



April 2, 2016

It is not surprising to read a consultant's report that attempts to downplay responsibility for failures by the very corporation that commissioned the report. Enodo Rights' review of Barrick Gold's deeply flawed remedy program for rape victims at the Porgera Joint Venture mine in Papua New Guinea follows this pattern. To avoid even the semblance of such bias the Office of the [UN High Commissioner for Human Rights](#) had recommended in 2013 that a review of this remedy program be conducted by a consultant chosen jointly by Barrick, the claimants, and other key stakeholders. This advice was not followed. To the extent that Enodo identifies flaws in Barrick's remedy framework, these have been described previously by MiningWatch Canada (see for example [here](#)), [EarthRights International](#) and the [Harvard and Columbia human rights clinics](#).

Enodo breaks the usual mold, however, in trying to put blame for failures of Barrick's remedy program for rape victims on "international stakeholders" (e.g, p.2) in general and MiningWatch, the Human Rights Clinics and EarthRights international in particular (e.g, p. 114). [MiningWatch](#) addresses this in our response to Enodo. Enodo's allegations have no basis in fact, and Enodo provides no substantiation for the report's malicious allegations.

For this reason it is not enough for Enodo to avoid dealing with these critiques by simply pointing out, as lead author [Yousuf Aftab](#) does, how many pages its report contains and how many footnotes it has.