

Responsible Minerals Sector Initiative (RMSI)

Summary of the Dialogue Session

***GEMM 20/20: Global Exploration, Mining and Minerals in 2020:
Responsibility and Sustainability Challenges and Opportunities***

April 17 & 18, 2012

Wosk Centre for Dialogue, Vancouver, Canada

Follow up discussions were held on April 19th.

An Invitational Dialogue to bring together people and organizations from diverse perspectives and experiences to share insights and concepts, develop strategies and tools, and build networks and relationships for effective leadership and responsible management in the mineral sector.

These notes were prepared in summary form to support ongoing dialogue and capture essential points made by participants, without attribution. They are intended to reflect the nature and flow of the conversation, highlighting themes and directions that emerged, and identifying areas of common ground, differences and underlying reasons. The notes do not represent a complete record or indicate any degree of approval by any participant. Responsibility for their preparation and content rests with RMSI.

Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Background	5
A Collaborative Space for Dialogue, not a Conference.....	6
Opening and Introductions.....	7
Theme 1: Where we’ve come from, where we’re going and how to move forward	8
Theme 2: Developing Norms and Embedding Sustainability	12
Theme 3: Living Together in spite of our Differences.....	16
Theme 4: Companies and Communities: Building Enduring Relationships	19
Theme 5: Directions and Actions	24
Potential Activity/Project Zones	24
Identified Key Projects	26
Acknowledgements.....	28
RMSI Team	28
Appendix 1: Additional Points Raised by Participants	29
Appendix 2: List of Participants	31

Executive Summary

In April 2012, participants from around the world congregated in Vancouver to talk about the future of the mineral sector. The gathering was not a typical conference or seminar, but rather the beginning of a continuing conversation to tackle the toughest questions that must be addressed if the mineral sector is to demonstrate sustainability and responsibility over the coming decade.

Glenn Sigurdson, Chair of RMSI opened the dialogue explaining the vision: “These dialogues are about more voices with fewer words, rather than few voices with many words. There are many truths in this room. This is a space for giving expression to them, not to decipher one truth.”

The event, ***GEMM 20/20: Global Exploration, Mining and Minerals in 2020 – Sustainability and Responsibility Challenges and Opportunities***, was the latest in a series of invitational dialogues held by **The Responsible Minerals Sector Initiative (RMSI)**, a collaboration housed at Simon Fraser University’s Beedie School of Business.

“10 years ago, the Mining, Minerals and Sustainable Development project (MMSD) identified the need for a structured way for multiple stakeholders to exchange views and concerns,” says Luke Danielson, then its Project Director and now President of the Sustainable Development Strategies Group.

“Understanding mining as a process is one of the greatest challenges for stakeholder development. There must be an ongoing structure for dialogue among stakeholders, and this series of dialogues is a tremendous opportunity to reflect and see where we stand.”

Held at SFU’s Wosk Centre for Dialogue on April 17 and 18, 2012, the dialogue saw over 140 invited participants representing communities, companies, non-governmental organizations, academic institutions and governments. The group assembled to share insights and concepts, develop strategies and tools, and build networks and relationships for effective leadership and responsible management in the mineral sector over the coming decade. Many saw in GEMM a global reconnection of thought leaders from across the sector, and an opportunity to reflect on the challenges that remain, identify gaps and adjust the course.

The central message was clear. The last decade has been about **standard setting and creating awareness** for sustainable development. The next ten years must be a period of **implementation**. Increasingly, it is being recognized that mineral extraction will be most successful if there is a clear answer to the question “**mining for whom and to what end?**” How communities, companies, NGOs and governments connect to answer this question is a key implementation challenge. Capacity building within governments (particularly at the local level) and communities interacting with the mineral industry is a critical gap. Without a role and support structures of government and communities, industry cannot succeed and move forward. Companies also need to look inside themselves. The challenge is to find ways organizations can reflect broader values and develop the competencies to understand and apply those values in the decisions they make and places they operate. This is going to require recognition of the rapidly growing influence of the human rights agenda within the sustainability framework.

Several informal groups came together on April 19th after the dialogue, to begin to scope activities which are the basis of working groups whose efforts are ongoing. These include: the need for more creative and accessible tools for communities affected by mining; mapping of the multitude of existing regulatory and non-regulatory activities, processes, standards and codes, and exploring the possibility for consolidation; and a framework for the implementation of responsible mining that reflects the interests of all sectors.

“The function of RMSI is not to “own” these projects, but rather to build a collaborative space and provide support for their advancement,” explains Sigurdson. Jessica Bratty, his RMSI Associate, adds: “We hope to reinforce, support and advance various projects and activities going forward. A year from now, at the next dialogue in the series, RMSI aims to be in a position where these projects can be debriefed, evaluated and furthered in a collaborative way.”

The next in the series of dialogues, ***GEMM 2013 “Building from the Ground Up: Implementing Responsibility and Sustainability in the Global Mineral Sector”*** will be held on **April 16th - 18th, 2013**. Developing *Pathways for Improving Practice and Agendas for Responsive Research* is integral to the RMSI platform, and specific work sessions to support this will be built into the dialogue design.

RMSI is currently accepting Expressions of Interest to participate in GEMM 2013.

Background

1. The **Responsible Minerals Sector Initiative (RMSI)**, a collaboration housed at Simon Fraser University’s Beedie School of Business, is hosting series of invitational dialogues and a growing portfolio of projects designed to advance responsibility and sustainability in the mineral sector. RMSI brings together people from around the world with diverse perspectives and experiences to share insights and concepts, develop strategies and tools, and build networks and relationships for effective leadership and responsible management in the mineral sector.
2. The overall goal of RMSI is to structure a “continuing conversation” on key issues among experienced and knowledgeable leaders, practitioners, decision makers and researchers from communities, indigenous societies, non-government organizations, companies and governments to develop a focused program of activities related to **Pathways for Improving Practice** and **Agendas for Responsive Research**.
3. This report is for the third RMSI Dialogue Series event, entitled “**GEMM 20/20 Global Exploration, Mining and Minerals in 2020: Responsibility and Sustainability Challenges and Opportunities**” held on April 17, 18, 2012 in Vancouver, BC, Canada. Follow up meetings were held on April 19th. The objectives of the GEMM 2020 Dialogue were to:
 - a. Confront the toughest issues that must be addressed for the mineral sector to move forward in demonstrating sustainability and responsibility over the coming decade.
 - b. Identify specific priority projects or activities responsive to these issues to define “Pathways for Improving Practice” and “Agendas for Responsive Research”.
 - c. Expand and deepen across sectors and disciplines the network of experienced and knowledgeable leaders, practitioners, decision makers and researchers from communities, non-government organizations, companies and governments.
4. The GEMM 2020 dialogue agenda was developed by the GEMM 2020 Steering Committee and Working Group members to address key issues and challenges facing the mineral sector. Accordingly, the dialogue was fashioned in a way that built a conversation around key themes and questions - not people and presentations. People registered for the event to engage, not to hear a particular person speak. A full list of participants is attached in Appendix 2.
5. Dialogue was structured around five focused theme areas:
 - a. **Where we’ve come from, where we’re going, and how to move forward.**
 - b. **Developing norms and embedding sustainability:** Issues of accountability and governance, risk assessment and management, competencies and corporate culture.
 - c. **Living together in spite of our differences:** Building resilient relationships and resolving conflict.
 - d. **Companies and communities:** Building enduring relationships.
 - e. **Directions and actions** – Shaping the agendas for advancing “Pathways to Practice” and “Agendas for Research”.

A Collaborative Space for Dialogue, not a Conference

6. The RMSI Dialogue Series maintains a consistent “**Spirit of the Dialogue**” to support a continuing conversation, and share and discuss diverse perspectives, values and interests - not engage in a conference or negotiation to reach outcomes. The following points reflect the shared understandings of how all dialogues proceed.
 - Beginning a conversation, not attending a conference. Lay the foundations for building the relationships and networks that will sustain a continuing conversation into the future.
 - Diverse voices from across the sectors with different values and interests. Participants open to the possibility that their ideas may evolve over the course of the dialogue.
 - Safe place to understand where we agree and disagree, and explore the reasons with a view to strengthening the common ground and finding ways to live with each other in spite of our differences.
 - More voices with fewer words, rather than few voices with many words. Respect for each other by respecting the need for the discipline of time, and trusting that what is said and done here will stay here so that each of us can engage in an open and comfortable way.
 - Summary notes will capture the history of the conversation without attribution, so that everyone is able to share the nature of the conversation and the discussions that took place.
 - Identify and advance shared projects and activities to address gaps and build a basis for effective collaboration.
7. GEMM 2020 was designed to maximize interaction and engagement among all participants. Each theme was introduced by pre-identified *Opening Discussants*, their ideas were further built upon by *Commentators*, and then all attendees participated if they chose in plenary dialogue. *Closing Discussants* provided concluding remarks at the end of each theme area. All presentations given at the event are available on-line at <http://beedie.sfu.ca/rmsi/>.
8. Simultaneous English-Spanish interpretation and some support for French translation helped to support a **cross-cultural exchange**, within the unique facility space of Simon Fraser University’s Wosk Centre for Dialogue’s Asia Pacific Hall (<http://www.sfu.ca/mecs/wosk+dialogue+centre/rooms/asia+pacific+hall.html>).
9. Participants could also provide comments, ask questions or suggest next steps through an online **collaborative technology** platform hosted and facilitated by a respected SFU Faculty member. On several occasions, the online contributions were introduced back into the plenary discussions to support integration of perspectives. Online comments and questions related to the in-person discussion are integrated into these summary notes. Additional points are attached in Appendix 1.
10. The GEMM 2020 Dialogue included opportunities for informal conversations over lunch, an opening and closing reception and **follow-up visits and meetings on April 19**, some of which had been organized in advance, and others that grew out of the dialogue. These conversations mapped out future collaborative projects that are now in their nascent phases.

11. These notes were prepared in summary form to support ongoing dialogue and capture essential points made by participants, without attribution. The notes do not represent a complete record or indicate any degree of approval by any participant. They are intended to reflect the nature and flow of the conversation, highlighting themes and directions that emerged, and identifying areas of common ground, differences and underlying reasons. Responsibility for their preparation and content rests with RMSI. This summary is an attempt to reflect and represent the important points expressed by different people at different times throughout the dialogue.

Opening and Introductions

12. In customary fashion, the Squamish Nation opened the GEMM 2020 Dialogue and recognized the Coast Salish traditional territories upon which the meeting was held.
13. The GEMM 2020 dialogue was designed to build a conversation within a community of participants. Participants were asked to break into small groups for introductions and to reflect on the question: ***“It is 2020. You are reflecting back on today. What is the most noteworthy occurrence that has changed the mineral sector over the past eight years?”*** Key points were captured on sticky notes and displayed at breaks so others could comment.
14. The **Responsible Mineral Sector Initiative** was the context in which the dialogue took place. The words in the Initiative were chosen to reflect the different themes of the RMSI Dialogue Series.
- **Responsible:** no matter what perspective you come from within the sector, there are responsibilities; RMSI is a space to understand and explore respective responsibilities of all parties.
 - **Mineral:** embraces the widest possible chain of activities, from exploration to development to production to sales; all stages of the supply chain are relevant.
 - **Sector:** RMSI is an *inclusive* place; each sector (corporate, NGO, community, government, etc.) has a reciprocal interest in understanding what other stakeholders are pursuing and why in order to effectually advance their own interests.
 - **Initiative:** RMSI’s goal is to support, coordinate, credential and advance projects through collaboration as partners, not owners.

Theme 1: Where we’ve come from, where we’re going and how to move forward

Key Questions:

- What are the key events over the past 20 years which have shaped “responsibility and sustainability” in the mineral sector, and what do these events reveal about what can be celebrated and what remains to be done?
- What are some of the key “tension points” that remain on moving forward, e.g.:
 - Responsibility and sustainability – moving from words to actions, but actions by whom, in what way, and to what end?
 - Directors, duties and dollars – is CSR a cost of compliance with the law or an investment in an asset?
 - Differences and disputes – Are they risks to be avoided or opportunities to create relationships?
 - Mines and neighbours – Will improving people’s lives increase or decrease the bottom-line? How do we make a difference on the ground?
 - Beyond rights to results – what will it take to turn declarations into dialogue that encompasses both rights and mutual interests?

Opening Discussants:

Luke Danielson	<i>Principal</i>	<i>Sustainable Strategies Research Group, USA</i>
Cristina Echavarría	<i>Board Member</i>	<i>Alliance for Responsible Mining, Colombia</i>
Brent Bergeron	<i>VP, Corporate Affairs</i>	<i>GoldCorp, Canada</i>
Stephen D’Esposito	<i>President</i>	<i>RESOLVE, USA</i>
Jim Cooney	<i>Senior Associate</i>	<i>RMSI and CBERN, Canada</i>

Commentators:

Judy St. George	<i>Director General, Trade Commissioner Service</i>	<i>DFAIT, Canada</i>
Jeffery Davidson	<i>Professor, Applied Mineral Economics and Mining Sustainability</i>	<i>Queens University, Canada</i>
Lilia Granillo Vazquez	<i>Professora, Cultural Studies, Gender, Language and Sustainability</i>	<i>Universidad Autonoma Metropolitana, Mexico</i>
Abbi Buxton	<i>Researcher, Sustainable Markets Group</i>	<i>International Institute for Sustainable Development, UK</i>

Closing Discussants:

Malcolm Scoble	<i>Professor, Department Head Mining Engineering</i>	<i>University of British Columbia, Canada</i>
Jeremy Hall	<i>Professor</i>	<i>Simon Fraser University, Canada</i>

15. In the late 90’s, the mineral sector was facing growing challenges in many places around the globe that was threatening the industry’s ability to access resources and operate mines. Several leading CEO’s meeting in Davos in 1998 decided that an initiative to examine the role of mining and minerals in the world should be initiated. They agreed to give leadership to the Global Mining Initiative (GMI) and soon many other companies agreed to become part of this initiative. Responsibility for a global project of research and engagement described as Mines, Minerals and Sustainable Development (MMSD) was delegated to the independent leadership and oversight of the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), headquartered in London. In 2002, MMSD issued a major report, together with several reports from regional MMSD activities. These were showcased in a major conference in Toronto that year, and then taken forward to the World Conference on the Environment in Johannesburg.

16. “MMSD offered an independent review of how the mining and minerals industry performed in relation to broad-ranging sustainable development issues. Its findings were game-changing for the sector. MMSD provided a foundation for shared understanding by stakeholders from mining CEOs to community groups. Mining CEOs of the day committed to act on its agenda as a robust and credible way to maximize the sector’s contribution to sustainable development.”
17. A decade later, IIED undertook a review of MMSD. A 10-page synopsis was prepared for and tabled at GEMM 2020 for the first time, in anticipation of the full report being taken into the Rio Plus 20 Conference, in Brazil in June, 2012. For a full review of MMSD, please consult Abbi Buxton’s paper, *MMSD +10: Reflecting on a Decade* (<http://pubs.iied.org/16041IIED.html>).
18. Since MMSD, against the backdrop of its findings, there have been many developments relating to the social and environmental performance of the industry, including a proliferation of performance standards, compliance ombudsmen, the GRI, voluntary principles on human rights, etc.
19. MMSD identified many critical challenges, and in doing so created expectations of actions, including:
 - Capacity building within governments and communities with extractive sector activities to enhance their ability to deal with companies.
 - A greater understanding within the industry of their roles and responsibilities.
 - Educating on sustainable mining within the industry.
20. Many of these challenges remain; expectations are unfulfilled. Why? What are the roadblocks inhibiting their development? What can be done? These were some of the central questions raised at the GEMM 2020 Dialogue.
21. The importance of cross-sectoral dialogue was one of the outcomes of the MMSD. One of the expectations envisioned was that ways to continue this dialogue would be developed. This has not happened. In that respect this GEMM dialogue represents the resumption of the promise of that continuing dialogue.
22. Other priorities identified through the MMSD process that remain unfulfilled include:
 - The critical challenge posed by the time-lag between when the impacts and needs of mining affected communities are being experienced, and when revenues from a mine start to flow. Corporate financial drivers are designed to postpone application of taxes and royalties for as long as possible. Unless sustainability is embedded into the financial culture of companies this challenge will go unanswered. Looked at through this lens, CSR activities and expenditures are in effect just a way of “buying time”. By the time revenues start to flow, there may have already been 10-12 years of serious social and environmental impact on communities and countries.
 - Brining China, India and other “emerging investor” nations that were not big overseas industry players into conversations around sustainability and capacity building was recognized as a key issue 10-12 years ago.
 - Developing an international facility for capacity building on the part of governments, particularly at the local level, and communities.

Why these challenges remain unfulfilled remains a critical challenge going forward.

23. **“Mining for whom, and to what end”** was the way one participant framed the essential challenge over the next decade. Is this not the heart of the issue? “Mining for whom” is the fundamental question that communities are putting to companies and government’s alike where mineral extraction is taking place. If industry is to work effectively within communities, it is this question that must be put and answered.
24. **Implementation** - what will it take to turn words into actions, was the way another framed the central challenge of the decade ahead. The last ten years have been about *standard setting and creating awareness* for sustainable development. There has been progress in recent years, e.g. scientific research/technological advancements, and also some governance/process accomplishments, e.g. the Kimberley process, the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM) and the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI). Putting standards into place is one thing, putting them into practice is another. It is the latter onto which we now need to focus.
25. **Governance** is central to implementation. Building effective governance will take effective engagement among a wide range of stakeholders; inter-sectoral dialogue will need to be a key element. The context has also evolved with an increasing focus on inequality and rights in countries where the extractive sectors are operating. Some stakeholders are longstanding, but there are also new players that also need to become involved. **Institutional investors** are an example for they are increasingly emerging as an active player in these emerging dynamics.
26. In Latin America, anti-mining movements have been growing in strength. Communities are demanding to understand how minerals are going to change their lives and livelihoods, as well as the risks with their extraction. Transparency and honesty will be critical if the dialogue is to have any integrity.
27. In Canada, there are a growing number of positive examples of industry-community relationships and partnerships. One such example was a mine in Northern Quebec with the Cree people. The development of a Cree Mining Policy by a Canadian company included an emphasis on collaboration committees on job and skills creation, education, and business development. Might some of these Canadian examples around consultation and accommodation provide helpful guidance to apply elsewhere?
28. Another perspective reflected on the trajectory of sustainability within the mineral sector over the past twenty years, as a movement from **resistance, reaction, experimentation** and **acceptance**, to **integration**. Emerging issues, including the global human rights agenda and the specific focus around *Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)*, seem to be moving along a similar course. The framing of the debate now starting to emerge on the horizon is wealth creation and distribution, social progress, environment enhancement, etc. Is now the time for reflecting, as the French describe it *“reculer pour mieux sauter”* ... stepping backwards in order to leap forwards.
29. A civil society energized by communities with a robust network of NGO’s emerged in the wake of the Rio Earth Summit in 1993. New dynamics followed. The corporative narrative was not up to the

challenge of dealing with conflict and disaster scenarios (e.g. the 2000 Baia Mare cyanide spill). Increasingly, control of the message and image of the mineral sector would be shaped by a global NGO network.

30. In this last decade, the context continued to evolve:

- High commodity prices with rising revenues, and profits.... And more questions about who was receiving all the benefits.
- More money brought increased exploration, particularly in developing countries was increasing the visibility of the industry worldwide
- Growing concerns from investors, especially institutional investors, demanding more transparency and better governance of companies within the sector.

31. This evolving context brought into focus the **Five C's; community; collaboration; capacity building** and “toolkits;” **consolidation; catalyzing activity.**

32. In making progress in the next decade some of the key areas that were brought into focus included:

- the importance of pilot projects
- shared responsibility of products and process made possible through supply chains,
- learning from other countries and institutional environments as well as other sectors such as oil and gas, forestry and agriculture,
- situational analysis *before* actions.

Theme 2: Developing Norms and Embedding Sustainability: Issues of accountability and governance, risk assessment and management, competencies and corporate culture

Key Questions:

- How effective have the instruments of public policy, regulation and international codes and declarations been in embedding sustainability into corporate, community and government structures?
- Are existing metrics, financial instruments and due diligence mechanisms sufficient to effectively measure “CSR and Sustainability” risks and opportunities across the “supply chain”? Is there a need for new metrics and /or processes and how might they be developed?
- Do we have the language we need, and adequate means to understand one another, to communicate and embed an appreciation of the risks and opportunities into the DNA of the different interests and organizations from “finance to operations, the rockface to community halls, and in boardrooms”?
- What special challenges arise with respect to exploration and junior operators, given their size, the nature of their operations, and their financial arrangements?
- What governance structures, management practices, and personal competencies are needed to embed sustainability? What are the fundamental lines of accountability that must flow from Boards of Directors down through organizations, and back up?

Opening Discussants:

Stephen Kibsey	Senior PM	Caisse de Depot et Placement, Canada
Alan Young	Director	Materials Efficiency Research Group, Canada
David Parker	VP, Sustainability	Teck Resources, Canada
Robert Adamson	Director, CIBC Centre for Corporate Governance and Risk Management	Simon Fraser University, Canada

Commentators:

Armando Ortega	Vice President, Latin America	New Gold, Canada
David Katamba	Chairman	Uganda Chapter for Corporate Social Responsibility Initiatives, Uganda

Closing Discussants:

Assheton Carter	Senior VP, Global Engagement and Strategy	Pact, UK
Wes Cragg	Director and Principal Investigator	Canadian Business Ethics Research Network, Canada

33. “Sustainability” and “CSR” are words more likely to resonate within companies than communities, particularly in the developing world. Similarly, a word like “social licensing” may convey different meanings, with different expectations. Many companies still understand the term as a permit to exercise their interests, not a long-term working relationship. The expectation within a community, where the mine and the company will be a neighbor for a long time, is more likely the latter. This raises the question, are we using the right language?

34. Words mean different things to different people, and they can get in the way of good communication. And they can often deflect from more fundamental questions that need to be addressed. A question put was this: Do words like "CSR", "Sustainability", "Indigenous Relations", and "Community Relations," allow us to sidestep the real point which is, **“What will it take to effect a change in corporate culture?”**

35. Both governments and companies have sustainability responsibilities. If a company assumes too many responsibilities, it may be enabling the government to avoid responsibilities to its

communities that should properly be assumed by it, the communities themselves or other institutions of civil society. This raises an even larger question; “What is the responsibility of host governments in assuring that mining activities occur in sustainable and responsible manners that leads to prosperity for its people? “

36. Achieving sustainability involves creating a **culture** of sustainability in organizations, such as has been accomplished with Health & Safety. There are many elements that need to be absorbed within this culture including relationships, rights and interests and integrating them. Organizations, and those within them, will only act in accordance with sustainability when that culture becomes the brand or identity by which the company is known. There are many elements involved in achieving integration:

- Clear expectations around dialogue
- Communication and collaboration
- Professional training and education that embeds the concepts and values of sustainability
- Clear roles and responsibilities expected by employees within organizations
- Building the language and analytics that link managing risk and generating profit
- Expenditures on sustainability need to be seen not just as “expenditures,” but as investments
- Understanding the main drivers affecting board decision-making processes and how such drivers will evolve over time
- Educated boards on the risks that companies are taking by failing to engage in sustainability would make them more responsive
- It is necessary to embrace the possibility that there are many possible ‘correct’ answers to problems.

37. Responses to sustainability vary widely across regions. Examples shared included:

- In Mexico, some, but certainly not all, Canadian companies have brought a culture of sustainability with them. Many of the operating companies are small and do not have the same corporate culture of sustainability, and much less the capacity to implement it. For companies big and small, the complexity of implementing sustainability practices includes dealing with complex landholding arrangements with multiple individual rights across much of the land base of the country.
- In West Africa, the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) has adopted regulations that cover principles of human rights and responsible development.
- In sub-Saharan Africa, broad geopolitical developments are shaping the response. Increasingly through the BRICS (an association of leading emerging economies – Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa), the focus is on **development partnerships**, not relationship building, with communities.

38. Voluntary measures are important, but are they effective? That was the hard question put forward. Unless they take place within the context of a regulatory framework and are enforced, will they

really ensure that adverse impacts and conflict will not occur? The role of government is larger than enforcement for a regulatory framework; it can also create requirements, expectations and set precedents within which voluntary measure can take place and be assessed.

39. **Junior mining companies** face specific challenges and several participants framed these in the form of questions, including:

- What tools and guidance are juniors using? Do they feel they have the resources and skills to implement the standards set by ICMM, and many other associations?
- What skills and capabilities need to be embedded into the education of future mining professionals so that they are able to and motivated to make use of the various sustainability and community engagement tools that are currently out there?
- How can experience knowledge and techniques be transferred between majors, mid-tiers and juniors?

40. Risk management can be looked at through the lens of sustainability, and that is becoming increasingly the case, especially within the institutional investment community. There are ongoing efforts to more fully understand this relationship and to develop the tools that give it effect, which include:

- Metrics to assess and mechanisms to manage;
- Isolating key parameters of assurance from the plethora of existing standards and codes;
- Identifying priorities

41. One participant put forth the view that **Stakeholder Panels** (company, community, NGO, government, etc.) were an important tool that responded to many difficult challenges, and specifically suggested that:

- Sustainability is best approached through a multi-sectoral panel that can identify ways to add value to CSR initiatives within companies.
- Companies can meet objectives more efficiently and with less conflict if they work with all stakeholders.
- The industry is influenced by the very constellation of our society; desired outcomes may require systemic changes beyond the mineral sector.

42. One concern raised was that Indigenous communities are often also governments, and, as such do not see themselves as “stakeholders,” and indeed resist the name. Panels of this kind will be compromised if the stewards of the land are not recognized or present as a different kind of interest at the table.

43. Mining involves the depletion of an ore body, an inherently unsustainable activity. How then can we speak of sustainability within a mining context? The term has come to be understood and applied as the extent to which the mining activity operates within a sustainable way with respect to the community, and leaves behind a positive legacy after the mine has closed. This is the community’s legacy; they must own it as it is they who are there before, during, and long after the mine has left.

A shared sense of sustainable development, not just an industrial legacy, must be the goal. This has implications:

- The legacy must include the environmental, social and economic viability of the community.
- Capacity building of mines must take place as part of that legacy.
- Comprehensive development plans are essential.

Theme 3: Living Together in spite of our Differences: Building Resilient Relationships and Resolving Conflict

Key Questions:

- How can conflict between mining companies and communities be managed and resolved more productively?
- What is the range or ‘smorgasbord’ of options that exists for managing conflict?
- What are the risks, challenges and resistance points for each option – from the perspective of companies, communities and civil society organizations?
- Who convenes stakeholders to begin a dialogue process? What is the role of 3rd party neutrality?

Opening Discussants:

Kate Kopischke (Co-Chair)	Senior Mediator	RESOLVE, US
Marketa Evans (Co-Chair)	Extractive Sector CSR Counselor	Office of the Extractive Sector CSR Counselor, Canada
Onome Ako	Program Manager, CSR Extractives	World Vision Canada, Canada
Paul Warner	Owner, Principal Consultant	Both Sides Now Consulting Inc., US
Antonio Bernales	Executive Director	Futuro Sostenible, Peru

Commentators:

David Atkins	Technical Advisor	Compliance Advisor/Ombudsman, US
---------------------	-------------------	----------------------------------

Closing Discussants:

Gary MacDonald	Principal	Monkey Forest Consulting, Hong Kong
Ricardo Sepulveda	Director General	Centro Juridico para los Derechos Humanos, Mexico

44. To provide some contextual background, some points raised included:

- Since 2001, the mining industry’s CSR ranking has only marginally improved.
- The significant liberalization of trade and investment globally has been accompanied by a significant rise in conflict.
- The Human Rights Risks Index shows that mining companies are going directly into conflict "hot zones," often characterized by discord between communities and corporations, with a high incidence of human rights violations.
- Measurements to recognize the “cost of conflict” are not well developed. There are conventional costs like the expenses of litigation, and the loss of employee time. But what are the risks of litigation, in terms of “winning/losing”, or relationships? Then there are the possible downstream implications relating to the viability of the project, or reputational implications implicating other potential projects.

45. When conflict arises, and inevitably it will, what tools have been developed to respond to it? This is an important, but too often, overlooked area of capacity building. Conflict, anticipating it and dealing with it when it arises, is complicated and when tools are being developed they need to take into account many considerations:

- Communities, particularly indigenous ones, bring distinct perspectives informed by their history.

- Capacity building is a long process – but that reality cannot be used to avoid the obligation to recognize and protect human rights in the present.
- Experience in negotiation and community engagement is essential, and this is often not a focus within technically orientated companies.
- Where governmental interests are implicated in the conflict, directly or indirectly, government representatives should participate; without them resolution may not be possible.
- Companies are managed by linear models and systems - e.g. *Results Based Management* - and do not accommodate easily to processes for managing complex conflicts.
- Conflict management tools should be a component of the Business Plan, but that is not often the case.

46. **Technical information** is often at the core of mining related disputes. This can take the form of conflict over data, or communicating the information in ways and with words that cannot be understood. This gives rise to confusion, distrust, and conflict. Responding to this is often key in avoiding, and responding to, conflict.

47. **Water** is a particular area of growing dispute - accessing it, the extent of its use, competing demands for it, managing waste discharge, and dealing with pollutants are all points of potential friction over water, and are conflict zones for the mines which invariably depend on it.

48. An effective relationship between companies and communities is based on an ongoing and engaged dialogue, which has several implications including:

- Agreements are not an end; they are more often the beginning. The negotiation of a specific agreement must be understood in this wider context.
- Mediation should be seen as a potential tool in the process toolkit for managing the relationship, not as a tactic looked to at the point of last resort.
- Often companies and communities have different expectations with respect to mediation and the subsequent agreement – communities may see it as a **start**, while companies tend to view it as an **end**. Unless these divergent outlooks are understood, respected and reconciled, they can give rise to conflict.

49. When conflict does arise, government may need to be part of the mediation process. There are many contexts where the community sees the company as an extension of government, or alternatively, supplanting government. Government is complex and has many faces. It has both regulatory and advocacy functions; it is an independent reviewer of EIA and responsible for natural resource management, while at the same time an advocate for development. Government may not be taking an active role in ensuring environmental regulation, or social development etc. Whatever the reason, when government is implicated in one way or another in the conflict, it is critical that it be a participant in any dialogue or mediation.

50. Challenges are external and internal. Communities, organizations and companies are not monolithic. There are many different interests at play within them. The stronger the company's

network and dialogue structures are internally, the greater will be its capacity to deal with external conflict effectively.

51. The best way to deal with conflict is to avoid it, and to this end, the most critical “tool” is **managing expectations** from the outset to ensure expectations are aligned with what the company can deliver and what the community can expect. Conflict management needs to be able to draw on a wide range of tools.

52. Conflict is complex and the context around it is a key factor in driving the complexity. Examples include:
 - Different political agendas can operate and interests can be advanced through any conflict.
 - Often, it is the government’s structures and decision-making processes, and its inability to adapt them that constrain government participation in dialogue-based processes.
 - Community concerns are bigger than a particular company or situation. Issues are never really bipolar (between companies and communities); they are multi-polar.
 - Indigenous community’s connection to the land must be recognized and respected in any conflict involving them. Economic and employment benefit agreements work, provided that governments are creating linkages between industry and Indigenous people. These agreements take time to develop and must be seen as an initial investment.
 - Mining companies need to place value on the *exploration of community receptivity* as part of the exploration process. Initial engagement and dialogue will reduce costs in the longer term.
 - Can we really speak of negotiation and mediation with any integrity if the community does not have the option of saying ‘no’?

53. An example of successful negotiations with the local communities at the Tintaya Mine in Peru demonstrated a model that could limit conflict and built consensus between both parties. When a company wants to engage, the other stakeholders will turn from an advocacy/adversary role, to a collaborative role. Lessons learned from this process included that the company had to abandon the traditional defensiveness and the attitude that they were constantly correct. The company imagined themselves in the situation that the community found itself. Meanwhile, from the community and NGO’s perspective, they were forced to see that the company was not just a faceless entity and started to work with the people from the company. Both sides sought to look past the myths about each other. The parties did not sign a content agreement for the first three years, instead focusing on process. Both parties agreed on a facilitator, rules of treatment, inclusion and transparency mechanisms, and not involving the government, in addition to not talking to anyone else unless they agreed upon the statement. Human rights, land issues and development were focused on, and commissions were set up based on consensus, not votes. The entire process demonstrates that proper conflict resolution can lead to trust and lasting relationships built on the interests and needs of involved parties.

Theme 4: Companies and Communities: Building Enduring Relationships

Key Questions:

- What are the critical “drivers of change” leading companies and communities to develop more “enduring relationships”, based on reciprocal benefits and meaningful ongoing engagement?
- What do these insights tell us about the kind of capacity required in all sectors (companies, communities, NGOs and governments) to achieve and sustain positive enduring relationships among all parties? What special challenges arise with respect to artisanal mining to explorations and junior operators?
- What has been learned from the experience of companies and communities regarding the key attributes of an effective, sustainable relationship? Are these attributes really what we mean by the expression “social license to operate”?
- Are the negotiated agreements being reached effective and sufficient in achieving optimal results for companies and communities? Have there been challenges in driving the relationship beyond the negotiation table into the community and company structures?
- What are the implications of the emerging focus around “rights” and expanding the discussion around “Free Prior and Informed Consent” (FPIC)?

Opening Discussants:

Stephen Ellis (Chair)	Senior Advisor	Northwest Territories Treaty #8 Tribal Corporation
Dave Porter	Chief Executive Officer	First Nations Energy and Mining Council, Canada
Mark Wiseman	VP, Sustainability	Avalon Rare Metals, Canada
Rick Killam	Director, CSR	NewGold, Canada
Laura Barreto	Director Chair	Materials Efficiency Research Group, Canada Alliance for Responsible Mining

Commentators:

Catherine Coumans	Research Coordinator	Mining Watch
Ann Marie Sam	Regional Advisor, BC	Canadian Boreal Initiative
Andrea Kennedy	Manager, Indigenous Affairs	Teck Resources
Katherine Teh-White	Managing Director	Futureye Pty Lt.d, Australia

Closing Discussants:

Susan Joyce	Partner	On Common Ground Consultants Inc., Canada
Sebastian Salgado Troya	Global Compact Network Coordinator	Consortio Ecuatoriano para la Responsabilidad Social (CERES, Ecuador)

54. Building relationships early with communities is important; the earlier the better. Early engagement was seen as a priority of building constructive partnerships between companies and communities.

Other important elements included:

- It is not sufficient obtain a “social license” to operate, companies must maintain it through continuous consultation.
- Companies should be open and responsive to change.
- Care should be taken to ensure that a mutual knowledge and understanding of each other’s needs is achieved.

55. First Nations want to know what the project will do for the community, and its members – “will it make us stronger?” To answer this, the First Nations will need to know who they are dealing with,

and more specifically, the track record of the company in Canada and elsewhere, particularly with respect to other communities. Companies must be prepared to answer this question.

56. The lack of transparency of mining agreements with communities and countries is an important issue. If mining agreements are meant to benefit communities, then the agreements must be made available to those communities. Furthermore, any prior agreements that were established before acquisitions must be understood in order to maintain any relationship.
57. Care must be taken to ensure companies identify priorities; if a company does not have significant resources at its disposal, it can still dedicate them to the most important matters. Evidently, leadership is needed concerning the reality of diminishing resources and land in the context of increased competition.
58. Building enduring relationships between communities and corporations takes time. Some considerations identified included:
 - Knowing how to begin a relationship is not sufficient; sustaining them is a no less critical challenge.
 - Identifying the first point of communication in a community can be difficult. The mantra should be, “If in doubt, talk to everyone.”
 - Companies will be seen as deceitful by only appearing to perform due diligence when dealing with communities.
 - Without a shared vision, it is impossible to make progress. And in order to develop a shared vision, there must be engaged dialogue between companies and communities.
 - Communities will react negatively to what they perceive are ‘divide and conquer’ strategies.
59. The trust building process is ongoing, and there are many places along the way where it can break down. Some of the points of peril included:
 - The local population is often overlooked as a source of labour in favour of outside workers.
 - The cyclicity of the industry: e.g., relationship building is often compromised in favor of profits in boom periods; and the overall competitive pressures that arise with dwindling natural resources.
 - Tension between managers and engineers, striving to maximize value, versus protecting the interests of the people in the community.
 - Tracking revenues may be difficult and compounds the difficulty of ensuring the revenue is flowing appropriately to the local community when there is some form of revenue sharing relationship.
 - The competition between small-scale and large-scale mines can impact sustainable development endeavors of industry.
60. The challenges of building long-term relationships are multi-faceted. Communities are strained in their resources to engage with mining companies, particularly when they are already overrun with

other extractive operations (oil & gas, logging, roads, power, etc.). Several questions were raised through these discussions:

- What strategies can be employed to equip communities with the resources to engage more effectively?
- How might communities be supported in the cases where they want to say ‘no’, ‘not yet’, or ‘not you’?
- What types of strategies are needed to support companies in understanding and addressing the unique problems of communities in order to support local employment and prosperity?

61. There is the potential for setbacks in building lasting partnerships in each phase of the mining development cycle. The **construction phase is key**, but often overlooked. It is the point of greatest vulnerability. Typically, it is conducted by exclusive and specialized teams that are brought in to do that particular work with no social and cultural experience or competencies. Research on this is limited.

62. The acquisition phase brings another set of challenges. Guidelines and reporting mechanisms are mostly crafted for majors. Most often, the properties on which they operate have been acquired from a junior exploration company, with a long history before the majors entered the scene. The community, on the other hand, has not forgotten this history, good or bad. Dialogue often begins without considering the years of prior interaction between the predecessor company(s) and the local community. The ability to maintain relationships in this context is linked to understanding chain of custody. Both corporate and community leadership and control is likely to change numerous times over the course of a mine’s lifecycle. How do you deal effectively with 3 or 4 different corporate cultures and imperatives relating to sustainability and responsibility? More importantly, how do the local communities?

63. Corporate governance is another factor. Boards of Directors have a responsibility to maximize shareholder value. Often this is construed around the boardroom table to trump the responsibility companies have to communities, for shareholders and stakeholders might have different priorities and expectations from companies.

64. Several regional experiences demonstrate the complexity and multipolarity of building operative relationships. They included:

- In Latin America, there has been a significant pushback to mining ventures. Latin American governments are becoming more sensitive and responsive to the rejection of mining projects by communities. This is very much informed by the history of natural resource extraction on the continent. Traditional means of negotiation and relationship building are not delivering the promised benefits from mineral extraction. Companies must become more innovative in approaches to relationship building in Latin America.
- The economic development of western Canada is putting tremendous pressure on the land and water resources of indigenous communities. First Nations are asking for leadership from Ottawa and provincial capitals, and demanding that they live up to their legal and constitutional responsibilities of consultation and accommodation of indigenous interests.

- In British Columbia, a successful agreement involving a First Nations Coordinator and a Joint Implementation Committee, and the use of an advancement policy that focused on rights, employment and training exemplified the benefits of a trustful relationship between a company and local community.
 - Trust is hinged on an ongoing dialogue, a mutual understanding and knowledge of projects and proof of dedication and commitment by the company. A trustful relationship between both parties leads to a reduction in risk and enhanced reputation.
65. What would it take for Canadian companies to employ domestic social and environmental policies and best practice in their operations abroad? Why is this not happening? These were questions raised in the context of comparing what takes place in Canada, and what happens abroad. The perception is that if Canadian companies did internationally what they do domestically, that would be precedent setting.
66. Additional key questions were identified which, if they were addressed could inform current international discussions around social licensing:
- Can approaches required for dealing with First Nations be applied to non-Aboriginal communities?
 - Might these experiences translate to places like Africa, where indigenous rights are not always recognized?
67. Discussions around securing and maintaining a “social license” will inform the difficult conversations developing around “Free Prior and Informed Consent”- both in terms of the meaning conveyed by the phrase and the challenges of giving it effect. One participant suggested that FPIC should be understood as “Free prior and continuous consultation in order to maintain consent.”
68. Project developers and communities, especially indigenous, relate to land in very different ways. This is a core tension. How can it be reconciled? Will FPIC be sufficient to deal with that tension, or do we need other means to address the cultural and customary views of land?
69. How can we make progress on the FPIC discussion? Involving directly affected communities was recognized as central. One suggestion that came forward was build engagement with a group called British Columbia First Nation Women Advocating Responsible Mining (FNWARM) .This is a group of leaders that have come together to support each other through their direct negotiations and decision making on mining projects on their lands (www.fnwarm.com).
70. Communities and companies must develop innovative capacities to build resilient and lasting partnerships. There is a need to create a shared vision of what the behaviors and activities that are required today in order to progress in the future.
71. More research needs to be conducted to show the financial implications when CSR is not a component of a companies business operation. If such a project was to be undertaken, and CSR was translated into conventional business language, it would become a non-issue in the boardroom.

72. Education and learning will play a fundamental role in the future. As the first point of contact for the community, geologists and mining engineers need to be educated on sustainability, indigenous and cultural history, rights and specifically communication.
73. Education will drive change through the chain of custody, so that responsibility for stewardship is downloaded from consumer expectations to production activities.
74. There is also a need to promote more collaboration and sharing of experiences among NGOs and civil society organizations at various levels. There is progress made on how communities and companies can develop good relationships or have collaborated to solve conflicts. Facilitating processes to share experiences, celebrating successes and learning from failures, will contribute to capacity building. The resources to do that could come from various sources, but communities and NGOs must have ownership in the process and outcomes.

Theme 5: Directions and Actions – Shaping the Agendas for Advancing “Pathways to Practice” and “Agendas for Research”

- Commentators were asked to highlight 1 – 2 key insights and/or key “go forward” activities. A list of potential projects and activities already identified and discussed within each of the theme area sessions was presented and further reviewed and assessed. In addition, projects were identified that complimented the discussion throughout the two day dialogue have been included.
- People with a keen interest in advancing these projects and activities had an additional opportunity to meet on the morning of April 19th.

Closing Commentators:

Maria Teresina Guitierrez Haces	<i>Professora, Economics Research Institute</i>	<i>Universidad Nacional Autonom, Mexico</i>
Jerry Cormick	<i>Senior Lecturer, Foster School of Business</i>	<i>University of Washington, USA</i>
Vinita Watson	<i>Executive Director</i>	<i>Inter-American Development Bank, Canada</i>
Kieren Moffat	<i>Stream Leader</i>	<i>CSIRO, Australia</i>
Aissatou Conte	<i>Executive Director</i>	<i>RSE Senegal / CFPMI, Senegal</i>
Marcello Viega	<i>Associate Professor, Sustainability Working Group</i>	<i>University of BC, Canada</i>
Carolyn Egri	<i>Professor, Management and Organization Studies</i>	<i>Simon Fraser University, Canada</i>

Potential Activity/Project Zones

75. Markers of success for projects going forward were identified as including: **joint investment, joint will, joint process, joint interpretation, and joint outcomes**. Other key elements included the quality of the government, the stage of the conflict, the company involved. Questions that always need to be considered in any assessments include:

- Who was involved, what was the goal of the conversation, what was the information available and how was it fed into the process?
- What happened as a result?
- Were the agreements realistic?
- Were they implemented?
- Was the relationship maintained?

76. Trade Agreements

- It was pointed out that this dialogue is taking place in a somewhat idealized world. Bilateral accords and negotiated free trade agreements typically include specific protections for foreign investment. This is true in much of Latin America. These companies are operating at both the supranational and national level. This is a key factor must be acknowledged and considered for the dialogue to be realistic, as there is always the potential for companies challenging government actions alleged to be inconsistent with these protections. Often there is a wide gap between what is taking place in the decisions of the boardroom, as opposed to at the mine site. Governments may have to pay more than they can afford in settlements. Under these trade agreements, companies are safeguarded while the communities, particularly indigenous communities, remain relatively vulnerable.

77. Emerging Tools

- A website that maps controversial ideas and how they progress into a social norms was highlighted (www.wikicurve.org/issues/). It is a useful tool in measuring the social maturation of issues (such as biodiversity, climate change, etc.) that can then be presented to government, policy makers, companies etc. to influence their decisions; it shows what the appropriate action would be inside society at the time. This mapping tools helps show how some issues nest into each other, and allows to view issues on a continuum, highlighting a theme of “going backwards in order to move forwards” of this GEMM 20/20 dialogue.

78. Artisanal Mining

- Artisanal mining accounts for 30% of all gold mined in the world, providing the livelihood for roughly 100 million people worldwide. This important field of activity is insufficiently understood, researched, and discussed. For mining to become more sustainable in the future finding ways to create value through artisanal mining must become a focal point for the industry to move forward.

79. Role of Government

- Developing relationships between companies and communities that will ensure long-term prosperity without the active involvement of government is completely unrealistic. Our discussions here have not considered this sufficiently. Expectations around what mining is and what it means have changed in the past 20 years – it’s about sustainable development and long-term prosperity. To bring about the required change, government needs to be involved in the conversation. It is not about licenses, agreements but rather it is about changing the way things are done. The term “CSR” implies that a corporation is “divvying up a pie” when the real discussion that needs to take place should be about creating shared value. The vocabulary is wrong. What is needed is a new language framework that is responsive to these evolutions within the sector.
- A starting point may be a survey addressing questions like: What is out there, what do we know, on topics such as, e.g., talking to companies, governments communities about their experiences; understanding how investment decisions are made and how communities are affected; how might we transfer technology, train, and educate, etc.
- An ECOWAS (Economic Community of West African States) piece of legislation was enacted in 2009 which makes it obligatory for all member countries and their respective companies (of ECOWAS) to respect certain *legal* obligations with respect to the environment, communities, and human rights. The mineral extraction companies operating in ECOWAS states must guarantee the respect and promotion of human rights, including the rights of women, children etc., including the protection of socioeconomic and cultural rights. Moreover, it companies must have permission from the communities before exploration phases occur, and also before the introduction of each phase of the mining cycle. This is envisioned as an ongoing consultation process with communities.

80. Corporate Culture and Alignment

- Developing risk management strategies is one of the primary reasons that motivate companies in the direction of sustainable development and practices. Risk is usually expressed by external factors, including how the community perceives the company etc. What is not sufficiently understood and what often poses the greatest risk is how a company is to manage itself. It was noted that “managers and employees in mining companies has an exhaustible capacity for self-deception that manifests as a disconnect between what the company thinks it is, and what it is doing.”
- There have been many suggestions to the effect that the people on the ground are uninformed about what occurs at a board level. Often, the opposite is true. Boardrooms are often uninformed and insensitive and simply not on the same plane as the people who are in the field, expressing values that do not percolate up through the corporation.
- Some corporations, motivated by a desire to avoid any perceptions of hypocrisy, might be open to a process of self-examination that would explore these challenges. Hypocrisy can be a civilizing force, a driver of progress which compelling us to try to live up to our rhetoric. Such an examination might lead to recognition of the need for tools to better understand ourselves, to enable us to respond to the challenge of aligning our corporate values and hierarchies and integrate our corporate cultures.

81. **The scale of resource development is at an unprecedented level in history.** A national survey is being conducted in Australia to understand the general public's perception, experiences and desires of the industry to start as a baseline for a vision for the future.

82. **Education, knowledge and learning, can and should be put into practice in every country.**

Identified Key Projects

Informal discussion groups met following the dialogue to refine some of the activities into projects and conduct some preliminary project scoping. Further refinements and efforts will be made in the coming months by working groups composed of individuals and organizations willing to contribute as appropriate to each project. RMSI will support the different collaborations in various ways, and several parties are committed to advancing the projects over the coming year, including:

83. **“Mapping” within a “Framework” for Responsible Mining**

- There is a need to make the plethora of existing regulatory and non-regulatory activities, processes, standards and codes more meaningful, responsive and relevant across sectors within a framework for responsible mining.

84. **Learning, Education and Capacity Building**

- Enhanced programming is needed to respond to the different competency requirements across the sector and several key target audiences were identified for follow up.

85. **Accessibility and Utility of “Toolkits”**

- There is a need for more creative and accessible tools, especially for communities affected by mining. A preliminary step toward addressing this need is to identify the tools already available and make them more readily accessible.

86. **Developing Case Studies**

- Case studies are an important tool to inform what it will take to build effective working relationships and resolve conflicts. Improving methodologies, inventorying existing case studies and developing new ones will enable this tool to be better utilized.

These activities will help shape the next GEMM dialogue to be held in Vancouver on **April 16 and 17, 2013**. For more information or to provide an Expression of Interest in becoming involved, please visit <http://beedie.sfu.ca/rmsi/> or contact rmsi@sfu.ca.

Acknowledgements

The Responsible Minerals Sector Initiative would like to thank the many individuals that contributed to making the GEMM 20/20 Dialogue possible. Developing something as ambitious as this dialogue required the commitment and assistance of many people in many different ways: their vision, their time, their energy, and money.

We would especially like to thank all of the 16 GEMM 20/20 Steering Committee and Working Group Members that dedicated significant time and attention to the dialogue design, credibility and profile. (<http://beedie.sfu.ca/rmsi/people/>). We also acknowledge and thank all participants who took the substantial time and effort to attend and enrich this dialogue. A special thank you is extended to the various participants who flew from all over the world to share their perspectives in this collaborative space. The Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) provided financial and embassy staff support, helping us to achieve an international dimension to our deliberations. A number of companies provided financial support to make it possible for us to extend bursaries to NGO and community participants. Goldcorp and New Gold were instrumental, and support from Teck, the Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada, Hudbay and Air Canada are all gratefully appreciated.

The Responsible Minerals Sector Initiative would like to extend a special thank you to Danny Shapiro, Dean, and Kirk Hill, Assistant Dean External Relations, at SFU Beedie School of Business, for their continued guidance and support. The RMSI would also like to thank the Faculty and staff at the Beedie School of Business for their ongoing guidance; in particular Dr. Stephanie Bertels worked tirelessly to facilitate the online discussion during the event.

The Responsible Minerals Sector Initiative thanks and acknowledges the many volunteer note takers, in particular Lindsay McIvor and Alexandra Cooperman, who made this Final Report possible.

RMSI Team

The Responsible Minerals Sector Initiative is committed to the continued growth and evolution of dialogue and practice while providing a collaborative space among an evolving group of partners. The RMSI Team is:

- Glenn Sigurdson - Chair, Responsible Minerals Sector Initiative
- Jim Cooney - Senior Associate, Responsible Minerals Sector Initiative
- Jessica Bratty - Associate, Responsible Minerals Sector Initiative
- Matthew McKernan - Intern, Responsible Minerals Sector Initiative
- Kirk Hill - Assistant Dean External Relations, Beedie School of Business, SFU
- Sudheer Gupta - Director, Jack Austin Centre for Asia-Pacific Business Studies, SFU
- Carolyn Egri - William J.A. Rowe EMBA Alumni Professor, SFU

Appendix 1: Additional Points Raised by Participants

Listed below are some additional questions and project ideas posed by participants during the online collaborative platform. Other points have been integrated into the summary above.

Theme 1:

- The industry is influenced by the very constellation of our society, and some of the desired results may require changes beyond the mining industry.
- Mining in 2012 has a global impact. By referring only to the supply chain or the chain of value of open pit mining (OPM), miners would be eluding the wide scope, the sphere of influence. OPM is open to where? The world. To be integrative, inclusive, up to date, let us account for the sphere of influence around a mining operation.
- Is mining a sustainable activity itself, or is it an activity that can contribute to sustainability?

Theme 2:

- Is the formalization of business processes guidelines (say issuing ISO 26000, GRI, CERES, etc.) helping to streamline business processes in minerals operations or is it adding complexity?
- What tools and guidance are juniors using? Do they feel they have the resources and skills to implement the standards set by ICMM and others?
- The stakeholder panel definition didn't include any inclusion of Indigenous Governments. How can there be true exchange when the land stewards are not at the table?

Theme 3:

- Under what conditions is there a 'case' for dialogue-based processes to resolve conflict? Under what conditions is it entirely inappropriate? Perhaps companies need a better understanding of the return on investment and the value proposition for mediation and other collaborative processes...is there a way to better understand and even quantify this value by reflecting on prior cases?
- Analyzing conflicting situations between communities and mining companies in various countries could help identify the causes of conflict: which are common causes, which have more influence in specific countries or regions of the world? What factors or strategies would be useful to prevent and/or deal with conflict?
- Mediation, facilitation, dialogue, etc. What are they? What can they do? What are we talking about?

Theme 4:

- What can be done to give communities better access to information about a mining company's activities? What can be done when a company develops an agreement with a community but does not comply with the agreement? And what happens if the community does not comply with the agreement?
- What is the risk that one bad apple in the company (e.g. an employee who loses his temper in an interaction with community members) can cause major problems? If this poses a significant risk, how difficult is it to diffuse the right culture?
- For communities to have the power of veto there needs to be a sea change in the concepts of sovereignty and the centralization of power in most countries as well as concepts of capitalism

and industrialism which prioritize economic development...this is a truly systemic change, not easily made but arguably one worth pursuing.

- How can communities have control over which mining comes in? Are there examples where mining companies have to "compete" for permission to mine, or are communities always faced with a "take it or leave it" decision?
- The emerging extractive industries in developing economies need help in shaping the responsibility agenda. Research into applicable local practices that could yield sustainability of this industry need to be documented, comparisons made and ways forward developed. This would include understanding how policy, regulation, and administration influence positive or negative outcomes...yet, the lessons from developed economies may not always apply.

Appendix 2: List of Participants

First Name	Last Name	Organization
Robert	Adamson	Simon Fraser University
Onome	Ako	World Vision Canada
Gustavo	Angeloci	University of BC
Mafalda	Arias	Mafalda Arias and Associates
David	Atkins	Compliance Advisor/Ombudsman World Bank
Erica	Bach	Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT)
Anke	Baker	Simon Fraser University
Yolanda	Banks	Export Development Canada
Maria-Laura	Barreto	Materials Efficiency Research Group (MERG)
Brent	Bergeron	GoldCorp
Antonio	Bernales	Futuro Sostenible
Stephanie	Bertels	Simon Fraser University
Hany	Besada	North-South Institute
Jan	Boon	Natural Resources Canada
Peter	Bradshaw	First Point Minerals
Jessica	Bratty	Responsible Minerals Sector Initiative (RMSI)
Abbi	Buxton	International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)
Sandy	Carpenter	Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP
Assheton	Carter	The Dragonfly Initiative
Ben	Chalmers	Mining Association of Canada (MAC)
Aissatou	Conte	RSE Senegal / CFPMI
Jim	Cooney	Responsible Minerals Sector Initiative (RMSI), CBERN
Alexandra	Cooperman	Simon Fraser University, Network for Business Sustainability
Jerry	Cormick	University of Washington
Silvana	Costa	New Gold
Valerie	Cotta	Evolve Human Systems
Catherine	Coumans	Mining Watch
Wes	Cragg	Canadian Business Ethics Research Network (CBERN)
Amy	Crook	Environmental Mining Education Foundation
Tom	Culham	University of BC
Luke	Danielson	Sustainable Development Strategies Group (SDSG)
Gillian	Davidson	Teck Resources
Jeffrey	Davidson	Queen's University
Steve	D'Esposito	RESOLVE
Kristi	Disney	Sustainable Development Strategies Group (SDSG)
Shawn	Doyle	McCarthy Tetrault LLP
Cristina	Echavarria	Alliance for Responsible Mining (ARM)
Lynda	Edzerza	Mining & Tunnelling Ltd.
Carolyn	Egri	Simon Fraser University
Stephen	Ellis	Northwest Territories Treaty #8 Tribal Corporation
Marketa	Evans	Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT)
Pablo	Feeley	Mexico-Canada Responsible Mining Network
Janine	Fiddler	Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT)
Vesta	Filipchuk	Teck Resources
Meg	French	Unicef Canada
Stephanie	Garret	Garrett Consulting
Javi	Glatt	Simon Fraser University
Lilia	Granillo Vazquez	Universidad Autonoma Metropolitana
Maria Teresa	Gutierrez Haces	Universidad Nacional Autonoma Mexico (UNAM)

First Name	Last Name	Organization
Jeremy	Hall	Simon Fraser University
Simon	Handelsman	University of BC
Julian	Harrison	Simon Fraser University
Kristina	Henriksson	Simon Fraser University
Kirk	Hill	Simon Fraser University
Rosanna	Hille	Yayasan Tambuhak Sinta
Ian	Hollingshead	Xanvil - Consultoria Ambiental y Servicios Forestales
Susan	Joyce	On Common Ground Consultants Inc.
Jeanette	Jules	Stk'emlupsemc te Secwepemc Nation
Norma	Kassi	Old Crow First Nation
David	Katamba	Uganda Chapter for Corporate Social Responsibility Initiative (UCCSRI)
Andrea	Kennedy	Teck Resources
Stephen	Kibsey	Caisse de Depot et Placement
Rick	Killam	New Gold
Bern	Klein	Department of Mining Engineering, University of BC
Kate	Kopischke	RESOLVE
Emma	Lehrer	Lehrer Law
Anne	Levesque	Boreal Canada
Martin	Livingston	BreakThrough Communications
Elaine	Lo	Simon Fraser University
Robin	Longe	Bull, Houser & Tupper LLP
Nicholas	Luff	The Partnering Initiative, International Business Leaders Forum
David	MacDonald	Simon Fraser University
Gary	MacDonald	Monkey Forest Consulting
Travis	Mathieson	Simon Fraser University
Stelvia	Matos	Simon Fraser University
Don	McCutchan	Gowlings - International Strategic Advisory Group
Suzette	McFaul	Sirolli Institute
Lindsay	Mclvor	Simon Fraser University
Warren	Mckay	D Gering and Associates
Matthew	Mckernan	Responsible Minerals Sector Initiative (RMSI)
Mike	Mckernan	Stantec Consulting Ltd.
Angeles	Mendoza-Sammet	White Eagle Sustainable Development
Dawn	Mills	University of BC
Kieren	Moffat	CSIRO
Derek	Moscato	Simon Fraser University
Zoe	Mullard	InfoMine
Amanda	Nahanee	Squamish Nation
Shaheen	Nanji	Simon Fraser University
Emily	Nunn	Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada (PDAC)
Kevin	O'Callaghan	Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP
Armando	Ortega	New Gold
Monica	Ospina	o trade and market access
Martin	Packmann	Fundacion Cambio Democratico
Dave	Parker	Teck Resources
Valerie	Pascale	GoldCorp
Alfreda	Pineda	Grupo Plural por la equidad de género y el avance de las mujeres
Dave	Porter	First Nations Energy and Mining Council
Randy	Price	Industry Council on Aboriginal Business (ICAB)
Ingrid	Putkonen	Agile Sustainability Management

First Name	Last Name	Organization
Dominique	Ramirez	GoldCorp
Karim	Ramji	Donovan & Company LLP
Andres	Recalde	Torex Gold Resources Inc.
Cole	Rheume	First Nations Energy and Mining Council
Joe	Ringwald	Selwyn Resources
Krista	Robertson	Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT)
Alanna	Rondi	Devonshire Initiative
Sebastian	Salgado Troya	Consortio Ecuatoriano para la Responsabilidad Social (CERES)
Ann Marie	Sam	Canadian Boreal Initiative
Malcolm	Scoble	University of BC
Mark	Selman	Simon Fraser University
Ricardo	Sepulveda	Centro Juridico para los Derechos Humanos (CJDH)
Janis	Shandro	University of Victoria
Daniel	Shapiro	Simon Fraser University
Glenn	Sigurdson	Responsible Minerals Sector Initiative (RMSI)
Sonja	Sigurdson	CSE Group
Mark	Sitter	Sherritt International
Dan	Smith	First Nations Summit
Rodrigo	Soreque	Secretaria de Economia
Paul	Sprout	Pacific Salmon Foundation
Judy	St. George	Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT)
Colin	Stansfield	Simon Fraser University
Matthias	Starzner	Environmental Mining Education Foundation
James	Stemler	Teck Resources
Giulliana	Tamblyn	Roktek Consulting
Katherine	Teh-White	Futureye Pty Ltd.
Ian	Thomson	On Common Ground Consultants Inc.
Kathryn	Tomlinson	BG Group
Meredith	Trainor	Boreal Conservation Campaign
Bakari	Traore	Centre Africain de Gouvernance des Organizations (CAGO)
Marcello	Veiga	University of BC
Federico	Velasquez	AngloAmerican
Paul	Warner	Both Sides Now Consulting Inc.
Vinita	Watson	Inter-American Development Bank
Jason	West	Griffith University
Marie	Wilson	Griffith University
Mark	Wiseman	Avalon Rare Metals
Andre	Xavier	University of BC
Alan	Young	Materials Efficiency Research Group(MERG)