

# Engaging stakeholders in post mining transitions

Jo-Anne Everingham<sup>1</sup>, John Rolfe<sup>2</sup>, Susan Kinnear<sup>2</sup>, Delwar Akbar<sup>2</sup>, & Alex Lechner<sup>3</sup> <sup>1</sup>SMI, the University of Qld, <sup>2</sup>Central Queensland University, <sup>3</sup>University of Nottingham, Malaysia





## **Overview**

- Project aim and methodology
- Models of stakeholder panels
- Steps, decisions and variables for workshop-based stakeholder panels
- Findings
  - Agreement on post-mining land use
  - Agreement on engagement
    processes





## Project aim and methodology

Action research modelling a stakeholder process for agreeing post mining land use by graziers

Core was 4 workshops with 39 stakeholders

- 1. Identify relevant issues general and regional
- 2. Undertake individual planning of a hypothetical site
- 3. Give technical info and group planning for the site
- 4. (a) Confirm final plan met stakeholder approval and (b) find preferred options for stakeholder input – who, when and how?

Hypothetical site (imagery+ map) for concrete focus





## Five Models for mining affected communities to have a say

- Community reference group (e.g. Rolleston CRG)
- Special interest group (e.g. water/ void) (e.g. Ensham Residual Void project and Glencore groundwater and environment group)
- Regional consultative committee (e.g.Gladstone Region LNG CCC)
- Expert advisory panel (e.g. FPRH's Expert Scientific Panel)
- Technical taskforce (e.g Fitzroy River Water Quality Technical Working Group)







https://www.shell.com.au/about-us/

Santos

GING



https://riverhealth.org.au/report\_card/ehi/

https://www.idemitsu.com.au/projects/ensham-rv-community-reference-group/



http://www.glencore.com.au/en/publications/fact-sheets/FactsheetsGCAA/GCAA\_Fact%20Sheet%20-%20Final%20Void\_WEB.PDF



### Steps, decisions and variables for workshop-based stakeholder panel

**Who**? (e.g. civil society, councils, government, 'experts', landholders)

**Why**? (i.e. purpose, scope and focus of a panel's deliberations)

**How**? (i.e. resourcing, structuring and operation of panel + IAP2)

When? (i.e. timing of stakeholder involvement)

**What**? (i.e. What sequence for the panel to follow in working through options

...to engage with mining affected communities.





## Key findings

- Shared views with regard to post-mining land uses
  - Grazing the most suitable use in CQ
  - Post-mining land can have a patchwork of ecological, social and economic functions
  - Native vegetation adds value as *part* of a grazing property
- Shared views with regard to effective engagement processes start early and adopt...
  - Collaboration and empowerment of cross-section of mainly local stakeholders
  - Use of spatial and visual representations or other authentic focus
  - Deliberative dialogue in group situations for varied perspectives and pooled experiences/ knowledge





## Conclusion

#### There are benefits to engaging stakeholders:

• E.g. including diverse knowledge and values; transparency; flexibility; facilitating mutual understanding, convergence and compromise

# There are effective models to engage stakeholders appropriate to:

- The risk or issue characteristics
- The people with a stake (interest, influence, networks, experience)
- The purpose and scope of the panel

#### Recommended steps and variables

Progress through determining: Who? Why? How?
 When? What ? to involve

Thank you



Dr Jo-Anne Everingham | Senior Research Fellow SMI: Centre for Social Responsibility in Mining j.everingham@uq.edu.au