

Mark Slade
Australia

I read your RMI draft methodology note with interest. I like the combination of breadth and rigour... including recognition that commitment does not equate to action, which – in turn – does not necessarily yield impact. It's an impressive initiative.

Two high-level observations:

- Ranking 30 large companies out of thousands operating in the sector risks focusing where problems may not be the most egregious. It's perfectly possible (indeed likely given the positive relationship between company size and the resources available to fund EESG objectives) that a company that ranks 25th out of 30 on the index would actually rank in the top 1 or 2% out of 6,000 if the whole sector was examined. Relative rankings don't work well when only looking at a very small subset of the population; especially when they are not selected at random. Given that the RMI is a relative ranking rather than a standard or certification, mid-size companies may well be pleased not to appear rather than aspire to best practice exemplified in the index.
- Within companies that operate multiple mines, there will be wide variation on many indicators between respective mines. Corporate policy is important, but results are delivered at a project level – and rely upon commitment and competence of individual project management. As such, when capturing a single metric for a given indicator, do you reflect the standards of the companies' best-performing mine, or their worst performing?