

CMSI Consultation Response

Respondent Details

NAME

Elise Milroy

COUNTRY

Australia

PERMISSION

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

STAKEHOLDER

Other: Consultancy

ORGANISATION

Pillar Two

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

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

General comment on Performance Area

COMMENT:

We have focused on the human rights focused elements of the Performance Areas. There is an opportunity for greater consistency and harmonisation across the Performance Areas from a human rights perspective. For example, the Performance Area on the rights of workers and the Performance Area on a safe, healthy, and

respectful workplace have significant overlap. Each Performance Area could benefit from the same overall structure, even if the details are different. For example, they could include a human rights-related statement of policy commitment, due diligence process, and a remediation component in line with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs). There is inconsistency between human rights-related Performance Areas where some have identifying and assessing human rights-related risks as a foundational practice and others classify identifying and assessing human rights-related risks as good practice. Consider strengthening the requirement for meaningful rights-holder engagement throughout each Performance Area, which is a foundational requirement under the UNGPs. Consider incorporating into PA10, 11 and elsewhere, a requirement to identify, assess, and address risks arising from conflict or high-risk contexts.

Overarching Glossary

COMMENT:

To align with our suggestions below, consider defining the term “salient human right risks”: “human rights that are at risk of the most severe negative impact(s) through the company’s activities and business relationships. These are risks to people that are most severe and most likely to occur”.

SECTION: Overarching Glossary

COMMENT:

“Business relationship”: Suggest making the definition clearer and aligning more directly with the UNGPs by incorporating the language of “include relationships with business partners, entities in [the Facility’s] value chain, and any other non-State or State entity directly linked to its business operations, products or services”.

Performance Area 11: Security Management

SECTION: 11.1 Security Management, Foundational Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Consider broadening to “...or security forces who have a negative track record on respecting human rights” since a security force may legally be involved with the mining facility but nevertheless have a history of negative human rights impacts.

SECTION: 11.1 Security Management, Good Practice, 4

COMMENT:

Consider if being “directly linked” to an impact is also relevant here. While companies are not required to participate in remediation for those impacts to which they are directly linked under the UNGPs, they may do so.

Performance Area 12: Stakeholder Engagement

SECTION: 12.1 Stakeholder Identification and Engagement, Foundational Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Suggest removing the references to “local” since stakeholders may not necessarily be local, for example if they are non-government organisations representing local rights-holders but are not from the local community or workforce.

SECTION: 12.1 Stakeholder Identification and Engagement, Foundational Practice, 2

COMMENT:

Suggest removing the language of “directly, indirectly, potentially” and instead referring to those “that may be at risk of an adverse impact by the businesses activities or that have an interest in...” for improved clarity (the distinction between who might be directly, indirectly, or potentially impacted may not be as helpful when the UNGPs require engagement with affected stakeholders).

SECTION: 12.1 Stakeholder Identification and Engagement, Foundational Practice, 3

COMMENT:

Suggest rephrasing to “engage potentially affected stakeholders...” to align with UNGPs.

COMMENT:

Suggest revising language to “...decisions that may impact on their rights and interests...” so as not to potentially limit the ways rights-holders may be impacted.

SECTION: 12.1 Stakeholder Identification and Engagement, Foundational Practice, 4

COMMENT:

Consider including language on closing the loop with stakeholders including rightsholders following the end of engagement so that they understand how the business will (or will not) take the feedback on board and so the business understands any ongoing concerns from stakeholders.

SECTION: Glossary and Interpretive Guidance

COMMENT:

“Meaningful engagement”: Suggest strengthening and clarifying that meaningful engagement involves two-way dialogue, is carried out in good faith, is ongoing, and responsive to the parties involved.

SECTION: Intent

COMMENT:

Consider inserting “meaningful” stakeholder engagement as defined under the OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Meaningful Stakeholder Engagement in the Extractive Sector. Consider also substituting “affect them” for “impact them”.

Performance Area 13: Community Impacts and Benefits

SECTION: 13.1 Identify and Address Community Impacts, Foundational Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Consider aligning more closely with the UNGPs and good practice that calls for the prioritisation of issues, by specifying that the requirement is to identify and assess salient human rights risks and impacts.

SECTION: 13.1 Identify and Address Community Impacts, Foundational Practice, 2

COMMENT:

Suggest aligning with the UNGPs and using salient risks: "implement measures to prevent or mitigate salient risks". Suggest also adding: "Implement measures to avoid, prevent, or mitigate adverse human rights impacts".

SECTION: 13.1 Identify and Address Community Impacts, Foundational Practice, 3

COMMENT:

Suggest incorporating language on publicly reporting on impacts and progress as required under UNGP 21.

SECTION: 13.1 Identify and Address Community Impacts, Foundational Practice

COMMENT:

Consider requirement to publicly disclose a policy commitment that includes preventing and addressing community-related human rights impacts.

SECTION: 13.1 Identify and Address Community Impacts, Good Practice, 3

COMMENT:

Suggest language of avoid, prevent and mitigate.

SECTION: 13.1 Identify and Address Community Impacts, Good Practice, 4

COMMENT:

Consider including a requirement to communicate externally on the progress and effectiveness of impact mitigation action plans in line with UNGP 21.

SECTION: 13.2 Community Development and Benefits, Good Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Consider incorporating a requirement to incorporate gender considerations, and specifically a gender impact assessment, when conducting a review of opportunities to increase positive social and economic development impact.

SECTION: 13.2 Community Development and Benefits, Good Practice, 2

COMMENT:

Consider incorporating a requirement that ensures the needs and vulnerabilities of marginalised groups are accounted for.

Performance Area 14: Indigenous Peoples

SECTION: 14.1 Managing Engagement, Impacts and Opportunities with Indigenous Peoples, Foundational Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Suggest incorporating stronger language with respect to FPIC by adding “expressly including the principles of FPIC” immediately after “UNDRIP”.

SECTION: 14.1 Managing Engagement, Impacts and Opportunities with Indigenous Peoples, Foundational Practice, 3

COMMENT:

Suggest adding the following at the end of the current wording: “in line with the principles of FPIC”.

SECTION: 14.1 Managing Engagement, Impacts and Opportunities with Indigenous Peoples, Good Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Suggest that this is moved to Foundational Practice level, and that it refers to decision-making processes being in line with the principles of FPIC.

SECTION: 14.1 Managing Engagement, Impacts and Opportunities with Indigenous Peoples, Good Practice, 11

COMMENT:

See overarching comment related to grievance mechanisms above. We would suggest a clearer process which is only included in one Performance Area (currently PA 17) and cross referenced in the other relevant sections.

SECTION: 14.1 Managing Engagement, Impacts and Opportunities with Indigenous Peoples, Good Practice, 12

COMMENT:

This seems duplicative of Requirement No. 4 in Foundational Practice.

SECTION: 14.1 Managing Engagement, Impacts and Opportunities with Indigenous Peoples, Good Practice, 2

COMMENT:

Suggest changing “guided by the principles of FPIC” to “in line with the principles of FPIC”.

SECTION: 14.1 Managing Engagement, Impacts and Opportunities with Indigenous Peoples, Good Practice, 3

COMMENT:

Consider rephrasing to “Take appropriate action to avoid, prevent, or mitigate adverse impacts on Indigenous Peoples’ rights, in line with the UNGPs, including...” to align more closely with the UNGPs.

SECTION: 14.1 Managing Engagement, Impacts and Opportunities with Indigenous Peoples, Good Practice, 6

COMMENT:

Suggest improving clarity by rephrasing to “obtain the free, prior, and informed consent of Indigenous Peoples to anticipated impacts...”.

SECTION: 14.1 Managing Engagement, Impacts and Opportunities with Indigenous Peoples, Good Practice, 7

COMMENT:

Suggest clarifying the wording to ensure it is clear that Indigenous Peoples may collectively, in line with traditional decision-making processes, withhold consent (in which case the activity should not go ahead). Suggest updating this to the following: “Recognising that Indigenous Peoples may collectively withhold consent, which must be respected. Recognising further that there may be circumstances where consent is provided through appropriate customary collective decision-making processes but that this is not unanimous, implement and publicly disclose appropriate steps the facility will take to manage anticipated impacts to Indigenous Peoples land or other rights holders in line with the UNGPs.”

SECTION: Intent

COMMENT:

Suggest incorporating stronger language with respect to FPIC: “Respect Indigenous Peoples’ rights by developing inclusive engagement processes and conducting human rights due diligence in line with the principles of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) and obtaining agreement with affected Indigenous Peoples that demonstrates their consent to anticipated impacts to the land or other rights.”

Performance Area 15: Cultural Heritage

SECTION: 15.1 Cultural Heritage Identification and Management, Foundational Practice, 2

COMMENT:

Suggest including language of “identify and assess” and “activities and operations, including its business relationships...” to align with the UNGPs.

SECTION: Intent

COMMENT:

We recommend changing “protect” to “respect” to better align with the UNGPs.

Performance Area 17: Grievance Management

SECTION: 17.1 Grievance Mechanism for Stakeholders and Rights, Holders, Good Practice

COMMENT:

Consider mentioning the opportunity to decide to participate in remedy or using leverage to encourage a business relationship to address human rights impacts a Facility may be directly linked to.

SECTION: 17.1 Grievance Mechanism for Stakeholders and Rights, Holders, Leading Practice

COMMENT:

Seems duplicative of Good Practice 2.

SECTION: 17.1 Grievance Mechanism for Stakeholders and Rights, Holders

COMMENT:

Consider adding requirement around establishing third party review/appeal processes for example, by establishing a review body composed of representatives from different organisational bodies (i.e. company, NGO, union, etc.).

COMMENT:

See comments throughout related to complaints and grievance mechanisms. We suggest that full requirements are developed here and cross referenced throughout the Standard.

Performance Area 3: Responsible Supply Chains

SECTION: 3.1 Responsible Supply Chain (applicable to all facilities), Foundational Practice, 2

COMMENT:

Suggest including "...sustainability risks according to the saliency of the risk..." to ensure that prioritisation is aligned with the UNGPs and focuses on risks to people vs business.

SECTION: 3.1 Responsible Supply Chain (applicable to all facilities), Good Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Suggest moving the requirement to identify, assess, and prioritise into Foundational Practice and instead move Foundational Practice, Requirement 2 on designing a system to prioritise risks to Good Practice. Designing a system to prioritise risks suggests companies have embedded the practice, which is more reflective of Good Practice.

COMMENT:

Suggest using the term salient rather than significant.

COMMENT:

Consider using "sustainability risks" (as defined in the glossary) since "parts or segments" is internally focused and may encourage companies to consider risks to business versus risks to people.

SECTION: 3.1 Responsible Supply Chain (applicable to all facilities), Good Practice, 3

COMMENT:

The requirements related to remedy here and throughout are overlapping which may lead to misunderstandings. For example, in this Performance Area "enable access" / "support remedy" is considered good practice, and "enable access to system" / "collaborate" to support remedy and "encourage prioritised business relationships to establish a grievance mechanism" is considered leading practice. However, in other Performance

Areas, the progression is represented differently. We would suggest a clearer process which is only included in one Performance Area (currently PA 17) and cross referenced in the other relevant sections. The differentiation of requirements between cause, contribute, directly linked could be clarified and seems most relevant to determining appropriate remedy rather than determining how mechanisms are set up. We would suggest keeping the entry criteria for complaints and grievances broad and explicitly tied to the UNGPs' effectiveness criteria for non-judicial grievance mechanisms. See detailed comments in PA 17 section.

COMMENT:

Consider expanding the scope to include stakeholders (which can include business relationships, and notably rights-holders). This will also help maintain consistency in approach/language between PAs.

SECTION: 3.1 Responsible Supply Chain (applicable to all facilities), Good Practice, 5

COMMENT:

See overarching comment related to grievance mechanisms above and consider removing the term "prioritised" when referring to the Facility's prioritised business relationships which may suggest that remedy is provided depending on whether the business relationship is a priority or not.

SECTION: 3.1 Responsible Supply Chain (applicable to all facilities), Leading Practice, 1

COMMENT:

See overarching comment related to grievance mechanisms above. We would suggest a clearer process which is only included in one Performance Area (currently PA 17) and cross referenced in the other relevant sections.

SECTION: 3.1 Responsible Supply Chain (applicable to all facilities), Leading Practice, 2

COMMENT:

See overarching comment related to grievance mechanisms above. We would suggest a clearer process which is only included in one Performance Area (currently PA 17) and cross referenced in the other relevant sections. This also appears to be substantially the same as Good Practice Requirement 5.

SECTION: 3.1 Responsible Supply Chain (applicable to all facilities), Leading Practice, 4

COMMENT:

See overarching comment related to grievance mechanisms above. We would suggest a clearer process which is only included in one Performance Area (currently PA 17) and cross referenced in the other relevant sections.

SECTION: 3.1 Responsible Supply Chain (applicable to all facilities), Leading Practice, 5

COMMENT:

Consider using "address their sustainability risks" instead of referring to "environmental, social, and governance risks" to maintain consistency in language use and to improve clarity.

SECTION: 3.1 Responsible Supply Chain (applicable to all facilities), Leading Practice, 8

COMMENT:

Suggest clarifying this requirement (potentially with examples) as it is currently a bit unclear. It would also be difficult for a mining company to “reduce conflicting requirements of customers”. Perhaps this could be broadened to collaboration across the value chain on implementation related to the Performance Areas.

SECTION: Glossary and Interpretive Guidance

COMMENT:

“Due diligence” / “human rights due diligence”: Suggest having only one definition of due diligence and that it be framed as “human rights due diligence”. Incorporate a UNGPs-aligned definition (see UNGPs 17). The definition of “due diligence” is focused on ESG-risks and should more clearly incorporate “human rights” to ensure that the practice of due diligence is on risk to people and not risk to business. Having two due diligence definitions is confusing.

SECTION: Intent

COMMENT:

Consider using “sustainability risks” instead of referring to “environmental, social, and governance risks” to maintain consistency in language use and to improve clarity.

Performance Area 4: New Projects, Expansions and Resettlement

SECTION: 4.2 Land Acquisition and Resettlement

COMMENT:

Consider incorporating elements from the requirements under IFC Performance Standard 5 more generally as they relate to human rights. For example: incorporate IFC PS5 8 on considering project designs that avoid causing or contributing to physical and/or economic displacement. Incorporate language from UNGPs that require companies to “avoid causing or contributing to” human rights impacts and to “prevent or mitigate” those impacts that are directly linked to the company’s operations or business relationships.

Performance Area 5: Human Rights

SECTION: 5.1 Human Rights, Foundational Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Consider a commitment to respecting all internationally recognised human rights and to confirming there should also be a clear statement of the company’s expectations of its business partners in relation to respecting human rights including suppliers, joint venture partners and other business partners.

SECTION: 5.1 Human Rights, Foundational Practice, 2

COMMENT:

Consider including a commitment to respecting the rights of at risk, vulnerable or marginalised groups and where appropriate to listing which types of these groups are most relevant to the company’s commitment to respecting human rights such as migrant workers and Indigenous peoples.

COMMENT:

Consider making the commitment to respect the rights of groups or individuals who are working to promote and protect human rights stronger by explicitly referencing non-retaliation, while making it clear that non-retaliation may only be one aspect of respecting the rights of human rights defenders, and revising text on “promote and protect”. For example: “Respect the human rights of groups or individuals (including human rights defenders) who are peacefully working to promote and protect human rights, including by maintaining an environment free from retaliation”.

SECTION: 5.1 Human Rights, Foundational Practice, 3

COMMENT:

See overarching comment related to grievance mechanisms in PA3. We would suggest a clearer process which is only included in one Performance Area (currently PA 17) and cross referenced in the other relevant sections. Having a mechanism aligned to the UNGPs effectiveness criteria should be Foundational Practice.

SECTION: 5.1 Human Rights, Good Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Consider moving the requirement to publicly disclose a statement of policy commitment relating to respecting human rights consistent with the UNGPs (UNGP16(d)) to Foundational Practice, including the change as indicated from disclosure of a “human rights policy” to disclosure of a “statement of policy”.

SECTION: 5.1 Human Rights, Good Practice, 2

COMMENT:

The separation between operations, supply chains and business partners related to the continuum of involvement (cause, contribute, directly linked) may cause confusion. There may be examples where the facility’s suppliers or other business partners also “cause” or “contribute to” an impact. For example, a construction subcontractor could knowingly exploit workers brought to an operation from overseas to assist with a project, which would mean there is a causality or contribution to the impact (beyond being directly linked). The facility could contribute to a harm even if committed by a business partner. See comments in PA3 related to grievance mechanisms. Suggest aligning these PAs for consistency.

SECTION: 5.1 Human Rights, Good Practice, 3

COMMENT:

The separation between operations, supply chains and business partners related to the continuum of involvement (cause, contribute, directly linked) may cause confusion. There may be examples where the facility’s suppliers or other business partners also “cause” or “contribute to” an impact. For example, a construction subcontractor could knowingly exploit workers brought to an operation from overseas to assist with a project, which would mean there is a causality or contribution to the impact (beyond being directly linked). The facility could contribute to a harm even if committed by a business partner. See comments in PA3 related to grievance mechanisms. Suggest aligning these PAs for consistency.

SECTION: 5.1 Human Rights, Good Practice, 4

COMMENT:

See overarching comment related to grievance mechanisms in PA3. We would suggest a clearer process which is only included in one Performance Area (currently PA 17) and cross referenced in the other relevant sections.

SECTION: 5.1 Human Rights, Good Practice, 5

COMMENT:

See overarching comment related to grievance mechanisms in PA3. We would suggest a clearer process which is only included in one Performance Area (currently PA 17) and cross referenced in the other relevant sections. Suggest also "...human rights impacts where the Facility identifies it has caused, contributed to..." to better align with the UNGPs.

SECTION: 5.1 Human Rights, Good Practice, 6

COMMENT:

Consider if the requirements could apply to all human rights impacts.

SECTION: 5.1 Human Rights, Good Practice, 7

COMMENT:

Consider the difficulties in practically implementing this particular requirement. That is, if "effective" is defined as reducing human rights harm, it may be difficult to practically assess and measure this. Consider revising this requirement to focus on assessment of how the Facility is tracking its effectiveness or, a gap analysis of where there are human rights risks using a UNGP analysis framework.

SECTION: 5.1 Human Rights, Leading Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Suggest reframing to "Establish metrics or indicators to measure the effectiveness of the Facility's response to human rights risks and/or impacts" to better align with UNGPs.

SECTION: 5.1 Human Rights, Leading Practice, 2

COMMENT:

Suggest broadening language to involve stakeholder engagement throughout the human rights due diligence process (not just in reviewing effectiveness). Can specify that where relevant, this should include rights-holders specifically, including at risk, vulnerable and marginalised groups. Consider also the difficulties in practically implementing this particular requirement. That is, if "effective" is defined as reducing human rights harm, it may be difficult to practically assess and measure this. Consider revising this requirement to focus on assessment of how the Facility is tracking effectiveness or, a gap analysis of where there are human rights risks using a UNGP analysis framework.

SECTION: 5.1 Human Rights, Leading Practice

COMMENT:

Consider adding further requirements under Leading Practice which involve business relationships. For example: assist business relationships in developing human rights policies and building capacity as appropriate to improve their ability to identify, prevent, mitigate, and account for adverse human rights impacts etc.

SECTION: Intent

COMMENT:

Consider deleting “management systems and approaches” from sentence as it seems unnecessary and may imply a more limited scope. For example, Human Rights Impact Assessments (HRIAs)/other impact assessments may not be viewed by some stakeholders as a “management system” or an “approach” but are important tools to identify, prevent, mitigate, account for, and remedy human rights risks. It would also simplify the sentence.

Performance Area 6: Child Labour and Modern Slavery

SECTION: 6.1 Risk, Mitigation and Operating Performance, Foundational Practice, 1

COMMENT:

It would be clearer and more practical to set out positive conduct that a business is expected to undertake under these requirements. Consider reformulating this requirement as follows: “Publicly commit to respect human rights, including the right to be free from slavery, consistent with the UNGPs and ILO Conventions 29 & 105 and take action to address...”.

SECTION: 6.1 Risk, Mitigation and Operating Performance, Foundational Practice, 2

COMMENT:

Suggest also “appropriate” action in the last sentence, which will also align with the UNGPs language (see Guiding Principle 19).

SECTION: 6.1 Risk, Mitigation and Operating Performance, Foundational Practice, 4

COMMENT:

In both PA3 and 5, addressing risks was considered to be “good practice”. Recommend moving to foundational practice given this is a core expectation in the UNGPs. Also suggest aligning language with UNGPs to identify, prevent, mitigate and account for the risk of involvement in child labour/modern slavery.

SECTION: 6.1 Risk, Mitigation and Operating Performance, Foundational Practice, 7

COMMENT:

Suggest separating the response to child labour and modern slavery into separate requirements as the response required could be different especially where there may be different at risk, marginalised or vulnerable groups that are impacted. For example, in cases of child labour, the individual should be immediately removed from the worksite, while in cases of forced labour or human trafficking, other support services may be required (i.e. law enforcement) in order to respond.

SECTION: 6.1 Risk, Mitigation and Operating Performance, Good Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Consider rephrasing the final portion of this sentence to “...Facility’s operations and supply chains” since it is unclear what is meant by “off-site worksites”.

SECTION: 6.1 Risk, Mitigation and Operating Performance, Good Practice, 4

COMMENT:

See overarching comment related to grievance mechanisms in PA3. We would suggest a clearer process which is only included in one Performance Area (currently PA 17) and cross referenced in the other relevant sections.

SECTION: 6.1 Risk, Mitigation and Operating Performance, Good Practice

COMMENT:

Consider adding additional requirements (in either Good Practice or Leading Practice) which seek to build the capacity of business relationships to identify, prevent, mitigate, and account for any involvement they could have in modern slavery and child labour risks.

SECTION: 6.1 Risk, Mitigation and Operating Performance, Leading Practice

COMMENT:

Consider adding a requirement that encourages stakeholder engagement throughout the HRDD process, including, as noted above, clarifying that stakeholders includes rights-holders.

SECTION: Intent

COMMENT:

Suggest rephrasing to “prohibit the employment of children below...” and then including another sentence picking up on the UNGPs and modern slavery more broadly: “respect human rights by identifying, preventing, mitigating, accounting for, and remedying instances of modern slavery, including the worst forms of child labour, and other forms of child labour, in which the company could be or is involved in line with the UNGPs”. As it currently stands, the intent is focused exclusively on child labour (with the exception of mentioning relevant forced labour conventions).

Performance Area 7: Rights of Workers

SECTION: 7.1 Workers’ Rights Risk, Mitigation and Operational Performance, Foundational Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Suggest this public commitment comes in the form of a statement of policy commitment to align with the UNGPs. Suggest also including “employment terms and conditions”.

SECTION: 7.1 Workers’ Rights Risk, Mitigation and Operational Performance, Foundational Practice, 3

COMMENT:

Consider reframing to a commitment to providing a workplace that is free from discrimination, including discrimination based on [list categories and consider including union membership as per ILO Convention No.98], harassment, and violence, including gender-based violence. Suggest removing “underrepresentation” since a category may not always be underrepresented per se but nevertheless should not result in discriminatory practices (i.e. union membership).

SECTION: 7.1 Workers’ Rights Risk, Mitigation and Operational Performance, Good Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Suggest language of identify, assess, and prioritise risks to align with UNGPs. Suggest language of “and address risks by taking appropriate action to prevent and mitigate risks”. Suggest rephrasing last sentence: “demonstrate respect for workers’ rights” to broaden the applicability of the requirement.

SECTION: 7.1 Workers’ Rights Risk, Mitigation and Operational Performance, Good Practice, 11

COMMENT:

Consider including language regarding non-reprisal so that workers are not retaliated against if they decline overtime.

SECTION: 7.1 Workers’ Rights Risk, Mitigation and Operational Performance, Good Practice, 4

COMMENT:

Consider using language of “for all workers” as highlighting part-time workers seems unusual to single out. Consider also including requirement that workers are paid regularly (at least monthly) and on time.

SECTION: 7.1 Workers’ Rights Risk, Mitigation and Operational Performance, Leading Practice, 7

COMMENT:

Could aim to simplify by moving this to Good Practice since it would already be encompassed in Good Practice Requirement 1.

SECTION: 7.2 Grievance Mechanism for Employees and Contractors (Workers), Good Practice, 4

COMMENT:

Consider removing language “part of which” and instead framing as “and engage with affected stakeholders, including workers...” for improved clarity.

SECTION: 7.2 Grievance Mechanism for Employees and Contractors (Workers), Leading Practice, 1

COMMENT:

See overarching comment related to grievance mechanisms above. We would suggest a clearer process which is only included in one Performance Area (currently PA 17) and cross referenced in the other relevant sections.

SECTION: 7.2 Grievance Mechanism for Employees and Contractors (Workers), Leading Practice, 2

COMMENT:

See overarching comment related to grievance mechanisms above. We would suggest a clearer process which is only included in one Performance Area (currently PA 17) and cross referenced in the other relevant sections.

SECTION: 7.2 Grievance Mechanism for Employees and Contractors (Workers), Leading Practice

COMMENT:

See overarching comment related to grievance mechanisms above. We would suggest a clearer process which is only included in one Performance Area (currently PA 17) and cross referenced in the other relevant sections.

SECTION: Intent

COMMENT:

Suggest including violence including gender-based violence in addition to discrimination and harassment here.

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

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