

CMSI Consultation Response

Respondent Details

NAME

Tania Bossi

COUNTRY

Germany

PERMISSION

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

STAKEHOLDER

Industry / trade organisation

ORGANISATION

International Platinum Group Metals Association

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: 3: Meets expectations

The careful selection of the value chain representatives will be key to ensure the broader acceptance of the standard, especially by NGOs

QUESTION 2

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

Response: unsure

Document:
Assurance

3. Who Can Conduct External Assurance?

COMMENT:

The selection of regional auditors with adequate cultural background and experience in the country will be key to assure smooth, cost-effective and on-time audits.

E.g. in South Africa, there is lack of auditors already now which makes it very difficult for mining companies to ensure good planning of audits.

4. Consolidated Standard External Assurance Process

COMMENT:

It will be essential to ensure low-level entry communications that are reflective of the common comms channels used in the respective country and by the respective facilities.

IRMA has been very creative in ensuring that communities are engaged, be it by using posters, WhatsApp or other social media that employees and community members are familiar with to reach a bigger audience. Auditors should also not only be reactive recipients of feedback but actively visit communities and other stakeholders to engage in a dialogue.

QUESTION 1

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

Response: 3: Meets expectations

The Assurance Process (auditing) should be open to all potential participants and fully available in all countries and jurisdictions. Equally, the founding members of the standard should facilitate the accreditation of audit companies representing all global regions and different countries, ideally there should be auditors in each country where major mining/production activities take place to ensure awareness of the socio-economic context and experience with the relevant jurisdictions.

This would help to reduce assessment costs, overcome language barriers, and schedule audits on time. The auditing market should be open to potential participants from all regions to avoid cartel agreements/monopol building.

Document:
Standard

Introduction

COMMENT:

Equivalency with other standards as well as cross-recognition with other existing standards should be a key priority in the further development of the CMSI. There is already a very diverse standard landscape, and while the CMSI aims to consolidate the standards of its founding members, it will be key to develop an attractive value proposition for all businesses by reducing the complexity of multiple audits. This is especially true for multi-metal producers.

The standard should seek recognition/harmonization not only with the OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from CAHRA, but also assess recognition by the China Chamber of Commerce of Metals, Minerals and Chemicals Importers and Exporters (CCCMC) Due Diligence Guidelines for Responsible Mineral Supply Chains, as far as these guidelines are based on the OECD Guidance.

Some of our members also asked for a track of compliance with the LME Responsible Sourcing policy through the CMSI.

Question:

How does the CMSI plan to deal with the upcoming amalgamation of the CSRD, EU Taxonomy Regulation and CS3D, into a single regulation, which as recently been initiated by the EU?

COMMENT:

Point 3 of the introduction is a big vague as it does not reference existing standards in the mining landscape. Also, it is not clear how downstream users are involved in the development of the standard.

We believe that even at the current stage of standard development the initiative should interact not only with mining and metalurgical companies and their industry associations, but also with downstream industries that are key users of the products (automotive, batteries etc.) in order to make the CMSI fully recognised by downstream users.

The situation should also be avoided that downstream users select specific standards for specific metals (such as IRMA for PGMs) and other standards for other metals (Copper Mark for copper). For multi-metal producers, this means multiple audits and efforts.

Overarching Glossary

COMMENT:

Realtionships with business partners, sub-contractors...which supply products or services => more precise description than in IRMA; wider than in IRMA

COMMENT:

Business relationship: it is not clear if only direct suppliers are included or the sub-suppliers too?

COMMENT:

Supplier: An entity in the supply chain that supplies products and services that contribute to the Facility's own operations, products and services.

=> more precise description than IRMA; wider than IRMA

Performance Area 5: Human Rights

SECTION: 5.1 Human Rights, Foundational Practice, 2

COMMENT:

5.1.2: Respect the rights of groups or individuals (including human rights defenders) who are working to promote and protect human rights

How are these groups connected to the production site or do they not have to be anyhow connected? There is a risk that human rights activists somewhere in the world exploit this clause without benefiting either employees or any adjacent communities.

Suggestion to replace this by generally respecting the rights of all stakeholders and employees.

Performance Area 9: Safe, Healthy and Respectful Workplaces

SECTION: 9.2 Psychological Safety and Respectful Workplaces, Foundational Practice

COMMENT:

Comment from one of our mine members: all the foundational requirements mentioning psychosocial hazards and risks are difficult to accomplish. Firstly, it is unclear what “psychosocial” means in the context of mining and production, the definition does not provide enough clarity.

Secondly, according to national legislation of several jurisdictions, any work related to human psycholloy should only be carried out with explicit written permission of the person concerned as it is considered integral to medical treatment. It is difficult to envisage how one can obtain consent from thousands of workers and explain the above term to them.

Thirdly, it is not clear how violations could be tracked.

Suggestion: move the psychological hazards and risks to Good or Leading Practice.

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: 3: Meets 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

The four achievement levels of IRMA (assessment of performance -50-75-100) are easier to comprehend as they demand 40 critical requirements to be met AND in addition define the percentage of performance met in the different performance areas.

The suggested CMSI approach might set the bar too high for some operations.

Example 2 is more convincing than example 1, but the difference condition 2 in Example 2 seems to add no further clarity to condition 1. In other words, the second sentence can be omitted.