

CMSI Consultation Response

Respondent Details

NAME

Simone Bailey

COUNTRY

Canada

PERMISSION

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

STAKEHOLDER

Assurance provider/auditor

ORGANISATION

WSP

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: 4: Exceeds expectations

Document:
Standard

Performance Area 18: Water Stewardship

SECTION: 18.1 Water Management and Performance, Foundational Practice, 4

COMMENT:

4. *This feels both too vague and too detailed. Outlining the full requirements, which may change during various stages, seems to be too detailed to me. Unless it is referring to just the general permit/stakeholder expectations, in which case it seems to vague.*

7. *Suggest including reporting to senior management and the corporate team.*

SECTION: 18.1 Water Management and Performance, Good Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Suggest a minimum interval of annually.

SECTION: 18.1 Water Management and Performance, Good Practice, 10

COMMENT:

This seems a bit unclear, is the training for everyone, or just for workers who have water-related roles? Perhaps: "Provide training on water risks and impacts to relevant workers in accordance with their water-related roles and responsibilities as part of orientation, to enable workers to identify and report issues."

SECTION: 18.1 Water Management and Performance, Good Practice, 3

COMMENT:

Suggestion- define beneficial uses (maybe it is defined elsewhere in the standard)

SECTION: 18.1 Water Management and Performance, Good Practice, 8

COMMENT:

I would suggest to specify if these targets are qualitative/quantitative and if they are published or internal targets.

SECTION: 18.1 Water Management and Performance, Good Practice, 9

COMMENT:

establish monitoring frequency

SECTION: 18.1 Water Management and Performance, Leading Practice, 2

COMMENT:

Suggest stating that learnings should be shared internally, with other departments as well as with industry peers and other water users in the catchment.

SECTION: 18.1 Water Management and Performance, Leading Practice, 4

COMMENT:

This seems like a foundational practice not a leading practice

SECTION: 18.2 Collaborative Watershed Management, Foundational Practice, 4

COMMENT:

Ensure water quality is addressed in stakeholder outreach. Often a focus is on quantity.

SECTION: 18.2 Collaborative Watershed Management, Leading Practice

COMMENT:

I leave this as a general comment on this area, but under good or leading practice I would suggest adding in establishing or joining a watershed/catchment water group. It seems like the water group would be a vehicle for the actions listed under leading practices.

SECTION: 18.3 Water Reporting, Foundational Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Is this a qualitative description?

SECTION: 18.3 Water Reporting, Good Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Public disclosure of any quality related targets would be a good practice here as well in my opinion

SECTION: 18.3 Water Reporting, Leading Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Suggest also added in public disclosure of progress against targets

COMMENT:

I think that the leading practices are not very "above and beyond" although I think that the sequencing is good.

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: 4: Exceeds 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: 4: Exceeds expectations

Document:
Claims

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