



CSRM OCCASSIONAL PAPERS: MINING INDUCED DISPLACEMENT AND RESETTLEMENT SERIES

Edited by Assoc. Prof. Deanna Kemp and Dr John Owen

Learning from Resettlement: Anglo American's Resettlement Working Group

By: Dr Laura Brooks

ABSTRACT

This paper offers an insider's perspective on some of the key challenges and dilemmas experienced by Anglo American on the topic of mining and resettlement. The paper explains how the internal Resettlement Working Group (RWG) is supporting the company's approach to resettlement planning and implementation.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

As the Head of Social Performance for a multi-national mining company and Chair of the company's RWG, Dr Brooks is in a unique position to comment on the challenges and dilemmas presented by involuntary resettlement and mining. Dr Brooks started her career working in refugee camps following the Rwandan genocide and witnessed the effects of post-conflict displacement. She then worked on involuntary resettlement with oil and gas sector companies in West Africa before joining Anglo American.

Keywords: mining, resettlement, planning, organization

Visit www.csr.uq.edu.au/mining-resettlement



THE UNIVERSITY
OF QUEENSLAND
AUSTRALIA

SMI **CSRM**
Centre for Social
Responsibility in Mining

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Mining can present significant opportunities for development, both in terms of the commodities produced and the socio-economic benefits that can be delivered to local communities and host country governments. The commodities themselves are key to development. For instance, platinum is a critical component of pacemakers, catalytic converters, platinum fuel cells, computer hard drives and drugs that slow the spread of cancer cells. Meanwhile, the mining value chain also presents opportunities to deliver socio-economic benefits to stakeholders at the local, regional and national levels (Eggert, 2001). This includes local procurement and employment opportunities, municipality capacity building and social investment. However, there is a risk that community benefits will not be realised if the industry fails to mitigate the negative impacts of mining, including resettlement (Adam et al., 2015; Cernea, 1999).

A mine's physical footprint is largely determined by geology. In most cases, it is possible to identify options for the design of a mine to minimise the social, environmental, health and safety impacts. However, in other cases, physical or economic displacement may be unavoidable and involuntary resettlement will be necessary.

Resettlement planning and implementation is complex and challenging. It can present significant risks for both the affected communities as well as the business (Owen and Kemp, 2015). For affected communities, resettlement can have profound implications for livelihoods. These impacts can be diverse, from the breakdown of social support networks to the ability to practice cultural traditions. For companies, poorly managed resettlement can trigger reputational risks and project delays. Therefore, there is a strong case for the mining industry to ensure resettlement is planned and implemented in accordance with best practice.

Anglo American has planned and managed a number of resettlements at sites in Brazil, Peru and South Africa. Each of these resettlements has presented a unique set of dilemmas while sharing similar conceptual challenges. Against this backdrop, Anglo American has established a group-wide Resettlement Working Group (RWG) to ensure that the lessons learned can be effectively leveraged. This paper provides an overview of the evolution of the RWG, from its conception to future direction, in the following sections:

- Section 1: Introduction
- Section 2: History of resettlement at Anglo American
- Section 3: Establishing the Resettlement Working Group (RWG)
- Section 4: Objectives and approach of the RWG
- Section 5: Benefits and limitations of the RWG
- Section 6: Lessons learned
- Section 7: Future considerations

2.0 HISTORY OF RESETTLEMENT AT ANGLO AMERICAN

A number of resettlements across Anglo American have provided valuable lessons for resettlement practitioners, colleagues from across the business and other interested parties. This paper features a selection of resettlement case studies – from small (e.g. 5 households at Quellaveco, Peru) to large (e.g. 957 households at Mogalakwena, South Africa) – to provide context and background to the Anglo American experience.

A summary of these case studies is shown in Table 1; the locations of these resettlements is shown in Figure 1; and a summary of lessons identified is included in Section 6.

Table 1. Summary of resettlement case studies

Location	Type of mine	Number of affected people	Year initiated	Current status
Mogalakwena, Limpopo, South Africa	Platinum	957 households, approx. 6500 individuals	1998	Ongoing
Dingleton, Northern Cape, South Africa	Sishen Iron Ore	911 households, approx. 3131 individuals	2008	Ongoing
Quellaveco, Moquegua, Peru	Copper	5 households, approx. 17 individuals	2012	Completed in 2015
Minas Rio, Minas Gerais, Brazil	Iron Ore	115 households, approx. 550 individuals	2010	Ongoing

Figure 1. Map of selected Anglo American resettlements



MOGALAKWENA (LIMPOPO, SOUTH AFRICA): 957 HOUSEHOLDS (APPROXIMATELY 6500 INDIVIDUALS)

The Mogalakwena platinum mine in Limpopo, South Africa was commissioned in 1992. An opportunity to expand the North Pit was identified that required the relocation of the Ga-Puka and Ga-Sekhaolelo villages. This was due to noise and dust exposure identified through the Environmental Impact assessment (EIA) and mine footprint constraints that necessitated additional surface area for waste rock dumps. Initial consultation commenced in 1998 and the community elected a Relocation Committee. However, the consultation was abandoned due to divisions within the community.

In 2002, the community appointed a new Relocation Committee and Anglo American appointed an internal team to plan the resettlement. By 2005, all of the 957 affected households had signed legal agreements confirming that they would relocate. The four-year construction programme for the resettlement sites commenced that year and was completed in 2009.

Despite reaching legal agreements with each household, the process stalled in 2007 for two years as families refused to resettle in line with the previously signed legal agreements. The resettlement recommenced in 2009 and by 2010 a total of 893 households had been relocated.

A final resettlement agreement was reached with the community in June 2012 with a new Resettlement Action Plan (RAP). This had a significant impact on mine planning. New land

had to be identified for the waste rock dump, further from the preferred location, with implications for operating costs.

In 2015, more than 15 years since the initial consultation on resettlement, a number of households remain in situ. The duration of the resettlement planning stage has had a significant impact on the resettlement with respect to engagement with the community. Over time, the validity of the initial consultation process and the community representation arrangements has been questioned, despite being initially accepted as valid and representative.

DINGLETON (NORTHERN CAPE, SOUTH AFRICA): 911 HOUSEHOLDS (APPROXIMATELY 3131 INDIVIDUALS)

The town of Dingleton, South Africa was constructed in the 1950s to serve the Sishen iron ore mine in the Northern Cape. Plans to expand Sishen mine required that the town be resettled in two phases: Phase 1 (Dingleton North) by 2014; and Phase 2 (Dingleton) by 2016.

At the outset, the Dingleton project team actively worked with the team at Anglo American's Mogalakwena mine to identify lessons and establish best practice. In particular, the team established an active approach to engagement, effective grievance procedures and appointed an independent NGO to monitor the resettlement.

Engagement with the community and development of the RAP commenced in 2009 and the community formally elected a Dingleton Resettlement Working Group to represent them in discussions with the mine. The Working Group became critical to the participatory approach to resettlement planning at Dingleton. As elected representatives of the community, they collectively agreed the principles and rules for the resettlement. This allowed the project team to use a transparent framework to make decisions using a consistent set of principles and rules. In some instances, this has required capacity building of affected households to participate in decision making. To date, the community has been largely supportive of the resettlement and the Phase 1 resettlement of Dingleton North has been completed on schedule.

With the first phase completed, a Livelihood Monitoring Framework (LMF) has been developed and deployed to monitor changes to livelihoods. The LMF is based on best practice identified at the Cerrejon mine (an Anglo American joint venture in Colombia) whereby multi-dimensional poverty indicators are identified with stakeholders in a participatory way. In addition, the Dingleton resettlement team are piloting the use of SMS technology as a platform for participatory monitoring, enabling the community to participate in real-time data monitoring through monthly SMS surveys.

Despite the best practice approaches adopted by the Dingleton team, the resettlement has not been without its challenges. At the time of writing, a small number (approximately 10%) of

households affected by the second phase of the resettlement have not yet signed legal agreements and negotiations continue with these families.

QUELLAVECO (MOQUEGUA, PERU): 5 HOUSEHOLDS (APPROXIMATELY 17 INDIVIDUALS)

Between 2010 and 2012 the Quellaveco copper project in Moquegua, Peru participated in a regional consultation with external stakeholders (known as the Dialogue Table). As part of this consultation process, the project committed to double the capacity of the planned reservoir to provide water for local stakeholders during periods of drought.

The land for the dam and reservoir was acquired in 2008; however, the former property owners left herds of llama and alpaca on the land in the care of shepherds. These shepherds were not paid, but were allowed to live on the land with their own animals. Anglo American signed agreements with 16 of these shepherd families to allow them to continue to graze their animals on the land.

As part of the socio-economic baseline study, each household was assessed in the following five areas: income, access to health services, access to education services, social networks and psychological impact. This analysis has allowed the team to design the livelihood improvement plans in a way that specifically targets vulnerabilities.

The project initially identified 8 of these 16 households to be resettled, but this has been reduced to 5 households and 946 animals through changes to project design. Key concerns for the resettlement team include the vulnerability of the households and the expectations of the 11 nearby households, also on company land, that will not be physically or economically displaced. For these households, the project team has agreed to make improvements to their homes and animal enclosures, as well as provide technical training for the production of alpaca wool.

In accordance with best practice and leveraging lessons from other resettlements across Anglo American, the process to develop the RAP was participatory and the resettlement has been completed according to the agreed schedule.

MINAS RIO (MINAS GERAIS, BRAZIL): 115 HOUSEHOLDS (APPROXIMATELY 550 INDIVIDUALS)

The Minas Rio iron ore project in Brazil was acquired by Anglo American in two phases, taking an initial minority stake in 2007. Construction of the mine (located in Minas Gerais state) and the 529km slurry pipeline to the Port of Acu (located in Rio de Janeiro state) was completed in 2014.

The land acquisition and resettlement commenced prior to Anglo American assuming management control and had been implemented in accordance with national legislation,

rather than IFC performance standards. The resettlement at Minas Rio is being planned and implemented in two phases. The first phase commenced in 2010 with the resettlement of 80 households (approximately 400 individuals) in the mine area and negotiating easements with land owners along the pipeline route. This phase was completed in 2014. The second phase commenced in 2014 affecting 35 households (approximately 150 individuals) and is scheduled to be completed within three years under a separate RAP.

Given the schedule pressures presented by a project of this scale and size, a significant challenge for the resettlement has been balancing meaningful engagement with affected households with ensuring the business understands the importance of a successful resettlement. The team has worked hard to formalise the resettlement approach by conducting long term planning through to 2025; and developing an operating procedure that clearly defines responsibilities and governance structures through an internal resettlement committee.

3.0 ESTABLISHING THE RESETTLEMENT WORKING GROUP (RWG)

THE SOCIAL WAY

In 2009, Anglo American made a step change in its approach to managing social performance with the approval of the Social Way¹ group-wide standard. The Social Way built on the well-established and externally recognised Socio-Economic Assessment Toolkit² (SEAT) which outlines the process for identifying and managing site-level risks and includes clear requirements for resettlement planning and implementation. The Social Way stipulates that:

All Anglo American managed sites shall seek to avoid and, when avoidance is not possible, minimise involuntary resettlement wherever feasible by exploring alternative project designs. Where resettlement is unavoidable, projects shall follow the IFC Performance Standard 5 on Land Acquisition and Involuntary Resettlement and supporting Guidance Note as well as seek advice from Group Government and Social Affairs'.³

The Social Way also requires that all resettlement activities aim to improve the livelihoods and standards of living of displaced persons on a sustained basis and that the final draft of

¹ The Social Way is Anglo American's group-wide standard on social performance. It includes ten requirements relating to the development of a social performance strategy, the development of stakeholder engagement plans and the management of social impacts (ranging from human rights to socio-economic development). The Social Way can be found at the following link: <http://www.angloamerican.com/sustainability/approach-and-policies>.

² SEAT is an award-winning approach to managing impacts on the communities where our operations are located. The Social Way requires that SEAT assessments are conducted by managed operations every three years. SEAT can be found at the following link: <http://www.angloamerican.com/sustainability/communities>.

³ Anglo American Social Way.

any RAP or Livelihood Restoration Plan (LRP) is signed off by the Group Head of Government and Social Affairs before implementation.

Prior to the approval of the Social Way, Jon Samuel (Group Head Government and Social Affairs) recalled that the management of resettlement was ad hoc and noted that, “whilst there was a general commitment to follow international standards, it wasn’t always honoured. Our Business Units had extensive freedom in managing projects, including resettlements, as there were no governance mechanisms for Government and Social Affairs interventions”.⁴

RESETTLEMENT SITE SELECTION CRITERIA

The main concerns of families affected by the Quellaveco resettlement related to: the proximity of the resettlement site to their pre-resettlement locations as they wished to remain close to social and family networks in nearby communities; and the carrying capacity of the land for their livestock to preserve their household income (i.e. quality pasture and access to water). These concerns underline both the importance of the ‘sense of place’ and psychological impacts of resettlements as well as the more practical issues of income restoration. As part of the participative site selection process, these concerns were included as key criteria for site selection by the affected families.

ADVANCED SOCIAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME

In 2009, Anglo American also launched its Advanced Social Management Programme⁵ designed to enhance internal capacity in social performance management. The course targets senior management from core business functions and Business Units. Since its inception, a number of mine General Managers have also participated in the programme as well as representatives from Anglo American’s NGO partners.

Each year, participants are required to complete a group project that sets out a proposal in relation to the management of social performance across the group. The group projects are unique as they convene a range of disciplines to assess social performance challenges; and identify innovative opportunities to address these challenges.

As part of the 2009 programme, one of the group projects⁶ developed a proposal to establish the RWG. One of the group members, Froydis

Cameron (Head of Safety, Sustainability and Corporate Affairs, Exploration), had spent significant time supporting resettlements in Brazil and Peru. When asked about the drivers for establishing the RWG she recalled that, “the multi-disciplinary group recognised that the

⁴ Interview with Jon Samuel (22 May 2015).

⁵ Advanced Social Management Programme is an internal Anglo American development programme that is run by the University of Queensland and Cambridge University. The programme targets senior managers across the group and is designed to develop informed, skilled and effective managers able to offer leadership in response to the socio-political pressures and trends affecting the mining industry.

⁶ The team comprised of Froydis Cameron (Head of Safety, Sustainability and Corporate Affairs, Exploration), Dave Morris (Group Head, Safety and Sustainable Development), Alex Khumalo (Community Engagement Manager, Platinum), Tebello Chabana (Head of Public Affairs, South Africa), Aart van den Brink (General Manager, Kolomela Mine) and a representative from CARE Zimbabwe.

company needed to both improve its practical understanding of resettlement issues, and unlock the value of the experience and lessons identified at the different sites”⁷.

Against this backdrop, the RWG was conceived to:

- Foster expertise and experience on resettlement across Anglo American;
- Establish a network of resettlement practitioners; and
- Create a repository of lessons and relevant best practice approaches to resettlement.

During 2010, the RWG was established as a network of resettlement practitioners across Business Units and group functions. The year also marked a step change for social performance management. The Social Way requirements were formally integrated into the review process for capital projects⁸; and governance structures for investment decisions were adapted to include all functions, including Government and Social Affairs.

4.0 OBJECTIVES AND APPROACH OF THE RWG

The RWG’s objectives are to:

1. Support site-level governance structures for resettlement through effective identification and management of resettlement risks.
2. Develop and share knowledge generated from resettlements both within and outside Anglo American.
3. Provide support and advice to colleagues across the RWG on specific aspects of resettlement planning and implementation by establishing a network of resettlement practitioners.
4. Establish a repository of tools and best practice for resettlement planning and implementation.

The RWG currently has over 40 members across the group. RWG members include resettlement practitioners from Anglo American Business Units as well as other interested parties and adjacent functions such as social performance practitioners, Group Technical and Sustainability and Group Finance. In addition to the members, independent experts are sometimes invited to share their ideas with the RWG.

The RWG is not a decision making body, but a network for sharing knowledge, tools and best practice. The group meets three times a year, including two conference calls and one face-to-face workshop.

The face-to-face meetings provide a unique opportunity for experiential learning and involve RWG participants travelling to a site with an ongoing resettlement process. To date, face-to-face meetings have included Michiquillay (Peru), Dingleton (South Africa) and Cerrejon

⁷ Interview with Froydis Cameron (19 May 2015).

⁸ In Anglo American, the review process for capital projects is referred to as the ‘stage gate’ process.

(Colombia). The objective of these sessions is to immerse the group in a particular resettlement to identify challenges, lessons learned and best practice. It also provides an opportunity for resettlement practitioners to network in person.

These meetings are usually scheduled for a week and often start with a visit to the mine and surrounding communities as well as any relevant places of interest relating to the resettlement (e.g. potential host sites). This allows the participants to get a sense of the context for the resettlement. Presentations and workshops are held to focus on specific resettlement challenges and solicit advice from participants. Given that the RWG is an internal forum, there is also a significant degree of openness regarding the challenges experienced. This differentiates the RWG from external resettlement courses or conferences.

With respect to external participation, the RWG meetings usually involve direct engagement between the resettlement practitioners and the community members that are affected by the resettlement. This allows the practitioners to really understand the resettlement from the view point of the community members. It also provides an opportunity for the community members to ask the RWG participants about resettlements elsewhere to understand how issues are being managed at other sites.

In addition to these formal meetings, the resettlement practitioners engage with each other on an ad hoc basis throughout the year to discuss resettlement challenges.

5.0 BENEFITS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE RWG

The benefits and limitations of the RWG, as identified through interviews with the participants themselves, are summarised as follows. A full list of interviewees is included in Annex 1.

CAPACITY BUILDING FOR INDIVIDUALS AND TEAMS

The RWG has been invaluable for capacity building for individual participants and Anglo American. It has created institutional memory and built a sense of teamwork among resettlement practitioners, interested parties and adjacent functions. It has created a forum where problems can be shared in a safe environment and can help to manage resettlement related risks. Ultimately this should lead to improved implementation and better outcomes for communities.

POTENTIAL TO EXPAND EXTERNAL INVOLVEMENT

Given that the RWG is an internal forum, Anglo American recognises that it may not be effectively capturing a broad range of best practice and this could potentially be enhanced through increased involvement of external parties. This could add to the exchange of ideas that is often achieved by participating in conferences and other events.

GREATER UNDERSTANDING OF CONCEPTUAL CHALLENGES

The RWG provides an excellent forum to learn from the over-arching conceptual challenges presented by resettlement. Participants indicated that this knowledge sharing has been leveraged to improve resettlement planning at different sites.

LIMITED ABILITY TO FOCUS ON UNIQUE DILEMMAS

Resettlements can often trigger a unique set of dilemmas that are complex in nature. Unlocking these unique dilemmas tends to require an intricate understanding of the context and background as well as the concerns of the individuals affected. Given the current structure of the RWG, whereby the participants only spend a week on site, it is not well-suited to address the unique dilemmas presented by each resettlement. To address unique dilemmas, participants indicated that they would normally convene multi-disciplinary workshops comprising of legal, technical, resettlement, supply chain, operational readiness and communications that have an in-depth understanding of the resettlement. As such,

project-specific teams are often better placed to work through these problems and to explore the consequences of different options and solutions.

DINGLETON'S LIVELIHOOD MONITORING FRAMEWORK

The Dingleton resettlement team adopted a participatory approach to developing a multi-dimensional Livelihood Monitoring Framework (LMF). The process involved working with the *Resettlement Working Group* to understand how the community defines livelihoods and identify their key concerns and expectations relating to the resettlement. From this engagement process, multi-dimensional livelihood issues (i.e. socio-cultural change, education, health, housing, infrastructure and amenities, and income and expenditure) were identified alongside a set of indicators and a process to monitor these indicators over time. To complement the independent monitoring process, the project team is also piloting a monthly SMS-survey with the resettled households to get real-time feedback on household perceptions.

VALUABLE PEER SUPPORT NETWORK

The participants interviewed indicated that whilst the RWG was designed to provide a forum to share best practice, it has also become an excellent peer support network for practitioners. Resettlement involves extensive engagement with multiple stakeholders with varying expectations and sometimes competing interests (Terminski, 2015). In planning and implementing a resettlement, practitioners are required to manage impacts that can have deep socio-economic, socio-cultural and psychological implications for affected households (Downing and Garcia, 2009). In this context, issues can quickly escalate into conflicts and proposed solutions can trigger unintended consequences. This clearly distinguishes resettlement planning from other types of project management. The decision-making environment can change on a daily basis and outcomes can be unpredictable (Owen and Kemp, 2015). The demands of this often around-the-clock role are not well understood and the level of support required to avoid burn-out is not appreciated by the

business. Against this backdrop, the RWG provides a forum for practitioners to share perspectives regarding the demands of the role.

GROUP DYNAMICS

The RWG has participants from a number of countries. This presents an opportunity to learn about resettlements in other contexts. However, it can also present barriers for communication given the range of languages spoken. The predominant languages are English, Portuguese and Spanish and professional translators are required at the workshops. Given the complexities and subtleties of resettlement challenges, the key learnings can potentially be lost in translation.

The RWG participants also represent varying levels of resettlement expertise. This provides an excellent opportunity for discussing issues in a multi-disciplinary forum, but also inhibits deeply technical discussions on aspects of resettlement.

6.0 LESSONS LEARNED

It is challenging to develop hard and fast rules for resettlement, given that the socio-political, economic and cultural contexts can vary between affected communities. What may work well in one context may be completely inappropriate in another. Furthermore, the multi-dimensional and inter-dependent nature of resettlement impacts often present unique complexities that need to be addressed with unique responses.

Despite these challenges, a selection of lessons learned is offered as follows. This is by no means intended to be comprehensive and a more detailed summary of the lessons identified by the RWG can be found on the Anglo American website.⁹

⁹ A more comprehensive summary of resettlement lessons has been included in Anglo American's Socio-Economic Assessment Toolbox (SEAT), Tool 4D – Resettlement Planning and Implementation (pgs. 107-109). SEAT can be found at the following link: <http://www.angloamerican.com/~media/Files/A/Anglo-American-PLC-V2/documents/communities/seat-v3-jan-15-2.pdf>.

CONSCIOUS LISTENING, STAKEHOLDER EMPOWERMENT AND PARTICIPATION

Key learning: Effective resettlement planning requires conscious listening and participation. In some cases, this may require empowerment of stakeholders to support their ability to participate in decision-making.

DINGLETON RESETTLEMENT SCHEDULE

The first phase of the Dingleton resettlement was scheduled to take place between November - December 2014. This date had been confirmed with the affected households early in the planning process. As the date approached, however, the project's independent monitor identified that the proposed date coincided with South Africa's year-end school examination period and that the affected families were becoming increasingly concerned that moving home on the proposed dates would affect their children's exam results. In response to these concerns, the project was able to re-schedule the resettlement of the households to ensure that any children sitting exams were not moved during the school examination period.

Conscious listening

In many cases, companies approach engagement with external stakeholders with outcomes and optimal schedules in mind. This mindset works against conscious listening. Complex resettlements often involve diverse and sometimes opposing stakeholders that need to be identified, understood and engaged in order to build relationships and establish trust. In many cases, mining companies approach decision making in terms of how the timeframes are aligned with project schedules. Within affected communities, the timeframes for decision making may be based on an entirely different set of priorities – ranging from the timing of crop harvests to cultural traditions that require decision making by elders. Conscious listening involves understanding these priorities.

Stakeholder empowerment and participation

In some cases, it may be necessary to empower stakeholders and build their capacity to effectively participate in the decisions that will affect their lives. For example, it may be necessary to provide financial management training or legal advice to ensure that stakeholders understand compensation packages. In particular, empowerment processes need to carefully consider any disadvantaged and vulnerable groups¹⁰ to ensure that they can effectively participate in decision-making.

¹⁰ Disadvantaged and vulnerable status can be determined by a broad range of factors, including: gender, age, indigenous groups, ethnicity, culture, socio-economic status, religion, language, disability, political affiliation, land title etc. It is important to note that certain stakeholders may be affected by multiple aspects of disadvantage or vulnerability.

PSYCHOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL IMPACTS

Key learning: A house is not just a home. The impact of resettlement is often complex, intangible and at times unspoken. It is critical that psychological and cultural impacts of resettlement are identified and addressed throughout the planning and implementation phases.

Psychological impacts

Understanding the underlying psychological concerns and expectations of stakeholders is particularly important, as it allows resettlement managers to predict and mitigate stakeholders' concerns. These concerns can be diverse and can range from the impact of resettlement on social support networks to concerns regarding security at resettlement sites. The ability to identify these concerns and expectations is heavily dependent on conscious listening.

PARTICIPATORY PLANNING

The Quellaveco resettlement planning involved extensive participation of the affected households. As part of this process, regular meetings were convened with the families explaining the process and providing the opportunity to ask questions or express concerns. The families actively participated in: the provision and validation socio-economic baseline data; the design of the replacement houses and assets; and the selection of the resettlement site. The meetings were conducted and the documentation provided (i.e. meeting minutes, signed agreements) in both Spanish and Aimara. In addition to this participatory planning approach, a meeting was held early in the resettlement process to explain the project's complaints and grievances procedure, including the different channels for lodging complaints and the investigation procedures.

Cultural impacts

Similarly, the underlying cultural impacts of resettlement need to be identified, understood and mitigated. Again, these impacts can be diverse and can range from concerns regarding the loss of 'a sense of place' to the ability to practice cultural traditions (e.g. burial practices) at resettlement sites. They can, therefore, be difficult to identify in the first instance and sometimes difficult to replace or improve in the context of livelihood improvement plans.

LIVELIHOOD IMPROVEMENT

Key learning: Improving the livelihoods of affected people should be a priority of resettlement programs. Measuring and monitoring how commitments are implemented over time requires an approach that is broadly representative, participatory, stakeholder-led and multi-dimensional.

Reliable baseline data

It is critical to establish an understanding of the complex dynamics within the community through accurate and comprehensive baseline data that assesses the socio-political, cultural and economic status of affected people. In developing the

baseline, the team should appoint a relevant specialist to collate data and not make assumptions about the political context, cultural background or economic conditions.

Livelihood improvement strategy

Effective livelihood improvement plans need to be developed to support sustainable livelihoods following resettlement. It is important to remember that livelihoods extend beyond socio-economic development and include psychological and cultural dimensions.

Transition

Although international best practice recommends that resettlement should replicate pre-existing ways of life as much as possible, there will inevitably be changes as a result of a resettlement. This can present particular challenges for vulnerable stakeholders. It is critical to ensure that transition support is provided as appropriate.

Livelihood monitoring

To demonstrate whether livelihood improvements have been achieved, it is necessary to develop a livelihood monitoring framework that can be used to:

- Understand how the community members define livelihoods;
- Identify and establish criteria that measure and monitor improvements to livelihoods;
- Measure baseline data to assess pre-resettlement livelihoods based on agreed criteria; and
- Track improvements to livelihoods through regular and longitudinal assessments.

A multi-dimensional approach to livelihood monitoring is strongly recommended. The approach needs to be:

- Stakeholder-led – whereby the communities themselves define the metrics that are appropriate for monitoring their livelihoods);
- Multi-dimensional – covering a broad range of impacts including security, cultural, education, health, employment and income); and
- Balanced – capturing both the positive and negative impacts of resettlement.

Independent monitors

Involving independent and reputable monitors is critical for establishing trust in the process and building relationships with the affected communities and other key stakeholders.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Key learning: *A structured approach to project management is critical in supporting effective resettlement planning and implementation. However, this approach needs to be complimented by strong interpersonal skills.*

MOGALAKWENA'S DOCUMENTATION PROCEDURE

At Mogalakwena, the project team designed a documentation system with the community that aimed to establish transparency and legitimacy regarding the household agreements. The system involved the household representatives and the project team representative signing, photographing and finger-printing documents. Whilst it took a number of months to design this system with stakeholders, the concept was easily transferrable to other sites.

Integration with Life of Mine (LoM) planning

Effective LoM planning needs to identify and manage a broad range of risks and impacts, including any known or potential resettlements. An integrated approach to LoM planning will ensure that the risks and impacts associated with resettlement are appropriately understood by site senior management at an early stage; and enable the site to identify options to avoid resettlement.

Resourcing

It is important to select a project manager who is suitably experienced and has the right attributes for managing a resettlement. One executive commented that the role of resettlement manager was “one of the most difficult and challenging in the industry”. It requires a high degree of intellectual and emotional intelligence as well as the ability to navigate uncertainty. The role is uniquely challenging due to the competing pressures from internal and external stakeholders alike. Key characteristics include the ability to manage uncertainty, conscious listening and being a ‘people person’. Psychometric tests may be useful in assessing candidates.

QUELLAVECO'S LIVELIHOOD IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMMES

Alpaca, llama and sheep provide the main source of income for the families affected by the Quellaveco resettlement. As such, the livelihood improvement plan includes various technical measures to improve livestock farming. Amongst these measures are technical training (e.g. breeding, processing wool, business administration and financial education) and assistance to optimise the sustainable use of the pasture land (e.g. simple irrigation systems). These measures were designed in a participatory way with the affected families and technical experts.

The project manager should be supported by an appropriately resourced team that has the capacity and expertise to plan and implement a resettlement. This should include experienced social and community specialists. Given the long term nature of resettlement planning and post resettlement monitoring, consistency in project team members can support long-term relationship building and trust.

Legal agreements and documentation

Thorough planning and preparation needs to ensure that legal lease and purchase agreements are in place before commencing the resettlement. In addition to legal agreements, there should be accurate and comprehensive records of all communications, agreements, changes to scope, processes and activities. Reliable records will support institutional memory. A robust approach to record keeping is imperative because resettlement projects often span several years and inevitably experience turnover within the project team.

MINAS RIO'S HOUSEHOLD MANUALS

As part of a resettlement, families often receive new homes with different services (e.g. water, power etc), fixtures and fittings and move into unfamiliar areas. At the Minas Rio resettlement, the team designed a 'Day-to-Day Manual' to help households make the immediate adjustments to life at their resettlement site (e.g. details of local health services) as well as provide advice about long-term issues that may arise (e.g. household maintenance, details of warranties etc). The manual was designed to provide user-friendly guidance with simple language and graphics.



7.0 FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

Mining can present a huge opportunity for development and, in particular, for local communities through broader socio-economic development. However, the failure to manage the negative social, health, safety and environmental impacts of mining can undermine efforts to support development and present human rights risks for affected communities. This is an industry-wide challenge and all parties need to ensure that the impacts of mining activities (both positive and negative) are managed in a holistic way.

Anglo American is rolling out a new approach to operational management through its *Operating Model*. This approach ensures greater integration of socio-political risks and opportunities into the Life of Mine (LoM) strategy. In doing so, the approach takes a long-term view of resource development that will allow site-based teams to proactively identify potential risks and impacts on the horizon. This will support the long-term nature of resettlement planning and implementation. In addition, the integrated approach to LoM strategy development will ensure that the risks and impacts associated with resettlement are better understood by site senior management.

Given the complex and multi-disciplinary nature of resettlement, the ability to learn from both successes and failures is critical. The RWG has been helpful in sharing knowledge relating to the conceptual challenges of resettlement and building a network of resettlement practitioners across the group. Future considerations for the RWG could involve:

A LEGAL PERSPECTIVE

It is important to avoid placing unrealistic reliance on legal agreements. Significant effort is needed in up-front planning and engagement to secure community support rather than relying on legal agreements and replacement assets. One of Anglo American's legal team asserted that 'the legal agreement for replacement assets and compensation is a component of the social agreement. It is important to concentrate on the *hearts and minds* and establishing buy-in'.

UNLOCKING UNIQUE DILEMMAS

As outlined above, the RWG was not designed to solve the unique dilemmas that are presented by a specific resettlement. However, as the group has evolved and matured, these dilemmas could be considered as the basis for future meetings and discussions.

COLLABORATING WITH OTHER COMPANIES

The RWG was designed as an internal forum. This has been useful in creating an environment whereby participants can openly share concerns and seek input from their colleagues. There is, however, a wealth of resettlement expertise and knowledge in other companies and other sectors. It will be important to ensure that the RWG identifies ways to access this invaluable knowledge in the future.

ANNEX 1 – INTERVIEWEES

Name	Title	Group Function
Jon Samuel	Group Head of Government and Social Affairs	Government and Social Affairs
Katie Fergusson	Social Performance Manager	Government and Social Affairs
Tricia Wilhelm	Social Performance Manager	Government and Social Affairs
Name	Title	Business Unit
Froydis Cameron	Head of Safety, Sustainability and Corporate Affairs	Exploration
Edgar Sarmiento	Resettlement Manager (now retired)	Cerrejon
Francisco Raunelli	Community Relations and Sustainable Development Manager	Copper
Joao Elias Bentes	Resettlement Manager	Iron Ore Brazil
Willie Human	Project Manager	Kumba Iron Ore
Etienne Espag	General Manager	Platinum
Jimmy Johnston	Senior Property Rights Manager	Platinum

REFERENCES

Adam, A. B., Owen, J. R., & D. Kemp. (2015). Households, Livelihoods and Mining-induced Displacement and Resettlement. *The Extractive Industries and Society*. doi: 10.1016/j.exis.2015.05.00

Downing, T. E., & C. Garcia-Downing. (2009). Routine and Dissonant Cultures: A theory about the psycho-socio-cultural disruptions of involuntary resettlement and ways to mitigate them without inflicting more even more damage. In A. Oliver-Smith (Ed.), *Development and Dispossession: the crisis of forced displacement and resettlement*. Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press.

Cernea, M. M. (Ed.). (1999). *The Economics of Involuntary Resettlement: Questions and Challenges*: The World Bank, Washington DC.

Eggert, R. G. (2001). Mining and Economic Sustainability: National Economies and Local Communities.

http://commdev.org/files/1412_file_Mining_Economic_Sustainabilitypdf.pdf

Gill, M. (1999). Dams and Resettlement as Development: A Case for Building Good Practice (Vol. 23, pp. 57). Cambridge: Cultural Survival, Inc.

Owen, J. R., & D. Kemp. (2015). Mining-induced displacement and resettlement: a critical appraisal. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 87, 478-488. doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.09.087

Terminski, B. (2015). *Development-induced displacement and resettlement: causes, consequences, and socio-legal context*. Stuttgart, Germany: ibidem-Verlag.