

INTRODUCTION

4	The Context
4	Project Origins
5	A Project with a Difference
7	The Process at the Global Level
8	Independence
8	The Process at the Regional Level
11	Report Scope and Structure
12	Endnotes

This report is the result of nearly two years of research, analysis, and consultation by the Mining, Minerals and Sustainable Development (MMSD) Project at the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED). This Introduction describes what the project set out to do and the process that evolved to accomplish those goals.

The Context

In the past decade, the mining and minerals industry has come under tremendous pressure to improve its social, developmental, and environmental performance. Like other parts of the corporate world, companies are more routinely expected to perform to ever higher standards of behaviour, going well beyond achieving the best rate of return for shareholders. They are also increasingly being asked to be more transparent and subject to third-party audit or review. In response, a number of companies, either independently or with other actors, are establishing 'voluntary standards' that often go beyond any law. But even so, some observers remain suspect that many businesses are merely engaging in public relations exercises and doubt their sincerity. In particular, the industry has been failing to convince some of its constituencies and stakeholders that it necessarily has the 'social licence to operate' in many areas of the world.

Despite the industry's undoubted importance in meeting the need for minerals and its significant contributions to economic and social development, concerns about aspects of its performance prevail. Mining, refining, and the use and disposal of minerals have in some instances led to significant local environmental and social damage. It is not always clear that mining brings economic and social benefits to the host countries, as the minerals sector sometimes operates where there is poor governance, including corruption, and is thus associated with it. In some cases, communities and indigenous groups near or around mines allege human rights abuses. The litany of concerns is long.

Project Origins

Against this background, and with the tenth anniversary of the Rio Earth Summit in mind, in late 1998 nine of the largest mining companies decided to embark on a new initiative intended to achieve a serious change in the way industry approached today's problems. They called this the Global Mining Initiative. It included a program of internal reform, a review of the various associations they belonged to, and a rigorous study of the societal issues they had to face. Through the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD), they commissioned IIED to undertake a scoping study in May 1999 to set out the global challenge of sustainable development facing the mining sector and to propose the scope of a two-year process of participatory analysis to explore the role of the sector in the transition to sustainable development.¹

A team of IIED researchers reviewed existing initiatives and materials, and consulted over 150 separate individuals and organizations to understand their views of how the minerals sector's contribution to sustainable development could be improved and to develop a more detailed framework for the process. The Mining and Energy Research Network (MERN) held an experts meeting to review the findings. There were few precedents to go by. The nearest was a project on the paper sector, conducted by IIED in partnership with the WBCSD in the mid-1990s.² There was also the comprehensive study of large dams, but it was conducted by a World Commission and at the time was just getting under way.³ While various 'multistakeholder' processes had been attempted, most were not convened on such a scale.⁴

IIED published its results in October 1999, making recommendations for the design and scope of the process that became known as the MMSD Project.⁵ It proposed four objectives of the new project. (See Box 1.)

Box 1. MMSD Project Objectives

- To assess the global mining and minerals sector in terms of the transition to sustainable development.
This would cover the current contribution – both positive and negative – to economic prosperity, human well-being, ecosystem health, and accountable decision-making, as well as the track record of past practice.
- To identify how the services provided by the minerals system can be delivered in accordance with sustainable development in the future.
- To propose key elements for improving the minerals system.
- Crucial for long-term impact, to build platforms of analysis and engagement for ongoing cooperation and networking among all stakeholders.

It was clear the MMSD Project had to be independent and collaborative if the results were to lead to trusted and accepted outcomes. In short, the project needed to build on past achievements and involve the sector as a whole. (Throughout this report, the term sector is used to describe all the key stakeholders associated with the minerals sector: industry from explorationists through to processors, government, international organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), academia, civil society, communities, and labour.) It also needed to decentralize – to confer much of the responsibility for undertaking the work to regional institutions in the principal centres of mineral production and consumption. Finally, from the outset it needed to integrate the element of planning for implementation in order to ensure that its efforts resulted in more than just a documentation of ideas.

Moreover, since mining is driven by society's use of, and need for, the products of the mining industry, the project needed to be inclusive in its scope and seek to examine the whole life cycle of minerals in the context of sustainable development. There would be little point in having perfect standards at a coal mine, for example, if society considered the use of coal too undesirable in terms of its potential climate effects.

Following the publication of the scoping report, WBCSD appointed IIED to undertake the MMSD Project. One key criterion for the selection of the study's host institution was that it would have no long-term institutional interest in the findings and outcomes of the report, nor would it seek to be the centre of mining expertise. It was on this basis, and on the

strength of its experience, that IIED was asked to house the project.

IIED then held a series of discussions with the main industry sponsors to clarify the MMSD Project design and objectives. Some important limits on the project emerged:

- The project would not be about building consensus on how to proceed in any area – there was insufficient time or capacity to do so (although should a consensus emerge, so much the better). Instead, MMSD hoped to set out key issues related to the minerals sector in ways that would fairly reflect different perspectives and suggest ways of moving forward.
- Consistent with this, MMSD would not be the same as a 'commission' of enquiry – the sector was too heterogeneous and divided for such a process to be contemplated. Rather, MMSD would be more in the nature of a feasibility study of what might lead to better outcomes.
- Limits to MMSD's geographical and 'stakeholder' reach were assumed from the outset. The project would not be expected to reach or understand the plight and problem of the last affected group or person in the world. The report would therefore not be 'speaking on behalf of any stakeholders' unless the project had been asked to do so.
- The project – it was hoped – would lay the basis for an ongoing process by many actors. It was not intended to be an end-point that would stop in 2002. It was intended to lay the ground for a strategic approach to solving problems based on analysis and consultation in which the boundaries of rights and responsibilities of all the relevant actors were clearer.

A Project with a Difference

Conducting the MMSD Project turned out to be a major challenge. The objectives were ambitious. Several realities shaped the way it was designed and then proceeded, and these too are reflected in the results. It was recognized from the start that a project on mining and minerals was bound to be more controversial and complex than earlier projects, such as the one based on the paper cycle. For example, the paper industry is based on a single 'renewable resource', instead of a multiplicity of very different non-renewable resources.

Photograph not shown

One issue at the core of controversy concerning mining and minerals is the idea that the use of ‘non-renewable resources’ is inherently undesirable. Some groups oppose all mining on this basis. This idea is, of course, not new. Many environmentalists from the 1970s onwards have campaigned against the extraction and use of non-renewable resources, either because these will ultimately run out or because of the adverse impacts of extraction and use.

Many stakeholders, however, are supportive of the minerals sector and of mining – not least, governments and some communities in developing countries seeking employment and sources of revenue. The MMSD Project convened several workshops where valuable exchanges of ideas occurred on such issues. But the low level of trust and high level of animosity between the minerals industry and many of its critics was problematic for the project from the start. This was a critical issue, especially if some sense of convergence were to be achieved for the future.

The critics of this industry include a diverse range of constituencies, such as communities in and around the mines and public advocacy groups concerned with the environment, human rights, indigenous peoples, poverty alleviation, and economic development. Labour, too, is in some instances in dispute with management. In order to tackle the public policy issues facing the minerals sector, the MMSD Project needed to have enough breadth to comprehend many of these concerns and their interconnections and implications. But most important, it had to try to create opportunities for the different constituencies to express themselves in confidence and, should confidence be

built, engage in dialogue to seek solutions. This objective was not entirely achieved. While participants from many diverse interest groups took part in the MMSD process, a distinct group of NGOs chose not to. Indeed, persuading others not to take part became a campaign for these groups in its own right.

The project design of MMSD recognized that campaigning by environmental and political groups has played an important role in catalysing major changes in the standards pursued by minerals industry in the past, and that these groups would continue to be major drivers of change. But these changes have taken place in a patchy fashion. For example, stringent environmental requirements in Europe and many parts of North America have made it more difficult for companies to operate mines in these regions. This is one reason why little mining is done within the European Union today, save in the building materials sector. The parts of the minerals cycle that have been retained are those where the business of adding value is less controversial (and more profitable). In contrast, governments of developing countries are perceived by some to be lowering social and environmental standards, fuelling a ‘race to the bottom’ as countries use lower standards to attract investment. Given the complexity and interconnections of all these issues, MMSD needed to examine the sector from regional and global perspectives. Understanding the practical politics of these intricate issues was a major challenge too.

MMSD also had to address a clear paradox. While consumers in the industrial world enjoy mined products – cars or planes, jewellery, mobile phones, computers, and even the fabric of buildings – they are less fond of the ‘holes in the ground’ needed for their supply. This disconnect between source and product is even reflected in the structure of parts of the minerals industry, which is quite stratified. The supply chains of minerals are different from those of timber, food, or even oil and gas. At its simplest, miners sell to refiners, who sell onto commodity exchanges used by fabricators, who sell to wholesalers, who sell to retailers and, eventually, to the consuming public. Some companies in the metals industry in Europe are keen to deny their connection to mining on the basis that much of their material comes from secondary sources. Such an approach mirrors the attitudes of many governments in Europe, which seem disinterested in the problems of metal and mineral supply even though

much of the minerals sector's investment and the demand for its products comes from industrial countries and all economies are dependent on such products. As a result, it was difficult at times to get the cooperation of key actors along the commodities chain.

There is great variation in the scale of enterprise. Some mineral commodities are largely produced by some of the world's millions of small-scale and artisanal miners, or processed by individuals or village artisans. Others are produced almost entirely by a small number of large multinational corporations.

The crisis of confidence that the minerals industry has been undergoing in some quarters has given rise to many defensive and divided attitudes. This industry is also diverse and heterogeneous, and the responses of different companies to a growing array of regulations and criticisms vary considerably. Many might like to dismiss criticisms as unreasonable, not least because some critics do not take into account the positive contributions the industry can make to development or acknowledge that society has a need for minerals. Leaders of the industry might argue that 'best practice' today is far ahead of the standard a decade ago, that the industry has been judged on the basis of the worst offenders, and that nothing has been done to recognize the failures of other players involved in the sector as a whole, such as governments or the users and consumers of minerals and metals. Others argue that the best practice of today is still not good enough. This is merely an example of the many perspectives that MMSD had to accommodate as best it could.

The Process at the Global Level

The MMSD Project began in April 2000. Before work could commence in full, it was necessary to recruit a new team into IIED to work alongside existing staff. The team, which reached a peak of 17, was drawn internationally and included people with a range of expertise on one or another aspect of the sector.

The project quickly set out to work with as many groups and individuals as it could in the process, and thereby include as many perspectives as possible. Four main functions to be fulfilled by MMSD were identified: research and analysis, stakeholder

engagement, information and communications, and planning for outcomes. These interconnected roles constituted the 'MMSD approach' and aimed to ensure the relevance of the research topics selected and the action plans derived from stakeholder input and the project's analysis, as well as the effectiveness with which they could be implemented.

In May 2000, soon after the project began, a two-day Strategic Planning Workshop for some 50 people known to be engaged in the issues was held. As with subsequent workshops, participants were drawn from a diverse range of backgrounds and experiences including industry and its trade associations, labour, governments, academia, indigenous peoples, UN and international organizations, and NGOs concerned with environment and social issues. Participants attended meetings as individuals rather than as representatives of organizations.

At the Strategic Planning Workshop, participants advised on the scope of issues and on the process that was envisaged. One result was a list of topics that different groups felt to be important, together with the work that had already been done on them. It became apparent at this early stage that a key feature of the process had to be a concentration on 'strategic issues', for there was not going to be time to enter into every last detail on specifics. The workshop also provided guidance on the process of stakeholder engagement, the project's governance structure, and decentralization of project activities.⁶

By the end of 2000 the project's scope at the global level had been condensed to a series of challenges. These were still wide subject areas, but they seemed to constitute the major issues that had to be faced. From August 2000 to February 2002 MMSD commissioned research and held a series of workshops organized around these challenges. Thematic research, workshops, and stakeholder engagement exercises were also conducted through the MMSD regional processes around regionally defined topics.

At the global level, workshops were organized around themes such as the management of mineral wealth; human rights, conflict, and corruption; the role of financial institutions; public participation; environmental issues, including land use, biodiversity, waste, and mine closure issues; life-cycle assessment; the reporting and verification of information; indigenous

peoples' issues; and artisanal and small-scale mining. (See Appendix 1 for a full list of meetings.)

Throughout the project there were many bilateral meetings and presentations to UN organizations, the World Bank, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the European Union, governments, and other significant groups and players. In addition, the process had numerous informal routes by which input and opinion were gathered. A project website was regularly updated and contained all documents generated by the project. A monthly news bulletin – in English and Spanish – was disseminated through the project's database to at least 5500 contacts.

Clear rules were observed throughout the MMSD process. These included a set of principles of stakeholder engagement that were developed early in the project and disseminated through its Bulletin and website. Among the key principles observed were:

- First, by attending or in some way taking part in the process, no one was represented as endorsing the process, much less the report itself.⁷
- Second, no person or group or entity was mentioned by name in workshop proceedings without a published reference or their agreement.
- Third, the Work Group – including all those in the regions – attempted to maintain a sense of fairness, balance, transparency, and openness to critics throughout.

Independence

This report hopes to reflect all these different perspectives in a balanced fashion. One of the project's aims was to create a structure that would guarantee the project's independence and the quality of the analysis and outcomes. The safeguards put in place centred on three issues: diversification of funding, quality control, and editorial control.

MMSD's funding comes from what is known as the Sponsors Group. To ensure a diversity of funding, the Sponsors Group was expanded to include companies other than the original 9 who initiated the Scoping Study (the 9 grew to 29), four consulting groups, the public sector (several donor governments), international organizations (including the UN

Environment Programme and the World Bank), one foundation, and six non-governmental sponsors. A target ratio of funding sources was set at 60% commercial to 40% non-commercial. Although in the end this was not achieved in cash terms, many of the non-commercial sponsors provided significant 'in kind' contributions.

An Assurance Group made up of recognized individuals with experience from different constituencies of the minerals sector – the so-called stakeholders – was established to ensure the quality, independence, and balance of the process and report. (See Appendix 1 for a list of the Assurance Group.) Members served as individuals rather than as representatives of any organizations. Initial members were appointed by the Project Coordinator in consultation with the Project Director. Subsequent members were selected and approved by the group itself through its Nominations Committee, which assessed under-represented stakeholder clusters, held independent consultation to identify candidates, and selected individuals. The Assurance Group met eight times through the life of the Project to review progress and advise on future direction. To ensure editorial freedom, IIED retained the right to publish the final report independently if in its judgement this was necessary.⁸

The Sponsors Group, the Assurance Group, and the Work Group were governed by a set of charters that were agreed to by one and all who were directly involved (but not by some constituencies that were interested).⁹ A Project Coordinator worked on behalf of the WBCSD and facilitated communication and coordination among the three groups.

The Process at the Regional Level

One of MMSD's most important elements was the regional partnerships established in four of the world's principal mineral-producing and -consuming regions: MMSD AUSTRALIA, MMSD NORTH AMERICA, MMSD SOUTH AMERICA, and MMSD SOUTHERN AFRICA. In each case, the partner organization was asked to establish a broad-reaching process of consultation and research. MMSD's regional partners designed the regional research work, through a consultation process, to reflect the issues and the locally derived options for change suggested by regional stakeholders. As regional workshops, meetings, and

other events took place, all documentation and meeting records were posted on the partners' websites. All publications – including draft and final regional reports – were made available for public review. The work in each case was overseen, guided, and reviewed by a regional advisory group or steering committee. The research issues, methods of consultation, and structure of the project were never exactly the same, reflecting the diversity of the regions. Yet there were often strikingly similar ways forward suggested as outcomes of the regional MMSD processes.

MMSD Australia

The Australian Minerals and Energy Environment Foundation (Ameef) managed the MMSD process in Australia. Ameef is an independent not-for-profit organization established in 1991 to promote sustainable development in the resources sector.

Priority areas for research were agreed to at a multistakeholder workshop in Melbourne in December 2000, video-linked to Brisbane and Perth. MMSD AUSTRALIA commissioned seven studies, including a baseline assessment of the Australian minerals sector and research into the management of industry impacts on biodiversity, the management of mineral wealth, and the operation of voluntary initiatives in support of sustainable development. The project also commissioned work on the development of new approaches to stakeholder engagement, case studies of formal consultation processes in Victoria, and research into mining company agreements with indigenous communities.

MMSD AUSTRALIA facilitated extensive multistakeholder engagement and dialogue. Research proposals and findings were presented to multistakeholder workshops at the initiation, mid-point, and conclusion of research. The draft report of the MMSD AUSTRALIA project was presented to a series of workshops in February 2002. In all, nine workshops brought together key representatives of industry, federal and state governments, NGOs, labour unions, universities, community, and indigenous representative groups. They provided a neutral forum in which stakeholders could express their views, explore common ground, and begin to address commonly recognized problems. This established a basis for longer-term dialogue, communication, and trust-building in the Australian sector.

Photograph not shown

MMSD North America

The North American regional process began in late 2000 with a scan of issues and interests. This led to the development of an initial Working Draft Action Plan that was vetted at workshops in Canada and the United States. As a result of these workshops, a five-task workplan for MMSD NORTH AMERICA was established that consisted of a profile of the North American mining and minerals industry, scenarios for the future, developing a guideline for assessing an operation's contribution to sustainability, an action plan for change, and a final report.

The general approach used by MMSD NORTH AMERICA was to convene work groups of approximately 25 individuals focused on specific tasks. To as great an extent as possible, participants were drawn from a range of interests, including companies (small, intermediate, large, and service), mining-affected communities, First Nations/Native Americans, NGOs, government, organized labour, and universities (teachers, researchers, and students). While participants were asked to share their knowledge and expertise, they were not asked to 'represent' any organization. Further, although a great effort was made to incorporate everyone's perspective and reach consensus on issues, neither participants nor their affiliated organizations (where they existed) were asked to endorse the results. Thus the end result is a reflection of a multiparty deliberation, though the final treatment of the various topics may not be fully supported by all participants. Rather, the output of MMSD NORTH AMERICA is seen as a contribution to a continuing and evolving discussion about how mining and minerals can best contribute to the broader societal shift to sustainable development.

MMSD South America

MMSD SOUTH AMERICA was led by the Centro de Investigación y Planificación del Medio Ambiente (CIPMA) in Santiago, Chile, and the Mining Policy Research Initiative (MPRI) in Montevideo, Uruguay. The South American process had two components: research (coordinated by CIPMA) and participation (coordinated by MPRI). Both components were carried out in close coordination to produce a final regional report that addressed a research agenda supported by the participatory process. The Partners relied on an Advisory Group drawn from different countries and constituencies for guidance and orientation.

The process was carried out in a decentralized manner with national teams conducting research and participatory activities – in Bolivia (Servicios Ambientales S.A. MEDMIN), Brazil (Centro de Tecnologia Mineral), Chile (Centro de Investigación y Planificación del Medio Ambiente), Ecuador (Fundación Ambiente y Sociedad/Fundación Futuro Latinoamericano), and Peru (Grupo de Análisis para el Desarrollo). These national-level processes worked in close cooperation with one another and with the regional coordinators.

Stakeholder profiles were developed for each country, which was an important first step for the planning of the engagement process. A survey was designed, applied, and completed by 345 individuals from 15 Latin American countries. The results helped establish priorities on the main issues of concern for different groups in the various countries and refined the regional research and participatory agenda.

Some 50 workshops, attended by more than 700 participants, were conducted at the national level. Three regional meetings of the Advisory Group, Regional Coordinators, National Coordinators, and interested observers were held to review findings and receive feedback and advice. Five national reports were produced, which were synthesized by the regional coordinators into the MMSD SOUTH AMERICA's regional report.

MMSD Southern Africa

The University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, South Africa, and the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research in Stellenbosch, South Africa, were

responsible for MMSD activities in Southern Africa. For the purposes of this process, Southern Africa was defined as consisting of countries within the Southern African Development Community (SADC), and consisted of Angola, Botswana, Democratic Republic of Congo, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. A regional Steering Committee, with members from South Africa, Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe, and the SADC Mining Coordinating Unit, was established early in the process to appoint and oversee the regional Working Group. The Steering Committee members also represented stakeholder groups in the region.

The first major outcome of the stakeholder engagement process was the identification of the issues in the region that stakeholders believed should be the topics of the research component of the process. This was initially done by questionnaire, followed by a multistakeholder meeting in November 2000. The areas identified for research were small-scale mining, HIV/AIDS, mining and society, the biophysical environment, and managing mineral wealth. Researchers and reviewers were chosen on the basis of sound knowledge of and wide experience in the region and to ensure good regional and demographic representation.

Focus group meetings were held in Botswana, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Tanzania, and Zimbabwe. Stakeholders had the opportunity to gain clarity about the MMSD process and to articulate the priority issues in their countries. In addition to national focus groups, meetings were also held with specific stakeholder groups. The first results of the process were presented to about 100 participants, drawn from eight SADC countries, at a multistakeholder workshop in September 2001. The process has resulted in an inclusive regional MMSD report.

Other Regions

From the outset it was difficult to establish a broad-based process in Europe, for several reasons. First, the metals industry perceived the project to be about mining and thus irrelevant to their major concerns around metals in use and market access. Most European environmental NGOs either had little interest in mining or were more concerned about

mining issues overseas. The key governmental institutions concerned with trade, environment, and development were already engaged in initiatives with the relevant major trade and commodity associations. Despite many efforts, it was impossible to establish any process comparable with other regions.

In other areas of the world, MMSD worked at the national rather than the regional level because of difficulties either establishing broad regional entities within the project time frame and resources or defining a cohesive regional unit for the purposes of the project. In Indonesia, the Philippines, and Papua New Guinea, MMSD worked with local organizations or individuals to produce baseline studies on the diversity of local issues, but did not attempt to go into the depth of consultation achieved through other regional partnerships.

Similar arrangements were made in the former Soviet Union through baseline studies done in Russia, Kyrgyzstan, and the Republic of Khakassia. In the latter two cases, the work was reviewed by a multistakeholder committee. A baseline study was also commissioned for India. Some areas of the world were beyond the scope and resources of the project, notably China and Japan. This is not an indication of the importance of these countries in terms of their mining and processing activity, but a reflection on the MMSD Project's capacity and resources.

Report Scope and Structure

Some final points on the scope of the MMSD report and lessons learnt from the process (See Box 2). The project excluded all considerations around the consumption part of the coal chain, as it did not wish to enter into the energy and climate debates associated with this commodity since they are well covered elsewhere. Similarly, the downstream part of the uranium cycle was excluded because the issues of weapons proliferation, security, and waste disposal are so complex and controversial that adequate attention to them all was beyond the available resources of time, personnel, and funding. The project focused heavily on the minerals that are traded in global markets, such as metals, and less on those traded primarily in local markets, such as aggregates, sand, and gravel. And it did not deal with cement (the topic of a separate WBCSD-sponsored exercise).¹⁰

Box 2. Multistakeholder Processes: Some Observations from the MMSD Project

- A broad-based, inclusive process of initiation is fundamental to the success of the effort.
- The time frame must take into account the differing capacities of participants as well as the need for a timely outcome.
- No one group should own access to the process or its follow-up.
- A group that is trusted for its diversity and its insights must be given primary responsibility for steering the process on behalf of all others.
- No process should override the importance of local endowments (cultural, environmental, and economic); thus decentralization should be the guiding rule.
- The initial scope must be agreed to by all, and be subject to revision as the dialogue unfolds.
- The process cannot succeed if any one stakeholder attempts prematurely to claim the high ground in public or works in private to circumvent due process.
- The rules of evidence are crucial – everyone needs to work to the same standards of rigour, honesty, and transparency.
- Any financial resources applied should not affect the relationship; at the same time, appropriate responsibilities for follow-up have to be recognized.

Much of this report is derivative. The project sought to consolidate the existing knowledge base from key actors such as the United Nations, the industry's trade associations, MERN, and the many specialist university departments around the world. It commissioned reviews, synthesis, and reports of existing knowledge. But it also held events to engage those who might be interested in critiquing its results as they developed.

Thus the MMSD Project was a considerable challenge from many points of view, particularly given the very tight timeline. The sponsors were asked to invest in a process they could not control (as a condition of their contract). For IIED, a Work Group had to be recruited, the regional processes had to be organized, and the funding had to be diversified – and then the analysis and consultation with all the stakeholders done across a subject area capable of supporting a thousand PhDs. Readers need to bear these limitations in mind. This report is principally a consolidation and synthesis of what has been done and is known by others – and a beginning for those who now want to move forward.

Photograph not shown

The Work Group retained both editorial and project management independence throughout the project. The industry players honoured their original ‘hands off’ pledge in full. None of the sponsors interfered in the selection of the Work Group or the Assurance Group beyond being consulted on the same basis as other interested parties. In addition to the companies, many other constituents, such as civil society groups, labour unions, academics, politicians, and civil servants, took part in the MMSD process and meetings. The engagement was tremendous. Of course, as indicated, the involvement of these individuals and groups in no way constitutes their endorsement of the final report, for which MMSD takes full responsibility.

To some extent this effort has brought the issues just past the starting line. This project was the first attempt, and an ambitious one, to tackle the issues of both supply and demand of minerals throughout the world by whatever means and affecting anyone. The players live in different worlds, work to different ethics, have different values, want different things. Many of these people, institutions, and cultures had rarely if ever exchanged ideas on these important issues before.

It does appear that at a high level, they share certain views: a realization that the status quo is good for very few of them; a desire to have a better, more functional sector that delivers better results for everyone; and a frustration that there seems to be such difficulty in getting good ideas advanced on all sides brought forward to action. This is a basis on which a way forward can be built.

Above all, MMSD hopes that it has succeeded in condensing a large mass of information and ideas into

a few key questions of strategic importance – a long process to reduce hundreds of concerns to a manageable number of issues to be taken forward. These form the basis of the nine chapters in Part III of this report, after Parts I and II provide a sustainable development framework and a review of current trends and actors. Part IV suggests responses and recommendations by reviewing regional perspectives and presenting an overall Agenda for Change.

Endnotes

¹ The original nine companies are now eight.

² IIED (1996).

³ World Commission on Dams (2000).

⁴ Hemmati (2002).

⁵ IIED (1999).

⁶ See the MMSD Project website for minutes of this meeting at <http://www.iied.org/mmsd>.

⁷ The MMSD ‘Principles of Engagement’ developed early in the project can be found in Appendix 1.

⁸ See the MMSD Project website at <http://www.iied.org/mmsd>.

⁹ See <http://www.iied.org/mmsd/chartwkggrp.html>.

¹⁰ WBCSD (2002).