

CMSI Consultation Response

Respondent Details

NAME

Kirsten Margrethe Hovi

COUNTRY

Norway

PERMISSION

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

STAKEHOLDER

Industry (upstream)

ORGANISATION

Norsk Hydro ASA

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: No Response

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: No Response

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:

The current draft of the standard appears to give limited consideration to activities beyond mining. While there are occasional references to refining and smelting, these are typically framed as ancillary to mining operations. The standard is defined explicitly as a mining standard, with terminology and implementation guidance focused almost exclusively on mines and mining companies.

As a result, many of the requirements seem applicable primarily within a mining context. In cases where refining or smelting is co-located with mining, it may be reasonable to interpret the standard as extending to those activities. However, the language and structure of the document are not well suited to standalone refining or smelting facilities. Several requirements are difficult to interpret or implement meaningfully in the absence of mining activities.

It is understandable that the standard is mining-centric, given its title –the Consolidated Mining Standard. However, if the intention is to encompass the broader upstream metals value chain, as suggested by ICMM’s stated objectives, the current draft does not adequately reflect the operational realities of refining and smelting facilities. Several Performance Expectations (PAs) appear to be immaterial to these types of operations. Moreover, the standard lacks a clear mechanism for evaluating PAs through a materiality or risk-based lens, which would be essential for meaningful application beyond mining contexts.

Performance Area 05: Human Rights

SECTION: 5.1 Human Rights, Leading Practice, 5

COMMENT:

We suggest adding “if applicable” towards the end of the requirement:

5. Assist business partners 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, if applicable.

SECTION: 5.1 Human Rights, Towards Good Practice, 2

COMMENT:

We suggest adding “where applicable” to the end of the requirement:

2. Conduct a human rights risk assessment or integrate human rights risks into Facility-wide risk assessments, including risks associated with vulnerable and marginalised groups and human rights defenders (HRDs), where applicable.

Performance Area 08: Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

SECTION: 8.2 Management of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (Facility Level), Good Practice, 6

COMMENT:

We recommend strengthening this by adding a Leading Practice expectation for monitoring supplier DEI performance.

ISO 30415:2021 -Encourages organizations to promote DEI practices among suppliers and, at more advanced levels, monitor their performance.

GRI 414 -While GRI 405 focuses on internal diversity, GRI 414 include supplier assessments on social criteria, which can encompass DEI and support accountability across the value chain.

SECTION: 8.2 Management of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (Facility Level), Good Practice, 9

COMMENT:

Given the sensitivity of this topic, we suggested moving it to Leading Practice or clarifying that Good Practice refers only to aggregated, non-identifiable data (which we assume should be a consequence of #8 but could be misunderstood).

ISO 30415:2021 -Calls for transparent reporting while ensuring confidentiality and compliance with legal requirements. This suggests that disclosure should be structured and anonymized at earlier maturity stages, with full transparency reserved for advanced levels.

GRI 405 -Recommends reporting diversity indicators (e.g., gender, age) for governance bodies and employees. While quantitative data is expected, the GRI guidance emphasizes using aggregated data to protect privacy.

SECTION: 8.2 Management of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (Facility Level), Leading Practice, 2

COMMENT:

We suggest expanding this requirement by explicitly encouraging participation in multi-stakeholder DEI initiatives.

ISO 30415:2021 -Promotes collaboration with external stakeholders and industry peers to advance DEI. At higher maturity levels, ISO recommends active participation in multi-stakeholder initiatives to address systemic barriers.”

COMMENT:

We suggest expanding this requirement by explicitly encouraging participation in multi-stakeholder DEI initiatives.

ISO 30415:2021 -Promotes collaboration with external stakeholders and industry peers to advance DEI. At higher maturity levels, ISO recommends active participation in multi-stakeholder initiatives to address systemic barriers.”

Performance Area 12: Engagement

SECTION: 12.1 Engagement, Good Practice, 1

COMMENT:

We suggest adding the words “wherever possible” as indicated in capital letters:

1. Develop and implement an engagement plan, informed by input from stakeholders and rights-holders, aimed at building trusting relationships between the Facility and stakeholders and rights-holders and informing how the Facility is managed. When developing the engagement plan, consider the convenience, accessibility and gender and cultural appropriateness of processes to stakeholders and rights-holders, and address, **WHEREVER POSSIBLE**, any barriers to participation.

SECTION: 12.1 Engagement, Towards Good Practice, 3

COMMENT:

We suggest adding the word “could” as indicated in capital letters:

Undertake meaningful engagement with potentially affected stakeholders and rights-holders on processes and decisions that **COULD** affect their health, wellbeing, safety, livelihoods, communities, lands, environment and other rights and interests. Hold separate engagements with women, vulnerable and/or underrepresented groups where appropriate. (...)

Performance Area 13: Community Impacts and Benefits

SECTION: 13.1 Community Impact Management, Leading Practice, 2

COMMENT:

How to define or demonstrate “effectiveness”?

Performance Area 14: Indigenous Peoples

SECTION: Glossary and Interpretive Guidance

COMMENT:

Indigenous Peoples: We believe the definition is ambiguous and it is unclear whether it refers exclusively to indigenous peoples or not. In the first paragraph, the concept seems more inclusive, referring to specific cases such as that of the Quilombolas.

However, at the end of the concept, it distinguishes indigenous peoples from other groups. Note that Quilombolas would not be “indigenous or pre-colonial, but a product of the history of slavery.”

However, ILO-169 in Brazil is understood to encompass other categories, such as Quilombolas. In the Aluminium Stewardship Initiative (ASI) under discussion, the categorization is also more comprehensive, using indigenous and land-connected people. (In our understanding, the ASI concept is more assertive).

Performance Area 17: Grievance Management

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

COMMENT:

It is unclear to us what a “mutually agreed process” would be if the assessment is linked to the provisions of the UNGPs. We therefore suggest removing this part.

Performance Area 18: Water Stewardship

COMMENT:

Comment relates to requirements outlined under PA18.1, Good Practice subindicators 1, 10, 11, and 12, PA18.2, Towards Good Practice 1, 2, 3 and 4 and Good Practice 1, 2 and 3, and PA18.3, Towards Good Practice 1:

Several requirements appear to represent a disproportionately high level of water management effort in contexts where water is not a material risk. While these expectations may be appropriate for mining operations or regions facing significant water-related challenges—such as drought, excessive rainfall, or flooding—they are less applicable to facilities where water risks are minimal. For example, smelting operations in regions like Norway typically do not face material water-related risks, making the implementation of these practices unnecessarily burdensome.

To ensure relevance and proportionality, it is recommended that the standard allow for a more flexible, risk-based approach to water management. This would enable facilities to assess the applicability of good practice requirements based on site-specific materiality and risk profiles, thereby maintaining credibility while avoiding excessive or misaligned expectations. An alternative is to make these indicators not mandatory to stand-alone smelters.

Performance Area 19: Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services and Nature

SECTION: 19.1 Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services and Nature

COMMENT:

Comment on PA19.1, Towards Good Practice 5:

The requirement is not risk-based. It obliges the facility to establish a biodiversity baseline before identifying relevant biodiversity values and conducting a risk assessment. This sequence seems misaligned with a risk-based approach.

The definition of “area of influence” includes associated facilities that are not under the facility’s control but would not exist without its activities. This is extremely challenging to incorporate into a biodiversity baseline in a quantifiable way, as we may lack direct access to the necessary data for these associated facilities.

Comment on PA19.1 Good Practice 2:

With respect to NNL (No Net Loss) and NG (Net Gain) outcomes when mitigating biodiversity impacts, NNL provides a clearly defined outcome that facilitates auditing and compliance. Transitioning to a NG requirement raises the question of how much additional gain beyond NNL is considered “enough” to comply with the Standard—e.g., 1% more, 10% more? It may be preferable to set a minimum threshold of NNL and then allow for other forms of nature investment that deliver broader or greater benefits, even if these are not directly tied to a measurable gain against the company’s own impact footprint.

Performance Area 23: Circular Economy

SECTION: 23.2 Additional Requirements for Smelters

COMMENT:

For PA23.2, it is likely that many aluminium smelters will not be able to progress beyond the “Towards Good Practice” level. The aluminium sector already has a mature recycling market, and for primary aluminium smelters, recycling external scrap may not—and in some cases should not—be a priority. This should be considered when defining expectations for higher performance levels. If this requirement is continued, it should be evaluated at the Group level rather than for each individual smelter. Scrap would normally be recycled closer to the market rather than transporting it over long distances to where the smelters are situated.

Performance Area 24: Closure

SECTION: 24.1 Closure Management

COMMENT:

Comment on PA24.1:

On a general basis, we believe that plants in full operation that update their closure plans every five years, would cause more anxiety than reassurance when addressing this type of issue with people in the community. We believe that the only stakeholders involved today in updating the closure plan that is applicable authorities, are more relevant.

Towards Good Practice 1: Several key terms lack clear definitions, including “safe,” “stable,” and “material risks.” The interpretation of “material risks” is particularly significant and has been a major point of discussion within GISTM and GTMI.

Good Practice 5: This indicator should specify a clear condition for when the required work concludes, such as upon regulatory approval or after relinquishment.

Good Practice 6: Ensure alignment with relevant accounting standards and practices, for example, IFRS, to maintain consistency and compliance.

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

With certain exceptions as commented in the survey, most importantly on the scope of the standard: While it seems tailor-made for mining operations, parts of it are less applicable for standalone refineries and smelters.

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

With certain exceptions as commented in the survey, most importantly on the scope of the standard: While it seems tailor-made for mining operations, parts of it are less applicable for standalone refineries and smelters.

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: 3: Meets expectations

With certain exceptions as commented in the survey, most importantly on the scope of the standard: While it seems tailor-made for mining operations, parts of it are less applicable for standalone refineries and smelters.

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: No Response