

**United States Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
Multi-Stakeholder Group Advisory Committee
Minutes of the February 13, 2013 Meeting**

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

Welcome and Overview

Interior Assistant Secretary Rhea Suh, as Chair and Designated Federal Officer for the Committee, opened the meeting by thanking everyone for coming and expressing appreciation for the amount of time and energy already spent on EITI. She described EITI as a goal, a process, and a fundamental philosophy: a goal around global standards that we aspire to accede to and become compliant with, a collaborative process that defines how we will fulfill those standards, and a philosophy that we must collectively provide the public with transparent information about the revenues we collect on behalf of all Americans. She added that Secretary Salazar chose individuals to serve on this committee because of both their expertise and their commitment to EITI principles, and that she looks forward to collaborative engagement throughout the existence of this committee. She then invited members of the committee, alternates and observers in the room to introduce themselves (*see enclosed attendance list*).

Interior Secretary Ken Salazar, who was named by President Obama as the Senior U.S. Official responsible for USEITI, noted the tremendous progress made over the past several years to reform oil and gas management and revenue collection, and attributed some of that progress to the help of many industry and civil society organizations that were represented in the room. He recalled splitting up the former Minerals Management Service to create three separate organizations, among them the Office of Natural Resources Revenue (ONRR) to collect revenue from resource extraction on public lands on behalf of American citizens. The Secretary stated how proud he is of the great work to date on revenue reforms and implementation of USEITI, and that both will continue to be a priority for ONRR under the leadership of AS Rhea Suh, Paul Mussenden and Greg Gould.

Senior Advisor to the President and Senior Director for Multilateral Affairs Samantha Power reminded the group that one of President Obama's first acts when he took office in 2009 was to direct agencies to come up with open government plans that have since made his administration the most open and transparent in U.S. history. Early on, it was clear from conversations with our civil society stakeholders that revenue transparency in the U.S. was of deep interest to them, as well as to Secretary Salazar and President Obama. While the State Department had provided funding to EITI and supported its implementation in other countries around the world, the U.S. hadn't signed on to do so ourselves. The Administration realized that implementing EITI in the U.S. not only complements our domestic revenue reforms, it enables us to lead internationally by example, doing so under the Open Government Partnership.

State Department Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Energy Resources Bob Cekuta serves as the U.S. government representative to and member of the international EITI Board. He added that our efforts to implement EITI in the U.S. bolsters good governance abroad by sending a strong signal to international partners that this transparency initiative is valuable for all countries, at all levels of development, and in all regions. He said the different perspectives in terms of expertise, insights, and connections to communities and businesses will make USEITI a strong example to the rest of the world. Finally, he shared a message from the EITI International Secretariat in Oslo, congratulating the U.S. on convening its first multi-stakeholder group meeting.

Federal Advisory Committee Act Overview & Discussion

Interior Deputy Solicitor Ed Keable gave a presentation about the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). His presentation covered general background on FACA and several additional themes, including applicability; consequences of a violation; roles and responsibilities; ethics rules; requirements; and subcommittees. Responding to an inquiry regarding the terms of reference, Mr. Keable said that the Solicitor's office has been working closely with Assistant Secretary Suh's USEITI team in vetting the various proposals and documents, like the charter and the draft terms of reference, and is confident that all of the provisions are consistent with legal obligations under FACA. He committed to continue providing counsel throughout the USEITI process on any questions that emerge.

United States Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
Multi-Stakeholder Group Advisory Committee
Minutes of the February 13, 2013 Meeting

USEITI 2013 Timeline and Implementation

Ms. Suh explained that the proposed draft timeframe sets the stage for meetings and associated action items for the committee to complete, with the goal of preparing a country and candidacy application by this summer. Thus far, the U.S. government has been quite successful in sustaining a high level of momentum in the early stages of USEITI implementation. Wishing to continue this momentum, the government has put forth a bold target to submit a candidacy application this summer, believing that the timeframe is both ambitious and doable. To carry this out, in addition to full committee meetings, there will need to be a number of caucuses and subcommittee meetings to draft documents and set up decisions for the committee as a whole.

Ms. Suh opened the floor for the committee to discuss the draft timeframe. Several members asked questions about what is entailed in a country workplan and candidacy application, how the two relate, whether there are any templates to follow, what examples exist from other countries in terms of timing, how often can applications be submitted to the EITI Board for consideration, and whether there is any stigma in making changes to an application/workplan that has been submitted. Federal government participants explained that per EITI sign-up Requirement 5, a candidacy application includes: a workplan with measurable and time-bound targets and objectives, actions to achieve those objectives and sources of funding to carry them out; an assessment of capacity constraints in government, companies and civil society that might be an obstacle to implementation; a determination of scope, including a list of all operating oil, gas and mining companies; and a legal framework review that identifies any potential obstacles for implementation. There is a standard template for EITI candidacy applications developed by the EITI International Secretariat in Oslo. There is no set timeframe or standard for completing a candidacy application, it varies by country—some countries have announced their intent to implement EITI and completed an application within a few months, others have taken a very long time. It is a deliberative process, but one that requires continued progress and momentum. There is an expectation that while the U.S. extractives sector and political system are complex, they're also developed and can be utilized to finish this task efficiently. Applications are typically submitted for consideration at EITI Board meetings, which occur three times a year in the fall, winter and spring/summer. Applications and workplans can be modified, and workplans should be updated at least annually, especially if scale and scope evolve over time.

Many members agreed that the proposed timeline seems ambitious. A few were supportive (Anand, Gould, Kohler, Rogers) of keeping it that way and adjusting as needed, while others (Brian, Bugala, Morse) expressed concerns about whether it allows sufficient time for developing a good process that allows full consideration and discussion of substantive matters, especially scope. Ms. Kohler noted that there is extensive expertise around the room, with people who have worked on EITI for many years, while the U.S. has a strong system in place already for implementing EITI, so the U.S. should be able to complete the application more quickly than other countries.

Ms. Suh recommended establishing a subcommittee to begin work on the application, and to utilize the subcommittee in combination with caucusing among the sectors and full committee meetings to complete an application. Mr. Bugala and Ms. Morse initially suggested forming subcommittees to begin to work through different elements of scope, but also stated a preference for keeping substantive discussions at the full committee level. To move forward expeditiously, Mr. Anand recommended asking the government to draft a candidacy application template that can be reviewed by the full committee. Ms. Taylor said that given the iterative nature of the EITI process, there is a possibility of starting with a narrow scope for the current workplan and build into the workplan future phases for expanding the scope. And Ms. Morse reminded the U.S. government of the need to conduct a legal analysis and inquired as to the status of this due diligence.

Ms. Suh adjourned the committee for lunch, and asked the sectors who wished to conduct a working lunch to discuss: who from their sectors could serve on the subcommittee, what issues the full committee wants to be engaged on for the timeline, and whether the committee could support a timeline that would enable the U.S. to complete an application by the summer.

United States Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
Multi-Stakeholder Group Advisory Committee
Minutes of the February 13, 2013 Meeting

USEITI 2013 Timeline and Implementation (continued)

Ms. Suh reconvened the Committee, and asked spokespersons to share the thoughts, perspectives and concerns of their sectors regarding the proposed timeline and subcommittee.

Civil Society sector spokespersons Ms. Brian and Ms. Morse stated that the timeline is too aggressive, and that more time is needed to give serious consideration to the substantive issues. Thus, they proposed that the timeline be adjusted so that a candidacy application would be completed in November in time for the winter Board meeting, rather than in July/August for the fall Board meeting. In addition, they suggested that subcommittees be formed to discuss initial aspects of scope, but also noted that the full committee needs to discuss and make substantive decisions about scope. They also reiterated that a good legal analysis ought to be completed sooner than later to know already what can and can't be disclosed under current law. Mr. Bugala suggested a later agenda item to have the EITI international secretariat review the terms of reference for consistency with EITI standards. Ms. Rogers asked for good templates of applications that were successful, and Mr. Romig request a list of best practices for how EITI has been implemented in other countries and encouraged substantive discussions to remain at the full committee level.

Ms. Suh responded that given the reality of the amount of work that must be completed, and the busy portfolios of everyone in the room, a subcommittee is needed. Some suggestions had already been made about putting together a template for the workplan, doing research and due diligence on legal questions, etc. that need to be brought back to the full committee—the subcommittee could begin this work and the full committee could focus on major substantive issues. We should be able to begin from some area of common ground to draft a candidacy application, to get a sense of what it might look like, and what goals and structure might be needed to move forward—we do not need to let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

Industry sector spokesperson Mr. Anand then stated that the industry sector thinks that the proposed timeline is ambitious but they are willing to work toward it. He again suggested, and Mr. Roper echoed, that consistent with the FACA process, the government prepare a draft workplan to present to the full committee, given that the government already has a lot of the information needed and that EITI criteria state that the host government must develop a workplan with assistance where needed. With a draft in hand, preferably at least a couple of weeks beforehand to allow sufficient time to review and prepare to discuss substantively, the committee members could then decide whether a subcommittee is needed and for what purpose, and could identify where the main issues may arise such as scope. Mr. Reynolds stated the sector's concern that going into a subcommittee process could delay the work of the committee, if it were to get bogged down in its own delegations, deliberations, etc., while having a government-prepared template would give members something concrete to react to, and conversations could be brought into the full committee environment sooner than later.

In response, the government clarified that one EITI principle states that the government is ultimately responsible for the entire EITI process, and that the government would submit the MSG-approved workplan as part of the candidacy application. Ms. Rogers suggested that the government provide parameters of what can be done, and Mr. Flannigan and Ms. Ginsberg agreed, stating that it would be helpful to have the government provide information and initiate drafts to which members can react. Meanwhile Mr. Boettner stated that he'd like to see what perfect looks like and start from there, working down to good if needed, while Mr. Wilkinson reacted that he'd like to see something we can do now without legal changes. Ms. Rogers repeated the need for Interior to provide parameters to start from, and Ms. Brian added that there are massive amounts of information civil society would like to know quickly from the government, but are reluctant to ask the government to do all of the work, and are willing to put in time to assist as well.

Mr. Gould, the government sector spokesperson, underscored that the federal government has already been operating on a very aggressive timeline that got us to this point, and that it's important to keep the momentum going. The government sector recommended that a subcommittee be formed with people who know EITI well,

United States Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
Multi-Stakeholder Group Advisory Committee
Minutes of the February 13, 2013 Meeting

and that it quickly develop a draft workplan and report out in order to facilitate substantive discussions by the full committee at its next meeting. Mr. Gould noted that each country gets to decide what is considered perfection in terms of EITI, and could start with what can be done under existing law, and then in the workplan it can be decided what else to do in out years. He also mentioned that everyone on the committee needs to become more educated on EITI, and that the EITI international website (www.eiti.org) has tremendous amounts of information, including other country workplans that have been successful. Mr. Carlson then suggested an alternative to having either the government or a subcommittee draft the workplan—that the government take the lead in drafting with some subcommittee members there in the drafting process to provide a heads-up on likely questions that will arise, so that the government gets input while it is drafting rather than waiting for feedback at the next meeting. Doing so would also keep committee members involved in the process, while the government leads the drafting.

Ms. Suh then responded that the government does have the expertise to begin drafting what we do now, and can put together a draft framework for the pieces of a candidacy application, including looking at existing government regulations and laws and other elements. She proposed that a subcommittee serve as the conduit to ask the government specific legal or technical questions, so that they are generated and directed by other sectors. The government could then respond in its drafting via the subcommittee and ultimately to the full committee. She also committed that the government would try to give as much information as possible as soon as possible in advance of the next full committee meeting.

Ms. Morse responded that she liked having an open conduit with the lead agency and a formal way to propose questions about scope during the drafting of the workplan to keep things moving, and Mr. Bugala sought clarification as to whether the subcommittee would then be responsible for the entire workplan. Ms. Suh characterized the subcommittee as focusing on an initial draft of the candidacy application, with a large piece of that being the template the U.S. government would draft as a strawman. However, the subcommittee would not be charged with completing the entire workplan—there is not enough information nor agreement to cede major decisions outside the full committee. Instead, the subcommittee could be a conduit for sectors to submit technical as well as substantive questions, which inform issues such as scope. This information would then be forwarded to the full committee, in order to determine how to reach enough agreement to submit a candidacy application.

Mr. Gould added that the subcommittee could provide both a drafting service as well as an educational role in terms of reviewing and sharing best practices and examples of plans. Subcommittees also have a lot of flexibility for how and when they meet, that would be less cumbersome than full committee meetings. Ms. Slajer asked whether materials could be provided while the subcommittee works on draft documents, including best practices for EITI and sample workplans, a snapshot for what is happening in the U.S. and how we're set up, an organization chart for the EITI board, etc. Ms. Suh summarized that members seemed to want more information about the international structure and how it operates, examples of other countries' applications and experiences, how the U.S. revenue collection process works, and anything else? Mr. Reynolds also asked for a presentation on the minimum criteria for getting a workplan accepted, and Mr. Romig for information on what data are legally not available and any constraints. Mr. Conrad noted that members are collecting a list of issues and concerns to be resolved as part of the workplan and/or for broader consideration, and Ms. Suh agreed that they should be sent to Karen to compile for the committee and subcommittee.

Ms. Suh closed the discussion by stating that the timeframe is an iterative process, with a concrete goal for submitting an application for the fall board meeting. She suggested that some larger issues of substance are not going to be resolved with an additional three months of discussion, but that it is better to build time into the workplan for these discussions and decisions. Otherwise there is a risk of lengthening the timeframe for developing the application, impeding us from joining the international community as a candidate country. Mr. Harrington responded that this approach could be supported, recognizing that if an initial scope were agreed to this year, data would be gathered for the first report in 2014 and the first report would be issued in 2015, and the committee could look to expanding as needed. The committee could start fast with a baseline, recognizing the

United States Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
Multi-Stakeholder Group Advisory Committee
Minutes of the February 13, 2013 Meeting

process will be carried out over years. Ms. Suh stated that the timeline discussion would be wrapped up at the end of the meeting, and moved ahead with the terms of reference discussion.

Multi-Stakeholder Group Procedures (Terms of Reference)

Ms. Suh stated that the draft terms of reference (TORs) can serve as guideposts for how the committee will conduct its business, debate important issues, and make consensus decisions as a body. Adopting TORs is a best practice for multi-stakeholder groups like this one, and lays ground rules for how the members will work together. In preparing this draft, Interior staff reviewed examples from other advisory committees, compiled and adapted them to the EITI framework. The draft is what members have been seeking for the candidacy application process—a strawman that the government is putting forward for discussion, which members should revise, edit, add to, etc. as needed. She then opened the floor to talk through the document section by section, recommending that issues be flagged in the meeting and sorted through by a subcommittee afterward.

Page 1: No comments

Page 2, Section IV, Membership:

- Ms. Brian and Mr. Boettner sought to clarify whether the committee had been appointed to a three year term as noted in their appointment letters, or match the renewable two year term of the committee’s charter. Interior responded that there had been a typo in the draft language, that a correction was needed here and also at the end of the document where the charter was referenced.
- Mr. Bugala recommended that the Committee seek out Congressional participation. After further discussion, it was agreed that the current language does not preclude such participation and thus did not need to be amended, but that the committee may wish to discuss Congressional participation in the future.
- A member commented that it is preferable to say that a member may designate an alternate, and that the language be permissive rather than required. A similar change would be needed in Section IV.B.3 to make it match. Per Mr. Gould, for the government to pay for an alternate in lieu of a primary member, that designation would need to be made clear in advance.
- Mr. Anand pointed out that in the course of this meeting there had been a free flow of conversation among members, alternates and in some cases observers, and that more structure was needed. Ms. Suh agreed and said that she erred on the side of inclusiveness in the absence of the terms of reference, which are intended to guide such future discussions. Going forward under the terms, just members at the table would speak, with alternates substituting in for substantive reasons as needed (as is done at EITI Board meetings), and observers could speak during designated public comment periods.

Page 3, Section V. Committee Leadership and Section VI. Decision-making:

- V. Committee Leadership. Ms. Ginsberg inquired about the purpose of co-chairs, and whether it would be counter to a consensus based process, particularly with regard to where it says the co-chairs would assist with resolving impasses, tensions and conflicts, but also other aspects that could be deemed substantive. Ms. Suh clarified that any decision-making should happen at the full committee level, but that co-chairs were intended to facilitate logistical aspects of managing the committee and its meetings, such as agendas, and suggested that language be added that the co-chairs work with the members of the full committee to resolve impasses, tensions and conflicts. Ms. Brian asked whether the sectors could be allowed to nominate their own co-chairs, (rather than the chair or the government). Ms. Suh confirmed that would be fine to have sectors nominate the co-chairs and that the committee would designate them as described in the terms.
- VI.A. Mr. Conrad asked that the numbers for quorum be changed to three for the government sector, since there are only five members for that sector.
- VI.B.4. Mr. Anand expressed a concern as to whether the ability of the chair, in consultation with the co-chairs, might make decisions to move the process forward which could have substantive implications to

United States Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
Multi-Stakeholder Group Advisory Committee
Minutes of the February 13, 2013 Meeting

which committee members do not agree. AS Suh replied that as chair she did not think it practical to move forward on any issue without consensus, but that she would try to push the committee to reach consensus.

Page 4, Section VI. Decision-Making

- VI.C.3. Ms. Morse stated that while she wanted to work in communion with the committee, she was concerned that this term that prohibits members from commenting negatively on consensus based language might be overly broad, since members may have agreed to something via horse-trading or other means, but would still be critical of the compromise that was made. Mr. Bugala echoed the concern and stated that this would be inconsistent with EITI Rule 6, which enables civil society to engage in public debate about EITI. Ms. Ginsber then responded that the same should be applicable to the other sectors as well. Ms. Suh explained that the goal is to ask members to abstain from intentionally and publicly undermining consensus decisions that the committee makes, so that the integrity of the members, the committee and the consensus based process is not diminished. Mr. Roper stated that they thought the language could be understood to mean that discussion and debate still occurs outside of the committee, without violating the principle mentioned by Ms. Suh. Mr. Bugala suggested that there be an ability to express consent to a decision while being able to publicly document any associated concerns. Ms. Suh agreed that modified language should clarify the principle and avoid constraining members or sectors in an unreasonable way.
- VI.C.5. Mr. Bugala raised a concern that by sending a set of options to the Secretary for decision, the committee would not be making a tripartite decision as required under EITI validation standards, and recommended that the language be modified to be consistent with EITI rules. He also recommended that the final terms of reference be shared with the EITI International Secretariat for their review to ensure that they meet EITI validation standards. Ms. Suh noted that the Interior staff had shared this public draft with the EITI International Secretariat, and that they had not expressed any specific concerns. She recommended that this clause be re-located to the section regarding addressing impasse, and to change the language to may, so that it would be an option for the Committee to use if there were consensus to do so rather than a requirement. Mr. Anand commented that this provision has implications for VI.D.2.b. as well, and needs to be considered together, and that he'd like to consult with his constituency on this provision. Ms. Brian added that with this language, it should be clear that any options presented to the Secretary would be part of the public record (which is required by FACA, that documents produced by the committee be shared publicly). Ms. Morse suggested that the language could be incorporated into a preamble rather than a term.

Page 5 Section VII. Committee Meetings.

- VII.B. Ms. Brian encouraged the government to utilize technology such as webcasting and a call-in number posted on the web for the public to observe committee meetings, and/or posting recordings if they are made, and to add language to that effect. Ms. Adamson asked whether attendance could occur by phone. Ms. Suh stated a willingness to do so, recognizing that the government's ability to utilize technology might be limited (for example, the phone lines for this meeting were listen-only). She also encouraged members to introduce themselves when they speak so that observers can better follow, and added that members who participate by phone might be at a disadvantage when trying to speak along with members who are in the room.
- VII.D. A member noted inconsistency with V. page 3, which states that the co-chairs will assist with agendas.

Page 6, VII. Committee Meetings and VIII. Committee Member Responsibilities

- VII.G.2. Ms. Brian suggested that while it is not a FACA requirement, in the interest of transparency any subcommittees should make information about their meetings, such as agendas and notes of the meetings, publicly available. Other members (Anand, Carlson, Gould) stated that this would be incorporated as part of full committee meetings when the subcommittee reports out, so it could be encouraged but not required, and include the list of attendees, but should not be burdensome for the subcommittee while it conducts its work.

Page 7, VIII. Committee Member Responsibilities

United States Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
Multi-Stakeholder Group Advisory Committee
Minutes of the February 13, 2013 Meeting

- VIII.E. Several members expressed strong concerns about this term, wanting to ensure that they can still interact with traditional and social media to communicate with the public. Ms. Suh stated the need to have one spokesperson for the committee to avoid inconsistent messages, similar to how the Interior Department often needs to have one voice for its disparate bureaus. Mr. Gould suggested clarifying that this term would apply only to media requests for official information about Committee business or seeking comment or statements on behalf of the Committee.

Page 8, VIII (IX). Sectoral Responsibilities and IX. (X.) Committee Duration and Termination

- The numbering is incorrect, and these sections should be renumbered.
- VIII.A. Ms. Morse recommended that the U.S. government have the same responsibility as the first one listed for both industry and civil society, and Ms. Suh agreed.
- VIII.A.3. Ms. Adamson asked about tribal consultation that had been conducted to date, and she and Mr. Conrad requested that Interior provide a briefing with further information.
- VIII.B.3. Mr. Anand flagged that industry may wish to review further so that compliance with a disclosure requirement is based in U.S. law.
- IX. The two/three year typo needs correction.

An additional request and reminder was made for members to submit their biographical information for a member directory, which will be made public. If members do not wish their information to be made public, they should notify Interior staff. Also, if members wish to voluntarily post for the public additional information regarding their organizations, financial disclosures, conflicts of interest or limitations, etc. they may do so.

Ms. Suh adjourned the committee for a break, and asked the sectors during the break to discuss amongst themselves whether they could adopt the proposed timeframe, and to identify three members from each of their sectors to serve on a subcommittee.

Summary: USEITI 2013 Timeline and Implementation & Multi-Stakeholder Group Procedures

Ms. Suh reconvened the committee, asking the sectors to respond to the aforementioned requests:

- Timeline. Mr. Romig stated that the Civil Society Sector supported the efforts of the government to date and the goals stated in the timeline, but would prefer to defer approval of the timeline until the next meeting. Mr. Anand and Mr. Flannigan said that the Industry Sector supports the proposed timeline, with the understanding it can be changed later as needed, and Mr. Gould said the same for Government, as long as Interior can provide the initial information that was discussed. Ms. Suh proposed that in the interim, to keep the process moving forward, the subcommittee will proceed with its work toward obtaining and preparing information needed for the candidacy application, and the members agreed.
- Subcommittee. Ms. Kohler from the Industry Sector asked whether meetings would be conducted via teleconference or in person, whether more than three people per sector could be included on the subcommittee, and whether other members or technical experts could participate. After further discussion, the committee agreed to establish the subcommittee with three members per sector for parity and functionality, with the expectation that the subcommittee members will engage with their sectors and with technical experts as needed. And they agreed that the subcommittee could meet via teleconference, and conduct some in person meetings if feasible and funding were available to support travel for out-of-town subcommittee members. The sectors nominated, and the committee named, the following individuals to serve on the subcommittee:
 - Civil Society: Danielle Brian, Project on Government Oversight; Paul Bugala, Calvert Investments; Deborah Rogers, Energy Policy Forum
 - Government: Curtis Carlson, Treasury Dept; Marti Flacks, State Dept; Greg Gould, Interior Dept
 - Industry: Susan Ginsberg, Independent Petroleum Association of America; Veronika Kohler, National Mining Association; Walt Retzsch, American Petroleum Institute

United States Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
Multi-Stakeholder Group Advisory Committee
Minutes of the February 13, 2013 Meeting

- Terms of Reference. Interior will revise the terms of reference based on the input in the meeting and circulate the revised draft to the committee. Members will provide feedback to Interior on the revised draft, preferably consolidated feedback by sector so that there will be fewer comments to reconcile. Interior will re-circulate a draft with all of the feedback for consideration by the committee, and possible approval, at the next meeting.

Opportunity for Public Comment

Ms. Suh opened the floor for members of the public to provide brief remarks. *(Note: No written comments were received prior to the meeting. Also, while members of the public in the room were able to speak, those listening via phone were not able to do so, due to technology limitations.)*

Ms. Isabel Munilla from Publish What You Pay, congratulated the committee on progress made thus far, and commended the Department of the Interior and Department of State on the same. She asked whether the U.S. Government has plans to attend the EITI Global Conference in Sydney in May, and inquired as to whether the government has sufficient resources to implement EITI and if there would be a possibility to bring back the Consensus Building Institute as a facilitator. A State Department official responded with brief information about the Global Conference, and said that there would be an opportunity to have a booth or exhibit, and that committee members were welcome to participate in supporting such a booth. She said that Mr. Bob Cekuta, will be there as the U.S. Board Member, but that no other decisions had yet been made regarding attendance. Regarding resources for the committee, Ms. Suh stated that resources are always constrained and that we would be moving into a period where that could be even more the case, with heightened uncertainty about resources. She mentioned that we have relied thus far on a lot of in-kind support of existing staff, especially from the Office of Natural Resources Revenue (ONRR). That said, she expressed confidence that some amount of resources for supporting EITI would be secure. With regard to a facilitator, Ms. Suh added that the Consensus Building Institute had been very helpful with the USEITI process to date, in getting our structure in place and launching the program, and she welcomed feedback on whether it would be useful to have a facilitator going forward. Ms. Munilla responded that it would be helpful to have a facilitator conduct committee meetings so that the government can more actively participate, and to provide administrative and logistical support.

Ms. Betsy Taylor, from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, and Committee alternate, asked how the proposed new rules currently under review by the EITI Board would apply to the U.S. candidacy application process. A State Department official responded that we did not yet know what the timeline would be for adopting or implementing the new rules, that we would know more after the EITI Board meeting in Oslo at the end of February. She gave her personal view that the rules might be adopted in May, and that given the new rules would need to be implemented by the U.S. and other countries at some point, it would be helpful for this committee to begin addressing them now as they work on the candidacy application.

Wrap-up, Conclusion and Next Steps

Ms. Suh thanked the committee for their energy and effort over a long day. Interior staff will reach out regarding members' availability for an April meeting. Some agenda items might include issues discussed today, such as wrapping up the terms of reference and considering whether and how to participate in the EITI Global Conference in May. The sectors should each identify co-chairs from among their primary members to begin working with their sectors and the chair on the administrative and logistical aspects of the committee. Until then, Interior will try to provide more opportunity for the sectors to provide input into agendas and to circulate materials as early as possible to allow members time to prepare. Interior also welcomes comments and suggestions on the process as we go along, to make this a joint effort as much as possible. When there are decisions needed by the Committee, they will be flagged in advance so that members have adequate opportunity to caucus within sectors beforehand.

**United States Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
Multi-Stakeholder Group Advisory Committee
Minutes of the February 13, 2013 Meeting**

TIME AND LOCATION

Time: 9:30am - 4:30 pm, Wednesday, February 13, 2013

Location: U.S. Department of the Interior, Room 5160, 1849 C Street NW; Washington, DC 20240

ATTENDANCE

Chaired by Rhea Suh, Assistant Secretary, Policy, Management and Budget, and Designated Federal Officer for the USEITI Advisory Committee, U.S. Department of the Interior

Participating Committee Members

Civil Society

Rebecca Adamson, First Peoples Worldwide
James Boettner, West Virginia Center on Budget and Policy
Danielle Brian, Project on Government Oversight
Paul Bugala, Calvert Investments
Rebecca Morse, Revenue Watch Institute (on behalf of Michael Ross)
Deborah Rogers, Energy Policy Forum
Keith Romig, United Steelworkers
Veronica Slajer, North Star Group

Government

Mitch Baer, Office of Oil and Gas Policy, Energy Department
Curtis Carlson, Office of Tax Policy, Treasury Department
Greg Conrad, Interstate Mining Compact Commission
Greg Gould, Office of Natural Resources Revenue, Interior Department
Mike Smith, Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission

Industry

Manpreet Anand, Chevron Corporation
Phillip Edward Denning, Shell Oil Company
Michael John Flannigan, Peabody Energy
Susan Ginsberg, Independent Petroleum Association of America
Veronika Kohler, National Mining Association
Robert Reynolds, BP America
Brent Roper, Rio Tinto
Bob Wilkinson, Conoco Phillips (on behalf of Jim Roman)

Committee Alternates in Attendance

Civil Society

Richard Fineberg, Research Associates (by phone)
David Goldwyn, Goldwyn Global Strategies LLC
Laurie Sherman, Transparency International
Betsy Taylor, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Industry

United States Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
Multi-Stakeholder Group Advisory Committee
Minutes of the February 13, 2013 Meeting

John Harrington, Exxon Mobil Corporation
Amanda Lawson, Walter Energy Inc.
Walt Retzsch, American Petroleum Institute

Government and Members of the Public in Attendance

Kathy Benedetto, House Natural Resources Committee
Michael Brown, Barrick Gold
Neil Brown, Goldwyn Strategies
Nancy Brysan, Holland & Hart
Rosita Compton Christian, Interior Department
Shirley Conway, Interior Department
Lisa Ellman, Office of Science and Technology Policy, White House
Marti Flacks, State Department
Norma Garza, World Bank
Cory Gill, Goldwyn Strategies
Jennifer Goldblatt, Interior Department
Anita Gonzales-Evans, Interior Department
Mary Beth Goodman, National Security Staff, White House
Surya Gunasekara, American Petroleum Institute
Nicolas Gutierrez, Interior Department
Jennifer Heindl, Interior Department
Emily Kennedy, American Petroleum Institute
Susan Lang, Interior Department
Kathy Mayo
Chris Mentasti, Interior Department
Ruby Minor, Interior Department
Aaron Mintzes, Earthworks Action
Isabel Munilla, Publish What You Pay
Clare Murphy, State Department
Paul Mussenden, Interior Department
Allison Nyholm, TCH Group
Kim Oliver, Interior Department
Chris Phalen
Terri Reeves, Interior Department
Jeremy Richardson, UCS
Karen Senhadji, Interior Department
Samantha Spiece, Interior Department
Jon Swedin, Interior Department
Katie Sweeney
Suzanne Swink, BP America
Margaret Triebisch, Interior Department
Aldric Ulep, Interior Department
Lane Wenger, Interior Department
Matt Williams, Interior Department
James Witkop, Interior Department

**United States Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
Multi-Stakeholder Group Advisory Committee
Minutes of the February 13, 2013 Meeting**

DOCUMENTS DISTRIBUTED
(See attached and www.doi.gov/eiti/faca):

- Agenda
- Charter of USEITI Multi-Stakeholder Group
- Draft 2013 Timeline—Schedule of Meetings and Actions to be Undertaken
- Draft Terms of Reference

**United States Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
Multi-Stakeholder Group Advisory Committee
Minutes of the February 13, 2013 Meeting**

CERTIFICATION

I certify that the above minutes are an accurate summary of the February 13, 2013, U.S. Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (USEITI) proceedings. The minutes may be released to USEITI members and made available for public inspection.



Date 5/1/2013

Rhea S. Suh
Chairperson and Designated Federal Officer
U.S. Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
Multi-Stakeholder Group
U.S. Department of the Interior