

CSRM

Centre for Social Responsibility in Mining

Developing a Community Impacts Monitoring and Management Strategy: A Guidance Document for Australian Coal Mining Operations

**Centre for Social Responsibility in Mining,
Sustainable Minerals Institute**

July 2005

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The material contained in this manual was developed as part of a research project conducted by the Centre for Social Responsibility in Mining, Sustainable Minerals Institute at the University of Queensland. The project was funded by the Australian Coal Association Research Program (ACARP), with cash and in-kind support from Anglo Coal Australia.

The authors would like to express their appreciation to the industry personnel and community representatives who contributed to the project. Particular thanks are due to Peter Forbes and Pam Simpson of Drayton Mine.

Research team

Project Leader

Professor David Brereton, Centre for Social Responsibility in Mining

Researchers

Jenny Moffat
Dr. Gillian McILwain.



Centre for Social Responsibility in Mining 2005
A member of the Sustainable Minerals Institute



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4
Background.....	4
Why community impacts matter	4
The benefits of a strategic approach.....	5
Developing the strategy: key steps	5
STAGE ONE: GETTING STARTED	7
1.1 Formulating a Project Plan.....	7
1.2 Defining ‘the Community’	7
1.3 Profiling the Community	8
1.4 Mapping Current Site Practices	11
STAGE TWO: OBTAINING COMMUNITY INPUT	12
2.1 Designing a Consultative Strategy	12
2.2 Providing Feedback and Follow-up.....	14
STAGE THREE: FORMULATING THE STRATEGY	16
3.1 The Planning Workshop.....	16
3.2 Prioritising Impacts.....	16

3.3 Selecting Responses	17
3.4 Selecting Impact Monitoring Measures	17
3.5 Documenting the Strategy.....	18
3.6 Stakeholder Feedback	18
STAGE FOUR: IMPLEMENTING THE STRATEGY	19
4.1 Developing an Action Plan	19
4.2 Monitoring and Review.....	19
4.3 Maintaining Contact with Stakeholders	19
APPENDICES.....	20
Appendix 1: Example Stakeholder Register Entry	20
Appendix 2: Example of Summary Stakeholder Consultations	21
Appendix 3: Strategy Assessment Framework	22
Appendix 4: Example Plan Output	23
Appendix 5: Suggested Report Format.....	24

INTRODUCTION

This manual provides guidance to mining operations on how to better understand and manage their impacts on local communities. It has been written principally for the Australian coal industry, but is broadly applicable to the non-coal sector as well.

This introductory section briefly sets out the ‘business case’ for adopting a formal Community Impacts Monitoring and Management Strategy (CIMMS) and outlines what is involved in developing such a strategy. The remaining sections of the manual provide a detailed description of each step in the process, under the following headings:

- Getting started
- Obtaining community input
- Formulating the strategy
- Implementing the strategy.

The appendices contain some useful tools to assist at various stages of the process.

Background

The manual and the accompanying *Sourcebook of Community Impact Monitoring Measures* are outcomes of a project funded by the Australian Coal Association Research Program (ACARP). This project involved working with an operational coal mine in the Hunter Valley to trial a process that mines could use to review and improve their management of community impacts.¹

The manual reflects the learnings from this trial. It is targeted primarily at established operations, but the basic process can be readily adapted for use in the planning of new mines or the closure of old ones.

We recognise that some companies have developed toolkits, guidelines and training materials that perform a similar function to this manual (for example, the *Socio-Economic Assessment Toolbox (SEAT)* designed by Anglo American for world-wide application). However,

¹ The main report on the project, entitled *Monitoring the Impact of Coal Mining on Local Communities*, can be accessed from the ACARP website: www.acarp.com.au

most of these resources are not available to the industry more generally. Also, quite a bit of this material has been fairly general in nature, rather than being tailored specifically to the Australian situation.

Why community impacts matter

Large-scale mining operations can have both positive and negative impacts on a community. On the positive side of the ledger, mines can stimulate economic activity, create local employment opportunities, and deliver significant improvements in infrastructure and services. On the negative side, impacts can include: adverse effects on the lifestyle and amenity of nearby residents; strains in the local ‘social fabric’; damage to the natural resources of an area; and distortion of the operation of local housing and labour markets.

Mines that fail to deal effectively with negative impacts, or with public *perceptions* of negative impacts, can jeopardise community support for the expansion and/or continuation of mining activity in the area, as well as damaging the reputation of the industry

more generally. Conversely, mines that are seen as having a positive impact on a community are likely to experience:

- fewer complaints and objections from 'near neighbours'
- better working relations with regulators and other relevant decision makers (e.g. local councillors)
- a more positive reputation and higher levels of trust within the local community
- fewer difficulties in obtaining planning approvals and negotiating access to new resources
- greater ease in attracting and retaining employees (because the local community is more likely to be seen as a desirable place to live).

A further important reason for mines to take community impacts seriously is to meet the expectations of parent companies. A growing number of companies are requiring all of their sites to produce and regularly update some form of community or 'social' plan. It has also become common practice for companies to specify that sites report on their social performance in annual

Health, Safety, Environment and Community (HSEC) 'Sustainability' reports. Looking to the future, mine managers are likely to be judged not just by their ability to maintain production and contain costs, but their sites' performance in terms of the corporate 'triple bottom line'.

The benefits of a strategic approach

In broad terms, the role of a CIMMS should be to:

1. prioritise impact areas for attention by the site
2. identify the actions that will be taken to mitigate negative impacts and enhance positive ones
3. define a monitoring and measurement framework for tracking changes in impacts overtime
4. set out a process for engaging with stakeholders and regularly reviewing and updating the strategy.

Taking a strategic, planned, approach to dealing with community impacts will assist mines to:

- focus their efforts and resources on those areas of greatest concern and interest to the local community
- identify opportunities to deliver mutually beneficial outcomes for the community and the mine
- flag emerging issues at an earlier stage and deal with them proactively, rather than reactively
- be more consistent in how they respond to community concerns and expectations
- improve how they assess and report on their social performance.

In the final analysis, the success of any strategy will depend, to a large extent, on the commitment and skills of those responsible for implementing it and the level of organisational support that they receive. However, having a well designed and thought out strategy in place will provide a good foundation for moving forward.

Developing the strategy: key steps

The specific content of a CIMMS will

depend on a large number of factors, including: the characteristics of the local community, the size and physical location of the mine, the type of operation, the history of community-mine interactions, and the number of other mines in the area. However, in broad terms the steps followed to formulate and roll out the strategy should be the same regardless of the operation.

Table 1 provides an overview of the basic stages involved. These are: preparation, obtaining community input, designing the plan and implementation and review.

Within each stage, there are a series of tasks that need to be undertaken. These are also shown in Table 1. The order in which specific activities are conducted is not critical and operations may choose to vary the timing and sequencing.

Table 1: Overview of the CIMMS Development Process

Stage 1 Preparation	Stage 2 Obtaining Community Input	Stage 3 Strategy Formulation	Stage 4 Implementation
1. Formulate a project plan 2. Define 'the community' 3. Profile 'the community' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify local stakeholders Conduct an issue scan Identify socio-demographic trends 4. Map current site-community interactions	1. Decide who will be consulted and by what means 2. Undertake consultations 3. Summarise the outcomes 4. Provide follow up to stakeholders	1. Convene a site-based planning workshop 2. Prioritise impact areas for attention 3. Decide on responses 4. Select monitoring measures 5. Document the strategy Inform stakeholders of outcomes and seek feedback	1. Develop an annual action plan 2. Put monitoring measures in place 3. Periodically review progress 4. Modify strategies as required 5. Continue to engage with stakeholders.

Community impacts: a definition

*The term 'community impacts' refers to the different ways – positive and negative – in which mines can affect people living in surrounding areas. These impacts can be environmental, economic, social or psychological in nature. They can also be indirect, as well as direct. Impacts, in turn, often give rise to **issues**: that is, matters of concern or interest to local communities.*

STAGE ONE: GETTING STARTED

In this initial stage, the main tasks are to:

- prepare a project plan for developing and rolling out the CIMMS
- formulate a working definition of who and what constitutes the mine's 'local community'
- prepare a profile of the community by: developing a stakeholder map; conducting an issue scan; and identifying significant demographic patterns and trends
- map current and past interactions between the mine and the community and flag any developments (e.g. closure or expansion) that could impact on future relations.

1.1 Formulating a Project Plan

As with any project, the first step is to put together a work plan that sets out the key tasks to be undertaken, and defines accountabilities, timeframes and resource requirements. The plan should

also include a risk register and strategies for informing key stakeholders and the broader community about the project.

Given the heavy demands on site personnel, provision may need to be made for external support to:

- undertake background research
- manage the stakeholder consultation process; and
- help pull the strategy together.

Factors to consider in estimating resource requirements and time frames include: the size and complexity of the local community, the ease with which the required information can be collected, and whether there are opportunities to 'piggy back' off other processes (e.g. recently completed social impact assessments, or other stakeholder consultation exercises).

Regardless of who does the leg work, it is vital that site-level management owns the strategy and drives its development. Otherwise, there will be insufficient local 'buy-in' and the strategy will most probably end up as 'just another document' to sit on the shelves.

1.2 Defining 'the Community'

'Community' is a term that is normally used to describe a group of people living in a particular area or region. Where mining operations are concerned, 'the community' generally means the people living in the immediate or surrounding area who are affected by the mine's activities. These effects may be economic and social as well as environmental.²

Some of the factors that mines need to consider in defining their community are listed in the text box on the next page. In the case of a sparsely populated area, where there is a single town located close to a mine, this will be a fairly straightforward task. However, matters can become more complicated when mines are located in settled areas (such as in the Hunter Valley) and there are multiple towns in the vicinity.

² This definition of community is taken from *Enduring Value, The Australian Minerals Industry Framework for Sustainable Development* (http://www.minerals.org.au/enduringvalue/resources/implementation_guidance).

Some general advice is to:

1. be inclusive – problems are much more likely to arise when a mine defines its community too narrowly than when it takes a broader view
2. take advice – be willing to ask external stakeholders and other ‘informants’ who they consider to be part of the local community
3. be flexible – be prepared to change the boundaries of ‘the community’ as circumstances change and new information becomes available.

Some issues to consider when determining who constitutes the community

- Which local government areas have dealings with the mine?
- Where does the majority of the workforce live?
- Whose amenity is affected by the operation? (Amenity refers to factors such as noise, dust, visual impacts, traffic, vibrations)
- Which town, or towns, would experience a significant economic impact if the mine was to close?
- Whose land is it?

1.3 Profiling the Community

Once the question of who and what constitutes ‘the community’ has been resolved, the next step is to start building a picture of that community. This involves:

- identifying the various local stakeholders and constructing a stakeholder register
- conducting an issue scan
- reviewing available socio-demographic information.

Identifying local stakeholders

Communities are complex entities made of groups and individuals with diverse views and interests. In order to engage effectively with a community, a mine needs to know who are the different groups and organisations in the community, what are their concerns and interests, who their representatives are, and what interaction, if any, they have with the mine. Compiling and organising this information is sometimes referred to as ‘stakeholder mapping’ (see Appendix 1 for a sample stakeholder register entry).

A fairly standard definition of a ‘stakeholder’ is a group, individual or organisation who is *interested in*, *affected by*, or has *the capacity to impact on*, a mining operation. (This definition is also taken from *Enduring Value*).

A *local* stakeholder describes a group or individual who resides locally, or has an active presence in the community. This definition could include community leaders, local regulators, business and commercial leaders and representatives, community action groups, employees who live locally, ‘near neighbours’ to the mine, and Indigenous groups³.

Table 2 provides a prompt list that individual mines can use to help construct a register of local stakeholders for their community.

³ When a mining operation is covered by a Native Title claim, traditional owners acquire the status of “rights-holders” rather than just stakeholders. Where this is the case, particular attention needs to be paid to addressing the concerns and interests of these groups.

Table 2: Local Stakeholder Identification Prompt List

Sector	Potential stakeholders
Near neighbours	Residents' organisations; Individual neighbours
Local businesses	Chamber of Commerce; Other industry associations; Professional organizations, individual large businesses in the area, e.g. suppliers
Govt. Regulators	Local government; Local representatives of State-based regulatory bodies (e.g. EPA)
Employees	Employees who live locally; workplace representatives; locally based union officials
Other land users	Agricultural Industry groups (e.g. grazing, dairying, viniculture, horticulture, apiarists); recreational land users (e.g. 4WD clubs)
Media	Local representatives of commercial and ABC radio and television; local newspapers
Indigenous	Traditional owner groups; local land councils; other Indigenous organisations
Health	Local hospitals; community health centres and services; medical practitioners
Education	TAFE and University campuses; private and state high and primary schools; school councils
Youth	Youth organisations; youth workers
Welfare	Govt. and non-govt. welfare agencies; council community workers
Religious	Local churches and church organisations
Activist groups	Locally active NGOs, Land care, environmental groups, residents' action groups
Voluntary sector	Service groups such as Red Cross, Lions, Rotary
Tourism	Private and government tourist organisations and businesses
Contractors	Local providers of goods, services and labour
Ethnic Groups	Local ethnic organisations/clubs

Mine employees who have lived in the area for some time can often be a useful source of information about 'who is who' in a community. Advice should also be sought from key informants from within the community who have a good knowledge of the local area and an appreciation of the dynamics of the community (e.g. the mayor, other local political representatives, or the editor of the local newspaper).

When the formal consultation process starts (see below) interviewees can be asked to nominate other groups and individuals who they consider should be included. Once the point has been reached where no new names are coming up, this can be taken as an indication that all significant local stakeholders have been identified.

Conducting an issue scan

Another preparatory activity is to find out what 'issues' – mining-related and otherwise - are a talking point in the community, or have been prominent in the past. This information will assist in focusing the stakeholder consultations and give an indication of the issues that are likely to arise in discussions.

Some possible information sources here are:

- minutes of Community Consultative Committees and other committees that involve members of the general public
- complaints data for the mine, and other operations in the area
- local media coverage (most local libraries can provide a media file - there are also specialist media organisations that will do this work for a fee)
- recent Social Impact Assessments (SIAs) undertaken by other mines in the area
- publications and material put out by local organisations (e.g. Chamber of Commerce newsletters, Council Annual Reports, NGO newsletters and media releases)
- Council websites and minutes.

Review key socio-demographic trends

In addition to being aware of current issues, it will help to have some understanding of the socio-economic make-up of the community and how it may have altered over time. Questions to consider here include:

- What proportion of the workforce is employed in mining or associated industries and has this changed over time?
- What are the other main sources of employment in the community and what are the key trends?
- Is the local population increasing, decreasing or stable?
- How do income levels in the community compare to the region and the state?
- What is happening in regard to the availability and cost of housing?
- What proportion of the local community self-identifies as Indigenous?
- What are the trends in relation to unemployment, particularly for young people?
- What is the age profile of the community relative to the State/national profile and is it changing?
- What is the mix of urban and rural dwellers in the surrounding area?

Standard demographic information can be obtained from the five yearly censuses undertaken by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Most local councils and regional bodies also have access to census information and are generally willing to share it with other organisations.

One problem with census data is that it may be several years out of date by the time it is accessed. For example, since the last census was conducted in 2001 the population of Queensland's Bowen Basin has risen much more quickly than expected. For this reason, it is a good idea to check with the relevant government agencies to see if they have more recent data (such as updated population projections).

Some useful sources of socio-demographic information about communities in coal mining areas are:

www.abs.gov.au This is the Australian Bureau of Statistics website; in addition to census data it contains information about many other surveys and reports.

www.hvrf.com.au The Hunter Valley Research Foundation publishes a range of research on socio-demographic and economic factors in the Hunter Valley region.

www.bowenbasin.cqu.edu.au The Mining Communities Research Exchange on this website provides socio demographic and other information about the Bowen Basin.

1.4 Mapping Current Site Practices

Another useful preparatory action is to map the interactions that the mine currently has with various groups and individuals in the community. This is not as straightforward as it sounds, as these interactions may not always be well documented and corporate memories may sometimes be quite poor.

Questions that should be addressed here are:

- What *contact* does the site currently have with different groups and individuals in the community, and in relation to what types of matters?
- What *processes* – both formal and informal - are in place for engaging with the community and dealing with community concerns?
- What financial and in-kind support does the mine provide to the local community, and for what purposes?
- Are there any recent or planned *changes* in the mining operation that might affect the community, such as expansion, downsizing, closure, or changes in shifts?

This information should be incorporated into the stakeholder register where relevant and updated on a regular basis.

STAGE TWO: OBTAINING COMMUNITY INPUT

A poorly designed strategy that has been formulated with little or no input from the community will be of very limited value to an operation and might even prove to be counter productive. For this reason, it is critical that a serious effort is made from the outset to obtain input from the local community and particularly from significant stakeholder groups.

The key tasks to be undertaken in this stage are to:

- find out what different sections of the local community see as the main ways – both positive and negative – in which mining is impacting on the area
- obtain their views and suggestions on how the mine should be addressing issues of concern
- provide stakeholders with feedback about what the mine is doing, or proposes to do, about the matters that have been raised.

Constructive engagement with the community from an early stage will help to ensure that the strategy has credibility and is focused on matters of interest and concern to the community.

The elements of good community engagement

At its simplest, [good] engagement is communicating effectively with the people who affect and are affected by a company's activities (its stakeholders).

A good engagement process typically involves identifying and prioritising stakeholders, conducting a two-way dialogue with them to understand their particular interest in an issue and any concerns they may have, exploring with them ways to address these issues, and providing feedback to stakeholders on actions taken.

(Draft Principles for Engagement with Communities and Stakeholders released by the Ministerial Council on Mineral and Petroleum Resources in late 2004)

2.1 Designing a Consultative Strategy

There are many different ways of obtaining input from a community. These include: writing to organisations and community groups and asking them to make a written submission, holding public forums, interviewing representatives of stakeholder groups on a one-on-one or collective basis, running focus groups and workshops, and conducting surveys.

Each of these approaches has some advantages and disadvantages, which can vary depending on the situation (see Table 3). For example, holding a public meeting might be a good idea in a small, relatively cohesive community, but will generally be ill-suited to larger, more diverse, communities.

Factors to consider in determining which particular consultation techniques to employ include:

- the level of community interest
- the needs and preferences of different stakeholder groups
- the resources available to the site

- the amount of information that already exists about the local community
- whether any other consultation exercises have been conducted recently in the area.

Deciding who to talk to

Wherever possible consultation processes should be inclusive, rather than selective. This means being prepared to seek out the views of groups that the mine does not currently have much contact with, and being willing to engage with critics as well as supporters. It is always tempting to avoid talking to ‘difficult people’, but excluding them may mean that some important issues and concerns get overlooked. Also, if a mine’s critics find out that they have been excluded from the process, this will most likely harden their negative attitudes towards the operation.

Using surveys

Surveys are valuable research tools, but it is generally not a good idea to use them as the main consultative technique. They have quite a rigid format, which does not allow for two-way communication and they cannot capture

the same ‘richness’ of information as an interview or group discussion. There is also a very real risk that the views of small but important groups (e.g. near neighbours, traditional owners) will be submerged in a general community survey.

Conducting workshops

One option worth considering is to run a multi-stakeholder workshop as part of the consultation process. A workshop can be a cost effective way of bringing different stakeholder groups together in order to elicit their views and explore the possibility of reaching a consensus on key issues (such as which impacts are considered most important).

Workshops need to be carefully designed and managed if they are to be effective. There must be clear ground rules and an experienced facilitator should be employed to run the session. It is also important that sufficient time is allocated – experience suggests that at least a day will usually be required to generate useful outcomes. Our full report (see page 3) describes in some detail a workshop that CSRM ran for Drayton Mine.

Using existing consultative mechanisms

Over the last few years many mines have established community consultative committees or reference groups. In New South Wales, this has become a requirement for all large mining operations.

Where these formal mechanisms exist, the members should be ‘kept in the loop’ and given the opportunity to express their views. However, relying only on these committees to speak for ‘the local community’ can be risky, as they may have been established for another purpose, and their membership may not be representative of the wider community.

Dealing with the issue of ‘over-consultation’

Communities sometimes complain about being ‘over-consulted’, particularly where there are other mining developments in the area. It is always a good idea, therefore, to find out what other consultation exercises or surveys have been undertaken recently. In some cases, it may be possible to rely on the outcomes of these exercises, rather than

conducting ‘yet another’ round of consultations. However, where it is decided to take this approach, stakeholders should still be told about what is happening and given the opportunity to have input if they wish.

Keeping participants informed

Any group or individual whose views are sought as part of the consultation process should be informed at the outset about:

- why the mine is interested in obtaining their views
- what will be involved (format, time commitment, etc.)
- what will be done with the information
- what follow-up will be provided.

If anyone declines to be involved, their decision should be respected. However, where this occurs it is a good idea to ask if there is another person from their group or organisation who might be agreeable to participating.

Framing questions

When asking people about the impacts of mining it is important to get them to think about both the **negative** and

positive aspects. They should also be encouraged to provide suggestions about what actions the mine should take to address these issues.

Organising the data

Particularly where the engagement strategy involves one-on-one interviews and group discussions, a lot of qualitative information will be generated. This information will need to be ordered in some way so that the key themes can be identified. One useful way of doing this is to prepare a table identifying what matters were discussed in the consultations and which groups raised them. Appendix 2 provides an example of this type of output.

Useful resources

Numerous publicly available resources provide advice on how to conduct community consultations. Two helpful websites are:

- *International Association for Public Participation*: www.iap2.org.
- *Citizen Science Toolbox*: <http://www.coastal.crc.org.au/toolbox/index.asp>

Another useful resource is *Best Practice Community Consultation in the NSW Mining and Extractive Industries*, which is available from the New South Wales Minerals Council.

Where an operation is uncertain about how to proceed, it should seek expert advice.

2.2 Providing feedback and follow-up

If mine representatives give any undertakings during the course of the consultations (e.g. to get back to a person with some information, or to investigate a complaint) there needs to be timely follow-up; otherwise, people are likely to lose faith in the process. In addition, all participants are entitled to receive some form of feedback. Some ways of doing this are to:

- circulate a summary of the consultation outcomes to those who participated
- provide regular progress reports in site newsletters
- let people know when the strategy has been finalised and ask them if they would like a summary.

Table 3: Comparison of Consultation Methods

Strategy	Description	Advantages	Disadvantages
One To One	This can be in the form of either a semi - structured or structured interview of 'opinion leaders' and other key stakeholders in the community.	Allows for more in-depth exploration of issues; data collected through this means is much 'richer' than that obtained from large-scale standardised surveys.	Depending on how many interviews are conducted, there may be a very large amount of qualitative data that has to be managed and interpreted. There is a risk that some people in the community will see the choice of interviewees as selective; findings may be criticised as 'not representative'.
Small Groups	Focus groups typically consist of 6 – 8 members with the discussion being led by a facilitator. Workshops are a form of small group communication and can be used for a range of purposes, e.g. providing a structured interactive process between representatives of a mine and a cross-section of community stakeholders.	The main benefit of the focus group is the generation of information or comment that comes from the group energy; a group in this context may be greater than the sum of its parts. Workshops can provide a forum for the exchange of information and ideas and the prioritising of issues and approaches. Another advantage is the potential for developing mutual understanding and building relationships.	As these are interactive and comparatively public processes, they need to be managed well by the facilitator, particularly in terms of any conflict that may emerge. Due to the logistics of running these activities, only a relatively small number of people can be involved. Workshops can also make substantial demands on the time of participants.
Larger Group	Community Surveys are typically conducted by either telephone or mail, with participants being selected at random.	The main advantage of a survey is that a large amount of information can be collected in a standardised format from a broad cross-section of the community. Data from well-designed questionnaires can be analysed comparatively quickly.	Due to the need to use a standardised format, there is very little opportunity for participants to expand on or explain their views. The views of important, but numerically small, groups may not be captured.

STAGE THREE: FORMULATING THE STRATEGY

The main tasks involved in this stage are:

- convening and briefing a site-level planning workshop to:
 - rank impact areas in terms of priority
 - decide on the management actions that will be taken to deal with these impacts
- selecting impact monitoring measures
- documenting the strategy
- keeping stakeholders informed.

3.1 The Planning Workshop

Holding an on-site planning workshop is a good way of bringing all of the key site participants together to focus on the major issues at hand. Group discussions often also draw out different issues and perspectives that are not necessarily apparent in one-on-one discussions, or when draft documents are circulated for written feedback.

Attendees at the workshop should include the site General Manager, personnel responsible for the environmental and community relations areas, and at least one senior manager from the operations area. Consideration should also be given to including external people (e.g. the local shire planner) who have a good knowledge of the issues and who can participate constructively. A minimum of 1.5 days should be allowed for the workshop.

Needless to say, good preparation and good facilitation are the key to a productive workshop. In particular, participants need to be provided with a concise summary of the preliminary research and the outcomes of community consultations. Some useful guidance on organising and running workshops is provided in the Sustainable Minerals Institute's *SOTA Workbook*, which can be obtained from the CSRM website at:

http://www.srm.uq.edu.au/docs/SOTA_Workbook.pdf.

3.2 Prioritising Impacts

A key function of the workshop is to identify priority impact areas for attention. It makes much more sense for an operation to focus its resources and attention on a limited number of areas, rather than trying to address every issue raised during the consultation process.

Table 4 lists key questions that should be considered when determining priority areas.

As a 'reality check', a comparison should be made between the workshop's ranking of impacts and what the community identified as important in the consultations. Where there is a significant divergence, the ranking may need to be re-visited. At the very least, the site will have to consider how it is going to explain this discrepancy to its external stakeholders.

Table 4: Impact Prioritisation Prompt List

Is the impact considered important by one or more external stakeholders and is there an expectation that the site – either singularly or in conjunction with other mines – should be taking action?
Could one or more sections of the community suffer significant negative consequences if action is not taken to mitigate the impact?
Could one or more sections of the community benefit significantly if the mine was to take action to improve its performance in this area?
Could the company and/or site suffer negative consequences (e.g. damage to reputation, difficulty in obtaining access to land) if the issue is not addressed?
Could the site and, by extension, the company, derive a benefit (e.g. improved reputation, enhanced relations with regulators) from improving its performance in this area?

High priority impact areas will generally be those where:

- failure to take action could cause significant disadvantage to part of the community; and/or
- there is potential for the site/company to suffer substantial

reputational or other damage if action is not taken; and/or

- there is scope for site/company to deliver a significant benefit to the community, or a section of it., and for the site/company to also benefit from this.

3.3 Selecting Responses

Once priorities have been determined, the workshop needs to consider what actions should be taken to mitigate/enhance these impacts. The key questions to address here are:

- how, if at all, is the site currently managing the impact?
- what other actions could be taken to mitigate/enhance this impact?
- what evidence, if any, is there that the proposed action would achieve the desired effect?
- what is the ‘degree of difficulty’ (including cost) involved in implementing this action?

As indicated, the higher the priority assigned to an impact, the greater the

effort and resources that should be applied to addressing it.

The stakeholder consultation process, if it has been managed well, should not only have flagged concerns but also highlighted some possible strategies for dealing with these concerns. It is also a good idea to look at what has worked well in the past, or in other contexts.

Appendix 3 lists some factors which should be considered when deciding on particular responses. This more detailed consideration will probably need to take place outside of the workshop forum.

3.4 Selecting Impact Monitoring Measures

A well-designed strategy will include mechanisms for monitoring trends in the key impact areas that have been identified. Having good measures in place enables sites to track changes and to assess whether strategies for dealing with them have been effective. A well-designed monitoring framework can also provide an ‘early warning’ of emerging issues. In addition, the information that is collected can provide

the basis for reporting publicly on the mine's social performance.

The accompanying *Sourcebook of Community Impact Measures* provides detailed guidance on how to select and implement measures for monitoring community impacts. Some general advice is to:

1. Focus on understanding and measuring key impacts, rather than attempting to track everything.
2. Where practical, use multiple measures, rather than a single metric. This will provide a more complete picture and enable patterns and trends to be cross-checked.
3. Use qualitative measures where it makes sense to do so – not everything has to be expressed in numerical terms.
4. Do not rely only on formal indicators: informal feedback from stakeholders and 'local intelligence' should also be regarded as important sources of information.

When developing a monitoring framework, sites should begin by establishing what information they

currently collect and then assess the cost and practicality of implementing additional measures. The aim should be to have measures that are robust, relatively easy to maintain and cost effective.

3.5 Documenting the Strategy

There are various ways in which the outcomes of the strategy development process can be documented. One option is to create a summary table which shows, for each area of impact:

- the issues relating to that impact
- the priority given to the impact and the basis for assigning that priority
- how the impact is currently being addressed
- planned additional management actions
- current monitoring measures
- proposed additional monitoring measures.

An example of a summary table is provided in Appendix 4.

Consideration should also be given to writing a report on the whole process. This is a way of recording the information that was collected and documenting key learnings. Appendix 5 suggests a possible format.

3.6 Stakeholder Feedback

As stressed throughout this manual, it is very important that external stakeholders are kept informed about outcomes and given the opportunity to comment. Some means of doing this are:

- sending a summary to interested stakeholders
- using newsletters and other communication mechanisms to let people know that the plan has been finalised
- providing one-on-one or group briefings to key local stakeholders.

STAGE FOUR: IMPLEMENTING THE STRATEGY

Once the strategy has been formulated, it needs to be rolled out. This requires:

- developing an annual action plan to guide implementation of the strategy
- putting in place procedures for regularly monitoring and reviewing progress
- ensuring that there are processes in place for maintaining contact with local stakeholders.

4.1 Developing an Action Plan

The Action Plan should be incorporated into the site's normal business planning processes and should identify:

- what specific management actions are required to be taken in the reporting period
- who is responsible for these actions
- what resources will be allocated to support implementations

- performance targets
- reporting and review time frames
- processes for communicating with external stakeholders.

4.2 Monitoring and Review

Regular reviews of progress will enable the effectiveness of particular initiatives to be assessed and help ensure that the strategy remains current.

Where it is practical to do so, baseline measures of key impacts should be taken prior to the strategy being rolled out. This will then provide a reference point for tracking subsequent changes in these impacts and for evaluating the effectiveness of mitigation or enhancement measures. Note that some of these baseline measures (e.g. levels of community satisfaction) may not have been defined as part of the community consultation process itself.

Reviews of the plan should be conducted on at least an annual basis and should consider issues such as:

- Are the strategies that have been selected working?

- Are the chosen indicators actually measuring the changes that are occurring or should another type of measurement be incorporated?
- Are external stakeholders being kept informed of the progress and what feedback are they providing?
- Have any unintended consequences arisen as a result of the strategy?

4.3 Maintaining Contact with Stakeholders

Feedback on the implementation and effectiveness of the strategy should be provided to key stakeholders, relevant industry representatives and the community on a regular basis. One obvious way to do this is through the annual HSEC/sustainability reports that most sites are now expected to produce. However, pro-active engagement strategies (e.g. regular briefings; informal visits) are also needed. The aim here should not just be to provide information, but to seek out the views of stakeholders, engage them in dialogue and act on their suggestions where it makes sense to do so.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Example Stakeholder Register Entry

Stakeholder group	Representatives/ contacts	Main focus/concerns	Contacts with mine
Near neighbours	Individual residents Local Residents' Association	Concerned about noise and dust; opposed to the expansion of mining	Regular complaints and inquiries; Some near neighbours attend CCC meetings
Traditional owners	Land council; Local tribal groups	Strong interest in protecting cultural heritage; Local leaders have criticised the mining industry for its environmental record and failure to provide economic opportunities for Indigenous people.	Sporadic and mainly in relation to cultural heritage requirements
Catholic Church	Local priest	Active in campaigning for more support for local welfare services; A priest has commented publicly on the adverse impacts of mine rosters on family life.	None to date

Appendix 2: Sample Summary of Stakeholder Consultations

Positive Impacts Identified	Near neighbours	Local Government Reps	Regulators	Town businesses	Other land users	Indigenous	Community Organisations	Education, health & welfare
Long term economic benefits for community	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Increased employment opportunities and local skill base	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Community support, eg sponsorships, infrastructure	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			

✓ = Indicates that at least one interviewee in this group identified this as an impact.

Appendix 3: Strategy Assessment Framework

Question	Sub-questions and clarification
What outcome/s do we want to achieve and by when?	How does the proposed response relate to the impact that is being addressed?
How will the option achieve the desired effect?	What is the mechanism for achieving the result intended?
What evidence is there to support this approach?	Has anything similar been done elsewhere? If so, was it well evaluated and was it successful?
What else needs to happen for the option to work?	Under what circumstances will the strategy achieve the intended outcome? Does it depend on specific conditions or resources, or on support from others? If so, are these conditions present or can they be created?
How will we know if it's working?	How and how often will progress be measured? Who will do the work?
What resources will be needed?	What start up costs, including staff time, capital and running costs are likely to be required, and how will these be met? What could be provided 'in kind'?
Will the benefits outweigh the costs?	Will the outcomes be worthwhile? Could the resources be better used on an alternative option? Does the option represent 'best value'?
What will the positive and negative side effects be?	

Appendix 4: Example Plan Output

Impact Area	Priority	Management Responses	Monitoring & Performance Measures
<p>Adverse Impacts on Amenity and Lifestyle of 'Near Neighbours'.</p> <p>Issues</p> <p>Dust Noise Blasting Damage Mine Traffic</p>	<p><i>High</i></p> <p>Near neighbours are recognised by the mine as being a very important stakeholder group. Failure to manage near neighbour issues appropriately can have significant negative consequences, including for relations with regulators.</p>	<p><u>Current</u></p> <p>Strong focus on ensuring compliance with license requirements.</p> <p>The site endeavours to respond promptly to complaints and inquiries.</p> <p>Affected near neighbours are usually warned in advance of operational changes that may impact on them.</p> <p>The site aims to distribute two newsletters a year to near neighbours.</p> <p>24 hour environmental contact line maintained.</p> <p>CCC provides a potential forum for near neighbours.</p> <p><u>Proposed</u></p> <p>Proactively initiate contact with all near neighbours <u>at least annually</u>, to identify possible concerns, follow-up on previous undertakings, and advise of operational proposals that may impact on them, etc.</p>	<p><u>Current</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Various environmental performance measures (dust, noise, blasting etc.) are reported in the Annual Environmental Management Report and to the Community Consulting Committee. SHEC report and Annual Environment report provide details on the number and type of complaints and enquiries received, and action taken in response. <p><u>Proposed</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Number of near neighbours who the site has initiated contact with in the previous 12 months.</i> <p>A register is already maintained of near neighbour contacts. This form should be amended to record whether the contact was initiated by the mine or the neighbour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Outcomes of a bi-annual qualitative survey of near neighbours, using face-to-face interviews where possible.</i>

Appendix 5: Suggested Report Format

A simple format to write the final CIMMS report is:

Executive Summary

Prepare an executive summary of no more than a few pages outlining key points and recommendations.

Process overview

Describes:

- the aims of the exercise
- what was involved
- how it was managed

Overview of Community Impacts

- presents community profile
- summarises key themes from community consultations
- identifies and discusses major impacts on the community from the mining operations
- outlines gaps in current operational and management responses to address the identified impacts.

Strategic Response

Details:

- the strategies that will be implemented to address the prioritised impacts and community concerns
- expected outcomes and how these will be measured
- time-frame in which each strategy will be achieved
- the measures that will be used to monitor impacts in key areas.