

Glen Mpufane
Director of Mining and DGOJP
IndustriALL Global Union
Switzerland

Dear RMI

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Responsible Mining Index Draft Methodology. It is a well set out iteration of an initiative that seeks to “encourage continuous improvement in responsible mining by transparently ranking the performance of some of the world’s largest mining companies on economic, environmental, social and governance (EESG) issues, and highlighting leading practice”

Our first comment is that the weighting system is not clearly set out to be understandable and we would urge that some investment be put into making this important piece accessible and understandable.

The 6 issue areas and the attendant odd 75 indicators are as close to key criteria for defining responsible mining.

Life - Cycle management section C, C.3 community viability post mine closure

Our comment will be not substantial but for emphasis and will be across the text where we feel that workers and their trade unions are not explicitly mentioned but are assumed to be covered under local communities/civil society. The stakeholder illustration 1. Is instructive in this regard.

As it so often happens, trade unions/workers and civil society/local communities are conflated and this is not correct and the risk is that issues specific to workers are not considered. Worker viability post closure is as important as is community viability post mine closure. The concept of “just transition” although developed by the trade union movement in the context of climate change impacts, is as relevant to post mine closure situations. The importance of a just transition **labour plan** for workers with a focus on job creation and retraining that is linked to **social plans** cannot be emphasised enough.

E. | Working Conditions, E.3 Collective Bargaining and Freedom of Association

Another comment that also affects workers and their trade unions is on working condition section E, E.3 on collective bargaining and freedom of association. The formulation is not correct.

There are two ILO instruments involved here. One is the Freedom of Association and **Protection of the Right to Organise Convention**, 1948 (No. 87) and the other is **Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention**, 1949 (No. 98). So as the indicator currently stands, it loses the important provision of the right to organise and the protection of that right. In practice this means that organisers must be able to gain access to the workplace to organise. Workers’ representatives must have access to facilities needed to carry out their functions. This includes access to designated non-work areas during organizing efforts for the purposes of communicating with employees, as well as accommodations for workers’ representatives at fly-in/fly-out or other remotely located mine sites, where relevant. This is a very important nuance and we would ask that the indicator be changed to reflect this nuance.

Our proposal would be as follows: **E.3 The Right to Organise, Collective Bargaining and Freedom of Association**, with reference to the two ILO instruments as articulated above.