CMSI Consultation Response

Respondent Details

NAME
Anonymous

COUNTRY
Australia

PERMISSION
Yes, CMSI can disclose my anonymous feedback.

STAKEHOLDER
Industry (upstream)

ORGANISATION
Anonymous

COMMENTS & QUESTIONS BY DOCUMENT

Document:
Standard

General comment on Performance Area

COMMENT:

The Standard's alignment with key industry frameworks–such as the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI), ICMM's Mining Principles and Position Statements, and the Global Industry Standard on Tailings Management (GISTM), demonstrates strong conceptual integration. We encourage the CMSI to also ensure equivalency or mutual recognition with other key industry frameworks, including the Aluminium Stewardship Initiative (ASI) and the London Metal Exchange (LME) responsible sourcing requirements, to minimise duplicative verification, streamline assurance processes, and enhance usability for multi-commodity operators.

COMMENT:

The success of the Standard will depend on its clarity, practicality and proportionality. In several areas, it remains difficult to translate expectations into workable, auditable requirements, especially where facility-level resources and capabilities may be limited.

The breadth and detail of the 24 Performance Areas add complexity and administrative effort that may challenge implementation–particularly for operators in regions with less-developed environmental or social regulatory frameworks, and for mid-tier smaller companies with fewer technical and financial resources.

To support broad adoption, CMSI could apply the principle of proportionality, linking expectations to each facility's scale, risk and potential impacts. For example, CMSI could allow facilities operating in emerging market contexts or smaller facilities with limited external footprints to temporarily operate at a "Towards Good Practice" level of conformance, supported by a clear pathway and timeframe to achieve "Good Practice". The transition period could be longer than the current general adoption timeline (for example, potentially doubled). This approach would encourage progressive improvement while recognising the capacity diversity that exists across the global mining sector.

COMMENT:

Stakeholder engagement models must be transparent, accessible and proportionate to the scale and impact of the facility. The Standard's emphasis on rights-holder engagement and documentation is commendable, but its breadth and frequency expectations may be resource-intensive. Smaller operations or those in complex socio-political environments may struggle to maintain the level of engagement envisioned.

Furthermore, engagement requirements are dispersed across multiple Performance Areas, which could lead to duplication and stakeholder fatigue if not integrated through a coherent engagement framework. We suggest that CMSI streamline and cross-reference these requirements, focusing on relevant, risk-based and context-specific engagement rather than procedural repetition

---

COMMENT:

The Standard commendably promotes a data-driven and transparent approach across both corporate and facility levels. However, the cumulative nature of the reporting requirements risks creating duplication–especially where companies already report under frameworks such as EITI, GRI, IFRS and SASB.

To enhance efficiency and consistency, CMSI must create sufficient flexibility to enable harmonisation and interoperability with other reporting and disclosure frameworks, allowing companies to leverage existing disclosures and assurance outputs. A guiding principle of "report once, use many times" would reduce administrative burden, mitigate reporting fatigue, and maintain transparency without unnecessary duplication.

COMMENT:

Managing external assurance costs and effort remains a key concern. We encourage CMSI to further explore mechanisms to expand the pool of approved assurance providers, ensuring sufficient market capacity to meet anticipated demand. In doing so, CMSI should aim to avoid unnecessary prescriptive requirements around assurance timing, mandatory provider/team rotation, or qualification criteria that could inadvertently increase costs or limit access.

Performance Area 01: Corporate Requirements

SECTION: 1.1 Corporate Accountability, Good Practice, 2

COMMENT:

The requirement to "demonstrate integration" may be difficult to evidence consistently in practice. Key challenges / complexities:

• The term demonstrate implies the need for verifiable, documented evidence that sustainability factors are systematically embedded across all corporate processes, which may not always be practical or measurable in a standardised way.

• Integration typically occurs through multiple governance mechanisms (e.g., Board oversight, risk frameworks, due diligence processes) and may rely on qualitative evidence such as Board minutes, committee reports or investment criteria rather than uniform documentation.

• Demonstrating integration for mergers, acquisitions and divestments is particularly complex given commercial sensitivities and confidentiality constraints.

SECTION: 1.4 Risk Assessment, Leading Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Direct participation of external stakeholders or rights-holders in risk assessments is not practical in many contexts. Risk assessments often involve confidential operational, financial, or security-sensitive information that may not be appropriate for direct external participation. Meaningful engagement requires resources, time, and technical understanding that may not be feasible for all operations or stakeholders. We suggest reframing the requirement to focus on considering actual and potential impacts on external stakeholders and incorporating insights from existing engagement processes (as addressed under Performance Area 12: Stakeholder Engagement), rather than requiring direct participation in the risk assessment itself.

SECTION: 1.5 Corporate Crisis Management

COMMENT:

There appears to be an inconsistency between PA1.5 and PA10 regarding the required frequency of crisis simulation exercises at the corporate level–three/two years in PA1.5 versus annually in PA10. Unclear definitions of "full crisis simulation" versus "table-top exercise" create scope for inconsistent interpretation, while rigid frequency requirements may not reflect variations in operational risk, complexity, or available resources.

We request that the CMSI clarify the intended frequency and define what constitutes a "full crisis simulation" versus a "table-top exercise" to support consistent interpretation and practical application across operations. We also suggest that the requirements be amended to allow the format, frequency and scale of exercises to be proportionate to site risk and complexity, provided the facility effectively tests the Crisis and Communications Response Plan (CCRP), involves relevant participants, and includes post-exercise review and improvement actions.

Performance Area 02: Business Integrity

SECTION: 2.2 Business Ethics and Accountability, Good Practice, 4

COMMENT:

We request that the CMSI clarify that the internal review should focus on anti-bribery and corruption, anti-money laundering, and anti-competitive behaviour to avoid ambiguity around scope. A business ethics and integrity audit/review is very broad and would exceed the intent of the requirement.

Performance Area 03: Responsible Supply Chains

SECTION: 3.1 Responsible Supply Chain (applicable to all Facilities), Good Practice, 2

COMMENT:

Confidentiality & privacy obligations may prevent the use of grievance data and information captured through hotlines in DD assessments, making achievement of this requirement challenging. We suggest revising the requirement to read: "Consider themes and issues raised through these systems" rather than "information," to ensure compliance with privacy obligations while maintaining the spirit of responsiveness

---

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

COMMENT:

The expectation to collaborate to increase leverage is supported; however, practical and legal limitations exist in some jurisdictions. In certain contexts, efforts to influence supplier practices can intersect with political sensitivities or expose companies to anti-competition risk. We suggest that collaboration should occur

where feasible and appropriate, taking into account applicable competition law, confidentiality obligations and geopolitical sensitivities, to ensure safe and lawful implementation.

SECTION: 3.1 Responsible Supply Chain (applicable to all Facilities)

COMMENT:

Clarification is needed on whether the requirements in 3.1 and 3.2 apply to both traded and non-traded goods and services. Many companies source both inputs for production (non-traded) and materials for resale (traded), and the scope of application will materially affect due diligence expectations.

SECTION: 3.2 Responsible Mineral Sourcing, Good Practice, 2

COMMENT:

The intent to align with the OECD Due Diligence Guidance is supported; however, the requirement as written goes beyond the OECD framework. Key challenges / complexities:

• Under OECD Step 4, independent third-party audits are to be conducted at identified points in the supply chain and are typically triggered when a Red Flag is identified or where the severity of risk warrants further verification, consistent with current industry practice (e.g., LME guidance).

• Requiring audits irrespective of risk level would impose unnecessary administrative and cost burdens on companies.

• Mandatory public disclosure of audit reports could expose commercially sensitive or security-related information.

We suggest that independent audits should be risk-based and triggered by the identification of Red Flags or other material risks. Public disclosure of audit reports should remain voluntary, with companies encouraged to disclose summary findings or conformance statements instead.

SECTION: 3.2 Responsible Mineral Sourcing, Good Practice, 4

COMMENT:

We suggest alignment with the OECD Guidance, which recommends a minimum 5-year retention period, allowing companies to retain documentation longer where warranted by risk or regulation. This would ensure proportionality and practicality without compromising traceability.

Performance Area 04: New Projects, Expansions and Resettlement

SECTION: 4.1 Environmental and Social Impact Assessments, Good Practice, 5

COMMENT:

How the ESIA has been used to influence the project design" needs clarification. This information is not always contained within the ESIA, and is often documented through complementary processes (e.g., design studies, management plans, or community consultation records). We suggest that the Standard allow flexibility for disclosures to be made through alternative publicly available sources rather than requiring it to be embedded within the ESIA.

COMMENT:

Define "significant adverse impacts" and "significant changes to existing operations" within this Performance Area, or reference an overarching glossary applicable across the Standard.

COMMENT:

Provide interpretation guidance or examples illustrating materiality thresholds (e.g., scale, duration, reversibility, and affected stakeholder groups).

COMMENT:

Clarify the linkages between Performance Area 4 and Performance Area 12 (Stakeholder engagement) to ensure consistent application of these terms across both new projects and operational contexts

Performance Area 05: Human Rights

SECTION: 5.1 Human Rights, Good Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Clarity is needed on the expected level of detail when describing identified impacts and management actions. Disclosure needs to balance transparency with privacy, security and commercial sensitivity. It would be helpful for the CMSI to provide examples or minimum disclosure expectations to guide consistent interpretation across operations.

SECTION: 5.1 Human Rights, Leading Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Clarification is needed on the meaning of "assist" business partners. We suggest that CMSI define "assist" as providing guidance, tools or capacity-building resources, rather than implying responsibility for directly developing or implementing partner policies.

Performance Area 07: Rights of Workers

SECTION: 7.1 Rights of Workers, Towards Good Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Publicly committing to identifying and removing barriers to the advancement and fair treatment of women may be challenging to implement consistently across global jurisdictions. In some regions, including the US, there are legal or political constraints on diversity-related statements or commitments, which could limit a company's ability to make public gender-specific commitments. We suggest that the CMSI consider reframing the requirement to focus on a commitment to equitable treatment and inclusion for all employees, allowing flexibility for companies to express this in a manner consistent with local legal and cultural contexts, while still upholding the underlying intent of gender equity.

Performance Area 08: Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

SECTION: NA, Good Practice

COMMENT:

Flexibility should be allowed for each company to design a corporate-level DEI strategy that reflects its context and priorities. Prescribing recruitment, retention and accessibility as mandatory focus areas may not be appropriate or relevant for all organisations. We suggest that the Standard require a DEI strategy that addresses key barriers to inclusion and equity identified as most material to the company, rather than prescribing uniform focus areas. This would preserve the intent of advancing equity and inclusion, while allowing flexibility for context-specific implementation.

Performance Area 09: Safe, Healthy and Respectful Workplaces

SECTION: 9.3 Training, Behaviour and Culture, Good Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Unclear if face-to-face delivery is expected, which is not practical or necessary in all contexts. We suggest allowing flexibility in delivery modes (e.g. e-learning, blended, or in-person) and focusing instead on the maturity, relevance, and demonstrated competence outcomes of training related to safe, healthy, and respectful workplaces. Additionally, the inclusion of visitor orientation content may be better placed under site access or induction requirements rather than within workforce training programs.

SECTION: 9.3 Training, Behaviour and Culture, Good Practice, 4

COMMENT:

Clarity is needed on what constitutes an appropriate mechanism for participation of underrepresented and marginalised groups in practice. Guidance would be helpful on the expected formality and scope of these mechanisms (e.g. through existing OHS committees, focus groups, surveys, or engagement sessions) and on how companies can demonstrate effectiveness in identifying and addressing disproportionate OHS risks for such groups.

Performance Area 10: Emergency Preparedness and Response

SECTION: 10.1 Emergency Preparedness and Response, Towards Good Practice, 4

COMMENT:

Resourcing can be challenging in some contexts, with increasing reliance on external or contractor support for emergency and crisis response roles. This dynamic is becoming more common across the industry. We suggest that CMSI acknowledge that teams may comprise both internal and external members, provided roles, responsibilities, and reporting lines are clearly defined and training or familiarisation is completed within the required timeframe.

SECTION: 10.1 Emergency Preparedness and Response, Towards Good Practice, 5

COMMENT:

Resourcing can be challenging in some contexts, with increasing reliance on external or contractor support for emergency and crisis response roles. This dynamic is becoming more common across the industry. We suggest that CMSI acknowledge that teams may comprise both internal and external members, provided roles, responsibilities, and reporting lines are clearly defined and training or familiarisation is completed within the required timeframe.

Performance Area 11: Security Management

SECTION: 11.1 Security Management, Good Practice, 7

COMMENT:

Requirement appropriately emphasises human rights training for security providers; however, it should specify that such training be competency-based, ensuring participants can demonstrate understanding & application of human rights principles in practice. This would strengthen the requirement by focusing on capability and behavioural outcomes rather than training frequency alone.

Performance Area 12: Engagement

SECTION: 12.1 Engagement, Good Practice, 4

COMMENT:

Training on inclusive engagement is valuable; however, training needs will vary depending on role, risk and level of stakeholder exposure. We suggest that inclusive engagement and cultural awareness training should be targeted and proportionate, aligned with role-specific responsibilities and local context.

SECTION: 12.1 Engagement, Good Practice, 7

COMMENT:

Implementation guidance is needed to ensure practicality. We request clarity on how internal reviews can be practically undertaken "in collaboration with" stakeholders, recognising that this may not always be feasible or appropriate depending on local capacity, sensitivities or willingness to participate. The requirement appears more consistent with leading practice and would benefit from examples of effective approaches or flexible mechanisms for stakeholder input.

COMMENT:

The requirements assume a high degree of stakeholder maturity, capacity and availability, as well as substantial internal resources to manage extensive and frequent engagement cycles. They do not sufficiently account for stakeholders' appetite or willingness to engage, or the risk of engagement fatigue—especially in communities already involved in multiple consultation processes led by different operators, regulators or government agencies.

Overly frequent or formalised engagement may inadvertently undermine trust and reduce participation, contrary to the intent of fostering constructive relationships. While the requirements are broadly aligned with ICMM and GRI expectations, they exceed what is typically considered good practice, which prioritises relevant, inclusive and proportionate engagement rather than exhaustive procedural expectations. As a result, compliance may be inconsistent, difficult to evidence and resource-intensive, limiting the framework's practicality and effectiveness.

Performance Area 13: Community Impacts and Benefits

SECTION: NA, Good Practice

COMMENT:

The requirement assumes ongoing, wide-ranging engagement but does not specify when it should occur (e.g., during assessments, planning, monitoring or closure). It does not consider stakeholder appetite or capacity, nor the risk of engagement fatigue, particularly in regions where communities are already subject to multiple consultation processes led by industry, government and regulators. Over-frequent or uncoordinated engagement can erode trust, reduce participation and divert attention from issues of genuine importance to stakeholders

We suggest that CMSI provide guidance on the drivers and triggers for stakeholder engagement under this Performance Area–such as new activities, material changes, or emerging risks. Engagement expectations should emphasise relevance, proportionality and decision-linkage, ensuring efforts are purposeful, coordinated and meaningful.

Performance Area 14: Indigenous Peoples

SECTION: 14.1 Indigenous Peoples, Good Practice, 6

COMMENT:

We request clarification on whether this requirement applies retrospectively to existing agreements with Indigenous Peoples, or only to new and renewed agreements. Alignment with the ICMM Indigenous Peoples Position Statement (which is not retrospective) would support consistency and feasibility. This feedback applies to all agreement-related requirements in this Performance Area.

The requirement appropriately emphasises agreement through FPIC; however, it lacks clarity on what is expected where agreement cannot be reached. The reference to "opposition from other affected communities" only partially addresses this scenario and does not account for situations where agreement is not achieved between a facility and an affected Indigenous community. We suggest that the CMSI align with the ICMM Position Statement on Indigenous Peoples and Mining by providing clearer guidance on demonstrating a legitimate, good-faith process, documenting efforts to respect rights, and transparently disclosing outcomes when agreement is not obtained.

Performance Area 18: Water Stewardship

SECTION: 18.1 Water Management and Performance, Good Practice, 6

COMMENT:

Clarification is needed on how this assessment aligns with related requirements under Tailings (GISTM) and Climate Change physical risk requirements to avoid duplication. We suggest that CMSI specify the distinct scope or purpose of this assessment within overall climate risk and water risk management to ensure clarity, avoid duplication, and enable efficient integration into existing assessment processes.

SECTION: 18.1 Water Management and Performance, Leading Practice, 2

COMMENT:

Further guidance is needed on scope, frequency and level of independence to ensure feasibility and consistency. We request that CMSI clarify expectations around review type and independence–for example, distinguishing between internal audit, management assurance, and third-party review–to ensure proportionality while maintaining transparency, credibility and practicality of implementation.

SECTION: 18.1 Water Management and Performance

COMMENT:

Clarification is needed on how these requirements align with Performance Area 22: Pollution, particularly PA22.6 on preventing accidental releases through monitoring and record keeping. It would be helpful for CMSI

to specify whether establishing a baseline is a standalone expectation or forms part of a broader water quality management framework..

SECTION: 18.2 Collaborative Watershed Management, Good Practice, 3

COMMENT:

Clarity is needed on the scope and frequency of expected disclosure. In practice, context-specific water data is typically shared through major environmental approvals, regulatory reporting, or referral processes. Without guidance, broader or more frequent disclosures may create unnecessary administrative burden or confidentiality concerns. We suggest that CMSI define when and how broader watershed-related disclosures are required and clarify their intended audience, format and frequency, to ensure practicality and alignment with existing regulatory and corporate reporting channels.

SECTION: 18.2 Collaborative Watershed Management, Leading Practice, 2

COMMENT:

It is unclear whether assurance must be facility-specific or may be met through corporate-level assurance under PA1 (1.2 LP2). Without clear guidance, there is a risk of duplication or inconsistent assurance approaches across Performance Areas. We suggest that CMSI clarify the type, frequency and flexibility of assurance expected for water-related disclosures and actions, ensuring consistency with other Performance Areas. Guidance should also define the extent of collective action expectations, recognising that participation may vary depending on local water governance capacity and context.

Performance Area 19: Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services and Nature

SECTION: 19.1 Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services and Nature, Good Practice, 2

COMMENT:

The revised requirement represents a significant change from Version 1, creating additional complexity that may hinder consistent implementation and reduce the ability to drive measurable performance improvement. Sub-points (c) and (d) may require operations to define three overlapping habitat types, multiple baseline years and different biodiversity objectives, potentially resulting in a fragmented set of targets for a single asset– particularly where brownfield and greenfield areas coexist within one Area of Influence.

This complexity risks overcomplicating biodiversity management planning and assurance, while diverting attention from achieving meaningful outcomes. We suggest that the Standard:

• Revert the Good Practice requirement to the Version 1 approach of achieving No Net Loss (NNL) or Net Gain (NG) of biodiversity by completion of closure, using a 2020 baseline (avoiding the need to differentiate between modified and natural habitats).

• Retain Net Gain for critical habitats as a Leading Practice expectation, applicable to new developments or expansions, with flexibility to use a more ambitious baseline year (e.g., 2020 or 2025).

This approach would maintain ambition while providing clarity, consistency and feasibility across diverse operational contexts.

SECTION: 19.1 Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services and Nature, Good Practice, 4

COMMENT:

Overlaps with PA 4 ‑4.1 ‑TGP #3 and PA 19 ‑19.1 ‑GP #1, which already require engagement with affected stakeholders through the ESIA process and biodiversity management planning. Multiple, similar engagement requirements across Performance Areas could lead to duplicative or fragmented processes. Without clear cross-referencing, there is a risk of engagement fatigue and inefficiency, particularly where the same stakeholders are consulted repeatedly on related issues.

We suggest that CMSI clarify or cross-reference engagement requirements across related Performance Areas to avoid duplication and promote a more integrated, risk-based and context-driven engagement approach.

SECTION: 19.1 Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services and Nature, Good Practice, 5

COMMENT:

Public disclosure of detailed loss‑gain methodologies is uncommon and often impractical. Methodologies are typically complex, site-specific and iterative, and may incorporate confidential, sensitive, or Indigenous environmental data. We suggest that CMSI clarify the expected level of methodological detail required for public disclosure. CMSI could specify that disclosure should focus on the overall approach, key assumptions, and principles used to achieve No Net Loss or Net Gain, ensuring transparency while respecting data sensitivity and contextual diversity.

SECTION: 19.1 Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services and Nature, Leading Practice, 4

COMMENT:

Clarity is needed on the intent and distinction between "independent review" and "independent assurance" within the CMS framework - specifically, whether this constitutes an additional layer of external verification beyond the CMS assurance cycle. If retained, guidance should specify the scope, frequency, and qualifications expected to ensure consistency and proportionality with other environmental Performance Areas.

Performance Area 20: Climate Action

SECTION: 20.1 Corporate Climate Change Strategy (Corporate Level), Good Practice, 1

COMMENT:

The phrase "aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement" can be problematic in cases where companies have not yet set science-based targets or lack verified evidence demonstrating that their pathway is consistent with a 1.5°C or 2°C scenario. In such cases, the language could expose companies to greenwashing or misrepresentation risk.

We suggest replacing "aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement" with more flexible language such as: "informed by the objectives of the Paris Agreement," or "guided by current climate science and international

climate goals." This adjustment maintains the spirit of alignment while ensuring credibility, accuracy and applicability across companies at varying stages of climate target-setting maturity.

SECTION: 20.1 Corporate Climate Change Strategy (Corporate Level), Leading Practice, 6

COMMENT:

The current wording implies a continuous or formalised engagement process specifically for assessing climate-related risks and opportunities, which is rarely feasible or meaningful in practice. It is also unclear

who constitutes "external stakeholders" in this context–whether investors, regulators, communities, or others –and what type of engagement (e.g., disclosure dialogue, consultation, or partnership) is expected.

We suggest replacing "ongoing external engagement" with more practical language such as "periodic or targeted engagement with relevant external stakeholders". CMSI should clarify the intended purpose, frequency, and stakeholder scope of this engagement to ensure feasibility and consistent interpretation across different organisational contexts.

SECTION: 20.2 Climate Change Management (Facility Level), Good Practice, 3

COMMENT:

Facility-level performance can be influenced by external factors such as market dynamics, regulatory changes, supply chain constraints, technology availability, weather variability, or government policies. Framing this as a compliance requirement may create unrealistic expectations and discourage transparent disclosure of shortfalls, undermining the learning intent of performance management.

We suggest that focus is instead placed on monitoring and reporting against targets and objectives and disclosure of reasons for variance and the management actions or lessons learned to improve future performance.

SECTION: 20.2 Climate Change Management (Facility Level), Good Practice, 6

COMMENT:

Expecting facilities to engage directly with stakeholders on progress against climate-related actions or targets may be impractical in many contexts. Stakeholders' primary concerns often relate to local environmental, employment, or community matters rather than corporate emissions or climate targets. This expectation could also duplicate existing engagement processes, adding administrative burden and contributing to stakeholder fatigue, particularly where communities are already engaged through multiple forums.

We suggest CMSI consider an alternative such as: "Engage with local stakeholders and rights-holders, as appropriate, on climate-related issues of relevance to them–such as local adaptation, resilience, or environmental initiatives."

SECTION: 20.2 Climate Change Management (Facility Level), Leading Practice, 1

COMMENT:

The requirement does not specify whether "carbon content or carbon intensity" refers to Scope 1 and 2 emissions only, or to a full life-cycle boundary (cradle-to-gate or cradle-to-grave). These distinctions substantially affect the calculation methodology, data requirements and comparability across assets and commodities.

For multi-commodity operations, determining product-level carbon intensity requires robust Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) data, process mapping, and allocation of shared emissions (e.g., between by-products).

Many operations currently lack verified LCA models or systems to support accurate product-level calculations. While LCA methodologies are advancing, data gaps will persist for certain commodities (e.g., lead) for several years, limiting feasibility in the near term.

CMSI should clarify:

• The intended scope of measurement (e.g., operational vs. life-cycle emissions);

• The level of granularity expected (facility-level vs. corporate modelling); and

• The allowable use of estimates or proxy data until LCA frameworks and datasets mature.

Performance Area 21: Tailings Management

COMMENT:

Requirements appear to duplicate assurance already undertaken through the GISTM, which independently verifies GISTM conformance. For GISTM-participating companies, this introduces two layers of external assurance over the same requirements. It would be beneficial for CMSI to clarify how GISTM verification will be recognised or relied upon within PA21 to avoid duplication and ensure assurance efficiency and consistency across ICMM members.

Performance Area 22: Pollution Prevention

SECTION: 22.3 Non, GHG Air Emissions, Leading Practice

COMMENT:

We suggest removing the phrase "in participatory monitoring" which would pose significant logistical, training and resource challenges, especially at remote or smaller facilities. In many cases, stakeholder involvement is more effective during the planning and review phases, rather than ongoing technical monitoring.

SECTION: 22.6 Accidental Polluting Releases, Good Practice, 1

COMMENT:

The intent to address accidental polluting releases is supported; however, the requirement does not clearly distinguish between reactive and proactive approaches to risk assessment. Current industry practice is to conduct risk assessments following an accidental release, as part of incident investigation and corrective action processes.

If the intent is to promote a preventive, forward-looking assessment of accidental release risks, we suggest that this should be explicitly stated and positioned as a Leading Practice expectation rather than a baseline requirement.

SECTION: 22.6 Accidental Polluting Releases, Good Practice, 3

COMMENT:

This requirement lacks clarity on the expected timeframes for remediation, which may vary significantly depending on the nature and scale of the release. Remediation actions are often complex, multi-phased, and may extend over months or years, particularly where environmental restoration or monitoring is required. In some cases, remediation may occur post-closure or be governed by specific regulatory frameworks, creating variability in timing and scope.

We suggest that remediation actions should be undertaken "as soon as practicable and in alignment with applicable regulatory requirements."

SECTION: 22.7 Noise, Vibration and Light Pollution/Nuisance, Towards Good Practice, 1

COMMENT:

Monitoring for noise, vibration and light typically focuses on people and community receptors, consistent with most environmental regulations and impact assessments. We suggest that the identification and monitoring of flora and fauna receptors should apply only where required by regulatory approvals, biodiversity management plans, or material site-specific risks. This would ensure clarity, proportionality and consistency with existing environmental management frameworks.

Performance Area 23: Circular Economy

SECTION: 23.2 Additional Requirements for Smelters

COMMENT:

The requirements in this section appear to be primarily designed for secondary aluminium operations, and prescribe a level of performance that would be highly challenging or unattainable for primary aluminium producers. For companies operating smelters processing virgin feedstock, many elements (e.g., scrap due diligence, recycled content, and circularity expectations) are not applicable or outside operational control.

We request that CMSI clarify the applicability of these requirements to primary aluminium producers and suggest that requirements for primary smelters focus on resource efficiency (energy and raw material use); and by-product recovery and waste minimisation within operations, rather than recycled content or scrap-related performance criteria.

Performance Area 24: Closure

SECTION: NA, Good Practice

COMMENT:

The intent to support positive community and workforce transitions is fully supported; however, what constitutes a "beneficial opportunity" will differ across asset locations and socioeconomic contexts. We suggest

that CMSI reframe the requirement to focus on enabling/supporting a responsible and inclusive social transition, aligned with local priorities and existing community programs. This would maintain the intent of supporting post-operational resilience while ensuring contextual flexibility.

SECTION: NA, Good Practice

COMMENT:

Elements of this requirement overlap with existing environmental planning and regulatory processes, and some expectations may be technically unrealistic for stakeholder participation. Aspects such as biodiversity management, ARD/ML prevention and water protection are typically managed under environmental management plans and statutory approvals, which already prescribe technical standards and review mechanisms. Expecting external stakeholders to engage directly on highly technical issues may also be impractical and could divert focus from areas where their input is most valuable. We suggest that CMSI clarify that collaboration under this requirement should focus on shared social, environmental and land-use outcomes.

SECTION: NA, Good Practice

COMMENT:

In the early stages of operation, closure concepts are often preliminary, and frequent or intensive engagement may not add meaningful value. We suggest that CMSI clarify that stakeholder and rights-holder engagement in closure planning should be scaled to the stage of the asset lifecycle. Early engagement should focus on awareness and information-sharing, with more active participation introduced in later stages, when closure pathways, options and post-closure decisions are being shaped.

SECTION: NA, Good Practice

COMMENT:

It is unclear whether "temporary closure" refers to care and maintenance, suspension, or another form of operational pause. Maintaining live cost estimates for temporary or sudden closure scenarios is not practical or value-adding, as these events are inherently unpredictable. Stakeholder engagement during sudden closure situations is generally not appropriate or feasible, as the immediate focus is on internal safety, regulatory compliance and risk management.

We suggest that the focus for temporary or sudden closure be on risk preparedness and emergency response planning, integrated within existing management systems. Costing and engagement requirements should apply only to planned closure scenarios, where assumptions are credible and stakeholder input can be meaningful.

SECTION: NA, Leading Practice

COMMENT:

Detailed disclosure of cost models, unit rates and financial provisions would likely reveal commercially sensitive information. Assumptions vary by jurisdiction and evolve over time in response to regulatory, market and technical changes, making publicly disclosed figures difficult to maintain, compare or interpret. We suggest limiting disclosure to high-level principles and methodologies used for closure cost estimation (e.g., regulatory compliance, independent review, and periodic updates), rather than detailed financial assumptions.

SECTION: NA, Leading Practice

COMMENT:

Companies play an important role in supporting social transition at closure; however, they cannot be held accountable for realising long-term post-closure social and economic outcomes, which depend on government, community and market dynamics beyond company control. We suggest refocusing the requirement on supporting and enabling a responsible transition, rather than directly delivering outcomes.

COMMENT:

While this Performance Area is broadly aligned with recognised closure good practice, it would benefit from greater clarity on proportionality, practicality and consistent terminology to ensure feasible application across different asset types and life stages.

Closure planning maturity varies significantly across the asset lifecycle. For operations with long mine lives, legacy assets, or limited near-term closure relevance, detailed stakeholder engagement, disclosure and cost estimation requirements may be impractical or of limited value. Applying uniform expectations across all operations could lead to inefficient resource allocation and stakeholder fatigue, particularly where closure planning is still conceptual.

It would be helpful to introduce clear thresholds for application, such as requiring enhanced closure planning and engagement within 10 years of expected closure or when a material change in mine life or land use occurs. This would promote proportionality and risk-based implementation, ensuring that requirements remain meaningful, achievable and aligned with financial provisioning and risk management systems.

SECTION: NA, Towards Good Practice

COMMENT:

During early design, impacts, options and closure pathways are often preliminary or conceptual, limiting the value of stakeholder input. Premature engagement can create confusion or unrealistic expectations before closure options are technically or economically defined. We suggest reframing the expectation to require that meaningful engagement be introduced once potential impacts, options and post-closure pathways can

be credibly defined. This would ensure that stakeholder engagement occurs at an appropriate stage, when feedback can meaningfully inform closure planning and outcomes.