

CMSI Consultation Response

Respondent Details

NAME

Anonymous

COUNTRY

Netherlands

PERMISSION

Yes, CMSI can disclose my anonymous feedback.

STAKEHOLDER

Industry (midstream/downstream)

ORGANISATION

Anonymous

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: No Response

We have taken notice of the publication from Public Citizen with alleged risks with the proposed CSMI. We do not have the expertise to review the proposed CSMI in detail and therefore cannot agree or disagree with the analysis. However, we do believe that any proposed mining standards should have rightsholders at the center and should come with (some degree of) acceptance by those representing them. We therefore recommend the CSMI to review the critique in detail and provide an adequate response.

QUESTION 2

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

Response: unsure

We have taken notice of the publication from Public Citizen with alleged risks with the proposed CSMI. We do not have the expertise to review the proposed CSMI in detail and therefore cannot agree or disagree with the analysis. However, we do believe that any proposed mining standards should have rightsholders at the center and should come with (some degree of) acceptance by those representing them. We therefore recommend the CSMI to review the critique in detail and provide an adequate response.

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

We have taken notice of the publication from Public Citizen with alleged risks with the proposed CSMI. We do not have the expertise to review the proposed CSMI in detail and therefore cannot agree or disagree with the analysis. However, we do believe that any proposed mining standards should have rightsholders at the center and should come with (some degree of) acceptance by those representing them. We therefore recommend the CSMI to review the critique in detail and provide an adequate response.

Document:
Standard

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

We have taken notice of the publication from Public Citizen with alleged risks with the proposed CSMI. We do not have the expertise to review the proposed CSMI in detail and therefore cannot agree or disagree with the analysis. However, we do believe that any proposed mining standards should have rightsholders at the center and should come with (some degree of) acceptance by those representing them. We therefore recommend the CSMI to review the critique in detail and provide an adequate 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

We have taken notice of the publication from Public Citizen with alleged risks with the proposed CSMI. We do not have the expertise to review the proposed CSMI in detail and therefore cannot agree or disagree with the analysis. However, we do believe that any proposed mining standards should have rightsholders at the center and should come with (some degree of) acceptance by those representing them. We therefore recommend the CSMI to review the critique in detail and provide an adequate 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

We have taken notice of the publication from Public Citizen with alleged risks with the proposed CSMI. We do not have the expertise to review the proposed CSMI in detail and therefore cannot agree or disagree with the analysis. However, we do believe that any proposed mining standards should have rightsholders at the center and should come with (some degree of) acceptance by those representing them. We therefore recommend the CSMI to review the critique in detail and provide an adequate response.

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