NSWG, is encouraged to consider practical solutions for ensuring that civil society can engage in the EITI freely in all regions of the country. The NSWG is encouraged to regularly monitor developments regarding civil society's ability to engage in the EITI. In accordance with the EITI protocol: Participation of civil society, civil society members are encouraged to bring any ad hoc restrictions that could constitute a breach of the protocol to the attention of the NSWG. The government, in collaboration with the NSWG, should document the measures it undertakes to remove any obstacles to civil society participation in the EITI.

Gmail Search mail

Compose

Inbox 17,212
Starred
Snoozed
Important
Sent
Drafts
Purchases
Bills
Social 12,515
Updates 3,915
Forums 40
Promotions 7,597
More

Labels

From: Edwin Wuadom Warden <EWarden@eiti.org>

Sent: Monday, January 26, 2026 6:42 PM

To: Saul Ongaria; Gloria Mugambe

Cc: Uganda EITI; Edwin Wuadom Warden; Saipira Furstenberg; Gilbert Makore

Subject: EITI International Secretariat request for consultation on follow-up on the corrective action regarding civil society

Dear Saul,

I hope this message finds you well. At the Board meeting in Yerevan in November, the Board discussed ways space is through corrective actions from Validation. Building on the Board discussions, the Secretariat is co meeting are:

1. To have an overview of how the corrective actions on Requirement 1.3 have been implemented by MS
2. To understand how to improve ways of formulating corrective actions for more impact and understanc
3. To understand how the Secretariat can provide more support.
4. To gather lessons learned and how to build on them.

Country inputs will be relayed to the Board ahead of the Global Conference in June with the aim of improvin We have scheduled a **90-minute consultation call on zoom. We would like you to forward this invitation to m followed by break- out sessions for each constituency (government, civil society, companies, national coordi** anonymised and not made publicly available. They are intended to inform the EITI Board's deliberations.

We kindly invite you to participate **on 4 February 12:40 PM CET** (GMT +1 Nigeria, GMT+3 Uganda)

Link to the Zoom meeting here:
Join Zoom Meeting:
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83409373635?pwd=E4yhyVE1rdoi2CnexdCnFs03GXaTz9.1

Meeting ID: 834 0937 3635
Passcode: 486811

New Message from okello francis Show Ignore