Devonshire
Initiative

Beyond Zero Harm 2.0 Scoping Meeting Report

Date & Time: February 28th, 2020 1 PM – 4PM
Location: Watershed Partners, Toronto, ON

Table of Contents

Devonshire
Initiative

Summary of Meeting and Discussion

Agenda

The meeting was split into three sections. Participants gathered in small groups and discussed specific questions and issues.

#	Topic	Time
1	**Introduction and Update** • Group Activity #1 – Is measuring outcomes still a challenge?	1:00 PM
2	**Discussing the current problem** • What are the problems with BZH 1.0?	2:00 PM
3	**Collaborative discussion about BZH 2.0** • How/do we align with SDGs? Where do we go next?	3:00 PM

Participants

Aaron Steeghs, Yamana Gold
Abel Page, Terenga
Alec Crawford, IISD & IGF
Amanda Moss, Plan Canada
Anna Atchison, Kinross
Anna, Kinross
Carolyn Burns, DI
David Vilder, SRGraphite
Deniz Yaylaci, Transparency International Canada
Dom Channer, Kinross
Doria Shima, WUSC
Emily Knickerson, PWYP
Esma Mneina, NRCAN
Hevina Dashwood, Brock University
Hugo Bonilla, ERM
Jane Church, NetPositive
Mairi MacEachern, Yamana
Nadim Kara, Stratos
Pierre de Pasquale, Responsible Mining Index
Robert Vandenberg, MERL Advisor at WUSC
Steffen Kramer, Independent
Tehtena Mebratu-Tsegaye, CCSI

Summary of Group Activity #1

Is measuring outcomes and community wellbeing in the mining context still relevant? Is supporting community led development planning still relevant?

- Yes, it's probably even more relevant and important
- There is more focus on quality data, community led processes, and multi-stakeholder dialogue
- Especially, in jurisdictions where there is no data or forums for collaboration
- BZH can be a catalyst for collaboration and support local government and other systems

Session #2: What are the Barriers to BZH?

What are the barriers to BZH? What are the common challenges and questions that people have?

Communicating and awareness

- How do we highlight the value of BZH? With different stakeholder groups?
- Not clear what the value is? For who?
- It's complicated (or it looks complicated)
- BZH is a process not an outcome, which makes it hard to describe the value
- Lack of awareness about the framework AND the issues
- The name is un-inspiring
- It's a major change in mind set, it's hard to get all parties aligned

Roles and responsibilities

- Who facilitates it? Co-ordinates? Leads? Pays for?
- Not clear who should pay for it? Who should lead it? Who 'owns' it?
- There is no leadership for BZH at a local, regional or international level
- Industry has various ways of working collaboratively and measuring outcomes (majors have proprietary ways, mid-tiers tend to work more collaboratively)

Process

- How do communities understand their right to information?
- Not clear how pilots happen
- Link to other processes is not clear (e.g. community development planning, ESIA, local development planning other frameworks)
- There are limited community forums or local processes to align with

Data

- There is a lack of transparency and access at a site level
- Is the focus on data collection or analysis? Or both?
- Core-indicators took away from co-creating community led aspects

Dialogue

- The dialogue part is incredibly complex at a local level
- How do we develop the trust and relationships required to make BZH work?
- How do we encourage local stakeholder interest? What are the barriers to community leading BZH? (local power dynamics? Resources? Priorities?)
- Doesn't focus on 'doing', not clear how it's connected to action

Session #3: Where do we go from here?

How do we align with the SDGs? Should we align the SDGs?

Why?

- Aligning with the SDGs supports company reporting and compliance for investors
- Could there be opportunities to align more local governments around SDGs?
- SDG "Bucket Approach" follows the principles of materiality and is fit for purpose which is very important
- How do we avoid SDG washing?

How?

- Bucket Approach lists indicators under each SDG, communities prioritize and choose the best indicators
  - Context Specific
  - National/local Development Planning
  - Development process for ranking
  - Flexibility – what about indicators not in SDGs
- Hard to demonstrate causation
- What are the key SDGs our work relates to?
- Communities should define priority indicators

What does BZH 2.0 look like?

- Reframe BZH as a tool (with case studies) as a way to talk about wellbeing and create a process to bring stakeholders together / enable dialogue
- BZH 2.0 should be process first (dialogue); then indicators (data); then doing (ideas for how to put programs into action)
- Be explicit about how data is used in planning and decision making
- It should be a living document

How can we enable this?

- Be clear about the value and purpose by stakeholder group

Data

- How can process be more straight forward so it can be community led?

- Can youth lead? How can we work with technology to simplify / improve accessibility / create excitement?
- Continue alignment with SDGs – relevant at international and national level, even though it might not be at the local level

Dialogue

- Dialogue is where the value is , but the framework is heavy on the data
- Power dynamics, capacity and culture make the dialogue process difficult
- Requires trust to enable action
- Up front process / stage needs to be re-thought
- Should reimagine the guidance document and process

Next Steps

- Simplify communications
    - o About value (include targeted communications)
    - o Clarify methodology and importance of dialogue and alignment with regional and national planning
    - o Clarify role of companies in community led development
- Develop guidance for transitioning ownership from original catalyst (e.g. NGO or company) to local organization
- Share
    - o Socialize with ICMM, with GoC other Governments
    - o Make connection to CMMP clear (Canada Brand)
    - o Pilot in Canada (include in an IBA negotiation)?