

# Consultation response

## Part 1: Your details

**Original language of response:** English

**Name:** Anonymous

**Country of residence:** United States

**Are you willing to let us publish your response publicly on the Global Tailings Review website?** Yes

**Please select which stakeholder group you are representing:** Mining Industry

**If 'Other', please specify below:**

**Are you responding on behalf of an organization?** No

**Please give the name of the organization:**

**Your level within the organisation:**

## Part 2: Your views on each of the Principles and Requirements in the Standard

### Topic 1: Knowledge Base

#### Principle 1

**In your view, will compliance with this Principle and its Requirements contribute to the prevention of catastrophic failure of tailings facilities?**

Partially

**Which aspects of Principle 1 do your comments relate to?**

Comments on the Principle itself, Requirement 1.3, Requirement 1.2, Requirement 1.4, Requirement 1.1

**Your comments on Principle 1**

1. "" or at a minimum every 3 years for 'Very High' and 'Extreme' Consequence Classifications, and every 5 years for others."" I suggest an Annual Update for all tailings facilities. Do not segregate based on ""current"" classification ... without specific direction there is no standard principle. This effort is minimal, Copying a few files and or updating the annual text with annotated date.... a few minutes of effort. R1.1 - AGAIN this is a part of an annual exercise. As ""best Practice"" could change .. or note that is ""has not changed"" R1.2 - AGAIN ""regularly"" this language is not that of a standard, but an idea - or suggestion. Without definitives the ""standard is neutered"". SUGGESTION - a part of the ANNUAL UPDATE. R1.3 - Seriously? ""..where there is potential"" with no Description or characterization of the ""potential"" this will result avoidance, neglect, and or miscommunication. An ANNUAL UPDATE would address this IN WRITING and for all stakeholders to see. Without annual or monthly reporting and or data dissemination we will not advance toward any standard

practice. R1.4 This is obvious but also need ""regular"" updating as the communities and the site operational considerations change on a regular basis. Should be a NOTE in the ANNUAL REPORT.

## **Principle 2**

### **In your view, will compliance with this Principle and its Requirements contribute to the prevention of catastrophic failure of tailings facilities?**

Partially

### **Which aspects of Principle 2 do your comments relate to?**

Comments on the Principle itself, Requirement 2.1, Requirement 2.4, Requirement 2.3, Requirement 2.2, Requirement 2.6, Requirement 2.5

### **Your comments on Principle 2**

2. ""9 The Standard does not ban any specific design technology, such as upstream tailings facilities. Banning particular technologies was outside the Expert Panel's scope of work, available here: <https://globaltailingsreview.org/about/scope/>"" .....2. Integrate the social, economic, environmental and technical information to select the site and the technologies to minimize the risk of tailings facility failure. --- Maybe it is a translation or language issue ""technologies"" does not specifically mean the TYPE and or MANNER of the TAILINGS or TSF structure, design or use -- it can mean many things in the context of the general principle. If specific to the DESIGN and CONSTRUCTION of the TSF or tailings impoundment -- then say so explicitly. R2.1 - The intent is correct. But who undertakes this? Is it kept in tact as a matter of record? Can it be amended, arrested, changed and or completely reworked, and if so, is it noted in the sites record and or annual report? ""monitoring program"" should be 1st and foremost. A site that is constructed for time, prevention, containment, and with resources to ensure its as-built respect to design, should need minimal monitoring, however MONITORING MUST BECOME THE DENOMINATOR OF ALL TAILINGS/TSF structural design components. The daily, monthly, other - frequency specified and mandated from the design status, though planning, construction, and operation. R2.2 - This is the first specific mention of an action -- as it entails a 3rd party consultant and or transaction of responsibility. R2.3 - The knowledge base is NO LONGER the suitable denominator. Fully completed and exercised models (physical or computer-and software based) of known - type issues, should be modeled and discussed, and made a part of the sites record. R2.4 -This event and any AMBP should be a part of the ANNUAL REPORT. R2.5 - ASSURANCE -- periodically -- estimated -- AGAIN LANGUAGE. Can you have ASSURANCE with unknown periodicity? ...and ESTIMATES? Assurance should be restated Annually and made a part of a PERFORMANCE BOND. R2.6 - AGAIN, no STANDARD HERE -- ""Operator will consider"" come-on....the Operators know a number of the RISK associated with the ""construction, operation, maintenance, and/or closure of a tailings facility."" If not they should not have a license to OPERATE ! BECAUSE no site has a historical record +5-10 years -- of fully cited and contextual MONITORING of these facilities the consideration of Unknown Risk is substantial. I submit that a pervasive, fully instrumented, and data aligned, reported, cited, and disseminated structure would have MINIMAL Risk -- thus ""cost"" associated with the same ascribed to it. The unknown and seemingly untenable costs envisioned are because there is NO standard of operations, risk assessment, management, monitoring, and dissemination of results.

## **Topic II: Affected Communities**

### **Principle 3**

**In your view, will compliance with this Principle and its Requirements contribute to the prevention of catastrophic failure of tailings facilities?**

Partially

**Which aspects of Principle 3 do your comments relate to?**

Comments on the Principle itself, Requirement 3.3, Requirement 3.2, Requirement 3.1, Requirement 3.4

**Your comments on Principle 3**

3. The Standard Principle 3 is -- "to have respect for" -- That we have to include this in a "standard" is sobering. Seemingly it is not an accepted "practice". This should be clearly stated that it has not been the case and is the NEW standard .. to have RESPECT for -- . R3.1 - Demonstrate how? A Webinar? Build a school? Have a meeting? LANGUAGE is not specific in any manner of a STANDARD. R3.2 - AGAIN -- LANGUAGE -- "Meaningfully....." What is that in terms of ACTIONS and Statements in Writing? Throughout the lifecycle of current residents, or as time moves forward and ANNUAL effort to do so that is qualified and recorded in writing or specific actions. R3.3 - "Where the risks of a potential tailings facility failure could result in loss of life or sudden physical and/or economic displacement of people, the Operator shall consider in good faith additional measures to minimize those risks or implement resettlement following international standards. ...this is every Tailings Facility and or TSF named and described in a mine plan. MONITORING AGAIN IS THE OPPORTUNITY for the Operator to share this reality and their constant vigilance and efforts in support of arresting any complete and or event driven "failure" or change in the as-built status of the asset. R3.4 - A proactive monitoring, reporting, dissemination, and education program may arrest and or redirect grievances in a constructive and non resource liable manner.

## **Topic III: Design, Construction, Operation and Monitoring of the Tailings Facility**

### **Principle 4**

**In your view, will compliance with this Principle and its Requirements contribute to the prevention of catastrophic failure of tailings facilities?**

Partially

**Which aspects of Principle 4 do your comments relate to?**

Comments on the Principle itself, Requirement 4.3, Requirement 4.1, Requirement 4.2

**Your comments on Principle 4**

4. "Design, construct, operate and manage the tailings facility on the presumption that the consequence of failure classification is 'Extreme', unless this presumption can be rebutted." -- AGAIN are you seriously supporting the fact that the Operators do NOT already Consider, discover, plan, engineer, and build a structure to a classification other than ""EXTREME"" classification of RISK? and then you support rebutting the assertion that you are instilling? R4.1 -- I am at odds with this a).b).c) .. i believe the premise is incorrect. If we create a standard, see it applied, and is

annually recognized v-- that at it's heart it specifies Professional full time monitoring, data acquisition, assessment, analysis, reporting, and dissemination .. of all existing sites and any new site, the premise is that the RISK level is only moderate unless specified and verified by data. These reports must be daily, and annually summarized, made publically accessible in their final or released form. R4.2 - Is made moot by creating the proactive services and results in R4.1. R4.3 - ""approve the implementation of measures..."" this could not be more vague. Clear statements of responsibility and purpose, with oversight is at the heart of a ""standard"" where proactive actions and specified practices and processes support the safety, operations, and nalue in the site assets.

### **Principle 5**

**In your view, will compliance with this Principle and its Requirements contribute to the prevention of catastrophic failure of tailings facilities?**

Partially

**Which aspects of Principle 5 do your comments relate to?**

Comments on the Principle itself

**Your comments on Principle 5**

5. - Not including for the 1st time MONITORING - manner, practice, assessment, integration, analysis, reporting, and dissemination within P5 weakens the substantive opportunity for real change. R5.1 - R5.6 all can benefit from Premise based Design and Monitoring as the new paradigm in TSF conceptualization, design, planning, and build.

### **Principle 6**

**In your view, will compliance with this Principle and its Requirements contribute to the prevention of catastrophic failure of tailings facilities?**

Partially

**Which aspects of Principle 6 do your comments relate to?**

Comments on the Principle itself

**Your comments on Principle 6:**

6. Here again, we want to change the manner of practice and specify the monitoring and assessment of the design, build, operationalization, service, and maintenance of the structure as PRINCIPLE to the Standardization of a new opportunity to realize safe, asset-stable, and value protective consideration for the TSF and allied structures as instrumental to operations and at asset level for resources and decision making.

### **Principle 7**

**In your view, will compliance with this Principle and its Requirements contribute to the prevention of catastrophic failure of tailings facilities?**

Yes

**Which aspects of Principle 7 do your comments relate to?**

Requirement 7.3, Requirement 7.8

### **Your comments on Principle 7**

R7.3 - The facility or asset changes EVERY DAY, so needs a DAILY status, health and performance report 1-2 page with wide area and specific quadrant data and instrumentation output results. R7.8 - NO 3 years is too long. Annual report and daily status negate the 3 year need, as the "pulse" of the Asset is always known.

### **Principle 8**

**In your view, will compliance with this Principle and its Requirements contribute to the prevention of catastrophic failure of tailings facilities?**

Yes

**Which aspects of Principle 8 do your comments relate to?**

Requirement 8.2, Requirement 8.4

### **Your comments on Principle 8**

R8.2 - The "at appropriate frequency" .. MUST BE DAILY. R8.4 - Minimum is WEEKLY, ONLY.

## **Topic IV: Management and Governance**

### **Principle 9**

**In your view, will compliance with this Principle and its Requirements contribute to the prevention of catastrophic failure of tailings facilities?**

No

**Which aspects of Principle 9 do your comments relate to?**

Comments on the Principle itself

### **Your comments on Principle 9**

P9 - Will not be successful. The decision-making responsibility is at the "Tailings or TSF" Asset management level .. now elevated to full operational status and under the Mine Manger, regional superintendent, and Global Operations and technical Manager. Evidence from Brazil suggests that alerts, data and anecdotal, as well as instrument data had no path to see the decision making opportunity that was inherent in the data. You cannot fear the data, but must accept it, validate and align all data, and make decisions in near real-time on the site, no matter of operational, production, or political considerations.

### **Principle 10**

**In your view, will compliance with this Principle and its Requirements contribute to the prevention of catastrophic failure of tailings facilities?**

Partially

**Which aspects of Principle 10 do your comments relate to?**

Comments on the Principle itself, Requirement 10.4

### **Your comments on Principle 10:**

10 - Appropriate position, scope of work, and managerial authority allied to financial

resources -- must be present in the change to Tailings as an OPERATIONAL level department. R10.4 - This is beyond obvious and again seems to be here as a result of the plain fact that globally Tailings is where the site refugees and staging positions in transition are relegated.. in my observational and conversational view on mine sites since 2006.

### **Principle 11**

**In your view, will compliance with this Principle and its Requirements contribute to the prevention of catastrophic failure of tailings facilities?**

Partially

**Which aspects of Principle 11 do your comments relate to?**

Comments on the Principle itself, Requirement 11.1

**Your comments on Principle 11:**

11. DEFINE REGULARLY. No standard can have nil definitions for time and actions of tasks related to the standard. R11.1 ..same "regularly" ..... 11.3 Likely not necessary if daily and weekly aligned monitoring and oversight are the "practice" 11.4 "3 to 10 years" ?????? In year 2, 4, 5, 7 etc ... leaving it open means NO STANDARD.

### **Principle 12**

**In your view, will compliance with this Principle and its Requirements contribute to the prevention of catastrophic failure of tailings facilities?**

No

**Which aspects of Principle 12 do your comments relate to?**

Comments on the Principle itself

**Your comments on Principle 12:**

12. This is not necessary. Is extremely costly and sets up all manner of social and political challenges. The data, in the hands of the professionals charged with the operation and management are sufficient, with DAILY, WEEKLY and Disseminated, peer reviewed and inclusive results.

### **Principle 13**

**In your view, will compliance with this Principle and its Requirements contribute to the prevention of catastrophic failure of tailings facilities?**

Partially

**Which aspects of Principle 13 do your comments relate to?**

Yes

**Your comments on Principle 13:**

13. Completely sobering that this is included and necessary..... R13.1 Completely sobering that this is included and necessary..... R13.2 ..how revolutionary ..... R13.3 - 13.5 these all go without saying as should be 1st consideration in any operations.

### **Principle 14**

**In your view, will compliance with this Principle and its Requirements contribute to the prevention of catastrophic failure of tailings facilities?**

Yes

**Which aspects of Principle 14 do your comments relate to?**

**Your comments on Principle 14:**

## ***Topic V: Emergency Response and Long-Term Recovery***

### ***Principle 15***

**In your view, will compliance with this Principle and its Requirements contribute to the prevention of catastrophic failure of tailings facilities?**

Yes

**Which aspects of Principle 15 do your comments relate to?**

**Your comments on Principle 15:**

### ***Principle 16***

**In your view, will compliance with this Principle and its Requirements contribute to the prevention of catastrophic failure of tailings facilities?**

Yes

**Which aspects of Principle 16 do your comments relate to?**

**Your comments on Principle 16:**

## ***Topic VI: Public Disclosure and Access to Information***

### ***Principle 17***

**In your view, will compliance with this Principle and its Requirements contribute to the prevention of catastrophic failure of tailings facilities?**

Yes

**Which aspects of Principle 17 do your comments relate to?**

**Your comments on Principle 17:**

## ***Part 3: Your views on the Standard***

***Your view as to whether the content of the Standard meets your expectations***

**Your view as to whether the content of the Standard meets your expectations (closed question):**

1: Falls well below my expectations

**Please summarize why you chose this option:**

Noted in my comments. generalized language with OPEN timeframes and no

realization that Monitoring, reporting, and dissemination with Operational level impact and perview is the real opportunity for CHANGE and success going forward.

***Your view on whether the Standard will create a step change for the industry in the safety and security of tailings facilities***

**Your view on whether the Standard will create a step change for the industry in the safety and security of tailings facilities (closed question):**

3: Will strengthen some but not all aspects of the safety and security of tailings facilities

**Please summarize why you chose this option:**

Noted in my responses per Principle and requirement. Monitoring, action, and authority to act will be the only real opportunity for change.

***Does the content of the Standard address all aspects of tailings facility management adequately?***

**Does the content of the Standard address all aspects of tailings facility management adequately (closed question)?**

No

**Please explain why and/or what is missing:**

MONITORING -- How to, when to, why , and what to do with data, and who acts on it completely ignored in the design and planning stages. It is an integral part of every aspect of the Standard for it to becoming a living document.

***Part 4: Suggestions for topics to be included in the accompanying Recommendations Report***

**On which topics would you expect to have further clarification or guidance in this document?**

Monitoring, the manner, practice, alignment of data, analysis, reporting and dissemination must become the DRIVER of the standard process. it has to start at the design stage with realized geology, geomorphology, and geotechnical investigations and the reporting and dissemination of those.

***Other information***

***Non-fitting response text (text submitted which did was not in response to one of the questions above)***

***Attachment 1 reference (if applicable)***

***Attachment 2 reference (if applicable)***