

CMSI Consultation Response

Respondent Details

NAME

Shahrzad Manoochehri

COUNTRY

Switzerland

PERMISSION

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

STAKEHOLDER

Non-governmental organisation (NGO) / civil society organization (CSO)

ORGANISATION

World Resources Forum Association

COMMENTS & QUESTIONS BY DOCUMENT

Document:
Governance

1. What is the vision?

COMMENT:

*Comment related to this statement "The Copper Mark will transition and evolve to become the Legal Entity":
While this approach is an effective and efficient way to establish and scale up the process, having an industry-led organization as the Legal Entity may raise concerns about the inclusivity and independence of the standard body.*

11. How would the initial Board be established?

COMMENT:

Comment related to the selection of 4 Mining Stakeholders, 4 Value Chain Stakeholders, and 4 Value Chain Company Directors (fourth bullet point on page 10):

The basis for the selection process is not clearly defined. To ensure inclusivity and transparency, a set of criteria should be established to guide the selection. Additionally, to promote accountability and public trust, the criteria should be made publicly available, allowing stakeholders to understand the rationale behind the selection decisions.

COMMENT:

Two comment related to the selection of Mining Company Director (5th bullet point on page 10):

1) In addition to the criteria mentioned in the document, it would be beneficial to consider other relevant factors for the selection of companies, such as their ESG performance. 2) The rationale for allowing Mining Company

Directors to be nominated exclusively by the ICMM, MAC, and WGC, without requiring approval from the Independent Chair, the SAG, or the IAG, is unclear and lacks justification. Including these independent bodies in the approval process would enhance accountability and balance, ensuring that nominations reflect a broader and more impartial perspective.

6. What will the composition of the Board look like?

COMMENT:

Comment related to the bullet point on "4 Directors from value chain stakeholders": To enhance clarity and inclusivity, it would be beneficial to include "intergovernmental" or "supranational" organizations in the list of potential members of this group of Board of Directors. This group could represent interests and address issues that span multiple countries or pertain to areas not clearly covered by national regulations or international agreements, such as ocean governance. Additionally, for NGOs, it is essential to specify the inclusion of "independent" NGOs to ensure balanced and impartial representation.

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

QUESTION 2

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

Response: unsure

Document:
Assurance

QUESTION 1

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

Response: No Response

Document:
Standard

Introduction

COMMENT:

According to the ISEAL Code of Good Practice, at the outset of a standard's development or revision, the standard developer should seek alignment and complementarity with other standards that have overlapping scopes. They should also identify and evaluate opportunities to enhance such alignment. While alignment is a core objective of CMS for the four involved partners, and the draft standard includes a clause on "Equivalency with other standards," it does not specify how alignment and synergies with other relevant independent standards and/or international conventions were addressed during the standard development process.

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: No Response

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: No Response

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: No Response

Document:
Claims

3. Types of Reporting & Claims

COMMENT:

The definitions and distinctions between various claims could be confusing. More specifically, issuing a “participant claim” may lead to public misunderstanding or even perceptions of “greenwashing”, as the public might interpret this claim as evidence of performance achievement.

COMMENT:

It is unclear why accredited assurance providers are not permitted to use the Consolidated Standard or other metal mark logos to indicate their accreditation. This approach differs from ISO certifications, where the market allows accredited assurance providers to issue claims on behalf of their clients to demonstrate compliance with the standards.

Disclaimer

COMMENT:

General comment: Large-scale mining operations in developing countries may find the proposed approach, with a centralized third-party assurer for claims, to be suitable. However, this raises questions about its accessibility and relevance for local mining operations and SMEs. How well would the CMS accommodate the unique challenges faced by these smaller or national mining activities, particularly given their budgetary and expertise constraints?

COMMENT:

General comment: While the stepwise approach to reporting and claims (Participant Claim, Assured Claim, and Performance Claim, along with the associated thresholds for achieving the Good Practice level) may incentivize companies to adopt the standard early and progressively, the definitions and distinctions outlined in the document could be unclear or potentially misleading to the public.

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