

# CMSI Consultation Response

## Respondent Details

NAME

Anonymous

COUNTRY

Canada

PERMISSION

Yes, CMSI can disclose my anonymous feedback.

STAKEHOLDER

Industry (downstream)

ORGANISATION

Anonymous

## COMMENTS & QUESTIONS BY DOCUMENT

### QUESTION 1

**Overall does the revised version of the Consolidated Standard system (including Standard, Assurance Process, Governance Model\* and Claims Policy) meet your expectations for improvement relative to the original public consultation version?**

Response: 3: Meets expectations

### QUESTION 2

**From your perspective, does the updated Consolidated Standard system, including Standard, Assurance Process, Governance Model\* and Claims Policy meet expectations for driving performance improvement across the industry at a global scale?**

Response: 4: Exceeds expectations

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

## General comment on Performance Area

### COMMENT:

• *Non-alignment with the EAA's trigger thresholds:*

*The document proposes internal criteria for assessing impacts, without reference to the regulatory thresholds that make an impact study mandatory (e.g., area, type of activity, sensitivity of the environment).*

• *Lack of compliance with the EEIRP:*

The standard does not mention the formal steps required by the EEIA: project notice, ministerial guidelines, study, public consultation, ministerial decision.

---

### **Performance Area 07: Rights of Workers**

SECTION: 7.1 Rights of Workers, Good Practice, 11

COMMENT:

*Where requirements are protected by law, what is the verification requirement?*

---

### **Performance Area 09: Safe, Healthy and Respectful Workplaces**

SECTION: Glossary and Interpretive Guidance

COMMENT:

*In certain jurisdictions, like Quebec, there are few certified hygienists. This will make this very difficult to achieve, even where there is will and intent by the site, especially if "oversight" implies "continual". Would suggest clarifying "qualified hygienist" and the boundaries of "oversight" so that jurisdictions where this role is difficult to fill are not unfairly penalized. While "Leading Practice" will not be the goal for all sites for every Performance Area, most mining companies will not tolerate lower performance in Health and Safety.*

---

COMMENT:

• *Omission of prevention obligations:*

*The document does not provide for a prevention plan, an OHS committee, or the designation of responsible persons, which contravenes sections 51 to 59 of the LSST and the Regulation respecting prevention and participation mechanisms.*

• *Non-compliance with Act 27 (PSM):*

*Since 2025, employers must include psychosocial risks in their prevention plan. The document does not address harassment, mental load, or psychological health.*

---

COMMENT:

• *No reference to OELs (occupational exposure limits)*

*The document does not mention any exposure thresholds for contaminants (dust, noise, solvents, etc.), which contravenes CNESST standards.*

• *Lack of environmental and medical monitoring protocol*

*No measurement, sampling, or medical monitoring mechanisms are provided for, even though these elements are required in high-risk environments (Occupational Health and Safety Regulations).*

---

### **Performance Area 13: Community Impacts and Benefits**

COMMENT:

- *Confusion between surface rights and mining rights:*

*The document does not distinguish between Quebec land tenure systems (claims, mining leases, private lots), which may lead to violations of property rights or legal occupation rights (Mining Act, Civil Code of Quebec).*

- *Omission of land access authorizations:*

*The standard does not require authorization from the owner or municipality to access land, which contravenes sections 235 et seq. of the Mining Act.*

---

## Performance Area 14: Indigenous Peoples

COMMENT:

- *Contradiction with the legal obligation to consult First Nations in Canada:*

*The document uses general terms such as “affected communities” without distinguishing Indigenous communities, whereas Quebec and Canadian case law requires specific, prior, and appropriate consultation with First Nations (QEA, Mining Act, Haida Nation case law).*

- *No reference to formal consultation mechanisms:*

*The standard proposes voluntary commitments, but does not mention the mandatory public consultations provided for in the Regulation respecting the assessment and examination of environmental impacts (REEIE)*

---

QUESTION 1

**Does the scope, content, and narrative style of the consolidated standard meet your individual expectations 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 (Towards Good Practice, Good Practice, Leading Practice) 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

**Does the level of transparency provided by the Claims Policy (i.e. through disclosing scores for each Performance Area, aggregated scores to indicate overall progress towards Good Practice, and Performance Claims) meet your expectations to incentivise continuous performance improvement?**

Response: 4: Exceeds expectations