IRMA

Initiative for Responsible Mining Assurance

Excerpt from the DRAFT Standard for Responsible Mining and Mineral Processing 2.0

Chapter 2.3 – Obtaining Community Support and Delivering Benefits

Context & Disclaimer on IRMA DRAFT Standard 2.0

IRMA DRAFT Standard for Responsible Mining and Minerals Processing 2.0 is being released for public consultation, inviting the world to join in a conversation around expectations that drive value for greater environmental and social responsibility in mining and mineral processing.

This draft document invites a global conversation to improve and update the 2018 IRMA Standard for Responsible Mining Version 1.0. It is not a finished document, nor seeking final review, but rather is structured to invite a full range of questions, comments and recommendations to improve the IRMA Standard.

This IRMA DRAFT Standard for Responsible Mining and Minerals Processing (v.2.0) has been prepared and updated by the IRMA Secretariat based on learnings from the implementation of the Standard (v.1.0), experience from the first mines independently audited, evolving expectations for best practices in mining to reduce harm, comments and recommendations received from stakeholders and Indigenous rights holders, and the input of subject-specific expert Working Groups convened by IRMA in 2022.

IRMA's Standard has a global reputation for comprehensive in-depth coverage addressing the range of impacts, as well as opportunities for improved benefit sharing, associated with industrial scale mining. This consultation draft proposes a number of new requirements; some may wonder whether IRMA's Standard already includes too many requirements. The proposed additions are suggested for a range of reasons (explained in the text following), including improving auditability by separating multiple expectations that were previously bundled into a single requirement, addressing issues that previously weren't sufficiently covered (e.g. gender, greenhouse gas emissions), and providing more opportunities for mining companies to receive recognition for efforts to improve social and environmental protection.

Please note, expert Working Groups were created to catalyze suggestions for solutions on issues we knew most needed attention in this update process. They were not tasked to come to consensus nor make formal recommendations. Their expertise has made this consultation document wiser and more focused, but work still lies ahead to resolve challenging issues. We encourage all readers to share perspectives to improve how the IRMA system can serve as a tool to promote greater environmental and social responsibility, and create value for improved practices, where mining and minerals processing happens.

The DRAFT Standard 2.0 is thus shared in its current form to begin to catalyze global conversation and stakeholder input. It does not represent content that has been endorsed by IRMA's multistakeholder Board of Directors. IRMA's Board leaders seek the wisdom and guidance of all readers to answer the questions in this document and inform this opportunity to improve the IRMA Standard for Responsible Mining.

IRMA is dedicated to a participatory process including public consultation with a wide range of affected people globally and seeks feedback, comments, questions, and recommendations for improvement of this Standard. IRMA believes that diverse participation and input is a crucial and determining factor in the effectiveness of a Standard that is used to improve environmental and social performance in a sector. To this end, every submission received will be reviewed and considered.

The DRAFT Standard 2.0 is based on content already in practice in the IRMA Standard for Responsible Mining Version 1.0 (2018) for mines in production, combined with the content drafted in the IRMA Standard for Responsible Mineral Development and Exploration (the 'IRMA-Ready' Standard – Draft v1.0 December 2021) and in the IRMA Standard for Responsible Minerals Processing (Draft v1.0 June 2021).

EXCERPT FROM THE IRMA STANDARD FOR RESPONSIBLE MINING AND MINERAL PROCESSING v.2.0 – DRAFT VERSION 1.0 – OCTOBER 2023
www.responsiblemining.net

1

Chapter Structure

BACKGROUND

Each chapter has a short introduction to the issue covered in the chapter, which may include an explanation of why the issue is important, a description of key issues of concern, and the identification of key aspects of recognized or emerging best practice that the standard aims to reflect.

OBJECTIVES/INTENT STATEMENT

A description of the key objectives that the chapter is intended to contribute to or meet.

SCOPE OF APPLICATION

A description of the conditions under which the chapter may or may not be relevant for particular mines or mineral processing sites. If the entity can provide evidence that a chapter is not relevant, that chapter will not need to be included in the scope of the IRMA assessment. A requirement is 'not relevant' if the issue to which a requirement relates is not applicable at the site. For example, requirements related to the use of cyanide would not be relevant at a site at which cyanide is never used.

TERMS USED IN THIS CHAPTER

This is a list of the terms used in the chapter ■ Each term is separated with ■

Terms listed here are identified in the chapter with a dashed underline. And they are defined in the Glossary of Terms at the end of the chapter.

Chapter Requirements

X.X.X. These are criteria headings

X.X.X.X. And these are the requirements that must be met for an IRMA assessment to be issued and subsequently maintained by a site. Most criteria have more than one requirement. All requirements must be met in order to comply fully with the criterion.

    a. Some requirements consist of hierarchical elements:

        i. At more than one level.

        ii. Operations may be required to meet all elements in a list, or one or more of the elements of such a list, as specified.

NOTES

Any additional notes related to the chapter and its requirements are explained here.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN THIS CHAPTER

Terms used in the chapter are defined here.

ANNEXES AND TABLES

Annexes or Tables are found here.

IRMA Critical Requirements

The 2018 IRMA Standard for Responsible Mining v. 1.0 includes a set of requirements identified as being critical requirements. Operations being audited in the IRMA system must at least substantially meet these critical requirements in order to be recognized as achieving the achievement level of IRMA 50 and higher, and any critical requirements not fully met would need to have a corrective action plan in place describing how the requirement will be fully met within specified time frames.

The 2023 updates to the 2018 Standard may edit some critical requirements in the process of revising and therefore there will be a further review specific to the language and implications of critical requirements that follows the overall Standard review.

Associated Documents

This document is an <u>extract</u> of the full DRAFT IRMA FOR RESPONSIBLE MINING AND MINERAL PROCESSING (Version 2.0) – DRAFT VERSION 1.0, released in October 2023 for a public-comment period. The English-language full version should be taken as the definitive version. IRMA reserves the right to publish corrigenda on its web page, and readers of this document should consult the corresponding web page for corrections or clarifications.

Readers should note that in addition to the DRAFT Standard, there are additional policies and guidance materials maintained in other IRMA documents, such as IRMA's Principles of Engagement and Membership Principles, IRMA Guidance Documents for the Standard or specific chapters in the Standard, IRMA Claims and Communications Policy and other resources. These can be found on the IRMA website in the Resources section. Learn more at responsiblemining.net

Comment on the IRMA Standard

Comments on the IRMA Standard and system are always welcome.

They may be emailed to IRMA at: comments@responsiblemining.net

Additional information about IRMA is available on our website: responsiblemining.net

Chapter 2.3
Obtaining Community Support and Delivering Benefits

BACKGROUND

There is widespread acknowledgement from extractive industries that efforts spent on building respectful relationships, responding to community and Indigenous Peoples' concerns, and minimizing project-related impacts can be beneficial to both companies and affected communities.

Mining companies typically contribute national and local economic benefits through payments in taxes and royalties and can contribute even more by procuring goods and services from the host country. Leading companies also recognize the need for delivering additional benefits to affected communities, and that benefits are best defined by the communities themselves. When communities' needs and aspirations are not at the forefront of mining company investments, experience shows that efforts often fail to deliver long-lasting benefits. Increasingly, efforts are being made to ensure that community investments made by mining companies provide both immediate and ongoing benefits that last beyond the life of the mining operation.

> **TERMS USED IN THIS CHAPTER**
>
> Affected Community ■ Broad Community Support ■ Closure ■ Collaboration ■ Consultation ■ Entity NEW ■ Exploration NEW ■ Indigenous Peoples ■ Mineral Processing NEW ■ Mining NEW ■ Operation NEW ■ Project NEW ■ Stakeholder ■ Supplier ■ Vulnerable Group ■
>
> *These terms appear in the text with a dashed underline. For definitions see the Glossary of Terms at the end of this chapter.*

In addition to providing tangible benefits to affected communities, there is a growing need for mining companies to obtain and maintain broad community support for their projects and operations.[1] A high level of community support can provide reassurance to an entity's shareholders and investors, and steps taken by a company to earn community support can foster the development and maintenance of strong relationships with affected communities.

---

[1] For example, ICMM members recognize that: "Successful mining and metals projects require the support of a range of interested and affected parties. This includes both the formal legal and regulatory approvals granted by governments and the broad support of a company's host communities." (ICMM. 2013. Indigenous Peoples and Mining. Position Statement. https://www.icmm.com/en-gb/members/member-commitments/position-statements/indigenous-peoples-and-mining-position-statement)

OBJECTIVES/INTENT OF THIS CHAPTER

To obtain and maintain credible broad support from affected communities; and produce tangible and equitable benefits to communities that are in alignment with their needs and aspirations and sustainable over the long term.

SCOPE OF APPLICATION

RELEVANCE: This chapter is assumed applicable to all exploration, mining and mineral processing projects and operations, and if an entity believes it is not relevant then it needs to provide evidence to that effect to IRMA auditors. This may be done, for example, through maps or other documentation demonstrating that there are no communities that may be affected by a proposed project and/or no communities being affected by ongoing operations or proposed major modifications to operations.

> NOTE ON SCOPE OF APPLICATION: This proposed version of the IRMA Standard is meant to apply to exploration, mining, and mineral processing projects and operations (see definitions of project and operation), but not all requirements will be relevant in all cases. We have provided some high-level information below, but the IRMA Secretariat will produce a detailed Scope of Application for each chapter that will indicate relevancy on a requirement-by-requirement basis (and will provide some normative language where the expectations may slightly differ for proposed projects versus operations, or for mining versus mineral processing, etc.).

CRITICAL REQUIREMENTS IN THIS CHAPTER

None at this time.

> NOTE ON CRITICAL REQUIREMENTS: The 2018 IRMA Standard includes a set of requirements identified as being critical. Projects/operations being audited in the IRMA system must at least substantially meet all critical requirements in order to be recognized at the achievement level of IRMA 50 and higher, and any critical requirements not fully met need a corrective action plan for meeting them within specified time frames.

> INPUT WELCOME: The proposed revisions to the 2018 Standard have led to new content, as well as edits of some critical requirements in the process. Therefore, there will be a further review of the language and implications of critical requirements prior to the release of a final v.2.0 of the IRMA Standard. During this consultation period we welcome input on any existing critical requirement, as well as suggestions for others you think should be deemed critical. A rationale for any suggested changes or additions would be appreciated.

Obtaining Community Support and Delivering Benefits Requirements

2.3.1. Commitments to Affected Communities

2.3.1.1. The entity publicly commits to maintaining or improving the social and economic wellbeing of affected communities.

> NOTE FOR 2.3.1.1: NEW. We removed the reference to health, as that is covered in Chapter 3.3, and separated out the previous sub-requirement (b) related to a commitment to broad community support for projects that are being developed. Instead, we are proposing that entities be required to demonstrate that they have obtained and are maintaining such support in 2.3.2.1, below.

2.3.2. Obtaining and Maintaining Community Support[2]

2.3.2.1. The entity demonstrates that broad community support for projects/operations has been obtained through a local democratic process or governance mechanism, or another process or method agreed to by the entity and an affected community (e.g., a referendum) undertaken to gauge the level of support for a project/operation, and/or a signed agreement between the entity and affected communities (e.g., a benefit sharing agreement). In all cases, the process used to gauge community support and/or reach an agreement:

   a. Occurs after the entity carries out consultations with relevant stakeholders regarding potential or actual impacts and benefits of the project/operation;

   b. Is transparent;

   c. Is free from coercion or manipulation; and

   d. Includes the opportunity for meaningful input by all potentially affected community members, including different genders, ages, ethnicities, and any potentially vulnerable groups,[3] prior to carrying out any decision-making or agreement-making process.

2.3.2.2.   The entity demonstrates that broad community support from communities affected by the project/operation is being maintained over time.[4]

---

[2] The requirements in 2.3.2 apply to non-Indigenous communities. If an affected community is an Indigenous Peoples' community, the entity is required to obtain the free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) of that community (as per Chapter 2.2). An entity may need to obtain FPIC from Indigenous Peoples and also demonstrate that it has broad community support for the same project, if there are any communities of non-Indigenous Peoples also affected by the mine.

[3] What may constitute a 'vulnerable group' requiring additional focus depends on the context and the matter at hand. Entities should draw on stakeholder mapping, stakeholder interviews, project documentation, as well as site observations to determine whether all relevant stakeholders have been identified and included. For this requirement, particular attention should be paid to those who are not able or willing to participate without particular considerations/accommodations; this often includes people with disabilities, socially or geographically marginalized groups, those in a state of poverty, the illiterate, groups for whom local cultural practices or household duties deter participation (i.e., women, elderly, children), etc. Additional guidance will be provided in the IRMA Guidance Document.

[4] This also may be referred to as social license to operate, or community support, etc.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 2.3-1

Background: 'Broad community support' neither requires nor implies 100% agreement in the community. Therefore, even if a democratic vote is taken or an agreement signed there will almost always be some community members who are supportive of a project or operation, and some who are opposed (see a similar discussion related to free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) in CONSULTATION QUESTION 2.2-1 in Chapter 2.2).

Furthermore, even if agreements have been signed or there was at some point in time a community vote, etc., sentiments can change over time: opposition may emerge or increase if entities are not responsive to community concerns and/or do not manage social or environmental impacts well; or support may increase if efforts are made to create positive opportunities or benefits such as jobs or training programs. As a result, at one point in time there may be significant enough community-based opposition to say that a site has not obtained or maintained broad community support, and a few years later this situation could reverse.

Ultimately, at every audit the auditors will need to determine about whether a project /operation has broad community support based on the weight of evidence that they have reviewed. Typically, auditors:

- Carry out interviews with affected community members, local and regional non-governmental organizations, and local authorities to understand any processes, events, or outcomes that might indicate presence/absence or change in level of broad community support; and

- Review current social and traditional media to ascertain community opinions and responses to the entity/project.

IRMA will continue to train auditors so that the narratives that accompany this requirement in the public audit report reflect the weight of evidence (i.e., any positive support and any opposition that may exist) that led to their conclusions. We will also develop additional guidance and training for auditors on how to assess/factor in the presence of some opposition (i.e., how much weight to give to a handful of negative articles, a few oppositional tweets, a group of unhappy community members, etc.).

Question: Are there specific metrics that can consistently and objectively reflect whether or not broad community support is being maintained? Or is it enough that auditors weigh the evidence and are transparent about their findings?

2.3.3. Planning and Delivering Community Benefits

2.3.3.1. The entity, in collaboration with affected communities and other relevant stakeholders (including workers and local government), develops a culturally appropriate participatory planning process to guide the entity's contributions to community development initiatives and benefits in affected communities.[5] The planning process:

   a. Facilitates participation by a broad spectrum of the community (including different genders, ages, ethnicities, and any potentially vulnerable groups);[6]

---

[5] "Relevant stakeholders" may include, for example, local economic planning entities, community service groups, social services agencies, land-use focused groups, chambers of commerce, artisanal and small-scale mining representatives, faith-based groups, school boards, conservation organizations, etc.

"Community initiatives" may include any projects or undertakings that support the community, such as infrastructure, training programs, social programs, scholarships, mentorships, grants, etc.

[6] Note that the purpose of including a broad range of stakeholders is to ensure that benefits to communities are not confined to a few, but rather are shared throughout the community. This approach should also aid in reducing potential conflicts within communities that could arise if some groups or individuals are viewed as gaining benefits while others do not.

Which stakeholders must be included and what may constitute a 'vulnerable group' requiring additional focus depends on the context. Entities should draw on stakeholder mapping, stakeholder interviews, project documentation, as well as site observations to determine whether all relevant stakeholders have been identified and included. For this requirement, particular attention should be paid to those who are not able or willing to participate in planning processes without particular considerations/accommodations; this often includes people with disabilities,

b. Adheres to principles of good governance, including:

    i. An agreed set of procedures to guide the process; and

    ii. An agreed set of criteria for how initiatives and beneficiaries will be selected;

c. Adheres to the principle of transparency, meaning that:

    i. Information on the planning process and procedures and are widely available and understood within the community; and

    ii. The planning process and any outcomes, decisions, and/or agreements are documented and made publicly available in languages and formats that are understandable to affected communities.

> **NOTE FOR 2.3.3.1.** REVISED. This requirement combines 2.3.3.1 and 2.3.3.2 from the 2018 Mining Standard, as both requirements related to the same participatory process. We added a reference to the need for the planning process to be culturally appropriate.
>
> More detail was added on what was meant by good governance and transparency. Previously, this information was in the IRMA guidance for this chapter,[7] but to increase consistency in expectations we are proposing to add it here.
>
> 2.3.3.1.c.ii used was requirement 2.3.3.5 in the 2018 Mining Standard. Since it relates to transparency, it was moved here.

2.3.3.2. Affected communities are offered access to funding for mutually agreed-upon experts to aid in the participatory process (e.g., as facilitators and/or community advisors) if such assistance is not provided by the appropriate public authorities.

> **NOTE FOR 2.3.3.2.** REVISED. This was requirement 2.3.3.3 in the 2018 Mining Standard. It stated, "If requested by the community and not provided by the appropriate public authorities, the operating company shall provide …" – however, this was difficult to audit because if the communities didn't know this was available, they were unlikely to ask for it, and if they didn't ask for it, there was nothing to audit. We therefore altered the language in 2.3.3.2 to put the onus on the entity to explicitly offer this assistance, in line with similar changes in other chapters. We also added "e.g., as facilitators and/or community advisors" to guide entities and auditors as to what form this assistance might take.

2.3.3.3. Community contributions include:

a. Initiatives that benefit a broad spectrum of the community (e.g., women, men, children, youth, and vulnerable and traditionally marginalized groups) and are culturally appropriate; and

b. Mechanisms that can be self-sustaining after closure of the operation (including building community capacity to oversee and sustain any projects or initiatives agreed upon through negotiations).

> **NOTE FOR 2.3.3.3.** REVISED. In the 2018 Mining Standard, this was requirement 2.3.3.4, and it had three sub-requirements. We separated out the previous 2.3.3.4.a, which referred to local procurement opportunities (now addressed in the new 2.3.3.6 below). We added a reference to the need for the initiatives to be culturally appropriate.

2.3.3.4. In collaboration with the community, the entity establishes and implements a procedure to regularly monitor the effectiveness of any mechanisms or agreements developed to deliver community benefits, based on agreed-upon indicators, and to evaluate if changes need to be made to those mechanisms or agreements.[8]

---

socially or geographically marginalized groups, those in a state of poverty, the illiterate, groups for whom local cultural practices or household duties deter participation (i.e., women, elderly, children), etc. Additional guidance will be provided in the IRMA Guidance Document.

[7] See IRMA Standard for Responsible Mining 1.0, Guidance Document (v.1.2). Explanatory Note for 2.3.3.2. Available at: https://responsiblemining.net/resources/#full-documentation-and-guidance

[8] Note that in Chapter 1.5 (Financial Transparency and Anti-Corruption), requirement 1.5.1.2.c.iv, entities are also required to public disclose "Project/operation-specific social expenditures, including the names and functions of beneficiaries."

2.3.3.5. The entity develops and implements a procurement policy (or equivalent) that:

a. Sets out minimum environmental, labor, human rights, and social standards for suppliers of goods and services to the project/operation;

b. Includes targets for sourcing from and supporting local suppliers and businesses; and

c. Is communicated to suppliers.

2.3.3.6. The entity monitors its suppliers for compliance with its policy and evaluates its own performance against its local procurement targets. Where supplier compliance is not occurring, or targets are not being met, the entity develops and implements an action plan to improve supplier compliance and its own performance.

NOTES

None.

---

[9] There are already expectations that entities evaluate risks of child labor and forced labor amongst suppliers in IRMA Chapter 3.1 (Fair Labor and Terms of Work) criteria 3.1.7 and 3.1.8, respectively), and Chapter 1.3 (Human Rights Due Diligence) expects that human rights due diligence includes evaluating and addressing human rights risks related to business relationships, which include suppliers (see criteria 1.3.2 and 1.3.3).

[10] See, for example, UN Working Group on Business and Human Rights. 2011. UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: An Introduction. p. 3. https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Issues/Business/Intro_Guiding_PrinciplesBusinessHR.pdf

This table will be added when the new content for all chapters is finalized and approved.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN THIS CHAPTER

PROPOSED NEW DEFINITIONS

Culturally Appropriate

Refers to methods, formats, languages, and timing (e.g., of communications, interactions, and provision of information) being aligned with the cultural norms, practices, and traditions of affected communities, rights holders, and stakeholders.

Entity

A company, corporation, partnership, individual, or other type of organization that is effectively in control of managing an exploration, mining or mineral processing project or operation.

Exploration

A process or range of activities undertaken to find commercially viable concentrations of minerals to mine and to define the available mineral reserve and resource. May occur concurrent with and on the same site as existing mining operations.

Mineral Processing

Activities undertaken to separate valuable and non-valuable minerals and convert the former into an intermediate or final form required by downstream users. In IRMA this includes all forms of physical, chemical, biological and other processes used in the separation and purification of the minerals.

Mining

Activities undertaken to extract minerals, metals and other geologic materials from the earth. Includes extraction of minerals in solid (e.g., rock or ore) and liquid (e.g., brine or solution) forms.

Operation

The set of activities being undertaken for the purpose of extracting and/or processing mineral resources, including the running and management of facilities and infrastructure required to support the activities, and the ongoing legal, environmental, social and governance activities necessary to maintain the business endeavor.

Project

The development phases before a mining or mineral processing operation can begin (e.g., exploration, pre-feasibility, feasibility, conceptual design, planning, permitting). Includes all desk-top and field-based activities, including exploration activities, needed to inform and develop a project proposal, support the environmental and social impact assessment of a proposal, generate information necessary to fulfill regulatory and permitting requirements, engage with stakeholders and rights holders, and maintain the entity's business endeavor.

EXISTING DEFINITIONS

Affected Community

A community that is subject to risks or impacts from a project/operation.

REVISED. Changed wording from project to project/operation.

EXCERPT FROM THE IRMA STANDARD FOR RESPONSIBLE MINING AND MINERAL PROCESSING v.2.0 – DRAFT VERSION 1.0 – OCTOBER 2023
www.responsiblemining.net

10

Broad Community Support (BCS)

A collective expression by the community in support of the mining project. Support may be demonstrated through credible (i.e., transparent, inclusive, informed, democratic) local government processes or other processes/methods agreed to by the community and entity. There may be BCS even if some individuals or groups object to the business activity.

Closure

A period of time when ore-extracting and/or processing activities have ceased and final decommissioning and site reclamation are occurring. It typically includes pre-closure (detailed closure design and planning), closure (actual activities of closure of mine workings, if relevant, and decommissioning of facilities), and post-closure (mainly long-term, monitoring, and treatment) periods, each with its own specific activities.

> REVISED. Changed term from 'Mine Closure' to 'Closure', as the term can also apply to stand-alone mineral processing facilities, and some language changes to be less mining-specific.

Collaboration

The process of shared decision-making in which all stakeholders constructively explore their differences and develop a joint strategy for action. It is based on the premise that, through dialogue, the provision of appropriate information, collectively defined goals, and the willingness and commitment to find a solution acceptable to all parties, it is possible to overcome the initially limited perspectives of what is achievable and to reach a decision which best meets the interests of the various stakeholders. At this level, responsibility for decision-making is shared between stakeholders.

Consultation

An exchange of information between an entity and its stakeholders that provides an opportunity for stakeholders to raise concerns and comment on the impacts and merits of a proposal or activity before a decision is made. In principle the entity should take into account the concerns and views expressed by stakeholders in the final decision.

Indigenous Peoples

An official definition of 'Indigenous' has not been adopted by the UN system due to the diversity of the world's Indigenous Peoples. Instead, a modern and inclusive understanding of 'Indigenous' includes peoples who: identify themselves and are recognized and accepted by their community as Indigenous; demonstrate historical continuity with pre-colonial and/or pre-settler societies; have strong links to territories and surrounding natural resources; have distinct social, economic ,or political systems; maintain distinct languages, cultures, and beliefs; form non-dominant groups of society; and resolve to maintain and reproduce their ancestral environments and systems as distinctive peoples and communities. In some regions, there may be a preference to use other terms such as tribes, first peoples/nations, aboriginals, Adivasi, and Janajati. All such terms fall within this modern understanding of 'Indigenous'.

> REVISED. Removed the term "ethnic groups" as this is broadly applicable to other populations that are not considered Indigenous Peoples and could make it challenging to audit.

Stakeholders

Individuals or groups who are directly or indirectly affected by a project/operation, such as rights holders, as well as those who may have interests in a project/operation and/or the ability to influence its outcome, either positively or negatively.

> REVISED. Changed wording from persons to individuals, and from project to project/operation.

Suppliers

Providers of goods, services, or materials to a project/operation.

EXCERPT FROM THE IRMA STANDARD FOR RESPONSIBLE MINING AND MINERAL PROCESSING v.2.0 – DRAFT VERSION 1.0 – OCTOBER 2023
www.responsiblemining.net

11

Vulnerable Group

A group whose resource endowment is inadequate to provide sufficient income from any available source, or that has some specific characteristics that make it more susceptible to health impacts or lack of economic opportunities due to social biases or cultural norms (e.g., may include households headed by women or children, people with disabilities, the extremely poor, the elderly, at-risk children and youth, ex-combatants, internally displaced people and returning refugees, HIV/AIDS-affected individuals and households, religious and ethnic minorities, migrant workers, and groups that suffer social and economic discrimination, including Indigenous Peoples, minorities, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer or questioning (LGBTQ+) and gender-diverse individuals, and in some societies, women).

Sources: Adapted from IFC. 2002. Handbook for Preparing a Resettlement Action Plan, FAO, and World Bank: "Vulnerable Groups."

REVISED. Proposing to add reference to LGBTQ+ and gender-diverse individuals in the list of examples.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 1.X-2 (From proposed Chapter 1.X on Gender Equality and Protection): References to women and gender-diverse individuals as potentially "vulnerable" or as "vulnerable groups" may sound disempowering and/or otherwise not aligned with the objectives of this chapter to advance gender equality. Are there other widely recognized terms or phrases we could use that recognize the potential susceptibility of women and gender-diverse individuals to adverse impacts such as health impacts or lack of economic opportunities due to social biases or cultural norms?

EXCERPT FROM THE IRMA STANDARD FOR RESPONSIBLE MINING AND MINERAL PROCESSING v.2.0 – DRAFT VERSION 1.0 – OCTOBER 2023
www.responsiblemining.net

12