IGT Companion Tool

Operationalizing the VPs through the Lens of Protecting and Respecting the Unique Needs and Rights of Women and Other Disadvantaged Groups

PARTICIPANT WORKBOOK

May 17, 2022

Table of Contents

Module 1: Stakeholder Engagement

Module Overview

Module Sections

1. Identify and understand disadvantaged groups

2. Identify barriers to meaningful engagement with disadvantaged groups

3. Create a conducive environment for engagement with women and other disadvantaged groups

Tools

1.1A Identifying Disadvantaged Groups provides a framework of questions to use in identifying groups (i.e., Are there different ethnic groups that are present in the community/region?)

1.2A Mapping Power Dynamics lists components (Governance and decision-making, economic relations, security…), against points for analysis, and specific information on Indigenous women

1.3A How do women and men share and receive security-related information at the operations site and in the community? Lists communication methods and gender differences

Activity #1: Scenario

Scenario: Stakeholder Engagement and Private Security	
	Time 30 minutes
	Objectives Apply a lens that considers gender and the potential disadvantage experienced by different groups to how stakeholder engagement processes related to security are undertaken.
	Materials Required Participant Workbook
	Individual or Partner Exercise Group exercise
	Activity Instructions Read the scenario and have someone capture notes for the group. Reflect on the following questions:

Scenario: Stakeholder Engagement and Private Security	
	• Consider what could have been done from an engagement perspective prior to the community having vocalized these concerns (i.e., prior to the private security company being selected/ contracted/deployed); • Consider what can now be done from an engagement perspective in both the shorter and longer-term; and • Consider how the concept of intersectionality can be incorporated into your recommendations. *Share your own experiences or examples to inform your response!*
	Reporting Back We will have a short Popcorn Style report back, where each group will be invited to share one idea

Scenario

You are part of an Advisory Committee to a company that is developing its stakeholder engagement approach within the scope of its implementation of the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights. The risk assessment at a particular mine site in Latin America has revealed that there are significant concerns from surrounding communities regarding the current presence of private security providers who are not originally from the area. Concerns presented by district leaders during a recent security meeting with the company included the influence that the group of security providers from outside the community – all men – may have on the young girls and women in the area. Concerns included the risk of harassment and increase of promiscuous behavior. Furthermore, it was apparent during the session that there remained significant misunderstandings around the role and responsibility of private security providers used by the company.

The company must now plan to engage local communities in response to these concerns raised in relation to its private security company. A lack of local options and the security context in the area has determined that the presence of an external private security provider remains necessary. You are tasked with proposing a series of considerations and recommendations on how the company should approach this engagement.

Relevant Resources from the IGT Companion Tool

Table 1: Exclusion or Marginalization Faced by Women and Other Disadvantaged Groups

Direct exclusion	Women or members of other disadvantaged groups are banned from certain or all stakeholder engagement activities (e.g., an engagement session with traditional authorities.

Indirect exclusion	Women or members of other disadvantaged groups are not directly banned but are not directly invited or actively encouraged to participate in engagement activities.
Exclusion due to practical barriers	Women or members of other disadvantaged groups are not able to effectively participate due to practical barriers they face in attending, such as the location of the activity (i.e., distance, cost of transport, etc.), timing of activity, competing priorities (i.e., household responsibilities, income generating activities, childcare, etc.), and language barriers.
Limited participation due to unequal access to knowledge and information	Women or members of other disadvantaged groups are less able to participate and express their views and concerns during stakeholder engagement activities because they have less knowledge and information with respect to a variety of elements (e.g., the proposed project, their own rights, etc.). In addition, some may also feel a lack of confidence or capacity to speak their mind or share their views because of a sense of not having the right knowledge or expertise.
Limited participation due to fear of reprisals or stigmatization	Women or members of other disadvantaged groups may be less likely to attend (e.g., if a woman doesn't have permission from her spouse) or actively participate in engagement activities because they fear they may experience negative repercussions for voicing their opinions, especially if it counters a dominant narrative (e.g., a woman may experience domestic violence by the hand of a spouse if she expresses a viewpoint that is counter to his).
Limited participation or exclusion because of their views on the project	Some organizations or groups of people may be excluded from engagement activities due to their views opposing a particular project or practice by a company (e.g., human rights defenders, environmental activists, labour activists, Indigenous groups, etc.).
Refusal to participate	Some women and members of other disadvantaged groups may choose not to participate in engagement activities due to a lack of trust of the company and/or government (including public security providers).

Tool 1.2A Mapping Power Dynamics	
Component	Suggested issues for analysis
Security	• Who is involved in providing security to local populations? • Who is involved in making decisions about security? • Who is involved in conflict mitigation / prevention efforts?

Other components of Tool 1.2A include:
- Governance and decision-making
- Economic relations within the project area, institution and at home
- Personal and family relations (including gender-related rules and norms)

Tool 1.3A How do women and men share and receive security-related information at the operations site and in the community?[1]		
Communication Method:	Women	Men
	*Consider how information is both shared and received	
Community Meetings • Who tends to organize community meetings? • Who tends to promote community meetings and reach out to community members? • At what time of day are they usually held? • How are women and men notified about them (same or differently)? • Where are they usually located? How long does it take for most people to reach the meeting venue? • Who tends to provide information during community meetings? • Who usually attends? Who usually speaks? Who is (most) listened to?	• Women do not feel implicated given that notices/invitation are often delivered by men working for the company and distributed to male leaders and male heads of households • Women infrequently speak up at community meetings because they are often overlooked when a man has their hand raised • Women's associations and youth organizations working on security-related issues were not provided with invitations • Men tend to dominate the topics on the agenda during the meeting, as the agenda is generally set by community leaders (almost all men); concerns of women, girls, other groups are not prioritized • The facilitator of the meeting is always a man from the local government • When meetings are security-related, members of the local police are always present – which tends to limit the ability to raise concerns • Men have more time to attend meetings at the end of the workday, as women have more domestic responsibilities (cooking, childcare, etc.) • Community meetings are often held in one location that is close to the local government office; this location is convenient and accessible for men in the community because they are working close to here, or are able to easily take public transport to get there. Women have to walk a considerable distance in order to access public transport, and experience long wait times	
Posters • In what language are posters usually written? • Where are posters usually placed? • Who usually has access to these places? • Who mainly reads posters and why? • Are the posters representative of women and men?	• The messages conveyed in posters put up by the company were not expressed or validated by women in the community, and thus did not resonate with their realities or perspectives • The posters were displayed in places that are predominantly frequented by men (e.g., government offices) • The posters only depicted men, and did not represent women • The posters used a lot of text in a language that is more accessible to men than women	
Others For example, megaphone, community theatre, word-of-mouth, newspaper	• Women tend to share and receive information through word-of-mouth, either by their husbands or through the women with whom they work with in the fields or mine site areas	

Other communication methods in Tool 1.3A include:

- Radio

---

[1] This tool is an adapted version of a tool published in IMPACT's Gender Impact Assessment Toolkit (https://impacttransform.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/IMPACT-GIA-Toolkit_EN-2020_web.pdf).

- Phone
- Online

Notes

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Module 2: Risk Assessment

Module Overview

Module Steps

1. Establish scope and scale of assessment

2. Identify sources of risk for women and disadvantaged groups

3. Identify and characterize risks for women and disadvantaged groups

4. Assess risks for women and disadvantaged groups

5. Identify risk treatment/mitigation for risks affecting women and disadvantaged groups

6. Communicate, monitor and revise risk assessment

7. Address risk assessment challenges

Tools

2.1A Self-Assessment Tool for Establishing Scope and Scale of the Risk Assessment

2.2A Sources of Risk to Women or Other Disadvantaged Groups

2.3 Identifying and Characterizing Risks: A framework to identify risks, impacted stakeholders and potential consequences

2.5 Identifying Risk Treatment/Mitigation

2.7 Risk Assessment Challenges framework describes the type of challenge, description of control, and action options

Activity #2: Case Study

	Case Study: Report on Preliminary Risk Assessment Field Mission for the Tingrela Mine
	Time 60 minutes
	Objective Apply a lens that considers gender and the potential disadvantage experienced by different groups to risk assessment is undertaken.
	Materials Required Participant Workbook
	Individual or Partner Exercise Group exercise
	Activity Instructions Read the case study and have someone capture notes for the group. Reflect on the following questions: • Are there opportunities for the company to improve their approach / activities described in the report? • Are there gaps with respect to inclusion and representation within the report? • Are there things that the company did that could be considered best practice? *Note that there are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers. The exercise is meant to be reflective and promote discussion and sharing of experiences or expertise within your group. All names of companies, individuals and entities are fictitious.*
	Reporting Back We will have a short Popcorn Style report back, where each group will be invited to share one idea.

Case Study

Summary:

In April 2022, ABC Mining Company's internal risk assessment team carried out a site-level visit to the Tingrela Mine, located in a high-risk and conflicted-affected country, in relation to the company's application of the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights. This report summarizes the methodology and process used in carrying out the internal risk assessment, as well as the initial findings.

Introduction:

The Tingrela Mine is located in a rural area and is comprised of a small central town area, and more rural villages on the outskirts of the central town. The area is located within dense Equatorial Forest, which is inhabited by a nomadic Indigenous group that continues to rely primarily on hunting and gathering. The main economic activities in the area are agricultural (small-scale and subsistence), agroforestry (e.g., palm oil production), artisanal mining, and service sectors to these sectors (e.g., moto taxis, small restaurants, small shops, etc.).

The ABC Mining Company has been the owner and operator of the mine for the past three years, following an acquisition from the previous owner.

ABC Mining Company's internal risk assessment team was comprised of the following individuals:
- Brandon Klein, Risk Analyst
- Stacey Granger, Security Manager
- Kyle Franco, Sustainability Officer

The team was supported locally by Jean-Paul Obango, the Head of Security at the Tingrela Mine. The company is supported by a private security company – SKP Security – which is a company comprised of national staff and is based out of the capital city. There are 25 men serving as private security officers on the concession, all of whom come from outside the community. This is due to a lack of private security providers in the area. The security providers are lodged within the community on a rotational basis, spending three weeks in the community and one week back home. In addition to its own private security provider, the concession perimeter is frequently patrolled by the local Mines Police.

Description of the Visit:

The risk assessment field mission was carried out over the span of a one-week period.
- On the first day of the visit, the team met with the Governor of the province where the mine is located, in the provincial capital, M. Luc Karrera.
- The Team then visited the mine site and was accompanied by members of the Mines Police and National Military.
- The Team hosted a community dialogue session:
    - It was a morning session for members of the community and was attended by men and women in the community who had been invited by the local Chief.

     o   The session was hosted in the central town in conjunction with the local Chief, and was facilitated by Paul Nkuba, a representative from a local NGO that works on community security issues.

Summary of Findings:

The issues identified by the risk assessment team during the preliminary field mission can be summarized as follows:

1) <u>Presence of Armed Groups in the Region</u>

    The presence of armed groups in the region poses a serious threat to the staff and operations of the Tingrela Mine. Armed groups may pose a threat to private security providers securing the perimeter of the mining concession, as well as to other staff should incursions on the property be attempted or successful.

2) <u>Presence of Artisanal and Small-Scale Miners on the Concession</u>

    There is a frequent presence of artisanal and small-scale miners on the perimeter of the mine site. While the company had previously allowed the miners to work on the concession, they have since been removed in order to allow for further exploration work to occur.

    The miners both try to access mine tailings in the hopes of being able to re-process the ore, as well as engage in new mining on other parts of the concession currently not being mined by the company. They are generally working in small groups. At times, they have clashed with the company's private security operators. Recently, there have been a number of apprehensions of several men and women miners on the concession. Trespassers who are apprehended are transferred to local authorities. The company has learned indirectly that several women in the community have started to meet informally to discuss this.

3) <u>Concerns Related to Private and Public Security Providers</u>

    Several comments were made during the community dialogue session around concerns held by community members regarding the presence of men from outside of the village. There were also concerns raised regarding the presence of the Mine Police, and requests for payments that are being made at certain routes frequently used for travel within the community.

Actions Taken by the Company:

1) <u>Monthly Security Meetings</u>

    The company has monthly security meetings in the central town with the following actors in order to discuss the latest security events and information:
    a. Chief of the central town
    b. Chief of the local Mines Police
    c. A representative from a local UN Peacekeeping Mission
    d. Head of the local Artisanal Mining Association
    e. International NGO working in the area

2) <u>Household-level Community Surveys</u>

The company has begun to conduct regular household-level surveys to identify the security concerns of community members near the mine. These surveys help to identify security and human rights-related concerns amongst various households in the community. The surveys are carried out in the home, and are administered by a community development officer in the company.

3) <u>Human Rights Training for Private Security Providers</u>
The company has rolled out a human rights training program for the private security providers stationed at the mine. The training program focuses on the implementation of the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights and includes sessions on the legal and regulatory human rights framework, company commitments, de-escalation and proportionate use of force. The program includes a review of the company's Code of Conduct – which private security contractors are required to abide by via their contractual arrangement with SKP Security.

4) <u>Complaints Hotline</u>

The company has established a complaints hotline which community members can use to voice concerns over the conduct of any company employees or contractors (including private security guards). The company keeps track of the type of complaints that it receives, and uses this information during its monthly security meetings.

Annex of Individuals/Stakeholders Met with during the Field Visit:
<u>Government / Traditional Authorities</u>
- M. Luc Karera, Governor of the province
- Pierre Kato, Advisor to the Governor
- Dieudonne Simbaya, Customary Chief in a rural village outside the central town
- Jean Kubali, Head of a local contingent of the national army
- Serge Lonema, Head of the Mines Police
- Alexi Mutasi, Representative, Ministry of Mines
- Sylvie Bayoko, Representative, Ministry of Human Rights

<u>Private Sector</u>
- John Sanoyni, Head of the local Artisanal Mining Association
- Sylvie Katenga, Sustainability Officer at Atlantic Mining Company (neighboring concession)
- Gerard Tongu, Chamber of Commerce of the province
- Patrick Leon, Representative of Artisanal Miners Cooperative

<u>Civil Society</u>
- Andre Simpenza, Local Pastor
- Aurelie Modi, Representative of a local development organization

Relevant Resources from the IGT Companion Tool

Tool 2.2A Sources of Risk to Women or Other Disadvantaged Groups
Note that Column 2 is not an exhaustive list but is designed to prompt thinking into the risks that may be relevant. Remember that you can add "other" security and human rights risks to those suggested.

Sources of potential risk	Potential security and human rights risks
Conflict Situation • Recent history of conflict • Potential for recurrence of conflict • Potential for international conflict • Illicit activity (e.g., drug trafficking, smuggling, etc.) • Insurgency, armed separatist or guerilla group • Unsettled territorial claims	• Sexual and gender-based violence used specifically as a tactic of war/conflict • Genocide or violence against targeted disadvantaged groups (ethnic minorities, religious minorities, etc.) • Destruction of community infrastructure that disproportionately impacts women or other disadvantaged groups (e.g., schools, places of worship, etc.) • Exclusion of women and other disadvantaged groups from peacebuilding / disarmament, demobilization and reintegration processes • Reduction of civic spaces, in particular for ethnic or religious minorities, following the proclamation of a state of emergency or state of siege • Human trafficking (especially of women and girls) • Tensions over influx of refugee populations
Security Provisioning • Low level of competence of public security providers • Low level of competence of private security providers • Low level of resources • Poor human rights record by public security providers • Low understanding of human rights and humanitarian law by security providers	• Sexual and gender-based violence – committed against members of the community • Sexual and gender-based violence – committed against security providers by other security providers • Inability of public or private security providers to adequately handle incidents of sexual and gender-based violence (e.g., lack of trained employees, lack of women guards, lack of proper facilities, etc.) • Lack of effective grievance mechanisms (judicial and non-judicial) • Use of firearms or other weapons in domestic violence incidents (either by public or private security providers) • Culture of fear / intimidation due to the presence of security providers • Security-induced restrictions close off civic spaces used by women and other disadvantaged groups to defend their rights

Governance
• Corruption
• Political instability
• Weak rule of law
• Poor governmental capacity
• Limitations or repression on press freedoms, media, civil society freedoms
• Disagreement between central and local governments related to resource extraction
	• Politically motivated violent attacks against disadvantaged groups in the extractives space (e.g., human rights defenders, labour union leaders, etc.);
	  o Heightened risk when they are women
	  o Heightened risk when they are Indigenous (women)
	• Growing restrictive legislation enables attacks and smear campaigns on civil society, putting women and disadvantaged groups in danger
	• Exploration of resources by international companies and their contribution to central government budgets are not accepted by local communities and lead to conflict which negatively affects women and other disadvantaged groups

Tool 2.2A Sources of Risk to Women or Other Disadvantaged Groups

Note that Column 2 is not an exhaustive list but is designed to prompt thinking into the risks that may be relevant. Remember that you can add "other" security and human rights risks to those suggested.

Sources of potential risk	Potential security and human rights risks
Socio-Economic • Poverty; income or wealth disparity • Land or resource conflict • Ethnic or religious tensions • Tensions over resettlement • Concerns over negative social impacts of company activities (e.g., local inflation, negative impacts on social cohesion, etc.)	• Increases in instances of domestic abuse/violence against women • Instances of sexual and gender-based violence perpetrated by security providers (public or private) • Tensions created due to increased income inequality between men and women, or between particular groups (e.g., Indigenous and non-indigenous) if hiring practices privilege men or specific groups (whether intentionally or unintentionally), and company wages are significantly higher than other employment or income generating activities ▪ Elevated risk of domestic violence for women hired by the company and receiving higher income ▪ Increased risk of prostitution / trafficking for women and girls with influx of migrant workers, including public or private security providers
Physical Environment • Negative environmental impact (e.g., air, water, soil, etc.) created by company activities • Past poor environmental performance by industry • Key environmental challenges (e.g., biodiversity, species at risk)	• Changes to physical environment that may have unintended negative impacts (e.g., blocking key transportation routes, placing security forces with poor human resource records in closer proximity to at-risk groups, etc.) • Introduction of access roads that leads to an influx of people from elsewhere into or near vulnerable communities • Introduction of worker camps that leads to an influx of foreign or non-native workers (predominantly men) near potentially vulnerable populations.

Tool 2.7 Risk Assessment Challenges

Type of Challenge	Description of Control / Influence	Action Item
When collecting information via desk-based means, it can be difficult to obtain news articles, reports or other sources of information that reflect the specific circumstances or experiences of women or other disadvantaged groups, as these are often gender-neutral or gender blind, and written from dominant perspectives.	Some influence – while the company cannot control what and how information is produced by others, it can control how its own information is gathered as well as invest in alternative methods for collecting more representative and inclusive information.	As information is pivotal to informing a complete risk assessment, identify gaps and how these can be filled, such as: • Conducting a gender-disaggregated community survey • Identifying community-based organizations or academic organizations to support • Hosting dialogue sessions Encourage various levels of government to collect gender disaggregated data.
Lack of specific gender or inclusion expertise on the risk assessment team	Some influence – while resources are not infinite, company's do control	To address this issue, companies can:

Tool 2.7 Risk Assessment Challenges		
Type of Challenge	Description of Control / Influence	Action Item
	how they budget for the implementation of the VPSHR, including those needed to carry out an effective risk assessment process, and can increasingly prioritize resources that support the application of a gender and inclusion lens to their implementation.	• Add a specific budget line to ensure that external expertise is available to the risk assessment team • Provide training resources to the risk assessment team in order to increase their own skills and ability to incorporate gender and disadvantaged groups into their risk assessment. • Incorporate experience related to gender, gender equality, inclusion, etc. into job advertisements or terms of reference for risk assessment teams.

Notes

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Module 3: Public Security Providers

Module Overview

Module Steps

1. Plan for engagement with public security providers regarding risks to women and other disadvantaged groups
2. Engage with public security providers to ensure the integration of security and human rights risks for women and disadvantaged groups into VPs implementation
3. Assess gaps and identify possible solutions
4. Work with public security advisers on deployment and conduct
5. Respond to human rights abuses
6. Address public security provider challenges

Tools

3.1A Plan for Engagement with Public Security

3.3A Rapid Assessment Tool to Assess the Responsiveness of Public Security Providers to Women and Other Disadvantaged Groups

Tool 3.5A Developing a Safeguarding Approach in Responding to Security and Human Rights-related Grievances

Notes

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Module 4: Private Security Providers

Module Overview

Module Steps

1. Define and assess private security requirements
2. Conduct due diligence and select/contract a private security provider
3. Deploy and monitor selected private security provider
4. Respond to private security provider misconduct
5. Address private security provider challenges

Tools

Tool 4.4A Action Planning offers step-by-step guidance, options for specific action items, and desired outcomes

Notes

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Module 5: Grievance Mechanisms

Module Overview

Module Steps

1. Analyze the accessibility of grievance mechanisms for women and disadvantaged groups

2. Identify corresponding measures to increase the accessibility and remove potential barriers to grievance measures

Tools

5.1A Evaluating the Accessibility of Grievance Mechanisms lists potential barriers per category (location, technology, etc.) and the impacted stakeholders

5.1B Identifying and Understanding Risk and Stigmatization for Victims of Sexual Violence lists type of risk / impact, the potential results, likelihood of occurrence, and mitigation options

Notes

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____