**NORTH MARA GOLD MINE LIMITED**

**Response to a September 2018 MiningWatch Canada Brief entitled “Inequality of Arms” regarding the Community Grievance Process at the North Mara Gold Mine, Tanzania**

**17 September 2018**

**Introduction**

The North Mara Gold Mine Limited (“the Mine”) appreciates the opportunity afforded by the Business and Human Rights Resource Centre (“BHRRC”) to respond to MiningWatch Canada’s (“MWC”) comments about the Mine’s Community Grievance Process (“CGP”). The CGP documents, including its draft Standard Operating Procedure (“SOP”) and a Handbook for Grievants (“Handbook”) explaining the process in simple terms have been posted on Acacia’s website [here](http://www.acaciamining.com/sustainability/grievance-process/gp-english.aspx), along with information about the consultation, since December 2017. MWC has published detailed critiques on the process previously, to which the Mine responded at length, and these and other exchanges with critics of the Mine are posted on the same Acacia webpage under the banner “[Grievance Process Consultation: Critiques and Responses](http://www.acaciamining.com/sustainability/grievance-process/gp-english.aspxt)”.

Like many companies, the Mine operates a community grievance process as part of its commitment to corporate social responsibility and respect for human rights. The Mine’s CGP provides members of its local communities a pathway for raising and seeking redress for minor and major issues which they attribute to the Mine, ranging from dust to livelihoods. However, the Mine also has chosen to extend the scope of its CGP beyond that of the typical company-based grievance process. Specifically, the Mine has chosen voluntarily to permit its CGP to receive and consider, in a non-judicial and non-legal way, grievances from its community members regarding the conduct of the Tanzanian State police when engaging in law and order enforcement activities in relation to or, in case of emergencies, on the property of the Mine.[[1]](#footnote-1)

The Mine is following the efforts to establish in Tanzania a State-based oversight body to monitor and ensure accountability of the State’s police force. For now, however, the Mine’s CGP provides an additional, effective and direct means of access to possible remedies for alleged human rights violations by the State police when trying to control or prevent the dangerous practice of illegal trespassing on the Mine site to steal gold bearing material. Removing this additional avenue, and leaving genuine victims to seek legal remedies and accountability for the alleged apprehension practices of their own State police force through the United Kingdom’s courts – as MWC apparently would prefer the Mine to do – simply cannot be a better option for members of the Mine’s communities, a sustainable way ahead for Tanzania or in keeping with the Mine’s corporate social responsibilities.[[2]](#footnote-2)

The Mine has invested heavily in seeking to ensure that its voluntary and private CGP is up to the significant challenge of providing an access to remedy for those who claim to have had their human rights violated by police while they themselves were engaging in illegal activities. The Mine is committed to operating a process that meets the criteria for effective company-led grievance processes set out in United Nations Guiding Principle on Business and Human Rights (“UNGPs”) 31.[[3]](#footnote-3) For the past two years, it has been developing an updated non-judicial, operational-level community grievance process operated according to the draft documents mentioned above. These current drafts draw heavily on the rules of procedure and guidance for petitioners of the African and Inter-American human rights commissions (although, unlike the CGP, these involve States and are quasi-judicial in nature), and take into account the latest thinking in company-led private operational grievance mechanisms. Throughout the process of updating the CGP, the Mine has been consulting with its local communities and other local stakeholders including government bodies, and with NGOs, interested observers, human rights advocates, critics and experts, in Tanzania and elsewhere. Information about these ongoing consultations is available [here](http://www.acaciamining.com/sustainability/grievance-process/gp-english.aspx).

**North Mara’s Community Grievance Process**

Under the updated CGP process, which began piloting in late 2016, where the Mine and a community member with a grievance are unable to reach agreement through direct discussions (a process of dialogue and engagement), the grievance is referred to an independent Community Grievance Committee (“Committee”). As is clear from Article 8 of the Mine’s draft SOP and Section I(E) of the draft Handbook, and as the Mine has explained repeatedly to MWC, including [here](http://www.acaciamining.com/~/media/Files/A/Acacia/documents/grievance/NMGML-response-to-MWC-april%202018-review-20180516.pdf), independent Committee panels are comprised of three members who are independent from Grievants and the Mine. Every panel is intended to have a member from the “Mine Roster”, which is not someone from the company, but rather someone nominated by the company from outside it; a member from the “Community Roster”, which is not someone related to the Grievant, but rather someone from a panel of members nominated by community representatives; and a member from the Chairperson Roster, which is not someone related to either the Mine or the Grievant, but rather intended to be someone from a panel of members nominated by an Advisory Board to the CGP.

The Mine still is in the process of seeking to organise the Community Consultation Body (“CCB”) that will nominate the members of the Community Roster. The CCB currently is envisaged as being made up of 22 persons, one male and one female, nominated from each of the eleven villages surrounding the Mine. The Mine also has not yet finalised the membership of an Advisory Board to the CGP. In the interim, a village elder is serving as the community representative on the Committee, while a representative of an NGO based in Musoma is serving as the Mine appointee, and a human rights academic and legal practitioner based in Mwanza is serving as the Chairperson of the Committee. The Committee and each of its members are independent from the Mine.

Claims of human rights impacts in relation to alleged police activities which are brought to the CGP are considered against a framework of Tanzanian and international standards and codes of conduct, including international human rights instruments to which Tanzania is a party. These standards are described in CGP’s draft Security and Human Rights Standards and draft Remedies Guides, which are available [here](http://www.acaciamining.com/~/media/Files/A/Acacia/documents/grievance/cgp_security_hr_standards_reference_guide_201804.pdf) and [here](http://www.acaciamining.com/~/media/Files/A/Acacia/documents/grievance/cgp_remedies_security_hr_impacts_reference_guide_201804.pdf).

Grievants may be represented if they so wish during the process, including by a lawyer, even though the voluntary process is designed not to be legalistic, does not determine any legal rights for any purposes whatsoever, and lawyers for the Mine are not involved in the process. Nonetheless, the Mine offers to pay for four hours of the services of a qualified lawyer chosen by any grievant. The Mine’s Community Impacts and Remedies Investigation Team (“CIRIT”) investigates all grievances and represents the Mine during the various steps of the CGP. CIRIT is not intended to lead the CGP process, including dialogue and engagement meetings, contrary to MWC’s comment. However, it has had to take on some administrative and secretarial tasks for the CGP on an interim basis pending the appointment of a Grievance Team Leader, who should be confirmed soon.

**MWC’s claims about North Mara’s Community Grievance Process**

The Mine chose not to suspend the operation of the CGP pending the outcome of the ongoing consultations, during the drafting of the new CGP documents or while the Grievance Team adjusted to the administrative burden of the updated CGP. Instead, it chose to begin piloting the updated version immediately to ensure that there continued to be an avenue for members of its local communities to bring grievances to the Mine while the process was developing.

Inevitably, there have been some challenges in implementing the full range of intended procedures and practices contemplated by the draft SOP as the various participants in the process – from members of the local community to the Grievance Team, the members of the Grievance Committee and the Mine – learn and experience how the updated process is intended to work and implement it in practice. However, that does not mean that the updated CGP has not been meeting the UNGPs effectiveness criteria in the meantime. As it evolves, taking on board internal and external feedback, the CGP represents exactly the sort of process of continuous learning that the UNGP 31(g) envisions.

MWC’s recent comments focus on concerns with the implementation of the updated CGP procedures. While some comments reflect concerns that have already been identified by the Mine and are being addressed as the process evolves, others reflect challenges that are inherent to the operating context – such as the illiteracy of some of the users of the CGP. MWC does not provide any practical suggestions for how MWC believes that the Mine could do better to address such challenges within the context of a private, non-judicial, company-run operational grievance process.

North Mara continues to invite MWC to provide concrete and practical suggestions for improvement of the design or implementation of North Mara’s private, non-judicial, company-run operational grievance process, but in the meantime we briefly comment on each of MWC’s latest critiques in more detail.

1. **“Lack of capacity of grievants”**

The CGP is designed to enable members of the Mine’s communities, regardless of the level of literacy, education or wealth, to understand and easily access a process to voice their concerns and receive remedies where appropriate with or without legal or other representation. It must be emphasised yet again, because MWC consistently fails to acknowledge this point, that the CGP is not intended to determine any legal rights or entitlement or settle legal claims. The CGP is part of the Mine’s corporate social responsibility programming and reflects the Mine’s commitment to respecting the right to remedy of members of its communities. Grievants are not asked to sign any legal documents or waive any rights at any point as against anyone, even when receiving a remedy from the Mine.

As MWC itself notes, grievants may be and often are assisted by grievance office personnel, friends, family and other members of the community and have the option of using a lawyer of their own choosing paid for by the Mine throughout the grievance process. The Mine has organised numerous capacity-building trainings, consultations and sessions to explain how the grievance process works. Information about these ongoing consultations is available [here](http://www.acaciamining.com/~/media/Files/A/Acacia/documents/grievance/HRGM-what-is-this-consultation-about-english.PDF), [here](http://www.acaciamining.com/~/media/Files/A/Acacia/documents/grievance/3J-theatre-performance-program-for-cgp-consultation.pdf) and [here](http://www.acaciamining.com/~/media/Files/A/Acacia/documents/grievance/3J-poster-english-swahili.pdf). MWC does not provide any constructive comments as to what more the Mine might be doing to address the level of literacy of its communities in connection with the CGP. The Mine itself will continue to consider this issue.

1. **“Lack of understanding of the full process and their rights therein by grievants”**

The feedback that the Mine has received from those who have used the CGP, from the broader community and from those consulted in Tanzania does not accord with MWC’s assessment of grievants’ lack of understanding of the process or their human rights. Moreover, over 10,000 people from the villages surrounding the Mine have attended the Interactive Theatre Performances regarding the CGP advertised [here](http://www.acaciamining.com/~/media/Files/A/Acacia/documents/grievance/3J-poster-english-swahili.pdf). The presentation [here](http://www.acaciamining.com/~/media/Files/A/Acacia/documents/grievance/HRGM-what-is-this-consultation-about-english.PDF) about human rights and the CGP has been given verbally to hundreds of people and contains imagery as well as writing to assist anyone who is illiterate. A pamphlet, explaining the CGP, has been distributed to all villages around the mine during the consultation process, as well as distributed to 24 village councils in the two impacted districts, and two district councils. 2,000 copies of the pamphlet, which is available [here](http://www.acaciamining.com/~/media/Files/A/Acacia/documents/grievance/NMGML-utaratibu-wa-malalamiko-ya-haki-za-binadamu-20180917.PDF), have been handed out so far.

In addition, the grievance process is explained verbally to anyone who comes to the Grievance Office with a grievance and they are given a copy of the Handbook for Grievants in Swahili for them to review later (obviously with assistance if they are not literate) and offered a voucher for four hours of legal advice from a lawyer of their own choosing. MWC does not provide any constructive comments as to what more the Mine might be doing to explain the CGP to its users and communities. The Mine itself will continue to consider this issue.

1. **“False expectations raised”**

The Mine does not understand MWC’s apparent objection to the Mine appearing, in MWC’s view, to be “keen to stimulate participation in the new OGM”. The CGP is a process through which community members have the possibility of receiving remedies (or additional remedies where previous determinations are found to have been insufficient) with nothing asked of them in return. If, as MWC claims, some grievants have expressed disappointment with the amount they received, the Mine is disappointed that MWC would seek to condemn the CGP on that basis alone without even attempting to present the standard by which MWC believes that remedies should be measured. The Mine has invested significant effort in establishing just that. The CGP draft “Remedies for Security-Related Human Rights Impacts Reference Guide”, which is available [here](http://www.acaciamining.com/~/media/Files/A/Acacia/documents/grievance/cgp_remedies_security_hr_impacts_reference_guide_201804.pdf), provides a detailed discussion of what rights-compatible remedies entail for the purpose of the CGP.

1. **“Mine does not return grievants’ submissions or provide them copies of documents they have signed”**

Although it does not recognise the problem to which MWC refers, the Mine is happy to commit to providing copies to grievants of all their submissions and documents that they have signed. Since MWC’s visit, the Grievance Office has established a register for all correspondence and copied and handed back originals of all correspondence received in person and all documents that grievants are asked to sign.

1. **“Neglecting to inform grievants of their right to four hours of legal support paid by the mine, or dissuading grievants from seeking or bringing legal support”**

The Mine finds that MWC’s repeated focus on the matter of legal vouchers is out of touch with the reality of its communities and the functioning of the CGP. Nevertheless, for the avoidance of doubt in the future, the Mine has established a register in which it will document whether each grievant has been offered the voucher for reimbursement of legal services even if they decline to accept it (as is almost always the case in a community where lawyers are not trusted and are almost non-existent). The Mine has not dissuaded grievants from seeking or bringing legal support. Consistent with the draft SOP and the Handbook, grievance officers continue to explain to potential grievants that the CGP is not a legal process and does not determine legal rights, and that grievants may but do not need to bring a lawyer if they do not wish to bring one.

1. **No “facilitated dialogue” as set out in the draft SOP**

As set out in the SOP, the CGP process involves an effort to resolve a grievance through dialogue and engagement between the Mine and a grievant or his or her representatives facilitated by a grievance officer. The Mine does not share MWC’s apparent view that “facilitated dialogue” means “lawyer assisted” dialogue.

The Mine is examining the issue of whether all grievants who have gone through the dialogue and engagement process have received “Grievance Resolution Reports”. It may be that MWC spoke only to grievants who had proceeded straight to Committee hearings because they had been through dialogue and engagement under previous CGP processes and were returning only for reconsideration of their grievances or original remedies by the Committee. Such grievants would not have received Grievance Resolution Reports drafted by grievance officers. The Mine also is endeavouring to speed up the process of issuing such reports and agrees with MWC’s suggestion that these should be provided further in advance of Grievance Committee hearings than has sometimes been the case in the past.

1. **Grievance Committee hearings**

The Mine is committed to seeking to ensure that the CGP meets the UNGP’s effectiveness criteria, including that the independent Community Grievance Committee operates as a legitimate, independent body determining matters in a manner that is predictable and equitable. This is challenging, particularly given the resources and skills that the Mine’s Grievance Team needs in order to act as an effective secretariat for the Committee and the knowledge and judgment required of members of the Committee. Further challenges relate to the environment in which the Committee operates; the onerous but necessary due process procedural requirements set forth in the SOP; the factual complexity of the human rights related claims that are brought before the Committee with respect to the police; and the levels of literacy, education, understanding of human rights and pre-existing economic circumstances of grievants.

Against that backdrop, the Mine is striving continually to improve the functioning of the Committee and the implementation of the CGP. In that regard, it appreciates MWC’s comments regarding the process, although it had already identified and reacted to some of the issues that MWC now raises. The Mine briefly will address each of MWC’s “concerns regarding due process”, regarding the Mine’s non-judicial, non-legal operational grievance process, in what follows:

* “Grievants receive documents prepared by the mine for the Grievance Committee hearing very late, if at all”: As MWC acknowledges, the Grievance Office has committed to providing all documents on which the Mine intends to rely to grievants at least a week before a dialogue and engagement meeting or a hearing of the Committee. The Committee likewise will receive grievants’ and the Mine’s documents at least a week before a hearing.
* “Grievants do not know what is in the mine’s documents that describe their case”: The Mine will consider whether there are ways to express the results of an investigation in simpler language, keeping in mind that sometimes complex facts and issues are involved.
* “Grievants did not understand the documents read out to them”: The Mine will seek to ensure that grievance officers (all of whom currently are Kuria) will assist grievants with understanding Swahili documents when they need such assistance.
* “Grievants are not aware of their right to legal counsel and have no vouchers”: The Mine’s offer to fund legal counsel of the grievant’s own choosing is addressed above.
* “Grievants are not told to bring documents or witnesses to the Grievance Committee hearings”: As noted above, the Committee will receive the documents on which grievants and the Mine intend to rely at least a week in advance of a hearing, thereby ensuring that all documents are considered in advance of and during the hearing by the Committee. The Mine will increase its efforts to seek to ensure that Grievants understand that they should bring documents and witnesses that they wish to rely on to hearings.
* “Grievants only go before the Grievance Committee once”: Some recent cases have focused exclusively on the amount of remedy assessed during a previous proceeding, thereby obviating the need for a two-stage process. As MWC points out, the independent Committee mistakenly evaluated impacts and remedies together during several hearings in August 2017. This has not been repeated. Incidentally, the outcome of this misstep happened to be the determination of remedies, both monetary and in-kind, that were far greater than would likely have been the case if the Committee had adjourned and then separately considered rights-compatible remedies consistent with international human rights standards.
* “Grievants do not know who they have met with from the mine’s team throughout the process and in the Grievance Committee hearing”: The Mine has ordered business cards for all members of the Grievance Team and CIRIT and will distribute an agenda before all Committee Hearings which will include the names of the Committee members.
* “Grievants are not receiving Final Chairman’s Reports on their cases”: As MWC notes, the Grievance Team has experienced delays in receiving translations of a batch of Committee reports that were drafted in English. These reports will be distributed in Swahili soon. The current chairman has been drafting reports in Swahili and English, so such delays pending translations should not occur in the future.

1. **Remedy**

It would be disappointing if some grievants expressed genuine, unsolicited dissatisfaction with the CGP process and the remedies received. That would not accord with the Mine’s experience, particularly with respect to remedies identified jointly and agreed with grievants through the dialogue and engagement process.

The Mine expects that, if some grievants genuinely are dissatisfied with the process and the remedies they received, as MWC suggests, their dissatisfaction will have been caused at least in part by an insufficient understanding of the nature of human rights remedies. Grievants often ask for measures that would alleviate pre-existing economic conditions – the construction of houses or the purchase of cars that they did not have before, or guaranteed education for children that are not theirs and that they did not support before, for example. Human rights compatible remedies are intended to restore, as far as possible, the situation that existed before the alleged impact on human rights occurred. They are not intended to address pre-existing conditions.

Providing remedies which addressed underlying economic conditions would create perverse incentives towards mine intrusion, violent confrontations and human rights impacts; would undermine all of the Mine’s efforts to improve mine security to minimise security incidents; undermine the efforts of the local police force to improve community respect for law and order; and undermine the Mine’s other ongoing community engagement processes including its Sustainable Communities programmes that are targeted to alleviate and improve the prosperity of its local communities. The draft Remedies Guide and the presentation used in community consultations and capacity building sessions explain this.

Nevertheless, the Grievance Office will consider, as a matter of priority, additional ways to seek feedback directly from grievants about the remedy process and its outcomes, and to educate the Mine’s communities and CGP users more effectively about what are and what are not human rights compatible remedies.

The Mine would have expected MWC to seek to provide insightful and well-informed commentary on human rights compatible remedies, rather than making sweeping and unspecified allegations about a lack of “equity in regard to determinations of remedy” by the CGP. The Mine takes issue with MWC’s simplistic and unhelpful assumption that, because the grievants MWC spoke to allegedly would have liked more compensation, the process and the remedies provided were somehow “inequitable”. MWC makes no effort to engage with or analyse the content of the draft Remedies Guide, or with any of the widely-accepted standards and reference points which the Guide has drawn on. MWC’s brief criticism of the amounts of compensation determined assumes the conclusion that it seeks to reach without any attempt at a serious inquiry into the design or implementation of the Mine’s CGP with respect to remedies.

The remediation of adverse human rights impacts - particularly the right not to be subjected to the use of excessive force by State police even when engaging in criminal and potentially violent activity - is far more complicated than MWC portrays it to be. The Mine would have hoped that before deciding on and publishing such serious criticisms, MWC would have at least attempted to apply a human rights remedies framework in analysing each of the remedy packages that it considered might be deficient. After such an analysis, reasonable people might then still disagree on whether remedies determined by the Independent Committee were proportionate or appropriate in a particular case, but where MWC has not appeared to attempt to apply such a framework, it is not possible to assess the validity of MWC’s assumptions that grievants’ dissatisfaction means that remedies were inadequate.

The Mine refers MWC to the Remedies Guide and suggests that MWC may wish to reconsider its critiques of the CGP remediation process in light of the human rights framework set out in the Guide and the international standards it incorporates by reference. In the meantime, it briefly will address each of MWC’s specific “concerns regarding equity in regard to determinations of remedy” in what follows:

* “Previous payments for ‘sponsored work’ deducted from the remedy value”: As noted above and set out in detail in the Remedies Guide, human rights compatible remedies are intended to restore, as far as possible, the situation that existed before the alleged impact on human rights occurred. However, the grievance process often has confronted the situation where a grievant was unemployed, has no evidence of a prior wage or other income, and apparently relied on illegal intrusion and theft of gold-bearing material as their only form of livelihood prior to a human rights impact. The Remedies Guide seeks to address such situations by recommending that loss of earning compensation should be calculated using a proxy wage based on a national minimum wage for a farmer in the region. If a grievant can show that they engaged in legitimate small scale mining prior to their arrest, the updated CGP will use a proxy wage based on the national minimum wage for licensed small scale minors.

In the past, some years before the CGP was updated, part of the compensation for future expected loss of earnings for grievants who had been unemployed before their arrest was provided in kind as sponsored employment or was earmarked for use as start-up capital for a business. These techniques, which were intended to foster sustainable livelihoods and viable alternatives to mine intrusion for the grievants concerned, were met with unreasoned and relentless criticism by MWC and were difficult to implement in practice. As a result, they are no longer deployed by the CGP.

MWC now claims that, where a grievant who received compensation for lost-earnings in the form of sponsored employment returns to the updated CGP to have their remedy packages reviewed under the updated methodology set out in the Remedies Guide (which they have been invited to do), they should receive the compensation they have already received in the form of sponsored employment a second time. While the Mine disagrees with that argument and analysis (and with the proposition that any grievant should ever receive compensation twice over), it is considering whether other arguments, based on the analytical framework set out in the Remedies Guide and taking into account how the original remedy packages were constructed, would support providing additional compensation or, perhaps more appropriately, rehabilitation services to such grievants. The Mine invites the grievants that MWC mentions anonymously to visit or write to the Grievance Office with a view to enabling the CGP to make this enquiry.

* “Humanitarian aid deducted from the remedy value”: The Mine agrees that past payments for humanitarian relief (i.e., medical care) should not be deducted from compensation for monetary harm (i.e. lost income due to injury or other consequences of the human rights impact) or non-monetary harm (i.e., “pain and suffering”). However, it may be that past payments for humanitarian relief were deducted from or offset against an amount intended to reimburse the grievant for medical expenses, to avoid reimbursing the grievant for the same out of pocket medical expenses twice. This is in accordance with the Remedies Guide and the updated CGP, and is an entirely reasonable practice, to avoid double-compensation. The Mine invites the grievants that MWC mentions anonymously to visit or write to the Grievance Office with a view to enabling the CGP to look into the matter.
* “Dissatisfaction with the remedy offered”: The Mine refers to its suggestion above that MWC consider its critiques of the CGP remediation process in the context of an analysis of the human rights framework set out in the Remedies Guide and the international standards it draws on or incorporates by reference. The Mine cannot attempt to comment on or respond to a series of negative comments by MWC about dissatisfaction apparently felt by anonymous grievants regarding the remedies they may have received, without any reference to or context in any analytical framework. In the meantime, the Mine does not accept that dissatisfaction alone represents inequity.
* “Questionable impact and remedy assessments”: The Mine will seek to identify the case raised by MWC and look into it. In all cases, the determination of degree of disability (where this is claimed) is made in accordance with the Tanzanian Worker’s Compensation Act and assessed by an independent physician.

\*\*\*

A key challenge facing the Mine in the design and implementation of all of its corporate social responsibility activities, including its Sustainable Communities investments and programmes around the Mine, other community engagements and the CGP itself, is managing expectations. A private, voluntary, operational grievance process which is non-legal and does not determine any legal rights is not, and is not intended to be, a substitute for a State-based judicial or legal process. Yet MWC, and possibly the grievants MWC has interviewed, seem to expect the CGP to do just that.

The Mine will welcome the day when there are no grievances brought to the Mine complaining of security-related impacts because illegal intrusions onto the Mine are a thing of the past and/or members of the Mine’s communities make use of other State-based remedy processes outside the CGP. Until then, the Mine intends to continue to maintain a CGP which makes specific provision for security-related impacts, and will continue to run capacity-building sessions with its communities to raise awareness about human rights, why, whether and how human rights may be adversely affected by excessive force and what a rights-compatible remedy may look like. The Mine also will continue to work with the police and with its local communities to support efforts to enhance respect for law and order, for human rights, and for accountability.

1. MWC acknowledges that it elides together “public (police) and private mine security” in its latest report. However, only one of the security-related grievances that the CGP has received this year has related to private mine security, with the balance relating to law and order activities by the Tanzanian police. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The Mine refutes MWC’s repeated claim that the Mine ever knowingly approached individuals who were represented by counsel in London. Any such individuals who later went through the grievance process came to the process independently. MWC also fails to explain its new claim that there is something nefarious about a member of the North Mara Grievance Team reaching out to individuals who have been through the North Mara process before to offer them an opportunity to do so again. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The Mine also has invested heavily, and continues to modify its operations, in efforts to minimise the risk and opportunity for security incidents. The Mine also strongly encourages the local police operating in the area to maintain law and order in a manner that respects rather than risks infringing human rights (see [Acacia 2017 Annual Report](http://www.acaciamining.com/~/media/Files/A/Acacia/reports/2018/2017-acacia-annual-report-accounts.pdf), pp 59-61). It is hoped that, while it will be ready to do so, the CGP will only rarely need to address police related grievances in the future, once all pending grievances from historical security incidents and past interactions between the Police and illegal trespassers on the Mine are addressed. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)