

CMSI Consultation Response

Respondent Details

NAME

Joel Zandvliet

COUNTRY

Canada

PERMISSION

Yes, CMSI can disclose my feedback, name, and organisation.

STAKEHOLDER

Academia

ORGANISATION

Queen's University

COMMENTS & QUESTIONS BY DOCUMENT

Document:
Governance

QUESTION 1

The governance principles that guided the development of the governance model are inclusive, effective, credible, impact-driven, pragmatic and efficient. From your perspective, does the proposed governance model meet expectations for consistency with these principles?

Response: 4: Exceeds expectations

QUESTION 2

Does the proposed governance model ensure no single group is able to unduly influence decisions?

Response: yes

Document:
Assurance

QUESTION 1

From your perspective, does the Assurance process meet your expectations of a robust, credible, replicable and transparent approach?

Response: 3: Meets expectations

Document:
Standard

Performance Area 12: Stakeholder Engagement

SECTION: 12.1 Stakeholder Identification and Engagement

COMMENT:

The current approach to Stakeholder Identification and Engagement lacks specificity, particularly when addressing diverse groups such as Indigenous and non-Indigenous stakeholders. Indigenous stakeholders, for

instance, cannot be grouped together with others in a one-size-fits-all stakeholder analysis, as their values, rights, and concerns differ significantly. However, there appears to be a generalized framework that attempts to categorize all stakeholders into the same “box,” failing to account for these distinct perspectives. Additionally, the foundational practice of simply stating that companies should “communicate meaningful information and provide materials to stakeholders and rights-holders in a timely manner and in ways that are accessible, understandable, and culturally appropriate” is overly broad. This blanket statement does not outline any concrete, actionable steps that companies can follow, making it difficult to ensure meaningful and effective stakeholder engagement.

Performance Area 9: Safe, Healthy and Respectful Workplaces

COMMENT:

Leading practice is a complete independent review at defined intervals to confirm that controls are in place and working effectively but these should be basic principles in any operation. I also found the documentation to lack on some meaningful examples of leading practices for training in Behavior and Culture. In order to make the document more accessible to policy makers within a company, the standards should provide specific examples of what “embedded commitment” looks like in practice, such as visible policies, regular meetings focused on safety, or employee recognition programs.

In addition, I feel that the “good practice” category is too diluted and much more of these standards could be allocated to either foundational practice or leading practice. For example, the good practice in Monitoring, Performance and Reporting says “Record zero fatalities in the reporting year.” In my opinion, this should be fundamental practice.

For the foundational practices for Psychological Safety and Respectful Workplaces, the standards should expand on what “existing mechanisms” are and what ones are already implemented, as this could vary greatly between facilities. For example, at my

work placement, there were open door policies with bosses among all employees and there were multiple mental health initiatives to both boost mental health and increase mental health awareness. This ties in nicely with the opportunity to introduce a Feedback Mechanism. A feedback mechanism can be used to introduce a medium for workers to provide feedback on the policies and suggest improvements, fostering a more inclusive environment. Some feedback mechanisms used at my place of employment were anonymous.

QUESTION 1

Does the scope, content, and narrative style of the consolidated standard meet your individual expectations and the collective industry expectation for responsible production practices?

Response: 3: Meets expectations

QUESTION 2

Do the requirements meet your expectations for being sufficiently clear to support consistent and practical implementation and to achieve necessary performance improvement?

Response: 3: Meets expectations

QUESTION 3

From your perspective, does the three-level performance structure (Foundational, Good, Leading) of the Consolidated Standard meet your expectations for providing an effective on ramp and clear articulation of good practice and effective path to continuous improvement?

Response: 3: Meets expectations

QUESTION 1

We would value perspectives on a few additional questions related to threshold of performance associated with achievement claims. Please click here/ see page 11 of Reporting and Claims Policy.

Response: No Response