

CRAFT Committee meeting

December 4th, 2019 / 8th GoToMeeting call
10:30 EST/COL | 16:30 CET | 15:30 GMT |
Duration: 1,5 hours

Support documents:

- CRAFT 2.0 concept proposal document
- Meeting presentation

Next Steps

- The CRAFT team will send a reminder message to receive comments on the CRAFT v2.0 proposal document from the members of the Committee.

Development of the meeting

1. Opening remarks and roll call

Simone (the Chair) opened the meeting agenda and confirmed the assistance of the Committee members in this call. Then, Yaw (the vice president) led the discussions of the call.

2. Approval of the last Committee minutes (July 22nd)

Simone requested the Committee to approve the minutes of the last Committee meeting (July 22). No objections were raised, and the minutes were approved.

3. CRAFT v2.0 Concept for discussion and recommendations from the Advisory Group

Felix Hruschka, the standards expert presented the document with the synthesis that brings together in detail the proposed changes for the CRAFT Code after the following options were presented in April 2019. The proposal covers other issues (medium and low risks), expand the scope of the minerals, improve the standard with the feedback received and reinforce the current criteria.

At the same time, the presentation was made, Yves Bertran with Jennifer Peyser commented on the recommendations and conclusions reached during the Advisory Group meeting on December 2.

The presentation was organized as follows:

3.1 Need to address medium and low risks

Due to the lack of demand, the development of Modules 6 and 7 is suggested to be suspended, until explicitly requested. This is because the level of demand for requirements of Module 1 to 4 and Module 5 as progressivity is considered sufficient.

The CRAFT team asked if there are observations or different demands to address other risks or issues? If so, what are the risks and objectives?

Recommendations from Advisory Group: *They advised to stay until Module 5 since if they extended it would be a greater compliance challenge for the miners.*

Comments from Committee: *there is no objection.*

3.2 Demand for broadening the commodity scope

Since the consultation period, stakeholders proposed the CRAFT could serve to different minerals from the ASM. Therefore, the first version was under this line, the current version covers only the criteria related to mercury that are specific to gold. For now, the interest received has been in cobalt, precious stones, 3T (Tungsten, tantalum and tin).

Felix consulted: Do you agree to expand the scope of commodities? And do you have suggestions from organizations?

Recommendations from Advisory Group: *they believe it is helpful to expand the scope of commodities or minerals for the new version of CRAFT.*

Member Comments:

Valcambi as a refiner considered that for its customers (jewelry and technology companies), it will be a good opportunity and also very useful and valuable.

RJC has expanded its RJC CoP scope to other precious stones and diamonds. They have seen it as an opportunity since 85% of precious stones are produced by artisanal miners. It is also closely linked to international standards such as the OECD Due Diligence Guidance. Participants asked if RJC has used CRAFT as a production process for the gemstones pilot? RJC indicated that it was not done but it could be considered.

3.3 Adjustments of some key features of CRAFT

Practical work with miners has always started with a complete analysis of Modules 3 + 4 and not maintaining the classification of different affiliation status. Therefore, the differences between the condition of applicant and candidate become blurred.

Felix proposed to reduce or eliminate affiliation levels to simplify the process.

Recommendations from Advisory Group: *they agreed that there are not many differences between the status, and they agreed that it is better to point to simplicity.*

Comments from members: *There were no further comments, so they approved to simplify affiliation*

3.4 Adjustments to the structure and presentation of the CRAFT Code

The indicators

Felix asked if the indicators were included in version 2.0, what types of indicators would have significant utility for the Artisanal minerals producers, the buyers, the downstream companies or the gold supply chain as a whole? To what extent are they important and to what extent would they be used?

If indicators are needed, do they have feedback on the time at which these indicators would be introduced in the CRAFT (that is, in version 2.0 or later)?

Regarding the indicators, it is also important that the information would be collected to feed the exchange platform on the impact of the application of the standard.

The incentives

The main incentive for miners to adopt by CRAFT is access to formal markets. Another implicit incentive is the support of CRAFT schemes for the risk mitigation plans.

Beyond that, CRAFT is not specific or prescriptive about other incentives, which CRAFT schemes or buyers may or may not be willing to offer.

Should incentives be specified in the Code?

Recommendations from Advisory Group: *if incentives are defined, this can limit the industry's engagement. They strongly recommended to not define the incentives and keep the freedom to the schemes..*

Comments from members: *Levin sources mentioned that the application of the CRAFT requires some investment. How could it be made more viable? How could the CRAFT be made more attractive?*

As for the structure

Felix proposed to readjust the current structure as follows:

Volume 1: CRAFT - Introduction and general characteristics

Volume 2: CRAFT for AMPs

Vol 2A: Generic Requirements

Vol 2B: Specific requirements according to minerals

Vol 2C: Guidance for AMPs

Volume 3: The standard for CRAFT schemes

Recommendations from Advisory Group: *they liked the idea since the most important aspect is to have a practical code for the miners.*

Member comments: *they did not comment on any change, they approved the structure.*

The members of the committee are encouraged to feed the discussion with feedback in the document or with the presentation regarding changes for the current CRAFT version. The team proposed that the members send the suggestions until December 16. Based on all comments, the ARM standards team will prepare and present a draft with a version of CRAFT 2.0, which will be discussed by the governance bodies and, after approval, will be published for public consultation.

Recommendations from Advisory Group: *The advisory group undertook to provide more comments on the same date.*

Comments from members: *Yaw invited members to agree to give their inputs on that date as well.*

3.5 New topics for volume 3: The standard for CRAFT Schemes

The team proposed to specify in the new version in more detail the rules regarding the development of CRAFT schemes. This refers to defining the implications of having an open-source license. This part will also include location of CRAFT, adaptation of CRAFT for specific purposes or branches, incorporation of other standards, communications and claims related to CRAFT.

Comments from members: *Yaw emphasized that it is important to have clarity of the rules for CRAFT branches or schemes.*

4. Timeline of CRAFT v2.0 and next steps

Natalia Uribe commented that the timeline that was previously proposed is maintained, this is for the purpose to publish the second version in the middle of 2020.

5. Other comments

None.

Present:

- **Simone Knobloch**-Valcambi COO
- **Yaw Britwum**- Solidaridad project coordinator in Ghana
- **Cesar Ipenza**-Peruvian and environmental mining expert
- **Jat Verma** –Apple Social Responsibility representative
- **Fabiana Di Lorenzo**-Estelle Levin Limited Due Diligence Manager
- **Nawal Ait-Hocine**- Representative RJC
- **Nimer Rivera** - Miner representative (Peru).
- **Rocio Fernandez**- UNIDO representative
- **Toby Pomeroy**-Miembro de la junta de ARM
- **Harbi Guerrero**-Miembro de la junta de ARM

Project team:

- **Yves Bertran**- ARM's Standards Director
- **Natalia Uribe**-ARM Standards and Certification Coordinator.
- **Felix Hruschka**-Standards expert
- **Jeniffer Peyser**- Senior Mediator and Director, Ethical Resource Program / RESOLVE
- **Taylor Kennedy**- Sr. Project Manager

Apologies and absentees:

- **Andreina Rojas**- Intel Conflict Minerals Outreach Specialist
- **Daniel M Riascos** - Colombia Coodmilla coop representative.
- **Lisa Sumi**-IRMA Standard Coordinator
- **Mariana Smirnova**-CFSI Project Manager
- **Neil Harby**-LBMA Head of Good Delivery
- **Louis Marechal** - OECD observer
- **Mauricio Cabrera**-WWF Mining Policy Coordinator
- **Michele Bruelhart** – Director Innovations of RMI
- **Phaedon Stamatopoulos**- Argor-Heraus Director Refining & Bank Products
- **Urica Primus** - Guyana Women Miners Organization (GWMO) president.