



## **ResponsibleSteel recognition**

of Bettercoal, IRMA and TSM

---

01 July 2022

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	3
Background and overview of recognition decisions .....	5
Minimum ESG performance expected from mines for Level 2 of the responsible sourcing requirements.....	6
Bettercoal .....	7
Bettercoal Profile .....	7
ResponsibleSteel recognition.....	8
Initiative for Responsible Mining Assurance (IRMA).....	10
IRMA Profile .....	10
ResponsibleSteel recognition.....	11
Towards Sustainable Mining (TSM) .....	13
TSM Profile .....	13
ResponsibleSteel recognition.....	15
Recommendation to all recognised programmes.....	18
Annex 1: The rating scales of the Bettercoal, IRMA and TSM programmes .....	19

## Introduction

ResponsibleSteel's vision is to “maximise steel’s contribution to a sustainable society”. To achieve this, our programme must eventually cover the entire steel supply chain. The [ResponsibleSteel Standard](#) applies to steel production, processing and finishing. The Standard comprises a Responsible Sourcing Criterion, but does not address the issue of input material sourcing in a comprehensive manner.

The steel sector relies heavily on extracted minerals, on scrap and – in some cases – on wood. There are many programmes that define environmental, social and governance (ESG) requirements for responsible mining and forestry. Initial steps have been made to create such programmes for scrap as well. The most effective and efficient way for ResponsibleSteel to address sourcing aspects is to recognise input material programmes that credibly verify ESG performance of suppliers and to build our responsible sourcing requirements for ‘Certified Steel’ on these programmes.

ResponsibleSteel has developed a recognition methodology that directs how we assess input material programmes for the purpose of recognition. Our methodology covers the review of a programme’s standard, of its governance and management structures, its assurance and oversight mechanisms as well as any rules on claims and labels that participating entities may use. We have taken such a broad view of the programmes since a strong standard on its own will not deliver positive change on the ground. It needs to be supported by robust procedures and operational practices to ensure effective implementation.

ResponsibleSteel’s recognition methodology was piloted with the assessments of the Bettercoal, Initiative for Responsible Mining Assurance (IRMA) and Towards Sustainable Mining (TSM) programmes. These three programmes were chosen for piloting since their scope is relevant for steel supply chains and because they approached us to seek recognition. The draft methodology and the pilot assessments were published for stakeholder consultation on 21 October 2021. ResponsibleSteel also discussed the initial findings and the methodology in 1:1 calls with stakeholders and with the assessed programmes. **The recognition methodology, assessment results, conditions and recommendations outlined in this paper were approved by the ResponsibleSteel Board in May 2022.**

**This paper provides high-level summaries of the three programmes and outlines under which circumstances ResponsibleSteel will recognise mine sites participating in the programmes.**

ResponsibleSteel recognition assessments are based on a review of programme documentation. A comprehensive review of how well the written rules and procedures of a programme are implemented in practice for each of their participants is beyond what we can deliver.

Going forward, ResponsibleSteel will work in partnership with the recognised programmes to help ensure that their standards, procedures and rules are implemented as stated and that any recognition conditions are



adhered to. We are also committed to assessing additional input material programmes that are deemed relevant for the steel sector. All programmes that achieve ResponsibleSteel recognition will be listed on our website together with any conditions that are attached to recognition.

Visit the [ResponsibleSteel website](#) for more information and background on recognition.

ResponsibleSteel's initial recognition work was possible thanks to a grant from the ISEAL Innovations Fund, which is supported by the Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs SECO'.



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft  
Confédération suisse  
Confederazione Svizzera  
Confederaziun svizra

Swiss Confederation

Federal Department of Economic Affairs,  
Education and Research EAER  
**State Secretariat for Economic Affairs SECO**

## Background and overview of recognition decisions

**ResponsibleSteel has assessed Bettercoal, IRMA and TSM against a defined recognition benchmark as laid out in the 'Recognition assessment tool'. We have not compared the three programmes to one another to establish whether they are equivalent or not.** The recognition assessments served to determine whether the programmes meet our benchmark and could thus be recognised.

Due to the fact that participation by mining companies in these three programmes is not yet material, a challenging decision to make was which ESG performance level mines would have to achieve to qualify for the responsible sourcing requirements of ResponsibleSteel. While stakeholders and downstream customers expect mines to demonstrate that they meet high ESG standards, the reality is that not many mine sites are currently in a position to do so. Our responsible sourcing requirements must acknowledge this and, at the same time, must provide a pathway for the mining sector to respond to these expectations. We have reflected this in the 4 Levels defined in our requirements.

Level 1 of our responsible sourcing requirements starts by asking mining companies for a commitment to one of the recognised programmes. For Level 2, a minimum ESG performance level must be achieved by the mines. This minimum level has been identified for each programme on the basis of conversations with stakeholders. It aims to reflect stakeholder views on the programmes in their entirety, meaning their standard, assurance and oversight, governance and transparency. At level 2, we are recognising Bettercoal, IRMA and TSM and the ESG performance we expect to see from mines under these programmes differ. For Bettercoal and TSM we essentially expect that mines have systems in place to manage important ESG issues. For IRMA, we expect that an audit has been conducted, that the full audit results have been published and that the mine is committed to achieve the 40 critical IRMA requirements within its 3-year cycle.

The minimum ESG performance levels defined for the three programmes for responsible sourcing Level 2 pose certain challenges to ResponsibleSteel: The Bettercoal and TSM assurance mechanisms are clearly defined, but lack some rules that would help clarify the expected levels of scrutiny for auditors. The IRMA assurance mechanism is very thorough and implementation is well-controlled, so audit results are set to be highly trustworthy. While the IRMA standard is very detailed and prescriptive, the standards of Bettercoal and TSM sometimes leave more room for interpretation. This can result in different outcomes if one and the same mine site were audited by different individuals. Under Bettercoal and TSM, a summary of audit results is published. Under IRMA, the full audit report is posted to the IRMA website, so stakeholders can clearly see where a mine has strengths and where it has weaknesses. However, where mines do not yet meet the 40 critical IRMA requirements, they might have serious gaps in some ESG areas. In summary, at Level 2, ResponsibleSteel is exposed to potential risks with all three recognised programmes, although the nature of the risk differs. Our Levels 1 and 2 serve to set things in motion with responsible sourcing. Over time and as we revise our

requirements, we expect that these lower Levels will be tightened to keep the mining and steel sectors moving on ESG issues.

Levels 3 and 4 are meant to reward steel companies and suppliers that commit to and are implementing recognised input material programmes that are considered to be ‘best-in-class’ in their sector in the views of stakeholders. These programmes are frontrunners in terms of the depth and breadth of their standard, the quality of their assurance and oversight mechanisms, the inclusivity of their governance structure, and the transparency about their processes, operations and participants. Currently, in the eyes of consulted stakeholders, this frontrunner is the IRMA programme, so for Levels 3 and 4 we require that mines have achieved IRMA 50 and IRMA 75 respectively. If, in the future, other programmes are found to be equivalent to IRMA through an equivalency assessment, they will qualify for Levels 3 and 4 too.

The different levels also allow steel buyers to articulate to their suppliers what their ESG expectations are. Being a market-based programme, our theory of change expects that the market will send clear demand signals to suppliers and thus incentivise improved ESG performance.

**For more detail on Bettercoal, IRMA and TSM, as well as any conditions and recommendations attached to the recognition decisions, see the respective chapters below.**

**Minimum ESG performance expected from mines for Level 2 of the responsible sourcing requirements**

Programme	Minimum ESG performance required for Level 2
Bettercoal	‘Substantially Meets’ at the Principle level. A ‘Partially Meets’ at Provision level (which is the level below the Principle) can be averaged against a ‘Meets’ at Provision level to achieve ‘Substantially Meets’
IRMA	‘Transparency’ with an action plan to meet the 40 critical IRMA requirements by the end of the mine site’s 3-year audit cycle
TSM	A or ‘Yes’, as applicable, in all TSM Protocols and against the Voluntary Responsible Sourcing Alignment Supplement

## Bettercoal

### Bettercoal Profile

[Bettercoal](#) was established in 2012 by major energy companies. The global initiative promotes continuous improvement of sustainability performance in coal supply chains through the Bettercoal Code 2.0 and the accompanying Bettercoal Guidance and Assessment Manual. Bettercoal Members are major energy companies, who also currently make up the Bettercoal Board, which is the initiative's main decision-making body. The Board and the steering of the Bettercoal Code and assurance processes are supported by the multi-stakeholder Technical and Advisory Committee that consists of up to 16 members from civil society, Bettercoal Suppliers (i.e. coal mining companies), representatives of Bettercoal Members, standards experts, and the Bettercoal Secretariat. Coal is an important input material for steel production and, to date, 17 coal mining companies with 69 assessed coal mining sites in 7 countries participate in Bettercoal.

The Bettercoal Code Version 2.0 was launched in January 2021 after two years of consultation with Bettercoal Members, coal producers, NGOs, peer sustainability standards and other stakeholders. The Code consists of 12 principles, covering environmental, social and governance issues in a comprehensive way. The Code is underpinned by extensive Guidance, which is aimed at helping coal mining companies and Bettercoal Assessors better understand and interpret the Code and the steps needed to implement it. Going forward, all participating coal mining companies will be assessed against the Code Version 2.0, with a Code 1.1 to 2.0 Transition Plan soon to be shared with coal producers to explain the transition from one Code to another over the next two years.

The Bettercoal Assessment Manual describes the process to be followed by coal mining companies and Bettercoal Assessors. The assessment cycle is composed of 4 steps:

1. **Supplier Commitment:** The coal mining company signs a Letter of Commitment and becomes a Bettercoal Supplier.
2. **Desktop Review:** The coal mining company submits a self-assessment against the Bettercoal Code and related documentation to the Bettercoal Secretariat. The Secretariat assigns a Bettercoal-approved independent Lead Assessor who reviews the Supplier Questionnaire and documentation.
3. **Site-Assessment:** Depending on the claim that the Bettercoal Supplier wishes to make to Bettercoal, either the entire organisation or an individual site is assessed. If an organisation is assessed, Bettercoal applies a sampling methodology which considers a list of risk-based factors. This means that those coal mining sites of a Bettercoal Supplier with the highest ESG risks are chosen for independent assessments. The sites are visited by Assessors that are approved and assigned by the Bettercoal Secretariat, and are assessed against the Bettercoal Code. Interviews with stakeholders are conducted

to cross-check mine site performance. The Assessors allocate one of the following ratings to the coal mining site(s) for each of the 144 provisions in the Bettercoal Code:

- Meets
  - Substantially Meets
  - Partially Meets
  - Misses
4. Continuous Improvement and Re-assessment: Where coal mining sites do not achieve a “Meets” rating, they must develop and implement a Continuous Improvement Plan. Progress against the plan is monitored and assessed by Bettercoal and the coal producer’s allocated Lead Assessor at least 2-3 times per year, with a full Reassessment taking place every 3-5 years, after the original or last site assessment.

A detailed Assessment Report is shared with Bettercoal Members (i.e. the energy companies) and the Bettercoal Secretariat together with the Continuous Improvement Plan. A summary of the Assessment Report, called a Public Report, is published on the Bettercoal website.

The Bettercoal Secretariat conducts oversight of the assessment programme, shadowing a large share of the on-site assessments, reviewing all assessment reports, and approving and training Assessors.

In addition, Bettercoal Members and Suppliers may promote their participation in the Bettercoal programme through the use of claims and the Bettercoal logo. Claims and logo use is guided by clear rules and adherence to the rules is monitored by the Bettercoal Secretariat.

### **ResponsibleSteel recognition**

Overall, Bettercoal has developed a robust programme to assess and verify ESG performance of coal mining companies. **ResponsibleSteel recognises the Bettercoal programme** for Level 2 of the responsible sourcing requirements with the following conditions and recommendations:

- Mine sites that participate in Bettercoal must have been subject to an independent on-site assessment against the Bettercoal Code Version 2.0 and the assessment must be repeated within the cycle foreseen by Bettercoal
- Mines must achieve at least a ‘Substantially Met’ rating at the Principle level of the Bettercoal Code Version 2.0. A ‘Partially Met’ at Provision level (which is the level below the Principle) can be averaged against a ‘Meets’ at Provision level to achieve ‘Substantially Met’ at the Principle level.



- During a recent governance review, it was decided that two positions for independents would be added to the Bettercoal Board. This is a positive development towards more equitable governance. We recommend to keep pursuing this path to further strengthen inclusivity of the Bettercoal programme.
- The level of detail in the Code Guidance and the Assessment Manual supports consistent application of the Bettercoal Code. Additional guidance in the Assessment Manual would further help strengthen and streamline assessments. These should cover rules or guidance on audit time, interviews with external stakeholders, root cause analyses and improvement actions by Suppliers, sampling of sites, as well as transparency of assessment findings.
- The summary reports that are posted on the Bettercoal website should cover strengths and weaknesses of the individual Suppliers more extensively .

The full Bettercoal recognition assessment can be found [here](#).

## Initiative for Responsible Mining Assurance (IRMA)

### IRMA Profile

[IRMA](#) was founded in 2006 by a coalition of civil society organisations, mining companies, purchasing companies, investors, communities affected by mining, and labor unions. These six groups each hold two seats on IRMA's Board of Directors, which is the organisation's key decision-making body. No decision can be taken if any of the five groups fundamentally disagree with the tabled decision proposal. This mechanism ensures that IRMA Board decisions have the full support of the mining sector's main stakeholder groups. IRMA also strives for balanced representation of all six groups in committees and working groups it sets up to address specific issues.

Membership in IRMA is open to all stakeholders with an interest in mining. However, there is a Policy on Association that allows IRMA to disassociate from organisations if IRMA's credibility or standing is at risk, for example due to illegal mining activities or violations against the eight fundamental International Labour Organization conventions. Whoever becomes a member, has to abide by IRMA's Membership Principles. For mining companies, these principles include having at least one mine site third-party audited within 12 months of joining IRMA.

The first version of the IRMA Standard for Responsible Mining was launched in 2018, after many years of consultation with stakeholders and following pilot testing in the field. The Standard comprises 26 chapters and specifies objectives and leading performance requirements for environmental, social and governance issues. It is arguably the most comprehensive and demanding responsible mining standard that currently exists. IRMA certification is achieved if a mine site meets all requirements in all 26 chapters as verified by a third-party audit firm. However, mine sites at all stages of the responsibility journey can participate in IRMA to conduct a self-assessment or third-party audit and have their result expressed on a sliding scale ranging from 50 to 100.

IRMA offers an online self-assessment tool called 'Mine Measure'. Mine sites can use the tool to understand their gaps compared to the IRMA Standard. If a mine site wants to undergo a third-party audit, a self-assessment has to be carried out to provide a basis for the auditors' work. Mine sites may request assessment of their performance against all or against a selection of chapters in the IRMA Standard. If they want to make any claims about any achieved performance level, they have to agree to the full audit results being published on the IRMA website. This level of transparency is unprecedented in the mining sector.

Currently, more than 70 mine sites apply the IRMA self-assessment tool and 11 mine sites are undergoing a third-party audit against the IRMA Standard. In total, mines in 23 countries are using the IRMA Standard and some of them extract iron, zinc and ferro-alloys such as cobalt, chrome and manganese, which are important input materials for the steel sector.



Third-party audit firms with IRMA-trained and approved personnel can carry out IRMA audits. Currently, IRMA works with only two audit firms to be able to gain in-depth insight into application of the IRMA audit protocol and to be able to exert a high level of oversight of its programme before opening up to other audit firms. The IRMA Certification Body Requirements lay out detailed rules that audit firms must follow.

An IRMA audit starts with a self-assessment by the mine, which includes uploading of documentation and other evidence to an IRMA platform to support the mine site's self-ratings. The mine's ratings and self-assessment documentation are reviewed by the Certification Body, and the auditors' ratings are shared with the mine to enable it to fill gaps, if needed ahead of the on-site audit. During the on-site visit, mine site management and workers as well as external stakeholders such as neighbouring communities, civil society organisations, labour unions and regulators are interviewed. The collected evidence is triangulated to determine the audit outcomes. The full audit reports, including the findings for each IRMA requirement that was assessed, are published on the IRMA website.

The IRMA Secretariat carries out oversight of the IRMA programme, however, IRMA is currently working with external assurance consultants to evaluate different oversight models and revise its system to increase the robustness and effectiveness of its processes. To start with, two audit firms were selected and trained by IRMA to carry out assessments. To date, all site visits have been shadowed by the IRMA team, but as the IRMA programme grows it is likely that only a sample of audits for each Certification Body will be shadowed in a given year. All audit reports are reviewed by IRMA prior to their finalisation. Members and mine sites may promote their participation in the IRMA programme through the use of claims and the IRMA logo. Claims and logo use is guided by a Communications and Claims Policy and adherence to the policy is monitored by the IRMA Secretariat.

### **ResponsibleSteel recognition**

The IRMA programme is very detailed, comprehensive and clearly laid out, and defines a very high bar for mine site certification, with intermediate milestones called 'Achievement Levels'. IRMA is generally considered to be 'best-in-class' by stakeholders. **ResponsibleSteel recognises the IRMA programme** with the following conditions and recommendations:

- To achieve Level 2 of the responsible sourcing requirements for 'Certified Steel', mines are expected to publish their full IRMA audit results. Where mines do not yet meet the [40 critical IRMA requirements](#), they must implement an action plan to achieve these 40 critical requirements by the end of their 3-year audit cycle. The 40 critical IRMA requirements are considered to cover the basics of responsible mining. For Level 3, mines are expected to achieve IRMA 50. For Level 4, mines are expected to achieve IRMA 75.



- IRMA has recently approved a formal oversight procedure. While oversight is carried out in practice and in a comprehensive manner, having clearly defined protocols using an external independent body, as foreseen by the procedure, will ensure that oversight is always conducted to the same level of rigour. We very much welcome this development and encourage IRMA to implement the procedure swiftly.
- IRMA should explore a mechanism to require that mine sites reach higher “Achievement Levels” over time. IRMA should not solely rely on other organisations and market forces to provide incentives for mine site improvement.

The full IRMA recognition assessment can be found [here](#).

## Towards Sustainable Mining (TSM)

### TSM Profile

[TSM](#) was created in 2004 by the Mining Association of Canada (MAC) to support the country's mining companies in managing key environmental and social risks. All MAC members must participate in TSM and have been reporting their TSM performance ratings publicly since 2006.

For Canada, TSM has defined a series of eight Protocols that lay out performance indicators in relation to environmental and social issues. In most Protocols, the indicators are depicted on a scale ranging from C to B to A, AA and AAA. As part of TSM participation, mining companies must commit to demonstrate continual improvement in their performance over time.

The highest governing body of TSM is the MAC Board of Directors, which is composed of member company representatives. A Community of Interest (COI) Advisory Panel makes recommendations to the Board and reviews Board proposals. The COI Panel is an independent, multi-interest group comprised of 12 to 15 individuals from indigenous groups, communities affected by mining, environmental and social NGOs, labour and financial organisations, as well as MAC Board members. The COI Panel has been integral to TSM's design and development. While the Panel does not have formal decision-making power, in practice, key decisions related to TSM receive support from the COI Panel before going to the MAC Board for decision.

TSM was originally developed for Canadian mines. Due to legislation and enforcement being comparatively strict in Canada, the TSM Protocols and procedures do not cover all issues that stakeholders might commonly expect from a comprehensive responsible mining programme. In an effort to align more closely with other programmes and to respond to expectations from stakeholders such as ResponsibleSteel, TSM has recently advanced its programme in various areas:

- An issues resolution mechanism for stakeholders has been drafted
- The rules for independent verification of mine site performance have been clarified on some points and are now backed up by voluntary guidance for verifiers
- Qualification requirements for verifiers have been strengthened
- Transparency on the rationales behind the self-assessments and independent verifications will be strengthened
- TSM will engage an independent consultant to carry out oversight of external verifications
- A new policy on claims and labels sets out rules for MAC members on how they may communicate their achievement under the TSM programme



- A Responsible Sourcing Alignment Supplement has been developed. This Supplement is a voluntary element in TSM

The TSM verification process can be summarised as follows: Mining companies participating in TSM self-assess and report performance of their individual sites against the eight TSM Protocols annually. Every three years, third-party verifiers review the mining companies' self-assessments for all their sites and against all Protocols, although some sampling within the Protocols is allowed. Verification can be conducted remotely, but on-site visits are encouraged by TSM as part of the third-party verification and, historically, the majority of mining companies have chosen to have on-site visits. Engagement of external stakeholders in the verification exercises is required if a site achieves performance level A or higher. Going forward, a summary of the verification results for individual sites must be published on the TSM website.

MAC works with an independent consultancy firm to train and approve verifiers prior to taking up TSM activities and holds an annual webinar to ensure that verifiers are aware of recent TSM developments. In planned revisions to verifier training requirements, the annual webinar will become mandatory and, with some exceptions, verifiers will need to undergo training and reapproval every three years. In a verification oversight process to be introduced in 2022, the independent consultancy will sample summary verification reports for review to assure the quality of the TSM verification process and will conduct analysis of the summary reports to inform the further development of TSM.

While the COI Panel does not have a formal oversight role in the external verification, it does have a formal oversight role in the verification process: Every year, the Panel selects two mining companies that have to appear before the Panel to participate in a post-verification review. During this review, verified results are discussed and the Panel further examines the company's performance against the TSM Protocols. Reports on these post-verification reviews are posted on the TSM website. If the Panel finds a reason not to agree with the verification findings, this would be discussed by MAC, the company, and the verifier to inform the subsequent self-assessment.

To date, TSM is applied by 64% of metal and metallurgical coal mine sites in Canada, including 5 of 7 iron ore mines and 6 of 10 metallurgical coal mines.

### ResponsibleSteel recognition

The individual TSM Protocols are revised from time to time and the 2021 TSM recognition assessment has been done using the latest versions of the Protocols. **ResponsibleSteel recognises the TSM programme in Canada** for Level 2 of the responsible sourcing requirements with the following conditions and recommendations:

- Mine sites must have been third-party verified on-site against the latest versions of all TSM Protocols and the Responsible Sourcing Alignment Supplement within the last three years.
- Verifiers must be able to demonstrate that they applied the new Verifier Terms of Reference and followed the new Verifier Guide in the on-site verification.
- External stakeholders must have been engaged in the verification exercise.
- Mine sites are required to fully meet the Responsible Sourcing Alignment Supplement and those TSM Protocols that apply a Yes/No rating. The other Protocols must be met at Level A across the board.
- TSM should incorporate the conditions for ResponsibleSteel recognition into the normal TSM programme. This would be testament to TSM's commitment to multi-interest governance and to offering a truly comprehensive responsible mining programme.

To further strengthen the TSM programme, ResponsibleSteel asks that TSM considers the following recommendations:

- Strengthen multi-stakeholder governance by formalising that no Board decisions can be taken against the advice of the COI Panel. This is already lived practice at TSM and might as well be institutionalised.
- While the tiered structure of the TSM criteria makes clear what is expected to achieve a certain grade, the indicators in the TSM Responsible Sourcing Alignment Supplement are phrased in a very high-level style, leaving room for interpretation by both companies and verifiers. We recommend that TSM tightens up the language to reduce ambiguity. We also advise to clarify that the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) in the Protocols are of authoritative nature.
- We recommend that TSM seeks to ensure the quality of verification engagements through additional rules and guidance in the Verifier Terms of Reference and the Verifier Guide, for example on the time to be spent on verifications, the number of worker and external stakeholder interviews to be conducted, etc.
- Site visits to mine sites are encouraged and many mines make use of that option. They are a condition for ResponsibleSteel recognition of mines in the TSM programme and we recommend making site

visits a compulsory element of external verification under TSM since they contribute to robust verification outcomes.

- Stakeholder interviews during external verification are mandatory where mine sites achieve grade A or higher. We propose to make stakeholder engagement a standard feature, independent of the achieved grade, since stakeholders are a rich source of information for verifiers.
- Oversight of the TSM programme could be further strengthened, for example through witnessing verifications, monitoring implementation of mine site action plans for improvement, stakeholder surveys on their TSM experience, etc.
- The Verification Summary Reports should be more extensive to increase accountability for verification results. For example, TSM might require that stakeholder engagement efforts and received input is included in the summary and that planned company action to achieve an A Rating is described. TSM could further help ensuring that disclosure of verification results is of high quality by providing guidance to verifiers on the expected level of detail and by reviewing disclosures before they are published on the MAC website.

The full TSM recognition assessment can be found [here](#).

ResponsibleSteel welcomes the advances that TSM has recently made and its willingness to continue strengthening its programme to meet the expectations of stakeholders like ResponsibleSteel. Since the above-mentioned developments have not yet been actively implemented and are not standard practice in the TSM programme, ResponsibleSteel will engage with TSM to review how implementation of the conditions and considerations of the recommendations is progressing. This review is envisioned to take place about one year after ResponsibleSteel recognition has been granted (i.e. in mid-2023). In addition, ResponsibleSteel will seek to be an active stakeholder in the TSM programme and might ask to witness TSM verifications on the ground and review verification reports on a sampling basis to be assured that the agreed conditions are taken on board by mine sites and verifiers.

**Where TSM has been adopted outside of Canada, the following process applies:**

Outside of Canada, the TSM system has been adopted by the mining associations of Finland, Argentina, Spain, Brazil, Norway, Botswana, the Philippines, and Australia. The associations are at varying stages of amending the TSM system to their respective contexts, including the creation of a COI Panel, and applying the system in practice. ResponsibleSteel recognition initially applies to MAC member mines in Canada. The TSM system has been developed for Canada and while some gaps have been addressed through the Responsible Sourcing Alignment Supplement and through some changes to procedures, assurance and oversight, this is not





considered sufficient to address the complexities that might arise from the varying strength of governance, legislative and regulative systems in other countries. Mines outside of Canada, whether belonging to a MAC member or not, can therefore currently not be recognised.

Mining associations of other countries that have adopted the TSM system and wish to apply for ResponsibleSteel recognition in the future, will have to establish a COI Panel and revise the TSM Protocols and the Responsible Sourcing Alignment Supplement to ensure they are fit for the national context. This must happen in a transparent and stakeholder-inclusive process. They must also accept the same conditions that have been agreed with MAC before they and their members' mines can be considered for a ResponsibleSteel recognition assessment. Beyond the agreed conditions, ResponsibleSteel advises that the mining associations consider adopting the recommendations made to TSM to be proactive in seeking to meet stakeholder expectations.



## Recommendation to all recognised programmes

ResponsibleSteel notes that there is a trilateral dialogue between ICMM, IRMA and TSM to explore how the three programmes might align more strongly. We very much welcome this initiative and advise to continue these conversations and to include other relevant programmes as well. The mining sector is in urgent need of improving its ESG performance and it has to ensure trust with stakeholders by demonstrating that improvements are indeed happening. The way forward is clear – independent, thorough verification of ESG performance against robust standards and assurance protocols that have been developed with a broad range of stakeholders under equitable governance models and with a high level of transparency. This dialogue is a valuable opportunity to create a race to the top from an ESG perspective.

## Annex 1: The rating scales of the Bettercoal, IRMA and TSM programmes

Bettercoal	Meaning
Misses	'Misses' the respective Provision of the Bettercoal Code
Partially Meets	'Partially Meets' the respective Provision of the Bettercoal Code
Substantially Meets	'Substantially Meets' the respective Provision of the Bettercoal Code
Meets	'Meets' the respective Provision of the Bettercoal Code

IRMA	Meaning
Transparency	Full audit results are published
40 critical requirements met	The 40 requirements cover the basics of responsible mining
IRMA 50	50 % of IRMA requirements met, incl. the 40 criticals
IRMA 75	75 % of IRMA requirements met, incl. the 40 criticals
IRMA 100	100 % of IRMA requirements met, incl. the 40 criticals

TSM	Meaning
C	No systems in place; activities tend to be reactive; procedures may exist but they are not integrated into policies and management systems
B	Actions are not consistent or documented; systems/processes are planned and being developed
A	Systems/processes are developed and implemented
AA	Integration into management decisions and business functions
AAA	Excellence and leadership

Note that some TSM Protocols apply a Yes/No rating.