

## CMSI Explanatory Webinar No.1 – Questions & Answers

This document provides an overview of all the questions posed during the first CMSI Explanatory webinar which took place on 23 October 2024 – at 08:00 BST and 16:00 BST to accommodate all time zones. This document aims to respond to all questions posed during these sessions, and includes those which were responded to live – both verbally or through the ‘chat’ function – and the questions which the CMSI partners ran out of time to answer due to the high volume of questions received.

### AM SESSION

Question	Response provided at the webinar	Additional responses
When is the training planned for assurance providers?	<p>Once we have confidence in the content of the assurance process.</p> <p>We anticipate that the rich feedback from the first public consultation will allow us to adjust the draft assurance process to improve it further. We envision a future where the independent body responsible for managing the standard will produce an outline of what assurance training looks like, ensuring that when the amended version goes through the second public consultation process, the training process can promptly begin once the Standard is launched.</p>	Assurance provider training will be planned following the launch of the consolidated Standard, likely sometime in 2026.
How do you anticipate current users of other standards will approach the Consolidated Mining Standard? Financial institutions particularly have been encouraging of the Partners’ individual efforts in recent years but continue to maintain their own standards. Do you see them aligning with your Initiative?	<p>The initiative aims to simplify the standards landscape. We do not envision a future where there is a single, monopolistic position for one standard- this would not be a healthy future; having a smaller number of well-regarded standards is a good outcome.</p> <p>We have received significant interest from investors and financial institutions but also intergovernmental bodies. We can envision a future where some may define the standard as the expectation for what good looks like for their investments, provision of finance or insurance.</p>	Investors might consider using the consolidated Standard as a way of setting expectations by, for example, indicating to projects or mines that they expect each to obtain certain levels of performance in specific areas, not unlike what the IFC does with its requirements.

<p>What is the best advice you would give to mine sites that are wanting to be assured against CMSI - what is the best step for us in the meantime considering it's a 2-3 year period until CMSI could be in effect.</p>	<p>Our ambitious timeline is working towards having the Standard in place by the start of 2026.</p> <p>For companies interested in and serious about the initiative, the second public consultation draft could be a very good basis for companies to think about the gaps they need to address.</p>	<p>Once finalised, the Standard is expected to be used by existing members of ICMM, World Gold Council and Mining Association of Canada, and participants of The Copper Mark. The four Partners' Boards will each decide how the new Standard will be applied to their respective memberships.</p> <p>Until the consolidated Standard is finalised and launched, the existing partner standards and membership requirements are still in place. Once it is finalised, it is up to each company to determine how quickly they would like to transition to the consolidated Standard, subject to any associated membership requirements.</p>
<p>The concept of foundational, good and leading practice is great. The foundational level will be crucial in moving performance of the full industry. Critical point, will the standard seek to be aligned with the EU battery regulation due diligence guidance? if so, how has this informed/will inform the current draft standard?</p>	<p>The Standard will not translate automatically into full compliance with the EU regulation. However, we are aiming to develop a standard that provides a good foundation to build upon, to ensure full compliance is met.</p> <p>We have been deliberative in seeking to understand what it would take to get to compliance with EU regulation and other standards e.g. OECD Due Diligence. We have a clear sense on how far the consolidated standard will take companies on this journey and what might need to be done supplementally. We will revisit this when the consolidated Standard is more mature following the feedback from the public consultation.</p>	
<p>How are the Secretariat &amp; implementation funded?</p>	<p>We are currently developing a business model. The intent is for the organisation responsible for the consolidated Standard to be financially sustainable through a fee-based model. The model builds on The Copper Mark's existing model.</p>	

<p>What will be the approach for companies that are already certified by organizations such as the Copper Mark? I'm curious to know if there will be an equivalency assessment in place or if there is a different procedure that could help streamline the assurance process and save time.</p>	<p>The intent and spirit of the initiative is to consolidate our existing standards and ensure streamlining. There will therefore be equivalency assessments where it appropriate. It is the expectation that the existing four standards will be retired in favour of this consolidated Standard.</p> <p>The assurance process will feel familiar because it has been founded on The Copper Mark and TSM assurance models. Participants will be expected to transition away from the RRA to the consolidated Standard. The Copper Mark will clearly articulate to existing participants what they need to do at the appropriate time in terms of any supplementarily actions needed to meet the requirements.</p>	
<p>Will this standard be an LME approved Track A standard?</p>	<p>LME is part of Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) and has been closely involved throughout the development of the consolidated Standard and associated documents. LME approval will be sought in due time for the environmental and OHS management system requirements.</p>	<p>The consolidated Standard is not designed to be an OECD-aligned standard. It seeks to recognise and build on the existing OECD-aligned standards, including those recognised by the LME under Track A.</p>
<p>Can the application process be made by facility rather than once by the Company? This would avoid all facilities having to complete self-assessment and assurance processes concurrently</p>	<p>The intention is that it will be on a facility-by-facility basis. A facility will be able to make an application.</p> <p>This is because different assets may be on different stages of the journey to conformance. Each facility will also need to individually go through an assurance process.</p>	

## PM SESSION

Question	Response provided at the webinar	Additional responses provided afterwards due to lack of time during the webinar
<p>How will performance be assessed? Importantly, who/what body, will assess performance ratings? How is CMSI going to ensure affected rights holder perspectives are integrated into that performance assessment?</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The assurance process defines the steps required to provide a credible third-party validation of the status of implementation of the Standard by individual facilities. It covers four stages including planning, execution, reporting, and quality oversight. The assurance process includes a procedure by which potential disputes between the assurance provider and facility can be addressed, as well as a publicly accessible grievance process managed by the Secretariat for citizens to raise concerns with the assurance process and its implementation.</p> <p>In addition, The Secretariat will maintain a list of accredited assurance providers with appropriate qualifications, training, independence and experience. See details of the independent assurance process which requires interviews with stakeholders and rights-holders <a href="#">here</a>.</p>
<p>How does CMSI differ from other voluntary standards developed by organizations like the UN and OECD in terms of practical implementation?</p>	<p>Perhaps one difference is that UN and OECD standards aren't necessarily supported by an assurance framework that rigorously assesses implementation on the ground, which is one of the features of what we are building here (drawing on the experience of Copper Mark and TSM).</p> <p>To avoid re-inventing the wheel, many other existing standards are embedded into the consolidated Standard, for example the UN Guiding Principles on Human Rights, the Voluntary Principles, Cyanide Code, EITI reporting requirements, etc.</p>	<p>The consolidated Standard builds upon the extensive body of work developed by various mining standards to date, drawing not only from the standards of the four Partners, but also from standards such as IFC Performance Standards and others.</p> <p>We believe that it offers value in extending the reach of responsible standards to all commodities, in a way that clearly differentiates between performance levels, supported by a robust assurance process and transparent governance model, that supports strong environmental, social and governance practices along individual metals' value chains.</p>

<p>Is the aim of the Business Model financial sustainability or financial self-sufficiency?</p>	<p>We are absolutely looking for a financially sustainable business-model, but on non-profit basis. Any profits would be reinvested into the organisation. If profits are being made, the fee may need to be adjusted accordingly as the process is not about making profit but about ensuring the integrity of the assurance process.</p> <p><b>Questioner response:</b> Thanks, so participation fees are proposed as the only revenue stream?</p>	<p>Correct – the business model is based predominantly on participation fees. The model builds on the Copper Mark’s existing business model. Other revenue streams, tied to specific services or work areas, may complement participation fees (e.g. training fees or grant income).</p> <p>The entity will operate as a non-for-profit. Driven by economies of scale, the fees will regularly be reviewed as uptake grows.</p>
<p>When will you let companies following the existing standards know that they have to adjust their practice to the new standard?</p>	<p>There will be an orderly transition for each of the four standards to the new standard that will begin once the Standard is launched. It is likely that the transition will be moving through the course of a cycle e.g. if a company assures against TSM in 2026, assurance against the new standard could be in 3 years’ time. Those details are still being worked out and it will be up to the four Partner organisations to manage the transition as the standard is finalised. More information will come on proposed transition plans in due course.</p> <p>Additionally, there will be plans in place to transition the verifiers and assurance providers into the new system. The Partners will be following up with the network of existing accredited assurance providers for Copper Mark and TSM to help companies understand how they can become accredited to the new standard. There will be a registry of assurance providers ready.</p>	
<p>Will the board members be selected based on additional criteria such as Governance or Sustainability or Financial oversight competencies?</p>	<p>Those will be important considerations in the selection of Board members as will the need to ensure diversity (broadly defined in terms of gender, areas of focus, geography, etc)</p>	

	<p><b>Questioner response:</b> Thank you. The Board Member selection will be critical. Too often, folks come from one area of focus (law or finance) and "science literacy" combined with Sustainability oversight competencies are often missing.</p>	
<p>Which company/asset is supposed to be assessed? CMSI clearly naming Mining by itself, but how about smelting/refinery, recycling and much downstream sectors? Is there any possibility having 1 seat from smelters?</p>	<p>Currently this is envisioned to cover mines, smelters, and refiners as the assessed entities in scope.</p> <p>The 'Mining Company' representatives will probably include some companies with integrated smelters, but the 'Value chain Company' representatives could include pure-play smelters.</p>	
<p>I want to share this benchmark assessment of the various mining standards as it is a good source for understanding to what degree the various standards meet expectations on integration of e.g. the UNGPs <a href="#">link</a></p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Thank you for sharing this assessment, which the CMSI team is aware of. It is important to recognise that the consolidated Standard was not included in the benchmark (as it was not released for public consultation).</p>
<p>Can you clarify if the focus is on company-wide assurance or project-by-project (and multi-jurisdiction) assurance, or a combination of both?</p>	<p>The assurance is at asset / site level. While the focus is on the asset or project, there are some aspects of the Standard that will be assured at the corporate level as well. For example, the first Performance Area focuses on corporate requirements. There are also other areas like climate change where there are requirements at both the project and the corporate levels.</p>	
<p>Can you make comments about the difference with IRMA and the benefits for companies/sites?</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>At this stage of the process – i.e. during the first of two public consultations – it is premature to comment on the differences with IRMA. The partners envisage comparisons between the Standard and IRMA to be carried out once we are closer to its finalisation.</p>

<p>What will happen to companies that are already certified under a standard? Will the certifications they have obtained become obsolete?</p>	<p>There will be an orderly transition from the existing four standards to allow facilities to transition to the new Standard. Each organization will work out their own transition plan in due course.</p>	
<p>Global NGO groups that have had success in facilitating litigation to ensure remediation for adverse impacts from mining on marginalized communities are absent from the Advisory group. It seems input from these groups would be helpful to ensure gaps in performance expectations are addressed in the consolidated Standard. Is there a reason why they are absent from the Stakeholder group?</p>	<p>We sought to achieve a good balance of representation across a diverse group of interests. We have representatives from different parts of the world including three Indigenous Peoples representatives, community representatives, organisations committed to biodiversity and environmental responsibility as well as value chain representatives. Our intent was to construct a SAG that brought diverse interests and could bring challenging and constructive perspectives to the process. A number of organisations were approached which did not want to join SAG but are watching the process closely and will comment through the public consultation process.</p> <p>We are conducting two fully transparent public consultation processes and welcome, expect and hope for feedback from all stakeholders and rightsholders. We hope to receive feedback from more Indigenous Peoples groups and NGOs in addition to those we have already been engaging with.</p>	
<p>May have missed this - is the plan to have a list of "approved" assurance providers?</p>	<p>Yes, there will be a list of accredited assurance providers for the Standard.</p>	<p>There will be a list of approved assurance providers who meet the required qualifications and have completed the mandatory training for assurance providers. This will be disclosed in due course.</p>
<p>Are mining industry expected to be members, like ICMM? Are they expected to participate if so, and what level of achievement is expected (if required)</p>	<p>No, they are not expected to be members. One of the objectives of the Initiative is to enable access to the Standard for companies which are not currently members of three Partner associations.</p>	<p>The consolidated Standard will be available to any facility regardless of whether they are a member of an industry organisation.</p>

<p>To follow up on the point made above. How was the stakeholder advisory group selected, what steps were taken to ensure its legitimacy?</p>	<p>See response above.</p>	<p>The Stakeholder Advisory Group members and Terms of References have been available on the CMSI website since its launch in April 2024, <a href="#">here</a>. A wide range of stakeholders starting with the four partners' networks, active in this space or already engaged with different voluntary standards, were invited to join the Advisory Group.</p> <p>In some cases, these individuals were previously appointed to represent their stakeholder group in other fora. For example, an Inuit representative from Canada sits on the SAG. She also sits on MAC's TSM Panel, appointed to that panel by the Canadian national Inuit organization (Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami).</p>
<p>What are the stakeholders that represent Indigenous Peoples' Rights and / or labour organizations, and what criteria is or will be used to ensure they represent the appropriate views of their representatives?</p>	<p>See response above.</p>	<p>The individuals on the CMSI Stakeholder Advisory Group have contributed in their individual capacities as experts in their fields. The members of this group and Terms of References have been available on the CMSI website since its launch in April 2024, <a href="#">here</a>.</p> <p>There are 3 Indigenous peoples representatives on the SAG, and 1 labour representative. The 3 Indigenous representatives are respected members of their communities, the labour rep served decades with Unifor, a large Canadian union, and many years on Industriall.</p>
<p>How far does the consolidated Standard go for standards that are specific on matters such as the Cyanide Code for cyanide management?</p>	<p>Where existing reputable, credible standards are in play already, we are not trying to replicate them through this process, but we point to them and require them through the requirements in the consolidated Standard e.g. UN Guiding Principles, Voluntary Principles, EITI reporting, Cyanide Code, etc.</p>	



<p>The draft notes that the four consolidation partners will lead the process for developing criteria and selection of Board members and the Independent Chair. Can you share more about the criteria you are considering and what the process will be for getting multi-stakeholder input (outside of the SAG and IAG) on those important details?</p>	<p>The four Partners will not lead the process for developing criteria and selection of board members and the independent chair. Instead, the Partners will initiate the process by proposing a limited number of criteria that will guide the selection of the independent chair.</p> <p>SAG and IAG will then refine the criteria and agree a short list of criteria, alongside criteria that speak to fiduciary responsibilities with respect to Board participation, etc. Once the criteria are agreed, the Partners will put out an open call for applications. Based on the applications, SAG and IAG will recommend several possible candidates to be the independent chair, from which the four Partners will make the selection. The independent chair will work with SAG and IAG to select the board participants from the stakeholder cohort (mining and value chain side) and the company cohort (with three mining association partners nominating one mining representative each for the inaugural Board). For value chain directives, some will initially be taken up by Copper Mark, but a similar process will be sought to ensure balanced representation.</p>	
<p>(Follow-up question)- Thank you for confirming. My question is how other public input will be considered if at all.</p>	<p>There will be an open call for applications to all interested parties.</p>	
<p>(Follow-up question)- Is an accurate takeaway, then, that there will be no opportunity for public input or public consultation period in the way that you are having for the standard?</p>	<p>There will be an open call for applications to all interested parties.</p>	
<p>How do you apply to become an assurer and what are the associated fees?</p>	<p>Those details will come but we'd like to get through the first consultation first to make sure the assurance process is directionally correct.</p>	

<p>I agree with that this this consolidation is a great step in the right direction, thanks for doing this! My question is: why not beyond and include iron ore/steel (e.g. Responsible Steel), bauxite/alumina/aluminium, cobalt, coal and other minerals/metals value chains? Also the RBA's RMI standards? Thank you</p>	<p>The intent is that the standard will feed into existing/other value chain standards. RBA and RMI are represented on SAG and have been closely involved in the development process of the standard.</p>	<p>The consolidated Standard is deliberately designed so that it can be implemented by any mine operator regardless of the commodity, geography or size – while also providing the basis to build bridges to existing systems downstream. The consolidated Standard therefore covers mines, smelters, and refiners.</p> <p>The consolidated Standard will exist as part of the broader ecosystem of voluntary standards. It is envisaged that it will connect to, interlink with, and complement other voluntary standards such as those further downstream, commodity-specific systems or subject matter specific standards.</p>
<p>Back on the Advisory groups. Is the idea is that the advisory groups will be disbanded when the board and committees are established?</p>		<p>Yes, that is correct.</p>
<p>According our understanding, it is supposed that all the reports should be published during the assurance process, the self-assessment report, as well third party assessment reports. Please, can you confirm this?</p>	<p>In the year of an assurance process, the assurance report is the report that will be published. This will include identified gaps to achieve the good practice level of performance where there are gaps. At this time, the facility will publish an improvement plan to address those gaps. In the two years between assurance processes, the self-assessed reports will be published. We invite you to read the full assurance process and provide your feedback.</p>	
<p>Interested in the response to the earlier question about how this standard compares to the IRMA standard.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>At this stage of the process – i.e. during the first of two public consultations – it is premature to comment on the differences with IRMA. The partners envisage comparisons between the Standard and IRMA to be carried out once we are closer to its finalisation.</p>
<p>Are you going to visit South America to also receive feedback from this side of the world? If so, which countries would you visit?</p>	<p>We are not conducting in person consultations but will be present at several events at COP16 in Cali, Colombia amongst other. Please refer to our <a href="#">events page</a> for details</p>	<p>To ensure accessibility to interested stakeholders, the consultation is available online in <a href="#">Arabic</a>, <a href="#">English</a>, <a href="#">French</a>.</p>

	<p>of other upcoming CMSI events. A webinar has been organized for Chilean civil society in Spanish on November 8, for example. If requests for other such consultations are received we will do our best to accommodate.</p>	<p><a href="#"><u>Japanese, Portuguese, Russian, Simplified Chinese and Spanish.</u></a></p>
--	---	--