

CMSI Consultation Response

Respondent Details

NAME

Jarrold Wilson

COUNTRY

Australia

PERMISSION

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

STAKEHOLDER

Supplier / business partner

ORGANISATION

Dynamiq

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

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: 2: Below expectations

As highlighted, independent data gathering in relevant areas would improve assurance outcomes. Many suppliers capture this data via various methods.

Document:
Standard

Performance Area 10: Emergency Preparedness and Response

SECTION: 10.1 Emergency Preparedness and Response Planning, Foundational Practice, 2

COMMENT:

Businesses find it difficult to define what is required capability and without a Globally recognized standard, we see various levels of capability set in a very subjective way. We have set a standard for this, that objectively, via real data, that defines what a pre-positioned capability looks like. This way, business leaders can make better and targeted investment decisions based on their goals & objectives. This data, de-identified, is measured across industry, with over 20 global mining and metals companies in our standard (see - <https://www.operationalresilienceindex.com/>)

SECTION: 10.1 Emergency Preparedness and Response Planning, Foundational Practice, 3

COMMENT:

A response process (standard) is critical here. Our Respond7 process allows the real time measurement, across each step of the crisis response process against a performance standard. This allows leaders to know what good looks like, before a crisis, but to also track performance of both training and actual events. This approach supports continuous improvement over time and provides the ability to measure outcomes and supporting a more predictable performance, regardless of event type, or location.

COMMENT:

In my experience, most organizations take a compliance approach to crisis management and miss many opportunities due to being reactive in nature. Without a standard approach, with objective measures and independent data, it will be difficult for the industry to move beyond the minimum. Educating leaders of the value of operational resilience (crisis management plays a part here, will lift standards and improve overall industry performance for all stakeholders. Until data is collected in a consistent and systematic way, many will hide behind government & regulatory minimums as the proxy for 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: 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: 2: Below 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

Rather than pass / fail, reporting should consider the starting baseline and performance trend over time. Working to be clear on the value, and linking each domain to what it achieves moves any standard from compliance to performance. I support the standardization, but not to a lowest common denominator. Why we want mining companies to act in line with a standard / set of standards, that improves performance and outcomes. Across a number of industries, codes of practice turn into legislation because participants don't see or understand where the value exists.