

**Mining Certification Evaluation Project (MCEP)**  
**Working Group Meeting 10**

**Tuesday 21 December 2004: 10 a.m. - 2.30 p.m.**  
**BHP-Billiton**

**Participants:**

Andrew Rouse, WWF  
Durham Davis, WMC Resources  
Ian Wood, BHP Billiton  
Kristina Ringwood, Rio Tinto  
Leah Horowitz, WWF  
Martha Macintyre, University of Melbourne  
Melanie Stutsel, Minerals Council of Australia  
Michael Rae, WWF  
Peter Colley, Construction Forestry Mining and Energy Union

**Guest:**

Hugh Wyndham, Golder Associates

**Facilitator:**

Tim Offor, Offor Sharp

**Apologies:**

Andrew Minns, Newmont  
Francis Grey, Sustainable Asset Management  
James Ensor, Oxfam Community Aid Abroad  
Malcolm Forbes, Environment Australia  
Margaret Donaldson, Office of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice  
Commissioner  
Nick Chipman, PricewaterhouseCoopers  
Nick Currey, Placer Dome Asia Pacific

**Summary of main points of discussion**

**1. Auditing outcomes**

- (a) A question was raised as to whether the audit protocol should focus on outcomes in addition to the systems that underpin them.
- (b) It was noted that this was currently the case, and that this feature differentiated the MCEP from other certification programs.

**2. Context of the mine sites**

- (a) Concern was raised as to how to make the evaluation tool universally applicable, as outcomes would depend partly on the context of the mine site.
- (b) It was noted that it would be important to design an audit protocol that would function on an international scale and not only in the Australian context.

### **3. Replicability of audits**

- (a) The point was made that it would be important to ensure that the audits would be consistent among auditors.
- (b) It was indicated that other certification programs, such as the ISO series, often result in reports that vary greatly from auditor to auditor, and that this was a situation to be avoided.
- (c) It was noted that a program that produced replicable audits would thereby gain credibility.
- (d) The opinion was expressed that the success of the auditing program would depend on its having more guidance and rigour than other certification programs.
- (e) It was suggested that one way to achieve replicable audits would be through careful training of the certifiers who would perform the certification audits.
- (f) It was also suggested that this could be achieved through a reformatting of the audit protocol, as outlined in the Next Steps document.
- (g) It was noted that trialing a program to train auditors would not be feasible within the scope of the MCEP, but that implementing a reformatted protocol would be a possibility.
- (h) It was generally agreed that a reformatted protocol would be worth testing at the next two field trials.

### **4. Timeframe for the next two field trials**

- (a) The Working Group was informed that the Newmont field trial at Waihi was scheduled for the week of 7 March.
- (b) The Working Group was also informed that the Anglo American field trial at Catalão was scheduled for the week of 11 April.

### **5. Reformatting the audit protocol**

- (a) Concern was expressed that there would be many new variables in the international field trials, and that trialing a reformatted protocol would add to the number of variables.
- (b) However, it was suggested that this reformatting would in fact make the protocol easier to use.
- (c) Concern was expressed regarding the ability of the Working Group to find the time to review a reformatted protocol before the next field trial in early March.
- (d) It was suggested that at least some sections could be reviewed before the next field trial.
- (e) It was decided that no substantial changes would occur to the protocol between the two international field trials, as the time frame would not allow this.
- (f) It was noted that, in the sample reformatted question, sent to the Working Group on 23 November, new material had been added.
- (g) Some Working Group members expressed a positive evaluation of this new material, but observed that it would have to be approved by the Working Group before being implemented in the field.
- (h) Additionally, it would be important to identify the sources of this additional material.

- (i) The suggestion was made that a reformatted version of some sections of the audit protocol, with additional material indicated and referenced, could be circulated prior to the next field trial.
- (j) The Working Group members would then have the power of veto over any new material.
- (k) It was agreed that the Project Officer would circulate such a document at least three weeks ahead of the next field trial.
- (l) It was agreed to change the wording in this new version from “minimum performance requirements” to “guidelines for performance assessment”.

## **6. Employee Relations**

- (a) It was noted that guidelines would have to be provided to the team member responsible for Employee Relations, regarding numbers of employees to interview.
- (b) It was indicated that the guidelines provided for SA8000 auditors suggested that 4% of the workforce would be an appropriate sample.
- (c) However, concern was expressed that at large sites, this would not be feasible.
- (d) It was decided that more research would need to be done on this question.
- (e) A request was made that future Employee Relations team members have SA8000 accreditation.
- (f) It was noted that the Project Officer had put in such a request for the Catalão field trial site, and that the site had indicated that an effort would be made provide an auditor with SA8000 accreditation.

## **7. ICMM presentation**

- (a) The Working Group was informed that Michael Rae had been invited to give a presentation on the MCEP at the next ICMM meeting.
- (b) The question was raised as to whether he would be representing the Working Group as a whole, or only WWF.
- (c) It was indicated that he would speak as a representative of WWF.
- (d) It was agreed that WWF would send an outline of the presentation to the Working Group ahead of the meeting.

## **8. Scoring**

- (a) It was noted that some field trial team members had felt that the boundaries between scores were unclear, so that they were uncertain as to what score to assign for some of the questions.
- (b) The question was raised as to whether to keep a five-tiered scoring system, or to reduce it to a three-tiered system in order to simplify the task.
- (c) It was agreed to maintain the five-tiered system.
- (d) It was noted that this referred only to the questions, as the site itself would not receive a ranked certification – it would be pass/fail.
- (e) The question was raised as to how the questions would be weighted in determining the final score.
- (f) It was noted that this would not be addressed as part of the MCEP.

## **11. Working Paper 2**

- (a) The Terms of Reference for Working Paper 2 were discussed.
- (b) It was agreed that the results of the Australian field trials could be analysed in advance of the international field trials.
- (c) However, it was noted that the final version of Working Paper 2 would likely discuss all the field trials in a single document, rather than having two separate documents.
- (d) It was suggested that a section could be added including commentaries provided by the auditors who had led the field trials.

## **12. Working Paper 3**

- (a) Hard copies of the Terms of Reference for Working Paper 3 were circulated.
- (b) The question was raised as to whether Working Paper 3 would include a literature review of certification schemes.
- (c) It was agreed that it would not include an exhaustive list of such schemes, nor a detailed history of each.
- (d) Instead, it would include a matrix that outlined the key elements of some certification schemes.
- (e) The opinion was expressed that Working Paper 3 should include a discussion of how the project could proceed after the termination of the research project which is the MCEP.
- (f) This would not entail a discussion of ownership or resourcing issues but instead would outline critical success factors for a certification program.

## **13. Actions**

- (a) The Project Officer will:
  - With the assistance of knowledgeable auditors, reformat some sections of the audit protocol.
  - Provide a draft of this reformatted audit protocol, with new material indicated and referenced, at least five weeks in advance of the next field trial.
  - Complete a draft of Working Paper 2 and circulate it.
  - Organise and participate in the field trial at Waihi.
  - Organise and participate in a workshop on Free, Prior and Informed Consent.
  - Conduct research into possible methodologies for interviewing internal stakeholders.
- (b) The Working Group will:
  - Provide feedback on the draft of Working Paper 2.
  - Provide comments and suggestions regarding the reformatted audit protocol.

## **14. Date for next Working Group meeting**

- (a) Either Wednesday 16 or Thursday 17 March were proposed as possible dates.
- (b) Working Group members are requested to express their preference for one of the two dates.
- (c) During this meeting:
  - The results of the field trial at Waihi will be presented.
  - The draft of Working Paper 2 will be discussed.

- The results of the workshop on Free, Prior and Informed Consent will be discussed.