The Global Investor Commission on Mining 2030: Investor Expectations – Mining Companies

Strategic Objective 1: Investor expectations of mining companies – Principles and explanatory notes

Introduction

The Global Investor Commission on Mining 2030 is a collaborative investor-led initiative seeking to define a long-term vision for a socially and environmentally responsible mining sector, and to develop a consensus about the role of finance in realising this vision.

This document sets out the output for Workstream 1 on promoting consistency in investor expectations.

The Commission Is inviting stakeholders to comment and share feedback on this output. Stakeholders can share their feedback directly with the Commission secretariat by the end of January 2026.

For more information on the Commission see: https://mining2030.org/ or contact the Secretariat if you have any questions about the consultation: mining2030secretariat@chronossustainability.com

Contents

INTRODUCTION 3
IN BRIEF: INVESTOR EXPECTATIONS 5
COMPANY PRINCIPLES 5
ASSURANCE PRINCIPLES 6
EXPLANATORY NOTES: INVESTOR EXPECTATIONS 7
COMPANY PRINCIPLES 7
Investor expectations linked to the Commission's thematic workstreams 9
ASSURANCE PRINCIPLES 10
Understanding Assurance Standards and Schemes 12
APPENDIX: THEMATIC ISSUES 15

November 2025

Development of the expectations was overseen by the Commission's Working Group 1 with input from the Commission's Investor Supporter Group.

The Working Group is chaired by Ashley Hamilton Claxton (Royal London Asset Management) and Stephen Barrie (Church of England Pensions Board).

Working Group members include Benjamin Hitchcock Auciello (Earthworks); Rob Pitman (Natural Resource Governance Institute); Joanne Jones (EITI); Gunter Becker (Independent); Julie Schindall (Levin Sources); Rebecca Campbell (White and Case Legal), Tricia Wilhem (Anglo American) and Vicente Mello (AECOM).

Other members of the Working Group wish to remain anonymous.

The Secretariat for the Commission is provided by Chronos Sustainability Ltd. The Secretariat oversaw the development of this framework.

Disclaimer: The Working Group has contributed to this document. However, the views expressed in this document do not necessarily represent the views of these individuals or their employers.

The Global Investor Commission on Mining 2030 is committed to compliance with all applicable competition laws and does not seek, require or endorse individual or collective decision-making or action that is not in compliance with those laws. This framework does not represent a commitment by investors or financial institutions to take aligned or coordinated investment decisions, nor does it constitute investment advice. Each institution retains full independence in determining its own strategies, policies, and actions in line with its mandate, fiduciary duties, and regulatory obligations including competition and antitrust laws. References to investors, financiers, or other stakeholders are intended in a descriptive sense only, recognising the diversity of roles across the financial ecosystem.

INTRODUCTION

Investors have a role to play in helping drive positive change across the mining industry. There is a need for greater clarity and consistency in investor expectations, and an understanding of how mining related standards can be better used by investors. This paper articulates expectations of institutional investors (in a principles format) for the mining industry with the aim to support responsible mining practices by 2030 and beyond. A multi-stakeholder working group was set up to define the investor expectations drawing and building on existing principles and standards. Rather than proposing a new set of standards, the initiative offers expectations in the format of high-level principles. These principles articulate a shared investor vision and overarching expectations for responsible mining, rather than codify detailed or prescriptive good practice.

Box 13. Key data sources used by investors

- Ratings, assessments and sector research produced by ESG data and ratings providers.
- Company benchmarks (e.g. World Benchmarking Alliance, BHRRC Transition Minerals Tracker).
- Industry reports (e.g. from investment banks) which consider the financial implications of social and environmental issues for the mining industry.
- Engagement with mining companies.
- Direct investment diligence.
- Sustainability and other reports produced by mining companies.
- Press coverage, e.g. analysis of mining-related controversies.
- Litigation cases.

Figure 1 Commission's Landscape Report

Long-term investors have a clear interest in the success of the companies they invest in. While some choose to avoid investment in mining companies due to their view of the relative risk (reputational as well as investment) involved in the sector, many recognise the systemic importance of mining, its fundamental role in multiple supply chains and in the low-carbon transition. For these investors the overarching goal is to support risk reduction and sustainable economic growth.

Investors use a wide variety of tools to understand and assess mining companies, from fundamental analysis, to revenue exposure to higher risk business lines, and exposure to macro-economic trends etc. There is a sliding scale in relation to the level and depth of investor analysis. On one end, passive investors whose exposure to a mining company is determined by the company's weight in an index, may use one or two data sources (shown in Box 13 which is an extract from the Commission's Landscape Report). On the other end, active investors may have deep knowledge of their portfolio companies and cross-reference multiple data sources, and could maintain a working relationship with company leadership and even conduct site visits. The principles are intended for all types of investors.

Investors are encouraged to integrate these principles into their investment and stewardship activities, signalling clear expectations to mining companies. They intentionally outline an aspirational vision for how companies should embed responsible and sustainable mining practices. At the same time, key to Mining 2030's vision is ensuring that all companies, not just industry leaders, gravitate towards high standards of social and environmental performance. This means fostering a culture of continuous improvement for junior and mid-tier companies,

which may lack the resources of mining majors but are critical to the sector's overall footprint. Investors should work proactively and collaboratively with all types of companies to support this multi-year transition.

Achieving the vision of a more sustainable and responsible mining industry requires action not only by mining companies, but also by the value chain actors whose purchasing, trading, and sourcing decisions can influence mining practices. This work is therefore complementary to the output of Working Group 2 which sets out expectations for value chain companies on responsible sourcing of minerals.

The ability of companies to meet these expectations also depends on an enabling environment that supports responsible mining. Governments play a key role through appropriate regulation and effective oversight. Legacy issues, for instance, require multilateral solutions and often cannot be addressed by companies alone.

Next steps

This document is an appendix to the Phase 2 Summary Report for consultation which sets out the proposed vision and recommendations of the Commission. The recommendations are a step towards reflecting on how to operationalise the principles further while being cognizant of the evolving standards landscape. The Global Investor Commission on Mining 2030 will explore how investors can support standard-setters, ESG rating agencies, and voluntary industry initiatives in promoting consistency and interoperability across their methodologies, frameworks and requirements.

IN BRIEF: INVESTOR EXPECTATIONS

These principles articulate foundational expectations across all levels of operation both at facility and corporate level. They are structured in two parts. The Company principles outline overarching commitments and behaviours expected by investors. The Assurance principles describe expectations of companies to apply mining standards and audit practices to assess performance and promote trust and accountability.

The Principles are described in more detail in the explanatory notes below.

COMPANY PRINCIPLES

1. **Transparency and disclosure**: The company is transparent about its past and present impacts, its risk management measures, plans and commitments for improvement and outcomes of any actions taken.

2. **Continuous improvement**: The company commits to continuous improvement through setting measurable, public commitments and demonstrating progress at both corporate and site levels.

3. **Responsibility**: The company goes beyond legal and regulatory compliance and aims for the highest standard of responsible business conduct.

4. **Collaboration and shared accountability**: The company seeks to address the environmental and social risks and impacts associated with its operations and throughout its value chain and business relationships.
5. **Risk prevention and precautionary approach**: The company proactively identifies, assesses, and mitigates risks to the environment, communities, and workers across the mining lifecycle. As set out in global norms, where risks or uncertainties exist, the precautionary principle should apply.

6. **Corporate Governance**: The company adheres to fundamental principles of corporate governance, ensuring accountability and ethical conduct, both at the corporate level and at the mine site. Senior management and the board provide strong oversight and management of sustainability related issues and ensure that these issues are a central part of how business is conducted.

7. **Credible assessment and assurance:** The company applies credible mining standards with robust and transparent auditing processes which are independently assured to provide investor and other stakeholders transparency and confidence around performance.

8. **Stakeholder engagement:** The company undertakes ongoing meaningful engagement with affected stakeholders and communities. The company recognises and respects the rights, cultures, and traditions of Indigenous Peoples, including their free, prior, and informed consent.

9. **Advocacy and public policy**: Companies should ensure that their direct and indirect lobbying and political engagement activities, including those undertaken through industry associations, are consistent with their commitments to responsible mining.
10. **Equitable and sustainable benefit sharing:** The company commits to transparent and inclusive benefit sharing that delivers long-term value for communities and host countries.
11. **Conflict**: Companies should assess their exposure to Conflict and High-Risk Areas (CAHRAs) and conduct due diligence including heightened human rights due diligence.

ASSURANCE PRINCIPLES

Robust and transparent assurance against credible mining standards are essential for advancing a more responsible and trusted mining sector. For investors and other stakeholders to have full confidence in a company's sustainability credentials, performance and continuous improvement must be objectively demonstrated and independently assured.

1) **Mining standards**: All mines and other related processing facilities should be assessed against a credible and independent standard by 2035 or be working towards this goal.

2) **Independent assurance**: All mines and other related processing facilities should be subjected to external assurance by a credible and independent auditor.

3) **Participation**: All assurance processes should be open, transparent and provide accommodations for the meaningful participation of affected communities, workers, stakeholders and rightsholders.

4) **Transparency**: All assurance reports should be published in full to provide transparency and accountability.

EXPLANATORY NOTES: INVESTOR EXPECTATIONS

COMPANY PRINCIPLES

Introduction to the principles:

These principles articulate foundational expectations across all levels of operation, both at the facility and corporate level. They are intentionally high-level, recognising that the industry is already supported by detailed mine-site assurance standards. They provide guiding principles for how companies can manage specific sustainability issues such as those listed at the end of the document. Investors acknowledge that companies need flexibility to implement practices that are most appropriate to their mine sites and operations.

1. **Transparency and disclosure**

   The company is transparent about its past and present impacts, its risk management measures, plans and commitments for improvement and the outcomes of any actions taken. It provides sufficiently detailed disclosures in line with recognised standards, of the impacts associated with its operations, covering its own operations and throughout its business relationships to allow stakeholders, including investors, to form a well-informed view of both positive and negative impacts.

2. **Continuous improvement**

   The company commits to continuous improvement through setting measurable, public goals and demonstrating progress at both corporate and site levels. The company is transparent and open about implementation challenges and constraints that hinder progress and the achievement of its goals.

3. **Responsibility**

   The company goes beyond legal and regulatory compliance and aims for the highest standard of responsible business conduct, including expectations set out in the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct and the IFC Performance Standards both at the corporate level and at the mine site. Companies should respect internationally recognised human rights, including the rights of workers (including the principles set out in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work -2022), Indigenous Peoples, and affected communities, and implement due diligence guidance in line with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs) and the OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Business Conduct.

4. **Collaboration and shared accountability**

The company seeks to address the environmental and social risks and impacts associated with its operations and throughout its value chain and business relationships. The company does not limit its responsibility and actions to areas of full control but takes proactive steps – proportionate to its influence and leverage - to work with partners to achieve high performance standards. This includes situations where the company may not have direct or full control or ownership but where impacts are directly linked to its activities. This may include joint ventures, suppliers, contractors, indirect workforce, or the infrastructure supporting the mine (e.g., roads, rail, energy) that may lead to unintended and indirect consequences like deforestation, in-migration straining local infrastructure, spread of diseases etc. Majors could have some opportunities to promote responsible practices when they partner with or invest in juniors. Where divestment or change of ownership occurs, the company should seek to minimise the risk of sustainability performance deteriorating under the new ownership.

5. **Risk Prevention and precautionary approach**

The company proactively identifies, assesses, and mitigates risks to the environment, communities, and workers across the mining lifecycle. It ensures that appropriately skilled and qualified personnel are in place to manage environmental and social risks, and that relevant expertise is embedded in governance and operational decision-making structures. As set out in global norms, where risks or uncertainties exist, the precautionary principle should apply. The company considers sustainability risks holistically, recognising interlinkages and feedback loops between issues. The company deals proactively and fairly with artisanal and small-scale miners to promote safe, responsible, and environmentally sound practices. When incidents or breaches occur, the company takes timely and effective action to investigate, respond, and remediate harm. It has clear procedures for corrective action and ensures that lessons learned are integrated into future practices in a spirit of continuous improvement.

6. **Corporate Governance**

The company adheres to fundamental principles of corporate governance, ensuring accountability and ethical conduct, both at the corporate level and at the mine site. Senior management and the Board provide strong oversight and management of sustainability related issues and ensure that these issues are a central part of how business is conducted. The company has policies in place to manage conflicts of interest and prevent bribery. It also supports transparency and accountability across the extractive sector in line with recognised frameworks and notably the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI). The company also strives for diverse representation and perspectives in its leadership and decision-making processes.

7. **Credible assessment and assurance**

The company applies credible mining standards with robust and transparent auditing processes which are independently assured to provide investor and other stakeholders

transparency and confidence around performance. Compliance with a standard is not static or a one-off process but requires continuous monitoring and assessment. The company should ensure appropriate resources are in place to maintain standards and improve over time.

See related section on Assurance Principles.

8. **Stakeholder engagement**

   The company undertakes ongoing meaningful engagement with affected stakeholders and communities grounded in a deep and evolving understanding of stakeholders and the local context. This includes potentially or actually affected people and/or their legitimate representatives, including workers (both direct employees and contractors) marginalised or under-represented groups such as women and minorities as well as artisanal and small-scale miners. The company recognises and respects the rights, cultures, and traditions of Indigenous Peoples, including their free, prior, and informed consent. It has a transparent and credible process for consulting with affected people and responding to and addressing stakeholder concerns and grievances. Grievance mechanisms are culturally sensitive, inclusive and gender-responsive. The company provides access to remedy at both site and corporate level, in accordance with the UNGPs.

9. **Advocacy and public policy**

   Companies should ensure that their direct and indirect lobbying and political engagement activities, including those undertaken through industry associations, are consistent with their commitments to responsible mining. This includes advocating for and not opposing regulatory frameworks and incentives that promote responsible mining. Companies should review the positions of their trade associations to ensure alignment and seek to address potential misalignments.

Investor expectations linked to the Commission's thematic workstreams

The Global Investor Commission on Mining 2030 has focussed on seven strategic workstreams. Below we have summarised some key principles and expectations arising from workstreams focussed on equitable and sustainable benefit-sharing, conflict, and legacy. These working groups have articulated separate sets of investor expectations alongside additional insights and recommendations. Investors are encouraged to engage with the respective outputs from those workstreams for more detail on these topics available on the Mining 2030 website

Further thematic issues identified by participants as important are listed in the Appendix.

10. Equitable and sustainable benefit sharing

The company commits to transparent and inclusive benefit sharing that delivers long-term value for communities and host countries. This includes responsible and transparent tax practices, the promotion of local employment and procurement, shared infrastructure and services,

economic diversification, and actions to build environmental and social resilience beyond mine closure. Benefit-sharing plans should be informed by local context, support inclusion of women and marginalised groups, and be embedded in company governance and stakeholder partnerships.

11. Conflict

Companies should assess their exposure to Conflict and High-Risk Areas (CAHRAs) and conduct due diligence including heightened human rights due diligence as set forth in the OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from CAHRAs. Companies should ensure that any public or private security forces engaged respect human rights and act responsibly, observing the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights (VPSHR).

12. Positive legacies and mine closure

Building positive legacies and planning for closure and post-mining transition should begin at the earliest stage and be embedded into the mine lifecycle. Companies should ensure closure and legacy planning remain iterative and adaptive and develop a collaborative guiding vision for mine closure and socio-economic transition in partnership with stakeholders and communities. Building positive legacies should address both progressive environmental rehabilitation but also community outcomes, aiming to promote economic independence post mining. Every mine and related facility should have the resources secured to cover full mine closure and rehabilitation, with full transparency on their financial provisions.

ASSURANCE PRINCIPLES

Robust and credible assurance play a role in advancing a more responsible and transparent mining sector. It provides a strong basis to demonstrate performance and progress to investors and other stakeholders, encourages continuous improvement and fosters a culture of openness and transparency.

1) **Mining Standards: All operational mines and other related processing facilities should be assessed against a credible and independent standard within the next 10 years or be working towards this goal.** Assessment against robust standards should be part of a continuous improvement process. Companies should disclose the standard used, basic information on the assessment process, who conducted the assessment (e.g., internal team, external consultant, accreditor auditor) and a summary of findings. Each company will have its own path towards continuous improvement reflecting differences in size, resources, operating contexts, and geographical footprint. The focus should be on measurable progress over time recognising that improvement will manifest differently and unfold over different timeframes.

Assessment against a credible and independent standard represents an important first step. Over the longer term, the ambition is for all mines and other related processing facilities to

progressively move towards independent assurance of site-level performance, beginning with higher-risk operations.

2) **Independent Assurance: All mines and other related processing facilities should communicate a timeframe for external assurance by a credible and independent auditor if assurance has not yet been achieved.** We recognise that achieving assurance across all sites will require a phased and prioritised approach, focusing first on operations with the most significant human rights and environmental risks. The costs of assurance for certain sites in low-risk areas might outweigh the benefits. High-risk sites should be prioritised for independent assurance. Companies should prioritise sites for assurance based on the severity and likelihood of salient human rights and environmental risks.

We recognise that this is an ambitious goal that will depend on collective action across the wider ecosystem including companies, assurance providers, investors, and governments to strengthen the institutional, technical, and auditing capacity needed to deliver credible and independent assessments at scale and across geographies, particularly regions that face institutional and technical constraints. We also acknowledge the need to maintain assurance costs at reasonable levels and uphold high standards of quality and professionalism.

3) **Participation: All assurance processes should be open, transparent and provide accommodations for the meaningful participation of affected communities, workers, stakeholders and rightsholders.** The objective of participation is to ensure that local perspectives, concerns, and knowledge inform the assurance process. Meaningful participation of affected stakeholders can both strengthen the legitimacy of assurance outcomes and provide valuable inputs. Companies and independent assurance providers must consider the local context, socio-political dynamics and cultural practices to design inclusive and accessible processes. This includes pre-announcing audits, providing safe spaces for marginalised groups to participate, and using a variety of written, verbal and visual tools for communication and involvement.

4) **Transparency: All assurance reports should be published in full to provide transparency and accountability.** Public disclosure of site-level findings including strengths, weaknesses, and any non-conformities, provides valuable insights to stakeholders and investors into how risks are identified and managed. While we recognise there may be legitimate challenges around disclosing some of the findings, there is significant value in companies acknowledging areas of challenge and being clear and transparent about how they will address them, in a spirit of continuous improvement. This provides investors more comfort that risks are acknowledged, understood and being managed.

Understanding Assurance Standards and Schemes

Mining 2030 is not endorsing specific assurance schemes or standards as these are continually evolving. Instead, we have reviewed key qualities of a credible assurance scheme. There has been a proliferation of standards in the minerals sector which reflect varying scope and quality over recent years. Companies should select schemes which are most appropriate to their activities, meet investor requirements (including those set out above) and reflective of global norms on responsible business conduct.

This section provides a set of criteria in the form of engagement questions to help investors understand how companies select voluntary standards and assurance schemes.

Rather than replicating existing assessments and developing a new methodology, this section was developed through a review and synthesis of existing frameworks and evaluations of responsible mining standards and assurance schemes. Sources include Levin Sources[1], Mercedes-Benz[2], Germanwatch[3], and Lead the Charge[4]. Additional reference materials encompassed the ISEAL Codes of Good Practice[5], and the EU Critical Raw Materials Act: Annex IV - Criteria for certification schemes[6].

This framework does not prescribe a one-size-fits-all model, nor does it aim to discredit initiatives that do not meet all criteria. Instead, it encourages investors to ask informed questions and understand the strengths and limitations of different schemes.

It is worth noting that some mining related schemes welcome investor feedback through ongoing or one-off consultations and encourage more formal investor participation e.g., in advisory committees or investor networks or through participating in formal membership or governance.

Throughout this section, "scheme" refers to the broader voluntary framework or initiative, while "assurance standard" refers specifically to the audit and verification processes embedded within or associated with the scheme.

Scope and ambition

- What is the scope of the scheme? Is the company using this scheme for a specific mineral, location or business activity? Is the company using one scheme across all sites, or multiple schemes, and if so, why?
- What issues are covered and not covered? What are examples of minimum requirements?

[1] Voluntary Sustainability Standards and Mineral Sector Governance: Synergies and Practices (Levin Sources for the German development agency GIZ)
[2] Mercedes Guidance: Mining and Supply Chain Standards (Version 2)
[3] An Examination of Industry Standards in the Raw Materials Sector (Germanwatch)
[4] Lead the Charge Assessment of Third-Party Assurance and Accreditation Schemes (PIRC)
[5] ISEAL Code
[6] EU Critical Raw Materials Act: Annex IV - Criteria for certification schemes

- What is the level of stringency? To what extent does it go beyond legal requirements?
- Does the scheme incentivise and reward continuous improvement?
- How does the Scheme evolve to reflect emerging good practice and evolving norms, regulations and stakeholder expectations?

Governance

- What is the structure of the governance model that oversees the assurance standards?
- Are stakeholder categories clearly defined to ensure meaningful representation from civil society, rightsholders and affected? What degree of voting rights do they receive? How is this balanced with industry representation?
- How are different representatives elected or selected to serve on governance bodies? Are different stakeholder groups allowed to elect their own representatives?
- What safeguards are in place to ensure no single stakeholder group dominates the decision-making process? Are there safeguards to protect the interests of vulnerable stakeholder groups (e.g., through unanimous voting or blocking power) Is the participation of less resourced stakeholders facilitated?
- What safeguards are in place to prevent individuals with potential conflicts of interest or close industry ties (e.g., former industry executives) from occupying seats intended for independent stakeholders?
- Is the finance sector represented?

Assurance and audit process

- **Audit**
    - How is auditor independence ensured, particularly in relation to financing and avoiding conflicts of interest with the company being assessed?
    - Are site-level visits and verifications part of the audit process? Are these announced or unannounced?
    - What qualifications are required for auditors, and how is their performance reviewed or overseen? What training is provided?
    - Does the auditor have a complaints process? Has this been used or tested and what was the outcome?
    - Is there a separation between those conducting the assessment and those making the final certification or assurance decisions?
- **Transparency of audits**
    - Does the assurance standard require full public disclosure of site-level audit reports, including compliance status and findings?
    - What is the level of details provided in audit reports? Does it include findings for each individual requirement, including incidents, violations and/or non-compliance? Does the report list corrective actions?
    - Does the audit report include a summary of stakeholder inputs and concerns raised?
    - Is there disclosure on risks identified?

- **Stakeholder and rightsholder (including potentially affected communities) participation and involvement**
    - How are stakeholder inputs used in audit findings and outcomes? Is there a formal process to respond to or incorporate stakeholder feedback? Can stakeholders challenge or clarify findings?
    - At what stages of the audit are stakeholders consulted (e.g., planning, evidence-gathering, validation, follow-up)? How does the standard facilitate the participation of stakeholders?
    - How does the assurance standard ensure that marginalised or less vocal groups (e.g., women, Indigenous Peoples, informal workers) are heard and their concerns considered? / How does the audit process accommodate language, cultural, or literacy barriers to participation?
    - Does the standard allow stakeholders to self-declare as being affected or having an interest in the audit?
    - Is there a formal mechanism for workers and their representatives (e.g. unions) to participate in the audit process? Does this include contractors?
    - In cases of dispute, are independent parties engaged to reassess parts/results of the audit?

Grievance mechanism

- Does the assurance standard have a formal grievance mechanism that is open to all affected rightsholders and stakeholders?
- What types of complaints does the mechanism cover (e.g., audit quality, company performance, rights violations)?
- How is the grievance mechanism governed? For example, is the grievance mechanism administered by an independent third-party, a supervising body (e.g., board), or by staff?
- Is there an appeal process?

Non-conformity and corrective action plans

- Does the assurance standard require clear corrective action plans with defined timelines and consequences for non-compliance?
- Are affected communities or workers meaningfully involved in the development or monitoring of these plans?
- How are audit findings and non-conformities used to improve the standard over time? Are there examples?
- Are audit findings shared with regulators where relevant?

ISEAL Alignment

- Is the scheme aligned with the ISEAL Codes of Good practice?

APPENDIX: THEMATIC ISSUES

We recognise that there is a broad range of environmental, social, and governance issues that are material to responsible mining depending on each mine's specific context. These thematic issues are already addressed in several existing standards and voluntary industry schemes, global norms, guidelines and regulatory frameworks[7]. Articulating investor principles for each thematic issue would risk duplicating existing work.

It was recognised that sign-posting these issues for investors would be helpful. This section therefore provides investors with an overview of key issues relevant to the mining industry. The topics are drawn from established industry standards[8] supplemented by some additional topics raised by working group members and stakeholders. Companies should identify the most material and salient issues for each site and at group level and disclose data at both corporate and disaggregated site-levels where relevant. While presented individually for ease of reference, many of these issues are interconnected, with overlapping and interlinked drivers, risks and outcomes.

Governance and business conduct

- Transparency in corporate structure and affiliations
- Independence, tenure and breadth of skills of the board
- Accountability for sustainability issues
- Anti-bribery and corruption
- Business ethics and integrity
- Conflict-affected and high-risk areas (CAHRAs)
- Cyber security
- Environmental and Social Impact Assessment and Management
- Legal compliance
- Mine closure and reclamation including accurate financial provisioning and reporting
- New projects, expansions, land acquisition, displacement and resettlement
- Responsible policy and political engagement
- Responsible supply chains
- Revenue and payments transparency and responsible tax practices
- Risk management

Worker and social safeguarding

[7] A useful tool to get an overview of the multiple standards and tools relevant the mining industry is the TDI standards and regulation browser: https://platform.tdi-digital.com/icat/explore/
[8] Sources include: the GRI 14 Mining Sector Supplement; CMSI's 24 Performance Areas; IRMA chapters (draft version 2.0).

- Automation and digitalisation
- Child and forced labour
- Community health & safety
- Diversity, equity and inclusion
- Emergency preparedness and response
- Fair labour practices and terms of work
- Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)
- Gender equality & gender protections
- Human rights
- Just transition
- Occupational health and safety
- Private Rights of workers including collective bargaining
- Security management

Social performance

- Artisanal and small-scale mining
- Community impacts and benefits
- Cultural heritage
- Grievance management and access to remedy
- Indigenous peoples
- Local procurement and employment
- Stakeholder management
- Talent shortage
- Training and transfer of skills

Environmental stewardship

- Air quality
- Biodiversity, ecosystem services and nature
- Climate change and greenhouse gas emissions
- Climate resilience and adaptation
- Hazardous substance management including cyanide and mercury
- Land and soil management
- Management of physical stability
- Noise and vibration
- Pollution prevention
- Tailings
- Waste and materials management
- Water stewardship

Emerging issues

- Artificial Intelligence
- Circular economy

- Deep sea mining