

# CMSI Consultation Response

## Respondent Details

NAME

Mora Johnson

COUNTRY

Canada

PERMISSION

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

STAKEHOLDER

Other Standard Setting Body: Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights

ORGANISATION

Voluntary Principles Initiative (Multi-stakeholder initiative)

## 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: unsure

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 11: Security Management

SECTION: 11.1 Security Management, Foundational Practice, 1

COMMENT:

*Foundational Practice level 1 reads: "Publicly commit to implementing the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights (VPSHR) and to not support, either directly or indirectly, non-state armed groups, or security forces who illegally control mine sites."*

The VPI is very supportive of including these public commitments, however, we believe that as currently drafted, there might be some conflation or confusion between the two sets of public commitments. The first commitment (VPSHR implementation) is a positive set of requirements to assess, prevent and mitigate human rights risks; however, the second set of commitments is a prohibition against supporting illegal armed groups and illegal control of mine sites (from the OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas). They are fundamentally different types of requirements for different purposes.

The Voluntary Principles Initiative recommends a simple amendment to better separate these two very distinct requirements; either:

- Separate them into two separate commitments under the Foundational Practice, numbers 1 & 2; or
- Within Foundational Practice 1, separate the commitments through formatting and punctuation, for example:

Publicly commit to: i) implementing the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights (VPSHR) and ii) to not support, either directly or indirectly, non-state armed groups, or security forces who illegally control mine sites.

---

SECTION: 11.1 Security Management, Leading Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Requirement “Communicate to local stakeholders the standards and conduct to which the Facility’s security personnel are expected to conform” is currently listed as a Leading Practice, the highest level.

However, the Voluntary Principles Initiative believes that current best practice on security and human rights would put this requirement as a Foundational Practice or at least a Good Practice, and formulate the requirement to include consultation of communities as well.

VPSHR, Part II, paragraph 1 reads: 1. “Companies should consult regularly with host governments and local communities about the impact of their security arrangements on those communities.”

The Implementation Guidance Tools, leading guidance tool on implementation of the VPSHR, includes Stakeholder Engagement as its first module, opening with the statement “Stakeholder Engagement often serves as the foundation for effective VPs implementation.”

Stakeholder engagement has emerged as a central practice of effective VPSHR implementation through the understanding that the impacts of company and public security arrangements on communities can be very significant, particularly if contextual risks are high (e.g. a very complex operating environment) or if security risks are high (e.g. security providers are armed with lethal weapons, there are open waste rock dumps that attract artisanal miners, etc). The human rights risks at stake related to the provision of security can be very severe, including right to life.

Therefore, we would recommend the addition of language which conveys the importance of consultation, such as (additions in red): “Consult with stakeholders regarding the impact of security arrangements on local communities, and communicate to local stakeholders the standards and conduct to which the Facility’s security personnel are expected to conform.”

Summary Recommendation: Relocate the stakeholder engagement requirement to the section on Foundational Practice and add wording to encompass consultation with stakeholders, such as “Consult with stakeholders regarding the impact of security arrangements on local communities, and...”

---

COMMENT:

Created in 2000, the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights (VPSHR) is an internationally leading set of principles that guide companies on how to conduct their security operations while ensuring respect for human rights. It was developed to address issues in the extractive sector (energy and mining industries), however, today is it implemented by many sectors, in over 150 countries. The Voluntary Principles Initiative (VPI)

*is a multi-stakeholder initiative in which governments, companies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and Observers promote the implementation of the VPSHR, as well as develop and disseminate best practices on security and human rights.*

*The Voluntary Principles Initiative applauds the consolidated standard for including a specific performance area on Security Management.*

*We recommend two changes: one important recommendation regarding stakeholder engagement; and a more minor drafting suggestion regarding the formulation of public commitments.*

---

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: 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

N/A