



# **COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS GLOBAL WORKSHOP**

## **Public Report**

*23 March 2010*

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	6
Objectives of the Global Workshop	7
Overview of the CRR Lessons Learned and Draft Implementation Plan	7
Discussion of the Draft Implementation Plan	9
Discussion of Community Consent	12
Concluding Remarks	13
<b>Annexes:</b>	
A Workshop Agenda and Participants	14
B Response from Newmont’s Board of Directors to the Community Relationships Review – Next Steps	20

## Executive Summary

Over 2007-2008, Newmont Mining Corporation conducted an in-depth review of its relationships with communities at five of its operating sites, as well as the policies, standards, and programs it had in place to manage those relationships. The resulting Community Relationships Review global summary report (CRR Report) provided eight lessons and associated recommendations that have been embraced and approved by Newmont's Board of Directors.

In its response to the CRR Report, the Board called for a global stakeholder workshop to convene a mix of internal and external stakeholders to discuss the findings of the Community Relationships Review (CRR) and the path forward.

The two-day workshop, held in November, 2009 in Washington, DC convened 19 external stakeholders, and 10 Newmont managers and Directors. Workshop objectives were to:

- share perspectives and experiences of what works, doesn't work, and could work in Newmont's engagement with local communities;
- identify common elements of successful community relationships; and
- explore the issue of what constitutes community "consent" and its implications for Newmont.

The CRR Study Directors provided an overview of the principal lessons of the CRR, and participants reflected on the problems noted by the Advisory Panel in its final report. Community participants noted problems that persist with mining operations in their areas, and Newmont shared an overview of its draft Implementation Plan, based on the action items outlined in the Board of Directors' response to the CRR findings. The implementation plan focuses on three core areas of activity:

1. Improved Engagement and Outreach
2. Review and Revision of Management Systems
3. Strengthening Internal Capacity

There were positive responses from participants regarding the proposed implementation plan, but several emphasized information gaps in the plan and that the quality of execution will prove its effectiveness. Participants offered Newmont a number of suggestions for improving its practices, including the following:

### **1) Improve Strategic Communications**

- Develop ways to share experiences, good practice, and challenges between networks of managers and local communities across the various sites.
- Communicate how Newmont links business priorities and goals with the priorities and goals of the communities.

- Establish communication feedback loops – reach out to understand community problems and concerns, and then review findings and proposed actions with community representatives. Consideration should be given as to how community representatives will be selected.
- Communicate goals, benchmarks, indicators, and timelines for and progress of implementation of the CRR to the broadest group of stakeholders, including community members, investors, civil society, and employees, on a regular basis – preferably every six months.

## **2) Enhance stakeholder engagement processes**

- Anticipate and develop mechanisms to respond to different needs along the key stages of the mining life cycle, including transparent dispute resolution mechanisms that support community rights.
- Understand local governance structures (both formal and informal) and engagement capacity of the community.
- Design ways to give communities a larger stake in the success of the mining operation.
- Incorporate an approach to seek and obtain “community consent” as mining projects move forward, from prior to exploration to the permitting stage and at major stages of operation.
- Engage communities on the recommendations from the CRR and in the development of the implementation plan. Consideration should be given to how community participation will be resourced in order to preserve the integrity of the engagement.

## **3) Integrate Community Relations into Business Processes**

- Establish clear company policy positions on key issues at the global and local level. This includes company standards on transparency, impact studies (environment, human rights, gender, social...), indigenous peoples, FPIC, community relations and avoiding dividing communities, displacement, conflict zones and human rights, and water and environmental standards that respect community rights and that are precautionary with regards to social and environmental impacts.
- Link the CRR implementation plan to site development plans and annual business plan/objectives.
- For new sites, add a “community impact/benefit” metric or target into the site impact assessment and subsequent site development plan.
- Develop robust oversight systems that are clearly linked to the external engagement agenda and processes both at the Corporate and Regional levels.
- Allocate relevant resources and assign effective accountability lines and local responsibilities.
- Form an expert advisory panel or committee to provide guidance on community relations governance issues.
- Provide regular communication on progress in implementing the plan, and challenges encountered along the way. Conduct another stakeholder workshop in a year.

Several participants identified Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) as one of the issues at the heart of today's responsible mining agenda. The full group engaged in a deep and frank discussion regarding the challenges of defining and implementing an approach to FPIC.

Participants compared the "rights" based approach to FPIC, i.e., ensuring that communities' rights are respected through formalized, legal and contractual processes, to a "needs" based approach to FPIC, i.e., ensuring that communities' needs are considered at the beginning of the relationship and addressed organically through a response mechanism over the life of the mine.

Some participants suggested that FPIC could be viewed as a more formalized process of on-going stakeholder dialogue and consent process including key milestones that are agreed at the beginning of the relationship. When viewed in this light, FPIC could be seen as somewhat less challenging for both the community and the company.

Closing the 2-day workshop, the group emphasized that mining companies will be even more challenged, and increasingly required, to take a leadership role in community development. Some posed the question: How can mining companies like Newmont use their unique mix of assets and relationships to empower communities to advance their own development?

## Introduction

The Community Relationships Review (CRR) was a response to a shareholder resolution submitted to the 2007 Annual General Meeting of Stockholders, calling on Newmont to prepare a report regarding its policies and practices relating to existing and future relationships with the local communities near its operations. A working group of expert assessors, led for most of the project by members of the corporate responsibility practice of the law firm Foley Hoag, conducted intensive site based studies of Newmont's community relationships at five mines selected as being representative of its global operating context (Minera Yanacocha in Peru, the Ahafo Mine in Ghana, the Martha Mine in New Zealand, the Batu Hijau Mine in Indonesia, and Carlin Operations in the United States) as well as an examination of the company's policies, standards, and programs in place to manage these relationships. A desk study of the Company's experiences at its Minahasa operation in Indonesia was also added to the study. The key lessons and associated recommendations of this review were summarized in a Global Summary Report ("CRR Report", see <http://www.beyondthemine.com/2008/?l=1&pid=470&id=471>).

The CRR process included the establishment of an independent Advisory Panel composed of experts and stakeholders to provide advice and guidance to the working group and Newmont Board of Directors during the review. The Panel provided its own independent report on the CRR process and findings and also provided their own set of recommendations. (See <http://www.beyondthemine.com/2008/?l=1&pid=470&id=474>)

The Newmont Board of Directors accepted the findings and recommendations of the Study Directors and published a set of action items to direct the company's implementation plan moving forward (see Annex B). Among the recommendations was to:

*Convene a global workshop, bringing together the Company's management, the study directors, community representatives and other stakeholders as appropriate, to discuss the findings from the CRR and Advisory Panel (AP) Reports and opportunities for moving forward.*

On November 17 – 19, 2009, Newmont Mining Corporation convened a group of external and internal stakeholders in Washington DC to review and reflect on the learning and recommendations from its CRR.

The information provided in this report should not be considered either as a record of formal agreement or commitments on the part of Newmont or any of the workshop participants. It represents a summary of key themes that emerged from the discussion and that Newmont might consider useful as it moves forward.

For the detailed agenda and list of participants, please refer to Annex A at the end of this report.

## Objectives of the Global Workshop

The purpose of Newmont's Community Relationships Global Workshop was to create an environment where Newmont's stakeholders could share ideas, views and perspectives to inform Newmont's planning and activities going forward. The objectives were to:

- share perspectives and experiences of what works, doesn't work, and could work in Newmont's engagement with local communities;
- identify common elements of successful community relationships; and
- explore the issue of what constitutes community "consent" and its implications for Newmont.

Newmont engaged AccountAbility<sup>1</sup> to help design and facilitate the global workshop. Participants were invited by AccountAbility, with input from Newmont and others, based on one or more of the following criteria:

- their familiarity with Newmont and the CRR;
- their familiarity with broader constituent and community interests at Newmont's operating sites;
- their reputation for expert knowledge or experience with community-related aspects of the mining industry.

## Overview of the CRR Lessons Learned, Advisory Panel Conclusions and Draft Implementation Plan

At the outset of the meeting senior managers and the chair of the Environmental and Social Responsibility Committee of Newmont's Board of Directors welcomed participants and expressed their gratitude for participant's willingness to take time to provide feedback and input to Newmont as it moves forward. Newmont stated its commitment to developing an action plan that addresses the findings of the CRR study and provides the basis for improved performance in the future.

The Study Directors provided participants with an overview of the CRR study process, the assessment teams, and the key lessons and recommendations from the CRR Report. As the starting point for the preparation of a path forward, the CRR Report identifies eight Lessons Learned:

**Lesson 1:** Every Newmont operating site should have a comprehensive and integrated strategic management plan for community relations that identifies the objectives and responsibilities of each functional department and takes into account relevant site-specific factors.

**Lesson 2:** Regular and comprehensive social impact assessments and risk assessments must inform cross-functional strategic planning at Newmont's operating sites.

---

<sup>1</sup> An international non-profit think-tank specializing in stakeholder engagement and sustainable development.  
<http://www.accountability21.net/>

**Lesson 3:** Regional and local managers in all functional areas must be accountable for implementation of the company's strategic objectives regarding community relationship building.

**Lesson 4:** Newmont's operating sites must assess stakeholder concerns and engage with external stakeholders in order to understand and effectively respond to their perceptions and concerns.

**Lesson 5:** Newmont's engagements with the community must reflect the company's values and responsibilities and clearly convey what can be expected from the company in its role as a community stakeholder.

**Lesson 6:** Newmont's operating sites must engage in conflict identification and manage community concerns before open conflict arises, while also respecting the rights of stakeholders to protest against the mine.

**Lesson 7:** Newmont must ensure that its operating sites have accessible and responsive grievance mechanisms.

**Lesson 8:** Management of the environmental impact of mining is directly linked to the management of community relations; Newmont must assess and respond to stakeholder concerns regarding both real and perceived environmental impacts of its operations.

Participants observed that the problems with the CRR noted by the Advisory Panel should also be stated even though an Advisory Panel report back was not made part of the formal agenda. These problems included timeline difficulties, problems with site selection and the absence of any exploration sites or sites in development or feasibility stage, problems with editing of Yanacocha and Ahafo reports, inconsistency across site reports, problems with participant selection at sites, lack of verification of accuracy of representation of the community concerns, and issues that were missing or incompletely addressed including indigenous peoples issues, FPIC, gender impacts, artisanal and small-scale mining, and water quality and use.

Throughout the meeting, community participants also noted problems that persist with mining operations in their areas.

Newmont then provided an overview of its draft Implementation Plan, based on the action items outlined in the Board of Directors' response to the CRR findings. The implementation plan, broadly outlined, includes:

**Improved Engagement and Outreach:** This will include efforts to keep internal and external stakeholders at all levels informed of the findings and path forward, opportunities for gathering feedback and advice, and commitments to report back on actions taken. The global workshop is one part of what is intended to be an ongoing commitment to better communication.

**Review and Revision of Management Systems:** Reflecting what is hoped is a better understanding of the critical aspects of better relationships across the entire mine life cycle, Newmont has committed to reviewing and revising its management standards and internal guidance to capture the lessons learned from the CRR. The standards were revised in 2009 and



will be rolled-out across the company for implementation in 2010. A social audit program will be developed and piloted in 2010. Sites are also being asked to review and improve local grievance mechanisms in 2010, based on a new standard. Sites involved in the assessment process of the CRR were asked to develop action plans by the end of 2009 to address the findings of the assessment teams specific to their sites.

**Strengthening Internal Capacity:** To support these efforts, Newmont has committed to working with experts in conflict assessment and management to develop the capacity of its employees in developing and maintaining constructive relationships with local communities. An initial training program will be developed and piloted in 2010.

## **Discussion of the Draft Implementation Plan**

There were positive responses from participants regarding the proposed implementation plan, but several noted gaps and emphasized that the quality of its execution will prove its effectiveness. To this end, participants offered Newmont their perceptions of Newmont's performance and suggestions for improving its practices.

### **Improve Strategic Communications**

Some participants stated that they came to the workshop with the perception that Newmont implements community engagement processes inconsistently across different sites, and with the concern that the systems, standards and processes established by the corporate office are not applied in the business operations and serve as little more than 'tick-the-box' checklists for site managers.

At the same time, several case examples shared by Newmont managers, and discussed during the meeting, were acknowledged as informative and moving in the right direction. Some commented that this discussion was particularly rich and offered a good opportunity to discuss and consider the operational dynamics related to policy commitments and issues. Several suggestions were made on how to further improve practice on the ground and inform policy:

- Develop ways to share experiences, good practice, and challenges between networks of managers and local communities across the various sites.
- To show Newmont's long-term commitment, communicate how Newmont links business priorities and goals with that of the communities.
- Establish communication feedback loops – reach out to understand community problems and concerns, and then review findings and proposed actions with community representatives. For example, participants identified gaps in Newmont's understanding of community needs on the issue of women's health and development, and water.

### **Enhance Stakeholder Engagement Processes**

The company queried on what actions it should take if it finds that its efforts to reach out on key issues receive seemingly little interest, limited response, or finds low participation on the part of the community or other stakeholders.

It was suggested that this problem often relates to the dilemma of how to address "asymmetry of information."

Participants offered that the company may inadequately communicate messages to local stakeholders. In other cases the community may lack capacity to actively engage in a representative fashion through engagement forums, processes, systems or other means. In some circumstances, stakeholders may not interpret certain messages communicated by the company as being a priority. There are also cases where the community may have access to information but does not have access to analysis or expertise that it needs to participate.

Participants identified areas where Newmont could focus in the interest of improving its success in engaging with communities, including:

- Anticipating and developing mechanisms to respond to different needs along the key stages of the mining cycle. Participants emphasized that stakeholder concerns and needs are not static. At the same time, the operations and priorities of a mining company's operations evolve as it goes from exploration, to operations, to eventual closure. Stakeholders suggested that Newmont should engage the community as early as possible, to learn about the community's diversity of interests, concerns, and needs.
- Understanding local governance structures (both formal and informal) and engagement structures or traditions and capacity of the community. Communities are often characterized by complex power relationships and decision-making structures. They may lack "one, unified voice." Therefore, Newmont should develop approaches that are responsive to these complex dynamics. This may include supporting a range of approaches including capacity building (for communities and Newmont), multi-tiered engagement and others.
- Designing ways to engage the community in negotiations over the design and operation of the mine. Stakeholders suggested that Newmont develop a series of actions that give communities a larger stake in the success of the mining operation. Some indicated that such actions must respect the right to FPIC and not serve to divide communities. Participants brainstormed several ideas, including:
  - creating a community fund (similar to the model of community foundations used in the United States) that could help the community build capacity as well as engage experts on specific areas of need;
  - implementing robust grievance mechanisms;
  - providing communities a financial stake or share in the business—enabling interested communities to become a business partner, changing the dynamic and supporting collaborative decision-making in key areas of importance to communities;
  - advancing – with partners – community-driven development approaches;
  - advancing – with partners – efforts to enhance the capacity of local government officials and community leaders as managers, decision-makers, and response leaders to their own constituencies;
  - supporting efforts – with partners – to reward ethical behavior on the part of officials and leaders who seek to benefit from mining royalty payments.
- Incorporating an approach to seek "community consent" as mining operations move forward, starting prior to exploration. Some participants acknowledged that understanding, defining, and achieving community consent is not a clearly defined concept and is a very complex and challenging arena. Other participants noted that FPIC is established under international law and that it involves seeking the consent from freely chosen representatives and customary or other institutions, that it

must occur in the absence of coercion or manipulation by the company or individuals affiliated with the company, that it occurs before mining activities or decisions occur, and that it includes conveying a defined minimum set of information in a format that is understandable and accessible and is accurate and thorough. Participants suggested that Newmont begin to undertake and test concrete steps that move in this direction. It could design in effect a joint implementation plan with the community, which would function as a 'living document' used to seek a common understanding of challenges and find solutions collaboratively. In particular, Newmont should ensure that:

- a "rules of engagement" protocol is developed that identifies stakeholders who should be involved in decision-making and the agreed processes of engagement;
  - issues and agreed upon responses are regularly reviewed as community and operating contexts change over time;
  - there is regular communication on progress including any challenges and dilemmas the company may encounter, especially if it refers to issues the company cannot address on its own;
  - clear and effective grievance processes are established;
  - there is a commitment from the outset that all issues brought by the community are acknowledged, including those that might be bigger than the sphere of influence of the company; and
  - Newmont legal and policy protocols are reviewed to ensure that they are consistent with, rather than contradict, this approach.
  - the community will, as it is stated through mutual-recognized channels, be consequential in determining the planning and execution of a project. Further that Newmont indicate that seeking community consent may sometimes result in the company not exploring land or developing operations, even if legally permitted to do so, as its peers such as Rio Tinto have acknowledged publicly.
- Engaging communities on the recommendations from the CRR and in the development of the implementation plan. Several participants suggested using local community advisory groups, formalized panels, or stakeholder convenings to help develop effective local action plans and to help explore future issues. In addition, participants suggested Newmont maintain a global stakeholder advisory body that would convene annually.

### **Integrate Community Relations into Business Processes**

Newmont was encouraged to strengthen the connection between business development and strategy and community relations performance management. Some pointed out the need for Newmont to more clearly link business priorities with the goals of local communities to help demonstrate Newmont's long-term commitment. Suggestions included:

- Establishing clear company positions on key issues at the global and local level. In particular, some stakeholders referred to the issue of Indigenous communities, which they felt lacked a clear policy

at the corporate level. This discussion included the circulation of a draft proposal for corporate policy on operations on Western Shoshone and other Native American lands. Participants noted that this subject in particular is an area where Newmont can provide a leadership role. Participants also noted the need for company standards on transparency, impact studies (environment, human rights, gender, social...), FPIC, community relations and avoiding dividing communities, displacement, conflict zones and human rights, and water and environmental standards that respect community rights and that are precautionary with regards to social and environmental impacts.

- For established sites, linking the CRR implementation plan to the site development plan and annual business plan/objectives;
- For new sites, adding a “community impact/benefit” metric or target into the site impact assessment and subsequent site development plan;
- Developing robust oversight systems that are clearly linked to the external engagement agenda and processes both at the Corporate and Regional levels;
- Allocating relevant resources and assigning effective accountability lines and local responsibilities; and
- With regard to Newmont’s global executive team, forming an expert advisory panel or committee to provide guidance on community relations governance issues. Some participants raised the question of how the CRR Advisory Panel might continue under new terms of reference.

The discussion closed with the request for Newmont to provide regular communication on progress in implementing the plan, and challenges encountered along the way. Suggestions were made to have another such workshop in a year.

## **Discussion on Community Consent**

As the discussion unfolded over the course of two days, several participants identified Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) as one of the issues at the heart of today’s responsible mining agenda.

The full group engaged in a deep and frank discussion regarding the challenges of defining and implementing an approach to FPIC. Some participants, emphasizing the “rights” based approach to FPIC, i.e., ensuring that communities’ rights are respected, presented FPIC as a formalized, legal and contractual process.

It was noted during the discussion that there are two points in international law which specifically address FPIC, both of which are focused on the rights of Indigenous peoples, and not more broadly on local communities:

- **International Labor Organization C169, Convention concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries (“ILO 169”).** Most of the language in the convention provides for the inclusion of Indigenous and tribal communities to participate in key decision-making opportunities that may affect their lands, resources, and cultures. It includes mention of FPIC

with specific reference to instances where they may be relocated. ILO 169 is binding on its signatory nations.

- The **United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples** (2007) explicitly affirms the Right to Free, Prior and Informed Consent and States' obligations to obtain it in many of its provisions.

Several in the group, emphasizing a “needs” based approach to FPIC, i.e., ensuring that communities' needs are considered, pointed out a distinction between issues that are conducive to negotiate at the beginning of the relationship and others that need to be addressed organically through a response mechanism over the life of the mine. From their own experiences, some participants stated that there can never be a guarantee that serious challenges will not arise along the way. As a community around a mine grows, the issues, concerns, and needs of the community will inevitably change. The notion of an ever-changing situation raised the question as to whether in practice it is possible to seek consent for the life of the mine. Other participants indicated that consent should be sought at particular stages in the mine development plan, such as before activities begin, when any expansion occurs, when mine closure is to begin, and when any other major change in the mine plan occurs.

Toward the end of the discussion, some participants suggested that FPIC could be viewed as a formalized process of on-going stakeholder dialogue and consent process including key decision milestones that are agreed at the beginning of the relationship. When viewed in this light, FPIC could be seen as somewhat less challenging for both the community and the company. FPIC could on one level represent a commitment, over the life of the mine, to engage in communication and reach agreements on key areas of interest, such as the go or no-go decision, access to revenues, transparency on royalty payments to the government and reports on operations, environmental stewardship, and protection of property, among others. Within such an approach, community advisory panels could be organized with clear, agreed roles in a shared decision-making process. Some participants added that FPIC adds an element that may make it more difficult for a company or community to break promises or back away from stakeholder engagement, because agreements form the basis of engagement and create a clear set of rules for both parties.

## **Concluding Remarks**

Closing the discussion of opportunities for improving company performance, the group emphasized that the risks and complexities of operating mines in rural, low-income communities will only grow as governments, economies, and communities become increasingly destabilized by economic volatility, climate change, food insecurity, water shortages, population growth among lower-income individuals, health challenges, decreasing protection of human rights, biodiversity loss, etc. Hence, mining companies will be even more challenged, and increasingly required, to take a leadership role in community development. Some posed the question: How can mining companies like Newmont use their unique mix of assets and relationships to empower communities to advance their own development?

In closing the event, participants reflected positively on the candor and openness demonstrated by everyone to discuss difficult issues. Several viewed the workshop as a step forward for Newmont in its efforts to engage more effectively with stakeholders, and expressed interest in ongoing communication and dialogue. Newmont committed to finding ways to continue the efforts begun at the workshop, and

to ensuring that a public report of the proceedings would be made available, with assistance from volunteers from the workshop.

## Annex A: Workshop Agenda and Participants

### November 17, 2009

Time	Session
1830	Informal Dinner for participants

### November 18, 2009

Time	Session
0800 – 0900	Breakfast
0900 – 0920	<b>Session 1 (S1):</b> Welcome
0920 – 0930	<b>S2:</b> Opening remarks by Jim Taranik, Chair of the Environmental and Social Responsibility (ESR) Committee of the Board of Directors
0930 – 0945	<b>S3:</b> Opening remarks by Newmont Senior Management
0945 – 1030	<b>S4:</b> CRR Process and Outcomes. Presentation by Gare Smith, CRR Study Director
1030 – 1045	<b>S5:</b> Presentation on the Board of Director’s response to the CRR and Newmont’s implementation plan
1045 – 1100	<b>Break</b>
1100 – 1230	<p><b>S6:</b> Initial brainstorming on the key questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Is Newmont heading in the right direction with its implementation plan? Do you see any critical gaps?</i></li> <li>2. <i>Starting with the fundamentals, what do you think are the three most important actions Newmont can take in establishing or maintaining a relationship with a local community, to help make that relationship successful?</i></li> <li>3. <i>How will Newmont know when it is being successful – or know when it is heading in the wrong direction -- with regard to a community relationship?</i></li> </ol>
1230 – 1330	<b>Lunch</b>
1330 – 1730	<p><b>S7:</b> Deeper Discussion of “the fundamentals”: Understanding what works in building a relationship with local communities. Participants are asked to share their experiences from working with Newmont (or other companies)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Making a good first impression, and a second, and a third – what company actions and behaviors are the basis for successfully entering into a relationship with a community, what helps to keep the relationship alive, and what must be</i></li> </ol>



Time	Session
	<p><i>done as we prepare to leave?</i></p> <p>2. <i>Disagreements happen in every relationship – from your experience, what can Newmont do or put in place to help resolve conflict before the relationship is put at risk?</i></p>
1900	<b>Group Dinner.</b> Hosted by Jim Taranik, Chair, Environmental and Social Responsibility Committee, Newmont Board of Directors.

## November 19, 2009

Time	Session
0800 – 0900	Breakfast
0900 – 0930	<p><b>S8:</b> Review of previous day</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overnight thoughts/questions</li> <li>Review summary from yesterday’s afternoon discussion. From participant experiences:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>What should Newmont be doing?</i></li> <li><i>What should Newmont make sure it does not do?</i></li> <li>Prioritizing where Newmont should focus its energy and time to improve existing relationships.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
0930 – 1300	<p><b>S9:</b> How will we know when a relationship is successful, or improving?</p> <p>Participants are asked to share their experiences of what a “successful” relationship looks like. Can we identify aspects that are common across experiences, regardless of geography, culture, and history?</p>
1300 – 1400	<b>Lunch</b>
1400 – 1600	<p><b>S10:</b> During the last several years, phrases like “Free Prior Informed Consent,” “Broad Community Support,” and “Social License to Operate” have been used to describe relationships between communities and mining operations. The challenge for Newmont is that these terms mean different things to different people and in different local contexts. Participants will be asked to share their thoughts on the concept of community “consent.”</p>
1600 – 1630	<p><b>S11:</b> Conclusions and wrap up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reflections</li> <li>Next steps for workshop outcomes</li> <li>Following up on “parking lot” issues</li> </ul>

## External Stakeholders

**Tessa Mackenzie\***, Project Coordinator, Waihi Social Development Group, Waihi, New Zealand

**Julio Dávila Silva\***, Mayor of Baños del Inca, Cajamarca, Peru

**Eric Addae\***, Asutifi District Chief Executive, Brong-Ahafo, Ghana

**Elaine Barkdull Spencer\***, former (until September 2009) Executive Director, Elko County Economic Diversification Authority, Nevada, US

**Norm Cavanaugh\***, Commissioner, Nevada Indian Commission; Director, Great Basin Indian Archive, Nevada, US

**Larson Bill**, Western Shoshone Defense Project

**Chris Jochnick\*\***, Director, Private Sector Engagement, Oxfam America

**Scott Cardiff**, International Campaign Coordinator, Earthworks

**Arvind Ganesan**, Director, Business and Human Rights, Human Rights Watch

**Sujata Lamba**, Manager, Global Linkages Unit, International Finance Corporation

**Paul Bugala**, Sustainability Analyst, Calvert Asset Management Co., Inc.

**Julie Tanner\*\***, Assistant Director, Socially Responsible Investing, Christian Brothers Investment Services

**Rev. Seamus Finn**, Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate

**Steve D'Esposito\*\***, President, RESOLVE

**Assheton Carter**, Vice President, Corporate Community Engagement, Pact

**Paul Hollesen**, Vice President, Environment and Community Affairs, AngloGold Ashanti

**Salil Tripathi**, Director of Policy, Institute for Human Rights and Business

**Gare Smith\***, Partner, Foley Hoag LLC

**Sarah Altschuller\***, Associate, Foley Hoag, LLC

*\* Indicates those participants/ stakeholders that were involved in the CRR process;*

*\*\* Indicates CRR Advisory Panel members.*

## **Newmont Participants**

**James V. Taranik**, President, Desert Research Institute, Arthur Brant Chair of Geology and Geophysics and Chair of the Environmental and Social Responsibility (ESR) Committee of the Board of Directors

**Alan R. Blank**, Executive Vice President, Legal and External Affairs

**David A. Baker**, Vice President and Chief Sustainability Officer

**Tom McCulley**, Vice President, Discovery and Development, Business and Planning Services

**Grant Batterham**, Regional Director, Environmental and Social Responsibility, Asia Pacific

**Luis (Tito) Campos**, Regional Director, Environmental and Social Responsibility, South America

**Nicholas Cotts**, Regional Vice President, Environment and Social Responsibility, Africa

**John K. Mudge**, Vice President of Environmental and Social Responsibility, North American

**Joseph Pollara**, Senior Director, Environmental and Social Responsibility

**Jo Render**, Senior Manager, Environmental and Social Responsibility

## **Annex B: Response from Newmont's Board of Directors to the Community Relationships Review – Next Steps**

Newmont's Board of Directors instructs the company to design and execute an action plan to:

1. Engage with representatives of the impacted communities who participated in the study to understand from them whether they believe the CRR Report properly captured their comments.
2. Engage key community representatives and local authorities to determine the appropriate forum(s) to discuss the findings from the report and opportunities to move forward which may include a workshop or other type of community engagement process. The Company will also commence a dialogue with community representatives and other stakeholders aimed at increasing the level of engagement and trust with due regard for the findings in the CRR.
3. Convene a global workshop, bringing together the Company's management, the study directors, community representatives and other stakeholders as appropriate, to discuss the findings from the CRR and AP Reports and opportunities for moving forward.
4. Revise the Company's Environmental and Social Responsibility policies and standards with reference to the CRR Report and the best practices to be identified as described in point number 5 below. We expect that the Company's ESR global team will lead this effort so as to draw from regions and sites around the world. We also expect that all levels of management will participate to the extent appropriate in the development and implementation of updated policies and standards. This will include undertaking additional research and analysis to develop policies, standards and best practices for the initial geological exploration stage of future projects.
5. Investigate other examples of high-quality community relationship and conflict management programs employed by other global enterprises, not solely mining companies, as a basis for informing the development of appropriate grievance mechanisms and conflict management programs at all Newmont operated sites.
6. Develop a set of key metrics, including metrics for individual and organizational accountability, to allow the ESRC and management to measure and monitor the Company's performance on the issues identified in the CRR Report. This will be part of a refined assessment or audit program that will be developed and tested over the next 18 months as the performance standards are revised. We expect that the new audit program will be fully implemented by 2011. Report of the Environmental and Social Responsibility Committee of the Board of Directors Report of the Environmental and Social Responsibility Committee of the Board of Directors.
7. Revise and amend as appropriate the Company's current three-year ESR strategic plan to incorporate explicit action plans implementing the CRR's findings and recommendations. For those sites that participated in the CRR, we expect the development and implementation of site-specific action plans to address the key findings of the site assessment process.

- 8.** Work to integrate the updated ESR strategic plan and the revised policies and standards into the Company's comprehensive Management Operating Systems, planning processes and audit programs.
- 9.** Management will report to the ESRC on progress made toward achieving these objectives prior to the 2010 Annual General Meeting of Stockholders.