



Sustainable Development

September 2001

No. 5

Fifth Assurance Group Meeting, Windsor, UK 13-14 September 2001

Meeting Minutes

Copyright © 2002 IIED and WBCSD. All rights reserved

Mining, Minerals and Sustainable Development is a project of the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED). The project was made possible by the support of the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD). IIED is a company limited by guarantee and incorporated in England. Reg. No. 2188452. VAT Reg. No. GB 440 4948 50. Registered Charity No. 800066



International
Institute for
Environment and
Development



World Business Council for
Sustainable Development

Attendees

Assurance Group (AG)

Duma Nkosi (Chair), Jacqueline Aloisi de Larderel, Patricia Caswell, Cholpon Dyikanova, Colin Filer, Reg Green, Gerard Holden, Namakau Kaingu, Daniel Meilan, Charles Secrett, John Stewart, Helmut Weidner and Doug Yearley.

Work Group

Luke Danielson, Caroline Digby, Frank McShane, Bernice Lee, Libby Wood, Anne-Marie Fleury, Gabriela Flores

Project Coordinator

Richard Sandbrook

Observers

Wanda Hoskin, Derek Osborne.

Items of Business

Richard Sandbrook called for a minute's silence in memory of those affected by the terrorist disaster in the USA.

Duma Nkosi accepted role of Chair of AG. Election of Vice Chair postponed until November meeting.

Agenda accepted for the two-day meeting.

Resignation received from Jay Hair, Roger Augustine and Damien Roland. AG accepted new members Reg Green, Richard Baldes and Mick Dodson.

Apologies from Mick Dodson, Ligia Noronha, Leon Rajaobelina and Osvaldo Sunkel. No response from Senzeni Zokwana. Travel interrupted for Richard Baldes, Anna Cederstav, Doug Fraser, Tony LaVina, Kathryn McPhail, Glenn Miller, Manuel Pulgar-Vidal and George Greene.

Johannesburg AG meeting minutes were accepted.

The new chair asked the work group to communicate to Jay Hair appreciation of his contribution to the AG group, and to congratulate and wish him well in his new job. Doug Yearley, chair of the ICMM Secretary General Search Committee, explained the sequence of events which led to Jay's appointment indicating that there had been a full international search for candidates identified globally. The search committee had clearly identified the outstanding candidate. ICMM will pick up the work of MMSD.

Review of Where we Are – Luke Danielson

Communications

MMSD's public profile is growing with more media attention, and this has been largely positive; for example, the BBC World Service. There have been criticisms, but MMSD is open and attempts to outreach to everyone. Those alienated from the mining industry historically are organising themselves. The organisation of environmental groups into one tent may be a useful counterpart to ICMM. There is also some movement in that direction from indigenous peoples groups. These developments are positive. The best way for MMSD to proceed is transparently, and with all documents available for public review.

Report Status

Challenges have moved from project set-up and contracting, etc, to having a structure for what we want to say. The Regional Processes are also well advanced: draft regional reports are available and the regional stakeholder meetings are about to take place –Brisbane September 16-17, Johannesburg September 18-19, Lima September 24 and North America October 3 (tbc).

The challenge is how to synthesise all this information into a report that makes sense, as the timelines are extremely tight, but the global report outline has been prepared.

The purpose of this AG meeting is to follow the handout on “Guidance we need on individual chapters” – vision, goals, specific issues, action plan.

The November meeting is critical because will have draft chapters from Parts 1 & 2. AG will need to establish whether it is balanced, fair to different points of view, good quality, and whether the ideas are appropriately expressed. There then follows a period for comments – through website and electronically, meetings and regional fora.

There is a need to communicate what happened at this meeting and the importance of the November meeting to other members of the AG who were unable to attend. An enormous amount of synthesis and writing needs to be done.

AG Expectations Tour de Table

1. There is a need to extract the real lessons from the volume of work and to maximise the input of the AG.
2. Must have clear statement of SD and mining and the governance structures.

3. Need a more explicit statement of the role of mining companies in SD policy dialogue. Need to describe social empowerment in broader context, contemplate how to win broad public support for SD, social justice, equity, redistribution, with the backdrop that there are structural changes at a global level that provide opportunities and challenges. Need to describe the political strategy to bridge the gap from theoretical to realisation of concepts of SD.
4. Build on what has been done and the unique aspect of MMSD –a multi-stakeholder approach to discussing the issues, especially regional work.
5. Need to recognise new kinds of conflict in the report – even amongst the AG – which reflect the broader differences out in the world. Problem solving and visioning are both important.
6. Report must be translated into other languages, such as Spanish and Russian.
7. Need to be modest in the approach to defining SD – but need to highlight main components. Indicators are important.
8. SD is not a soft concept – much work has been done to harden it up. SD is an analytical paradigm, not just an aspiration about the future.
9. Platform, on-going contact and networking is what is new and maybe that was what was wrong in the past – insufficient engagement. Everyone learns from different perspectives.

Discussion of the Draft Report

Draft report circulated in advance

Key issues:

1. SD Paradigm – hard or soft
2. Presentation issues (case studies/length/cross-cutting boxes)
3. Wealth/trade/price/nexus
4. Needs
5. Applicable metrics for SD by group
6. Going forwards- modalities and methods, roles and responses

Hot topics:

1. Waste management/protected areas/toxicity (use/abuse of precautionary principle)
2. Communities and indigenous peoples
3. Governance

4. Corruption and human rights
5. Starting places (historical issues, perspectives)

Afternoon Discussion

For absent AG members, a transcript of this meeting will be provided and possibly a teleconference arranged with Luke Danielson if possible.

Location of next meeting on November 15-16th to be investigated in central or outer London. May need to allow for a third day (Saturday 17th).

Date of February meeting: Monday-Tuesday February 18-19th. Tentatively it will be in Melbourne. It was also agreed that it would be helpful if regional AG members would be involved with regional consultations.

| Anticipated MMSD Timeline | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| 5 November | Full report to AG – with or without action plan |
| 15-17 November | AG meeting |
| 17 November – 1 December | Edits, rewrites following comments |
| 14 December | Draft report released |
| Last week January | Regional meetings |
| 4 February | Full final report in draft |
| 18-19 February | Approval by AG at AG meeting |
| 15 March | Report to printers |
| mid April | Launch event |

In a discussion about the circulation of draft chapters, there was general agreement to distribute these as they are completed; the committee structure remains in abeyance. At the next meeting, it was suggested that we break into two groups.

In terms of vetting the draft report, AG members and regional partners should get the draft at the same time. The draft report is due out on 14 December by email. This will then be followed by regional input and February sign-off by the AG.

This meeting has been a chance for the AG to raise points. But should November be a three-day meeting?

AG will not be able to resolve all or to agree on all the issues, but hopefully it will endorse the process and agree that the issues have been discussed in an open way. Richard Sandbrook drafted a sample statement of endorsement for the AG on acceptance of the draft report.

At the next meeting, there must be a discussion of critical or core issues up front – not editing text. There should be two dynamics for the next meeting: (i) the balance

of the report in terms of quality and depth, and (ii) discussion of the hot topics. Following a tour de table, where AG members suggested the most critical elements of the action plan for them, a list of key issues and hot topics was drawn up, and follows below.

2002 Forward

Industry's continued intention to take MMSD forward to Toronto, May 13-15th. The industry is currently looking at attending WSSD through WBCSD and the International Chamber of Mines. Industry has taken the lead on 23 reports to input to WSSD. Expecting 100,000 people.

IIED may try to facilitate a government or a civil society approach to deliver at Johannesburg. Report will be presented at WMMF in March. Other possible forums would be the ILO's sectoral conference – next year or the year forward – optimal place to bring this forward.

A possible way forward in the longer term is a tripartite global forum of like-minded CEOs, governments and civil society groups to get a sectoral global compact. It might also be possible to get other sectors – oil & gas, paper, etc – on board as well.