Outcomes and impact template

Component A: Requirements 1.5, 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3 on work planning and monitoring, public debate, open data and follow-up on recommendations.

**Period under review:** *What is the period that this template covers?*Month and year to month and year: April 2021-October 2025

*Note: for Validation, it is the day of commencement of the previous Validation which marks the beginning of the period under review until the date of commencement of the upcoming Validation .*This form is submitted for ☐ International Secretariat feedback as part of implementation support   
  
 OR ☒ Validation as part of final submission for assessment

**Introduction**

Regular disclosure of extractive industry data is of little practical use without public awareness, understanding of what the figures mean, and public debate about how resource revenues can be used effectively. The EITI Requirements related to outcomes and impact seek to ensure that stakeholders are engaged in dialogue about natural resource revenue management and that EITI disclosures lead to the fulfilment of the EITI Principles by contributing to wider public debate. It is also vital that lessons learnt during implementation are acted upon, that recommendations from EITI implementations are considered and acted on where appropriate, and that EITI implementation is on a stable, sustainable footing.

**What is the purpose of this template?**

The purpose of this template (A) is for the multi-stakeholder group (MSG) to conduct a self-assessment on meeting the EITI requirements on the component “outcomes and impact” on the efforts to ensure that the EITI has an impact and leads to learning. It covers Requirements 1.5, 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3 of the EITI Standard. Each requirement section contains:

1. A box with additional resources
2. Corrective actions from the previous Validation, where applicable
3. A self-assessment against the technical aspects and underlying objectives of the requirement in questions & response format
4. Comments from the Secretariat

The template includes an optional tool for compiling the recommendations from EITI implementation, the excel form (‘[A Outcomes and impact\_Overview of EITI recommendations (optional](https://extractives.sharepoint.com/:x:/s/Validation/Ebo8ZY2wl_tPm5b1UzyP1u4BTy6NxT8jDYCA4bVVeQhYVg?e=D2lBjf))’) which may be used as alternative to the section in this [word document.](#_heading=h.l07dsd703gki) Ideally this is done in preparation of the work plan, to ensure they are prioritised and reflected in the planning for the coming months. This template does not replace annual review of outcomes and impact. Rather, it allows the MSG to check if the process is robust and serves the objective of ensuring learning and impactful implementation.

For Validation, this template serves as documentation from the MSG about progress on this component.

**When should this template be completed?**

The template should be used as a tool for implementation. MSGs are encouraged to **use this template regularly and ahead of Validation** to monitor outcomes and impact as part of day-to-day EITI implementation. You may ask for feedback from your country lead and indicate that this form is for International Secretariat feedback.

**The templates should be finalised and published by the commencement of Validation.** For Validation, this form serves as basis for assessing the country under this component. The form must be reviewed and [signed off](#_heading=h.sz0v40lcg2cb) by the multi-stakeholder group and submitted latest on the day of the commencement of Validation and be published on the country’s website. At this stage, it should be indicated on the form that the template is submitted for Validation.

**Who should fill in this template?**

The **MSG** should fill this template with support from the national secretariat and guidance from the International Secretariat. Where relevant, inputs could be sought from government agencies and constituency members outside of the MSG. The MSG needs to give a final sign- off on the contents of the template.
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# Requirement 1.5 Work plan, monitoring and review

## Resources

|  |
| --- |
| [Requirement in full](https://eiti.org/eiti-requirements#_5-work-plan-monitoring-and-review--17283), [Validation guide](https://eiti.org/guidance-notes/validation-guide-2023-eiti-standard#requirement-15-work-plan-monitoring-and-review-18954)  Guidance notes:   * [Establishing an EITI work plan](https://eiti.org/guidance-notes/establishing-eiti-work-plan), including [Annexe A: Narrative work plan template (Word)](https://eiti.org/sites/default/files/2022-01/gn_1.5_annexe_a_narrative_work_plan_template.docx) [Annexe B: Activity matrix template (Excel)](https://eiti.org/sites/default/files/2022-01/gn_1.5_annexe_b_activity_matrix_template.xlsx) * [Addressing corruption risks through EITI implementation](https://eiti.org/guidance-notes/addressing-corruption-risks-through-eiti-implementation) * [How to become an EITI implementing country](https://eiti.org/guidance-notes/how-become-eiti-implementing-country) * [Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of EITI implementation](https://eiti.org/documents/monitoring-and-evaluation-me-eiti-implementation) * [Recommendations from EITI reporting](https://eiti.org/guidance-notes/recommendations-eiti-reporting) |

## Corrective actions / recommendations from previous Validation

ⓘ To inform the work on this module, stakeholders should be aware of corrective actions from previous Validation. In line with Requirement 7.3, the MSG should also consider recommendations from EITI implementation such as those arising from EITI reporting related to this requirement or from other studies undertaken.

|  |
| --- |
| *To improve public debate, ZEITI could consider developing summaries of EITI reports focusing on different constituent needs. This could include developing summaries on subnational payments and environmental issues for local communities. Government could also benefit from receiving an overview of the economic contribution from industry and the areas were there may be wide differences in revenue or payment data. Other summarised data could include an overview of and progress on beneficial ownership and contract transparency. .* |

## Self-assessment

ⓘ The self-assessment allows the MSG to understand the aspects of the requirement and estimate its progress towards meeting it. Diverging views within the constituency or between constituencies can be documented in the form.

### Technical requirement

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Required** | **1.5.a. Availability** |
| *Key information on work plans* | **Does the EITI MSG have a work plan covering the current year?**  ☒ Yes ☐ No  If no, explain why not: Click or tap here to enter text.  **When was the latest work plan approved by the MSG?**  **21/11/2024**  **What period does the EITI work plan for EITI implementation cover?**  ☒ 12 months ☐ Multi-year ☐ Combination of both  Optional: add explanation Click or tap here to enter text.  **How often is the work plan reviewed?** Annually |
| **Required** | **1.5.a.i. Objectives** |
| *Linkage to national priorities and key issues* | **Does the work plan reflect and address national priorities?**  ☒ Yes ☐ No  If yes, which ones? Include references to where these national priorities are stated.  Examples include government industry strategy, a multi-year national strategy, a head of government speech or statement.  EITI implementation reflects national priorities for the mining sector. The Government of Zambia envisages major growth in the sector in the coming years. The need for this growth to be underpinned by transparency is reflected in several key policy documents. For example, the [National Three Million Tonnes Strategy](about:blank), which aims to boost copper production to three million years annually by 2031, and the [Critical Minerals Strategy](https://www.mmmd.gov.zm/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/1-National-Critical-Minerals-Strategy-2024-%E2%80%93-2028-Booklet-August-27-2024.pdf), which aims to harness global demand growth for socio-economic development, are in line with the mandate to be transparent and disclose mining sector data for public use.  **Does the work plan reflect any of the following issues?**  Check the ones applicable and insert an explanation on how and where that issue is reflected in the work plan:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Issue** | **How reflected in work plan** | | ☒ Anti-corruption | Dissemination of ZEITI data on contentious matters helps create an environment for anti-corruption. The 2025 work plan has a dedicated section on anti-corruption activities. This includes engagement with the Anti-Corruption Commission to serve as a member of the Zambia EITI Council and activities to identify and document corruption risks in extractive sector governance. | | ☒ Gender equity | ZEITI has emphasized gender mainstreaming in its work plan. ZEITI requests the disaggregation of data by gender in all relevant disclosures, including employment data. The work plan also encourages MSG members to take into account gender balance in membership renewal. | | ☒ Energy transition | The ZEITI workplan advances energy transition related disclosures and dialogue in various ways. Following recent national developments such as drought and pollution, the Secretariat included in its work plan data collection and dissemination of greenhouse gas emissions data, the management of the Environmental Protection Fund and EIA reports. ZEITI has also been advancing transparency on Power Supply agreements in the mining sector and engaged more broadly on energy transition policies and associated opportunities and risks. | | ☒ Revenue collection | Through disclosures on the Website and portal covered under dissemination.The Zambia data portal has ensured timely disclosures of company payments with innovations including the disclosure of the g-factor in relation to company payments to government. | | ☒ Artisanal and small-scale mining | ZEITI has promoted disclosure of ASM data through disclosures on the Portal. The development of the portal was part of the ZEC plans in the period under review. | | Other issues of national relevance: (add more rows if necessary) Add | Beyond the issues outlined above, the ZEITI work plan includes activities on MSG governance, capacity building, corrective actions, budget management, annual report production, data mainstreaming, beneficial ownership disclosure and visibility and impact. |   **Are any of the objectives or outcomes in the work plan the result of consultation with key stakeholders of the MSG?**  Constituencies can refer to documentation in forms for stakeholder engagement: government (form B1), companies (form B2) and civil society (form B3) on consultation with wider constituencies.  ☒ Yes ☐ No  If yes, which ones and by whom? Explain  Work plan development is informed by follow up on recommendations from previous EITI reports. For example, the decision made at the MSG meeting in 2023 resolved to fund and establish the ZEITI online portal to improve public disclosure to real time reporting instead of the original annual reports. The objectives of the workplan are an outcome of the collective consultation of MSG and EITI stakeholders in Zambia. |
| **Required** | **1.5.a.ii. Measurable and time-bound activities** |
| *Activities* | While it is not expected that all recommendations from reporting, recommendations and corrective actions are reflected in the work plan, the MSG should ensure that the prioritised items (see next section 1.5.a.iii) are followed up upon. This means that the prioritised items are reflected as activities in the work plan to achieve progress.  **Are the work plan activities measurable, meaning they have measurable outputs that contribute to achieve the agreed objectives and outcomes, as well as recommendations from Validation and reporting?**  ☒ Yes ☐ No  The work plan has a section to guide monitoring of activities. This indicates the key deliverables associated with each activities, enabling the monitoring of progress.  **Are the work plan activities time-bound, meaning that they have a start and end date?**  ☒ Yes ☐ No  The work plan includes timelines for each activity.  **Monitoring framework**  Columns N-R provide the work plan’s monitoring framework. <https://zambiaeiti.org/workplans/>  As part of the guidance note on Requirement 1.5 the International Secretariat provides a template for formulating and monitoring activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts which the MSG may wish to consider in its design of the work plan. |
| **Required** | **#1.5.a.iii Prioritisation** |
| *Prioritised requirements* | **Does the work plan include a justification of which EITI Requirements are prioritised?**  ☒ Yes ☐ No  The work plan prioritises implementation of specific EITI Requirements. Notably, activity 3 covers gender mainstreaming, including documenting women’s employment (Requirement 6.3), activity 4 covers environmental issues (Requirement 6.4), activity 9 covers beneficial ownership (Requirement 2.5) and activity 10 covers energy transition policies, commitments and plans (Requirement 2.1), among other activities advancing EITI requirements.  **Does the work plan include a description of which activities in the work plan contribute to fulfilling each requirement, including those that are deprioritised?** ☐ Yes ☒ No |
| **Required** | **#1.5.a.iv work plan costing** |
| *Fully costed and funded work plan* | **Does the work plan include a fully costed budget?**  ☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No  **Does the work plan budget include the sources of funding?**  ☒ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No  **Optional: For the current work plan, what percentage is funded by government?** Percentage: 100  **Optional: What are other sources of funding?** List:  **Chamber of Mines, GRZ, Various Stakeholders** |
| **Required** | **#1.5.b. Availability of annual progress review** |
| *Key information* | **Did the MSG undertake an annual review of progress of the previous work plan?**  ☒ Yes ☐ No  If no, explain why not:  **When was the latest annual review of progress approved by the MSG?**  **21/11/2024**  **What period does the progress review cover?**  ☒ 12 months ☐ Multi-year ☐ Combination of both  Other:  Some MSG may undertake reviews more frequently than annually, such as quarterly.  Optional: add explanation |
| **Required** | **#1.5.b. Elements of annual progress review** |
| *Review of progress and changes*  *1.5.b.i* | **Does the annual progress review include a reflection on progress and challenges in achieving work plan objectives?**  ☒ Yes ☐ No  **Does it highlight changes in those objectives?**  ☒ Yes ☐ No  **Does it highlight how implementation will be adapted to better achieve those objectives?**  ☒ Yes ☐ No  The progress review describes challenges and adjustments made in planning and implementation to address those challenges. This included mapping out priority activities, in-person trainings with reporting entities on how to populate templates and engagement with MSG members to reach out to constituency members over non-compliance issues. |
| *Documentation of activities, outcomes*  *1.5.b.ii* | **Does the annual progress review include a brief overview of activities and outcomes achieved through EITI implementation?**  ☒ Yes ☐ No  Section 3 of the annual progress review provides an assessment of performance against targets and activities in the work plan. It provides an overview of activities and describes the status of completion.  Overview of activities can be a stock take of the work plan and provided as annexe to an annual progress review. Outcomes are usually documented in a narrative form, reflecting if the outputs of those activities have achieved the expected outcomes, or not (yet). |
| *Mechanism for stakeholder feedback*  *1.5.b.iii* | **Is there a mechanism for stakeholders in and outside the MSG to provide feedback on progress on achieving the objectives of implementation?**  ☒ Yes ☐ No  Part II of the progress review describes the methodology for consultation and soliciting stakeholder feedback. This included the civil constituency holding meetings ahead of quarterly MSG meetings. More broadly, MSG members hold constituency meetings with organisations outside the MSG as a feedback mechanism and share outcomes with the MSG.  **Were the stakeholder views documented in the annual progress review?**  ☐ Yes ☒No  If yes, include the references to where the documented stakeholder views can be found in the annual review of progress: |
| *Gender and inclusiveness*  *1.5.b.iv* | **In its annual review, did the MSG take** **gender considerations into account?**  ☒ Yes ☐ No  The progress review notes that the MSG has encouraged its members to nominate female representatives to the MSG. In the latest year under review, ZCCM-IH nominated a female employee to serve on the Zambia EITI Council.  **In its annual review, did the MSG take** **inclusiveness into account?** Inclusiveness can refer to sectoral diversity, such asindigenous people, marginalised communities, differently abled, linguistic diversity.  ☒ Yes ☐No  If yes, briefly describe how or where that is documented: In the MSG minutes. |
| **Required** | **#1.5.b.v. Expense report** |
| *Financial accountability* | **Does the annual review of progress include a report on actual expenses compared to the work plan budget?**  ☒ Yes ☐ No  Both the progress review and work plan compare the budget versus actual expenses. This is captured in Section 1 of the progress review and columns J and K of the work plan.  **Optional:** For the current latest expense report, what percentage of the work plan was actually funded by the government? Percentage:  **100** |
| *Per diems* | **If the EITI provides renumeration of MSG members, is the amount of annual renumeration clearly listed in the expense report?**  ☐ Yes ☒ No  Elaborate (optional): Only If MSG meetings are held outside of a members town. |
| **Required** | **#1.5.c. Consultations with national stakeholders and public availability** |
| *Broader consultation work plan and monitoring* | **Were national stakeholders consulted in the elaboration of the work plan?**  ☒ Yes ☐No  Members of the MSG and various partners had a chance to review the work plan and give feedback, including through ZEC meetings.  Examples include development partners, anti-corruption agencies, wider constituencies of government, companies and civil society.  For how and where, examples include workshops with wider stakeholders, surveys sent beyond MSG members, consultations during national or local conferences, outreach events.  If applicable, provide examples on how issues from the wider stakeholders were considered in the work plan: Examples: |
| *Broader consultation on achievement of objectives* | **Where key stakeholders asked for feedback as part of the annual progress review?**  ☒ Yes ☐No  Stakeholders provided feedback through ZEC meetings and various stakeholder engagements, including separate engagements organized by constituencies, where members were are asked to give feedback on matters arising in the report.  **Where stakeholder views documented?**  ☒ Yes ☐No  If yes, include examples on who those were documented and references to where the documented stakeholder views can be found in the annual review of progress: Examples ZEC minutes and workshop reports. |
| *Public availability* | **Can the work plan be publicly accessed?**  ☒ Yes ☐ No  <https://zambiaeiti.org/workplans/>  **Can the annual review of progress be publicly accessed?**  ☒ Yes ☐ No  If yes, provide the <https://zambiaeiti.org/annual-progress-reports/> |
| **Encouraged** | **#1.5.d. Measurement, evaluation and learning (MEL) framework** |
| *MEL framework* | **Did the MSG undertake any efforts to link the work plan to a monitoring framework, evaluating if activities improved extractive sector governance in policy and practice?**  ☒ Yes ☐ No  If yes, provide information on what those efforts were and where the result of those efforts (the measurement, evaluation and learning (MEL) framework and any measurement, progress reviews can be accessed: Columns N to R of the work plan provide the monitoring framework. |
| **Encouraged** | **#1.5.e. Addressing known corruption cases** |
| *Relevance* | **Are there any publicly known corruption cases in the sector that are of national relevance for the year in review?**  This includes corruption cases that occurred in the past but that are relevant in the public debate in the year(s) under review.  ☒ Yes ☐ No  If yes, which one(s)? Elaborate The Solwezi property rate and business fees resources abused. |
| *If relevant* | **Has the MSG provided a narrative of any of these cases?**  ☒ Yes ☐ No  If yes, where can that narrative be accessed? Click or tap here to enter text.  **Did the MSG issue a statement or response of the MSG regarding any of the corruption cases?**  ☐ Yes ☒ No  If yes, where can that statement / those statements be accessed? Click or tap here to enter text.  **Did the MSG issue any recommendations?**  ☐ Yes ☒ No  If yes, where can those recommendations be accessed? Explain |

### Underlying objective of Requirement 1.5

*The objective of this requirement is to establish a consultative work planning and monitoring cycle that ensures the relevance and accountability of EITI implementation to national stakeholders, helping the EITI to achieve relevant outcomes and impacts.*

1. Have there been any significant developments in the years under review in the economic or political context that have had an impact on the extractives sector or public financial management?

Examples include new political leadership, discoveries of new reserves or deposits, adoption of policies that impact the extractives sector, new company entrants, stalling extractives projects, corruption cases in the sector, opening of new pipeline, loss of control over territory with extractives activities, bilateral or multilateral funding agreements that are backed by future oil, gas or mineral revenues, global shifts in demand, rapid development of illegal mining activities, creation of state-owned enterprises, adoption of new legislation, constitution or regulation with relevance to the extractives sector governance?

|  |
| --- |
| ☒ Yes ☐No  *The drought of 2023 created an energy crisis due to Zambia’s reliance on hydropower, negatively impacting both households and industry. These developments brought about a desire to diversify Zambia’s energy mix and ensure more reliable power. This prompted the creation of Power Purchase Agreements and Power Supply Agreements, including contracts signed between ZESCO and mining companies for the supply of electricity.* |

1. Did these developments (see question 1) influence the MSG’s formulation of objectives and work plan?

|  |
| --- |
| ☒ Yes ☐No  *Explain your answer: Yes the MSG requested ZESCO and mining companies to disclose power agreements, as well as emissions data. The motivation is to ensure transparency in these agreements to ensure they are balanced and well governed.* |

1. Have there been any changes in funding for EITI implementation that may have an impact on the execution of the work plan and the achievement of progress towards the objectives of EITI implementation? How is the MSG addressing those?

This can be both a reduction or increase in funding

|  |
| --- |
| ☐ Yes ☒No  *Elaborate how changes in funding are affecting implementation.*  *Elaborate how the MSG is addressing any (potential) changes in funding.* |

1. Do MSG members think that the work plan is a result of their priorities?

|  |
| --- |
| ☒ Yes ☐No  *Explain. Stakeholder views may differ.* |

1. What is the MSG’s overall assessment on progress on the following:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. implementation of work plan activities: The implementation of work plan activities is very good and is evidenced by some of the policy announcements by the Government that reflect ZEITI’s priority areas such as local content, beneficial ownership and disclosure of Power Supply Agreements on the Zambia EITI Data Portal. 2. addressing corrective actions: Satisfactory as some of the corrective actions from previous validations have been implemented. 3. addressing recommendations from implementation: Explain Satisfactory |

1. Is the work plan used as a tool to obtain funding by clearly outlining the strategic alignment of the EITI with national and sectoral priorities and follow-up from recommendations and corrective actions?

|  |
| --- |
| ☒ Yes ☐No  *The work plan reflects the key principles of the EITI and key stakeholders views and aspirations. It forms the basis for securing funding for EITI implementation.* |

1. Is the work plan used a tool to prepare MSG meetings and for assuring commitments are followed up on?

|  |
| --- |
| ☒ Yes ☐No  *Explain. The Secretariat has to present to the MSG quarterly reports on activities from the work plan that have been implemented with quantifiable outcomes.* |

1. Is the review of progress presented to local and national stakeholders?

|  |
| --- |
| ☒ Yes ☐No  *Explain. Yes, during dissemination exercises* |

1. Does the review of progress include any evidence of achievement of impact in the year under review, such as legal reforms or changes in practice?

|  |
| --- |
| ☒ Yes ☐No  *The progress review highlights impacts of EITI implementation across years, including contributions to policy and legislative changes. This includes the introduction of beneficial ownership information in the Companies Registration Act of 2017, the introduction of the Statutory Instrument on Local Content that has been included in the Citizens Economic Empowerment Commission, as well as the enactment of the Minerals Regulation Commission Act of 2024.* |

1. Do the monitoring and progress reporting support the MSG’s deliberations in updating the work plan and its objectives? Does that process allow the EITI to remain relevant to the country context?

|  |
| --- |
| ☒ Yes ☐No  *Zambia’s implementation of the EITI undergoes quarterly review through the MSG meeting and as such the workplan and objectives for the following year are reviewed and renewed allowing for the EITI process to remain relevant to the country.* |

1. Does the work plan, monitoring or review of progress include any innovative aspects that go beyond the EITI Standard?

|  |
| --- |
| ☒ Yes ☐No  *ZEITI goes beyond the EITI Standard in several ways:*   * *Efforts to disclose power sector help to ensure the initiative’s relevance to a pressing governance challenge in the mining sector.* * *Disclosure of information on the “g-factor”- i.e., the government’s economic take from the mining sector – helps to frame revenue disclosures in a manner that is easier for citizens to understand and better suited to informing policy responses.* * *Plans to disclose local content information further helps to ensure ZEITI’s relevance to national priorities for the mining sector.* |

1. Any further comments

|  |
| --- |
| *Add if wished.* |

### Conclusion

Based on the above, what is the MSG’s self-assessment towards fulfilling both the [objective](#_heading=h.9leawvpbasow) and [technical requirements](#_heading=h.48znouw47vm9) of [Requirement](#_heading=h.bs8pu2i24fsm) 1.5 ?

Score is

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |  | ☐ |
| Very poor (0) | Poor (25) | Limited (50) | Good (70) | Very good (90) | Leading (100) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Or**

☐ not applicable

|  |
| --- |
| Explanation |

## International Secretariat feedback

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *To be filled in by the International Secretariat*  *Observations of comprehensiveness of addressing the aspects, any gaps identified and further clarification needed.*   |  |  | | --- | --- | | 1.5.a. Availability of work plan  *Required* |  | | 1.5.a.i. Objectives  *Required* |  | | 1.5.a.ii. Measurable and time-bound activities  *Required* |  | | 1.5.a.iii Prioritisation  *Required* |  | | 1.5.a.iv work plan costing  *Required* |  | | 1.5.b. Availability of annual progress review  *Required* |  | | 1.5.b.i Review of progress and changes  *Required* |  | | 1.5.b.ii Documentation of activities and outcomes  *Required* |  | | 1.5.b.iii Mechanism for stakeholder feedback  *Required* |  | | 1.5.b.iv Gender and inclusiveness  *Required* |  | | 1.5.b.v Expense report  *Required* |  | | 1.5.c. Consultations with national stakeholders and public availability  *Required* |  | | 1.5.d. Measurement, evaluation and learning (MEL) framework  *Encouraged* |  | | 1.5.e. Addressing known corruption cases  *Encouraged* |  | | Underlying objective of 1.5 |  | | Any other observations |  | |

# Requirement 7.1: Public debate

## Resources

|  |
| --- |
| [Requirement in full](https://eiti.org/eiti-requirements#_1-public-debate--17335), [Validation guide](https://eiti.org/guidance-notes/validation-guide-2023-eiti-standard#requirement-71-public-debate-18956)  Related guidance: [Talking Matters](https://eiti.org/documents/talking-matters), [Gender-responsive EITI implementation](https://eiti.org/guidance-notes/gender-responsive-eiti-implementation) |

## Corrective actions / recommendations from previous Validation

ⓘ To inform the work on this module, stakeholders should be aware of corrective actions from previous Validation. In line with Requirement 7.3, the MSG should also consider recommendations from EITI implementation such as those arising from EITI reporting related to this requirement or from other studies undertaken.

|  |
| --- |
| *Insert recommendation and or corrective action from previous Validation, if applicable. If this is a first Validation, this section can be left blank.* |

## Self-assessment

ⓘ The self-assessment allows the MSG to understand the aspects of the requirement and estimate its progress towards meeting it. Diverging views within the constituency or between constituencies can be documented in the form.

### Technical requirements

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Required** | **7.1.a****Efforts to provide comprehensible information** |
| *Key audiences* | **Has the MSG identified key audiences for communicating disclosures from the EITI process?**  ☒ Yes ☐No  Explain: Key audiences include MSG stakeholders, mining communities, relevant government ministries and agencies beyond those participating in the MSG, and members of the general public with an interest in mining sector governance.  **Did the MSG ensure that government and company disclosures, as well as EITI diagnostic and analysis are tailored to any of the following audiences?**  Check the ones applicable and add an explanation how they were considered:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Key audience** | **Examples of tailoring communications to that audience** | | ☒ Government | Example: Feedback on various issues raised by stakeholder and providing data based information. | | ☒ Parliamentarians | Example: Data based discussions on matters of interest and appearing before the Committee on National Economy, Trade and Labour matters. | | ☒ Civil society | Example: Data based dialogue on issues affecting various constituents, including mining communities. ZEITI also participates in domestic and regional conferences organised by various CSOs. | | ☒ Companies | Example: ZEITI provides a neutral platform that encourages data based dialogue discussions with other stakeholders. ZEITI was invited to participate in the AZMEC AGM. | | ☒ Media | Example: media provides coverage of all ZEITI public engagements; media articles and reports showcase ZEITI innovations, e.g. [G-Factor](https://www.miningweekly.com/article/well-done-zambia-on-your-transparent-g-factor-mining-revenue-system-2025-06-13), ZEITI Social media networks. | | Other key audiences (add more rows as needed)  Click or tap here to enter text. | Example |  |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | |
| **Required** | **7.1.b. Accessible information** |
| *Distribution efforts*  *7.b.i* | **Has the MSG undertaken any efforts to ensure that the information published in EITI products is widely accessible and distributed?**  ☒ Yes ☐No  Explain, including examples of those efforts: *The creation of the Zambia EITI data portal makes data available for all anywhere in the world. Likewise the revamping of the ZEITI website has greatly enhanced accessibility of ZEITI information, including EITI reports, work plans and annual progress reports.* |
| *Accessible language and access needs*  *7.b.ii* | **Has the MSG undertaken any efforts to ensure that the information published in EITI products and through systematic disclosure are written in a comprehensible, accessible style?**  ☒ Yes ☐No  Explain, including examples of those efforts: *The ZEITI portal provides a simple, visual overview of key extractive sector data. The ZEITI website presents information on the EITI in simple and concise language.*  **What are the languages of key audiences in your country?**  List key languages of your country, including any minority languages from communities affected by extractive industries operations. **English, Bemba, Chewa, Tonga, Luvale, Kaonde, and Lozi.**  **Has the MSG undertaken any efforts to ensure that the information published in EITI products and through systematic disclosure is published in appropriate languages?**  ☒ Yes ☐No  Explain, including what languages have been considered and examples of those efforts: **English is the official language in Zambia. EITI products are therefore published in English.**  **Has the MSG considered access challenges and information needs of different genders and subgroups of citizens?**  ☒ Yes ☐No  Explain, including examples of those efforts: **The ZEITI portal and website ensure easy access to EITI data in comprehensible formats.** |
| *Outreach events*  *7.b.iii* | **Building on EITI disclosures (both data and diagnostic), have outreach events (whether organised by government, civil society or companies) been undertaken to spread awareness of, and facilitate dialogue about, governance of extractive resources?**  ☒ Yes ☐No  Explain, including examples of outreach events: ZEITI staff have **attended national and regional events to advance dialogue on extractives governance issues. Engagements have included Mining Indaba (Cape Town), ZIMIC, CAMINEX, Trade Fair, DRC Mining Week, AFROSAI-E Extractive Industries Workshop, the Lufwanyama District Indaba, Zambia Alternative Mining Indaba, the Open Government Program, Africa Public Service Day and the Energy for Growth Hub retreat in Ghana. These engagements have given the Secretariat an opportunity to engage in dialogue with partners and stakeholders and raise awareness of ZEITI’s work.**  ⓘ You may also include a reference to the section in the stakeholder engagement forms B1, B2 and B3 that list examples of outreach by individual constituencies |
| **Encouraged** | **7.1.c Further efforts to inform public debate** |
| *Summary reports*  *7.1.c.i* | **Did the MSG produce brief summary reports, with clear and balanced analysis of the information, ensuring that the data sources and authorship are clearly stated**?  ☒ Yes ☐No  Explain, including how to access examples of such summary reports: ZEITI publishes a weekly Minerals Commodities Dashboard that summarises weekly commodity prices that Zambia Trades in. |
| *Thematic reports*  *7.1.c.ii* | **Did the MSG produce thematic reports on specific areas of extractive sector management?**  ☐ Yes ☒No  If yes, which ones? Please include the links to the reports if they are available online: |
| *Disclosing data beyond the EITI Requirements*  *7.1.c.iii* | **Did the MSG use EITI implementation to disclose data beyond the EITI Requirements that would enhance public debate on extractive sector governance?**  ☒ Yes ☐No  If yes, does the data relate to any of the following issues?   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Purpose of data** | **Type of data and place of disclosure** | | ☒ Identify corruption risks | The Secretariat participated in a National Risk Assessment to assess the country’s risk profile to anti- money laundering and terrorism financing with a particular focus on anti-corruption and fighting environmental crimes. | | ☒ Promoting gender equity | The disaggregation of data disclosures and the specific requirement to have gender information broken down further than required in the standard. Also encouraging the ZEC MSG constituencies to ensure that the nominated should include women who hold decision making positions. | | ☒ Impact of the energy transition | The request for disclosures of Power Supply Agreements from ZESCO underscores the adaption of the Secretariat to quickly identify risk areas and provide clear insight of the prevailing situation, ensuring relevance to emerging governance challenges. | | ☒ Strengthening revenue collection | The request to have revenue disclosures broken down further than the required standard.  The adoption and use of revenue sharing tools such as the G-Factor has enhanced transparency in this section. | | ☒ Artisanal and small-scale mining | The reporting and disclosure of ASM licenses and production figures as well as the ASM formalization process. | | Other issues of national relevance, as defined by the MSG: (add more rows if necessary) Specify | Specify | |
| *Summarising and comparing revenues*  *7.1.c.iv* | **Has the MSG summarised and compared the share of each revenue stream to the total amount of revenue that accrues to each respective level of government?**  ☒ Yes ☐No  If yes, provide the title of publication and where to access: The ZEITI Reports provide this information and are available on the ZEITI website. |
| *Capacity building efforts*  *7.1.c.v* | **Has the MSG undertaken capacity-building efforts in the period under review?**  ☒ Yes ☐No  Explain. Capacity building for CSO-MSG members on the new EITI requirements.  **Is the MSG aware if the capacity building led to an improved understanding of the information and data from the reports and online disclosures?**  ☒ Yes ☐No  Explain and provide any evidence:  **Is the MSG aware if the capacity building has led to an increase in the use of the information by citizens, the media and others?**  ☒ Yes ☐No  Explain and provide any evidence: |

### Underlying objective

*The objective of this requirement is to enable evidence-based public debate on extractive industry governance – including on corruption risks, energy transition, gender and revenue collection – through active communication of relevant data to key stakeholders in ways that are accessible and reflect stakeholders’ needs.*

1. Has the EITI’s outreach and communications efforts targeted specific issues of public debate?

|  |
| --- |
| ☒ Yes ☐No  If yes, which ones? Provide links to examples: ZEITI has held various outreach programs with sub-nationals to disclose payments received from mining companies. The Solwezi dissemination in 2023 brought to light revenue misappropriation by the local authorities. |

1. Are there any topics that are particularly sensitive in the national context, or challenging to understand where the EITI has managed to provide factual data and improved public understanding?

|  |
| --- |
| ☒ Yes ☐No  If yes, which ones? Provide links to examples: The disclosure of information on the G-factor helps to clarify the total contributions each company makes to the government. This format for disclosing data allows citizens to get a more comprehensive view of the relative economic role of different companies, which the disclosure of data on individual revenue flows does not shed light on. Further, the disclosures of Power Supply Agreements helps to shed light on an emerging governance challenge related both to the government’s ambitions to expand mining production and the country’s energy transition goals. |

1. Has MSG sought feedback from key audiences on the accessibility and style? For example, if the EITI Report is too technical and hard to understand?

|  |
| --- |
| ☒ Yes ☐No  If yes, what has been the feedback? How has this been addressed? The MSG acknowledged the issues raised by stakeholders and proceeded to create an online portal for easy accessibility. |

1. Has MSG considered tailoring EITI disclosures to communities, by providing information on project level that take place in their region, and comparing those to total revenues?

|  |
| --- |
| ☒ Yes ☐No  Explain During dissemination, disclosures are tailored to the particular community in which the dissemination exercise is taking place. These are compared to the total revenues paid during the period covered by the report. |

1. Has the MSG tried out new communications channels or formats in the period under review, to tailor to the needs of key audiences or to respond to shifts in sharing and accessing information?

|  |
| --- |
| ☒ Yes ☐No  The ZEITI Secretariat has relied on LinkedIn as an addition to social media channels and the news letters. |

1. Is the MSG aware of any tangible impacts that the outreach efforts have had on changing behaviour or inspiring reform?

|  |
| --- |
| ☒ Yes ☐No  *One of the most tangible results is that,through town hall meetings, more local authorities are now revealing data and information on locally generated revenue.* |

1. Describe examples of use of EITI data.

|  |
| --- |
| *Document instances of use of EITI data in various formats, whether from MSG members or any stakeholders. You may wish to reference existing documentation (for example an annual review of progress and impact)*  *Examples of types of EITI data use include:*   * *Print and broadcast media coverage of stories referencing EITI data* * *Research and analytical studies drawing on EITI data* * *Advocacy and lobbying notes referencing EITI data* * *Parliamentary submissions or proceedings drawing on EITI data* * *Provide links to supporting evidence where available.* [*https://www.facebook.com/share/p/1NHfMQeBQX/*](https://www.facebook.com/share/p/1NHfMQeBQX/) * [*https://www.facebook.com/share/p/1CaFULhpAu/*](https://www.facebook.com/share/p/1CaFULhpAu/) * [*https://www.facebook.com/share/p/17EXaXibPT/*](https://www.facebook.com/share/p/17EXaXibPT/) * Anecdotal evidence can also be recorded, for instance in the following way: *[This person / group ] has used [type of data in the scope of EITI disclosures] to do [what the data was used for / what problem did it solve.]* |

1. Are there any innovations in the outreach and communications efforts the MSG wishes to highlight?

|  |
| --- |
| Optional |

### Conclusion

Based on the above, what is the MSG’s self-assessment towards fulfilling both the [objective](#_heading=h.oo2thpbdo0u4) and [technical requirements](#_heading=h.48znouw47vm9) of 7.1. ?

**Score is**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |  | ☐ |
| Very poor (0) | Poor (25) | Limited (50) | Good (70) | Very good (90) | Leading (100) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Or**

☐ not applicable

|  |
| --- |
| Explanation |

## International Secretariat feedback

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *To be filled in by the International Secretariat*  *Observations of comprehensiveness of addressing the aspects, any gaps identified and further clarification needed.*   |  |  | | --- | --- | | 7.1.a. Comprehensible information  *required* |  | | 7.1.b. Accessible information  *required* |  | | 7.1.c Further efforts to inform public debate  *encouraged* |  | | Underlying objective of 7.1 |  | | Any other observations |  | |

# Requirement 7.2: Data accessibility and open data

## Resources

|  |
| --- |
| [Requirement in full](https://eiti.org/eiti-requirements#_2-company-engagement--17280), [Validation guide](https://eiti.org/guidance-notes/validation-guide-2023-eiti-standard#requirement-12-company-engagement-18965), Related guidance: [EITI Summary Data Template](https://eiti.org/guidance-notes/eiti-summary-data-template), [Open data policies and disclosures](https://eiti.org/guidance-notes/open-data-policies-and-disclosures), [open data in EITI implementation](https://eiti.org/documents/eiti-open-data-policy#open-data-in-eiti-implementation-15832) |

## Corrective actions / recommendations from previous Validation

ⓘ To inform the work on this module, stakeholders should be aware of corrective actions from previous Validation. In line with Requirement 7.3, the MSG should also consider recommendations from EITI implementation such as those arising from EITI reporting related to this requirement or from other studies undertaken.

|  |
| --- |
| *Insert recommendation and or corrective action from previous Validation and indicate the status of addressing the corrective actions, if applicable. If this is a first Validation, this section can be left blank.* |

## Self-assessment

ⓘ The self-assessment allows the MSG to understand the aspects of the requirement and estimate its progress towards meeting it. Diverging views within the constituency or between constituencies can be documented in the form.

### Technical requirements

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Required** | **7.2.a.** |
| *Open data policy*  *7.2.a.i* | **Has the implementing country agreed a policy on the access, release and reuse of data published as part of EITI implementation?** The policy can be on the government level, if the government has adopted an open data policy, or have been agreed by the MSG.  ☒ Yes ☐No  Provide the title of the policy and how to access the open data policy: The MSG has agreed to rely on the EITI data Accessibility and Open data policy. |
| *Open data publication*  *7.2.a.ii* | **Has your country made the data, which is required to be public as per the EITI requirements, available in open format?** At a minimum, the data of all tables, charts from EITI Reports and thematic reports must be available in CSV or Excel format.  ☒ Yes ☐No  The ZEITI portal allows for allow applicable data to be downloaded as image, Excel or CSV file.  **Has its availability been publicised?**  ☒ Yes ☐No  Explain. The data is available on the ZEITI portal, website and also disseminated through stakeholder engagements. |
| *Summary data submission*  *7.2.a.iii* | **Has the summary data file for each fiscal year covered by the EITI been submitted to the International Secretariat, in accordance with the** [**template**](https://eiti.org/guidance-notes/eiti-summary-data-template)**?**  ☒ Yes ☐No  The latest summary data file was submitted to the International Secretariat on 23 June 2025. |
| **Expected** | **7.2.a.i** |
| *Publication under open license 7.1.a.i* | **Have government agencies and companies in practice published the data published as part of the EITI requirements under a re-use or modify license[[1]](#footnote-1)?**  ☒ Yes ☐No  Provide examples: The Ministry of Mines released a statistical bulletin using some of ZEITI’s data.  **Have they made users aware that the information can be reused without prior consent?**  ☒ Yes ☐No  **If not, has the MSG discussed this expectation?**  ☐ Yes ☐No  Provide reference to MSG meeting minutes or other documentation that demonstrates this expectation having been discussed: |
| **Encouraged** | **7.2.b. Machine readable data** |
|  | **Are any EITI disclosures published in an open format, according to a specified data standard or using metadata to describe what is in the open datasets?[[2]](#footnote-2)**  ☒ Yes ☐No  Provide evidence: all data disclosed through the ZEITI portal is disclosed in a machine-readable format which is in CSV and Excel format. |

### Underlying objective

*The objective of this requirement is to enable the broader use and analysis of information on the extractive industries, through the publication of information in open data and interoperable formats.*

1. Is the MSG aware if open data sets from EITI implementation are being used for analysis?

|  |
| --- |
| ☒ Yes ☐No  Provide examples or refer to existing overview: The Zambia Revenue Authority and Ministry of Mines do use EITI data for their various forms of analysis. E. g. G-Factor data. |

1. Is there better appreciation of publication of data through open and inter-operable formats as a result of EITI implementation?

|  |
| --- |
| ☒ Yes ☐No  Elaborate |

1. Have any activities been undertaken to strengthen the capacity of stakeholders to use data sets that are published as part of EITI implementation?

|  |
| --- |
| ☒ Yes ☐No  Provide examples or refer to existing overview: **During various stakeholder engagements the ZEITI has encouraged and showcased the data portal and its use.** |

1. Any other aspects the MSG wishes to highlight on open data disclosures?

|  |
| --- |
| Elaborate |

### Conclusion

Based on the above, what is the company’s self-assessment towards fulfilling both the [objective](#_heading=h.vcy2fuu2kwl9) and [technical requirements](#_heading=h.q8yurrjdn7j9) 7.2 ?

Score is:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |  | ☐ |
| Very poor (0) | Poor (25) | Limited (50) | Good (70) | Very good (90) | Leading (100) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Or**

☐ not applicable

|  |
| --- |
| Explain |

## International Secretariat feedback

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *To be filled in by the International Secretariat*  *Observations of comprehensiveness of addressing the aspects, any gaps identified and further clarification needed.*   |  |  | | --- | --- | | 7.2.a.i. Open data policy  *Required* |  | | 7.2.a.ii Open data publication  *Required* |  | | 7.2.a.iii. Submission of summary data  *Required* |  | | 7.1.a.i Publication under open license  *Expected* |  | | 7.2.b. Machine readable data  *Encouraged* |  | | Underlying objective of 7.2 |  | | Any other observations |  | |

# Requirement 7.3: Follow-up on recommendations

## Resources

|  |
| --- |
| [Requirement in full](https://eiti.org/eiti-requirements#_3-recommendations-from-eiti-implementation--17337), [Validation guide](https://eiti.org/guidance-notes/validation-guide-2023-eiti-standard#requirement-73-recommendations-from-eiti-implementation--18960)  Related guidance: [Recommendations from EITI reporting](https://eiti.org/guidance-notes/recommendations-eiti-reporting) |

## Corrective actions / recommendations from previous Validation

ⓘ To inform the work on this module, stakeholders should be aware of corrective actions from previous Validation. In line with Requirement 7.3, the MSG should also consider recommendations from EITI implementation such as those arising from EITI reporting related to this requirement or from other studies undertaken.

|  |
| --- |
| *To strengthen EITI implementation, the ZEC may wish to further improve public access to open data. Additionally, ZEC is encouraged to ensure that any additional efforts to consider marginalised groups by accommodating different languages, ages, genders or others, is actively documented and published to ensure added accessibility by all interested stakeholders, including for Zambia EITI publications* |

## Compilation of all current recommendations and corrective actions from EITI reporting, Validation and any study that was commissioned as part of EITI implementation

ⓘ The International Secretariat may support countries in preparing the first three columns and the compilation should include all recommendations from EITI implementation from the period under review. The purpose of this compilation is to make all MSG members aware of the number and nature of recommendations that result from implementation and to support their prioritisation efforts. If such a compilation already exists, it suffices to submit it with this form.

This overview is also available in Excel format (‘An Outcomes and impact Overview of EITI recommendations (optional)’) and could be part of work planning, monitoring and reviewing process. It can be continuously updated to ensure that there is prioritisation of what recommendations should be followed up on, and that the recommendations are adequately translated into action through the work plan.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Nr | Recommendation | Source of recommendation | Priority level | Responsible entity | Followed up through | Status  (action completed, ongoing/no action/ not adopted by MSG) | If applicable: related EITI Requirement and other comments |
| 1 | Example: Recommendation that contracts should be published | 2021 Oil and gas report, p. 69 | High | Ministry of Oil | Work plan, activity 4. To be decided in MSG meeting on 23.7.2025 | ongoing |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Self-assessment

ⓘ The self-assessment allows the MSG to understand the aspects of the requirement and estimate its progress towards meeting it. Diverging views within the constituency or between constituencies can be documented in the form.

Recommendations from EITI implementation include, and are not limited to:

* Recommendations from EITI reporting or Reports
* Recommendations from studies commissioned by the MSG
* Recommendations from Validation
* Corrective actions from Validation

### Technical requirements

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Required** | **7.3 Follow up on recommendations from EITI implementation** |
| **Does the MSG have an understanding of all findings and recommendations from EITI implementation?**  ☒ Yes ☐ No  Describe :  **Has the MSG gone through the findings and recommendations from EITI implementation and prioritised the ones it wishes to follow-up on?**  ☒ Yes ☐ No  Describe how and where that prioritised list is reflected, MSG meeting minutes where such decision-making is documented:  **Who typically provides an overview of the status of recommendations from EITI reporting?**  Explain:  **Did the MSG decide what recommendations and findings from studies that it commissioned should be pursued, and which not? (Respond if applicable)**  ☐ Yes ☐ No  Explain:  **When prioritising recommendations, did the MSG consider**:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | **Yes** | **No** | | a. national priorities | ☒ | ☐ | | b. EITI’s strategic priorities (anti-corruption, DRM, energy transition) | ☒ | ☐ | | c. international commitments (OGP, treaties, other global standards | ☒ | ☐ | | d. current developments in the sector | ☒ | ☐ |   **Does the MSG have a mechanism to follow up on recommendations, information gaps and discrepancies?**  ⓘ A mechanism means that the MSG has a process to continuously take stock, prioritise and monitor the follow-up on findings and recommendations on a continuous basis. Hence an annual stock take of previous recommendations from the EITI Report through the IA as part of EITI reporting does not constitute such a mechanism.  ☒ Yes ☐ No  Describe how that mechanism works: Through constructive analysis of outcomes and public feedback. | |

### Underlying objective

*The objective of this requirement is to ensure that EITI implementation is a continuous learning process that contributes to policymaking, by ensuring that the multi-stakeholder group regularly considers findings and recommendations from the EITI process and acts on those recommendations it deems are priorities (see Requirement 1.5).*

Has follow-up from findings and recommendations led to changes in reporting, policy-making and/or changes in practice?

|  |
| --- |
| ☒ Yes ☐No  Provide examples or refer to existing overview |

### Conclusion

Based on the above, what is the company’s self-assessment towards fulfilling both the [objective](#_heading=h.3djpfkucf4gt) and [technical requirements of 7.3](#_heading=h.r0daa8dnr2p)?

Score is:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |  | ☐ | ☐ |
| very poor (0) | poor (25) | limited (50) | good (70) | very good (90) | leading (100) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Or**

☐ not applicable

|  |
| --- |
| Explain |

## International Secretariat feedback

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *To be filled in by the International Secretariat*  *Observations of comprehensiveness of addressing the aspects, any gaps identified, and further clarification needed.*   |  |  | | --- | --- | | On the compilation of findings and recommendations |  | | 7.3.a Follow-up  *required* |  | | Underlying objective of 7.3 |  | | Any other observations |  | |

# For Validation: Sign-off

Please include below the names and contact details of the constituency leads who submit this information on behalf of their constituency. Alternatively, the Chair can sign off on behalf of the MSG. Add rows as needed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **On behalf of** | **Email address or telephone number** |
|  | Government |  |
|  | Companies |  |
|  | Civil society |  |

**Date of sign-off**

Click or tap to enter a date.

\*\*\* Form ends

1. An open data policy should specifically describe the conditions under which the public can use the data that it publishes. By doing so, it gives users the right or permission to use it for analysis, for example. Licences are how you as a reporting entity explicitly give someone else permission to use the data you publish in open format. The [EITI open data policy](https://eiti.org/documents/eiti-open-data-policy) (art 9.f) recommends [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.en) which allows the public to share and transform the data for any purpose, while requiring the user to give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made.

   To help you choose the right license, please find a <https://chooser-beta.creativecommons.org/> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Tagging data with labels and structuring data according to a data standard allows people who want to use it navigate it more easily, as it describes what the data is and organises it in a way that is familiar to users. It also allows the data to work with other data sets (‘be interoperable’). Find more information in the guidance note: <https://eiti.org/guidance-notes/open-data-policies-and-disclosures> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)