

NZ Taxonomy Minimum Social Safeguards framework



The Minimum Social Safeguards (MSS) framework ensures that an entity seeking to demonstrate that its activities are NZ Taxonomy aligned meets minimum corporate governance standards and adheres to a defined set of social standards.

Compliance with MSS is determined through an assessment of performance criteria against the NZ Taxonomy's three MSS pillars. MSS criteria are principles-based and, in contrast to the NZ Taxonomy's TSC and DNSH criteria, defined at an entity level due to the significant usability challenges associated with activity-level disclosure.

Like the Do No Significant Harm (DNSH) criteria, the MSS criteria function as a safeguard – they are not designed to deliver net-positive social outcomes but rather, to prevent harm. The NZ Taxonomy's MSS criteria in general represent compliance with relevant New Zealand laws and regulations, with additional requirements to reflect international soft law standards and guidance widely accepted by global capital markets.

The MSS criteria help to ensure that activities cannot be considered Taxonomy aligned if the performing entity creates negative social impacts. This ensures the NZ Taxonomy promotes truly sustainable activities that respect both environmental and social standards.

See the [DNSH/MSS approach paper](#) for more information about the approach and design of these criteria.

The NZ Taxonomy is made up of three sets of criteria, which together are the 'Technical Screening Criteria' (TSC):

1. **Substantial Contribution (SC) criteria:** The activity demonstrates that it makes a substantial contribution to the particular environmental objective (i.e., climate change mitigation or adaptation and resilience).
2. **Do No Significant Harm (DNSH) criteria:** The activity making this substantial contribution does not cause significant negative impacts on other environmental objectives.
3. **Minimum Social Safeguards (MSS):** Entities must meet minimum standards for social responsibility, including labour rights, governance rights and Indigenous rights.

This first version of the NZ Taxonomy has been developed for voluntary use by a range of users, including lenders, issuers, investors, asset owners and managers, New Zealand businesses and public entities.

This first version of the NZ Taxonomy can be utilised in any of the following three ways:

- Demonstrating alignment with the SC criteria for climate change mitigation or climate change adaptation and resilience and alignment with **all** applicable DNSH and MSS criteria.
- Demonstrating alignment with the SC criteria for climate change mitigation or climate change adaptation and resilience and **partial** alignment with the applicable DNSH and/or MSS criteria.
- Demonstrating alignment with the SC criteria for climate change mitigation or climate change adaptation and resilience **only**.

Users making claims of alignment with the NZ Taxonomy Version 1 **are responsible for disclosing the parts of the NZ Taxonomy to which they are aligning** (and those to which they are not), and ensuring that the impression conveyed by those claims is not misleading or deceptive.

All users are encouraged to give consideration to relevant aspects of the DNSH and MSS frameworks.

In future versions of the NZ Taxonomy, it is intended that the DNSH and MSS frameworks will become a requirement for claims of NZ Taxonomy alignment; i.e., there will be no partial alignment options, only alignment or no alignment. Consideration for proportional application of the DNSH and MSS criteria will be given at this time.

Under Version 1, any entity found in breach of any law or regulation within scope of the DNSH or MSS frameworks, at the time of their alignment claims or in the previous five years, will be excluded from alignment with the NZ Taxonomy. The NZ Taxonomy and its users are not responsible for verifying an entity's compliance with New Zealand laws and regulations.



Minimum Social Safeguards pillars and core topics

Social pillars	Core topics
Corporate governance	Good corporate governance; taxation; anti-corruption and bribery; fair competition; consumer protection; community engagement; anti-money laundering.
Human rights	Employment; labour and working conditions; occupational health and safety; modern slavery; procurement practices; gender equality; non-discrimination; equal opportunity.
Iwi/Māori rights and cultural heritage	Iwi/Māori rights; cultural heritage; data sovereignty.



Minimum Social Safeguards criteria

The NZ Taxonomy and its users are not responsible for verifying an entity's compliance with New Zealand laws and regulations. If an entity is found in breach of laws or regulations within the previous 5 years, its NZ Taxonomy alignment for existing or proposed activities will be void.

Requirements regarding corporate governance

1. The entity demonstrates a commitment to implementing high-quality corporate governance, including for environmental and social matters.
2. The board and/or management is qualified and adequately structured to oversee the entity's strategy, management and performance.
3. The entity's internal controls, systems and training are sufficient to support a culture of acting ethically and in compliance with relevant laws and regulations, including those related to anti-bribery and anti-corruption; fair competition and taxation; money laundering; and consumer protection.
4. The entity has policies and mechanisms in place to enable effective stakeholder engagement. This includes engagement with potentially affected people in relation to potential and actual impacts to iwi/Māori rights and cultural heritage, as discussed further below.
5. The entity discloses whether the entity, its board or its management (including the board or management of any subsidiaries) has been convicted of corruption or bribery, breach of competition law, tax evasion, money laundering or tax avoidance.

Requirements regarding human rights

1. The entity has a public policy in place that outlines the entity's commitment to respecting human rights in line with the expectations of the [United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights](#) (UNGPs).
2. The entity has a human rights due diligence process or processes to identify the actual and potential adverse human rights impacts of their operations and supply or value chains, and account for the way they work to prevent or mitigate these, as appropriate for the entity's size, circumstances and operating context.
3. The entity has processes in place to enable the remediation of adverse impacts on human rights, in line with the expectations of the UNGPs.

Requirements regarding iwi/Māori rights

1. The entity has processes in place to recognise the rights of iwi/Māori, in line with [Te Tiriti o Waitangi](#) (the Treaty of Waitangi).
2. The entity has processes in place for Free, Prior and Informed Consent, in line with the [United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples](#) (UNDRIP) principles and local guidance where available.
3. The entity has processes in place to uphold the rights of Māori to control data about their people, culture and resources.

Requirements regarding cultural heritage

1. The entity has processes in place to identify and manage historic and cultural heritage sites.

Minimum Social Safeguards guidance

Corporate governance

1. The entity demonstrates a commitment to implementing high-quality corporate governance, including for environmental and social matters.

Indicators	Guidance	Alignment with existing standards and frameworks
The entity develops and applies good corporate governance principles and effective self-regulatory practices and management systems that foster a relationship of confidence and mutual trust between the entity and the societies in which it operates.	The entity publicly commits to respecting the OECD Guidelines and/or United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs).	OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct , chapter 2, general policies 6, 7 UNGP 11, 12 UNGPRF A1 GRI 103-2

2. The entity's board and/or management is qualified and adequately structured to oversee the entity's strategy, management and performance.

Indicators	Guidance	Alignment with existing standards and frameworks
The entity has a board and/or management of effective composition and size, with clearly delineated roles and responsibilities to adequately implement its corporate governance policies.	<p>The entity has one or more documents setting out:</p> <p>A. The roles and responsibilities of its board and/or management, including in relation to the oversight of climate, environmental and/or social issues that materially affect the entity</p> <p>B. Those matters that are expressly reserved to the board and those that are delegated to management</p> <p>C. Its process for periodically evaluating the performance of its board and/or management</p> <p>For listed entities, this document is a board charter or similar.</p>	IFC corporate governance methodology and tools UNGP 19 UNGPRF A2, A2.1 GRI 102-19, 102-20 NZX Corporate Governance Code

3. The entity’s internal controls, systems and training are sufficient to ensure compliance with relevant laws and regulations, including those related to anti-bribery and anti-corruption; fair competition and taxation; money laundering; and consumer protection.

Indicators	Guidance	Alignment with existing standards and frameworks
<p>The entity has developed and adopted adequate policies and procedures for preventing, detecting and addressing bribery and other forms of corruption.</p>	<p>The entity has anti-bribery and anti-corruption policies and procedures in place that are tailored and proportionate to the entity’s size, operations and risk exposure, and overseen by the entity’s directors and/or management.</p> <p>The entity’s anti-bribery and anti-corruption policy can be a stand-alone policy or form part of its code of conduct. The policy acknowledges the serious criminal and civil penalties that may be incurred and the reputational damage that may be done if the entity is involved in bribery or corruption, and it prohibits any conduct that could amount to bribery or corruption. It also outlines appropriate controls regarding political donations and/or offering or accepting gifts; and it requires breaches of the policy to be reported to the appropriate person or body within the entity.</p> <p>The entity’s anti-bribery and anti-corruption procedures enable it to prevent, track, investigate and respond to allegations or incidents relating to bribery and corruption, and may include risk assessment and due diligence processes, whistleblowing mechanisms and investigative procedures, as well as regular communication and training.</p> <p>The entity’s anti-bribery and anti-corruption policy and procedures are periodically reviewed for effectiveness.</p>	<p>SASB topic: Business ethics & transparency (mining industry) EM-MM- 510a.1 (description of the management system for prevention of corruption and bribery throughout the value chain)</p> <p>European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) G2 28, 30</p> <p>NZX Corporate Governance Code</p> <p>Organised Crime and Anti- Corruption Legislation Bill 2014</p>
<p>The entity has robust systems in place to ensure compliance with both the letter and the spirit of the tax laws and regulations of the countries in which it operates.</p>	<p>The entity treats tax governance and tax compliance as important elements of its oversight and broader risk management systems.</p> <p>In particular, the board or senior management has tax risk management strategies and/or systems in place – including assurance processes where applicable – to ensure that the financial, regulatory and reputational risks associated with taxation are fully identified and evaluated.</p>	<p>OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct, chapters XI.1, XI.2</p> <p>GRI 207-2</p> <p>European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) 2 31 (a)</p>
<p>The entity incorporates sustainability considerations into its guidelines/criteria for sourcing goods and services, to account for significant risks associated with environmental and social externalities created by suppliers through their operational activities.</p>	<p>The entity has a process for screening, selecting, monitoring and engaging with suppliers on their environmental and social impacts that is proportional to the entity’s size, operations and risk exposure.</p>	<p>GRI 414</p> <p>SASB: Labour conditions in the supply chain; raw materials sourcing</p>

Indicators	Guidance	Alignment with existing standards and frameworks
The entity regularly implements communication and training programmes for employees and persons or entities linked by a business relationship, to raise awareness of, and support compliance with, anti-bribery, anti-corruption and fair competition laws and policies.	<p>The entity delivers communication and training on anti-corruption, anti-bribery and fair competition to its management and employees in a form and frequency that the entity deems necessary to build capacity.</p> <p>Training promotes employee awareness of the importance of compliance with all applicable laws and regulations, as well as covering the entity's commitments and expectations for employees and other business relationships.</p>	<p>NZX Corporate Governance Code</p> <p>OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct, X.4</p> <p>GRI 205</p> <p>European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) G3 40, 42</p> <p>Organised Crime and Anti- Corruption Legislation Bill 2014</p>
The entity protects consumer privacy by ensuring it collects and uses consumer data in a lawful manner and takes all reasonable measures to safeguard the personal data it collects, stores, processes and disseminates.	<p>Where an entity collects or uses consumer data, the entity has a system for identifying and addressing data security risks, including regular risk assessments of its data security systems, and takes necessary actions to mitigate any identified risks. The entity also discloses any incidents of violation of customer protections that have been reported or confirmed, as well as the remedial action(s) taken.</p>	<p>OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct, chapter VIII.6</p> <p>SASB topic: Data security</p> <p>GRI 418</p>

4. The entity has policies and mechanisms in place to enable effective stakeholder engagement.

Indicators	Guidance	Alignment with existing standards and frameworks
The entity's board and/or management recognises that the entity is dependent on its social licence to operate and therefore relies on a range of stakeholders (including communities, consumers, suppliers, employees, governments, investors, regulators and suppliers) to operate and succeed.	<p>The entity has clearly identified its key stakeholders and has strategies or processes in place to engage with them and report any material issues to the board and/or management.</p>	<p>NZX Corporate Governance Code</p>
The entity's board or management ensures the entity provides stakeholders with access to an operational grievance mechanism(s), or to mechanisms that allow stakeholders to raise and seek resolution or remedy for grievances that may occur in relation to the entity's operations or actions.	<p>The entity has an operational grievance mechanism(s) for stakeholders in place to address complaints and seek appropriate resolutions.</p> <p>The grievance mechanism(s) is legitimate, accessible, predictable, equitable, transparent, rights-compatible and a source of continuous learning in line with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs). The mechanism addresses a range of grievances, including human rights issues and whistleblowing, while ensuring access to other judicial or non-judicial mechanisms is not impeded.</p> <p>Refer to the Human Rights and iwi/Māori criteria and indicators for further guidance on grievance mechanisms concerning human rights issues and iwi/Māori peoples.</p>	<p>UNGP guiding principle 31</p> <p>OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct, chapter VIII</p> <p>OECD/LEGAL/-356</p>

5. The entity discloses whether the entity, its board or its management (including the board or management of any subsidiaries) has been convicted of corruption or bribery, breach of competition law, tax evasion, money laundering or tax avoidance.

Indicators	Guidance	Alignment with existing standards and frameworks
<p>The entity discloses, without prejudice to national laws and requirements, any misconduct related to bribery and other forms of corruption, as well as measures adopted to address cases of suspected bribery and other forms of corruption.</p>	<p>The entity discloses any confirmed incidents of bribery or corruption during the relevant reporting period, including sanctions or legal cases brought against the entity, its directors or employees, as well as the remedial steps taken by the entity, including any disciplinary action taken against offending directors or employees.</p> <p>The entity discloses all activities that it undertakes in countries that rank among the 20 lowest on the Transparency International Corruption Perception Index.</p>	<p>OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct</p> <p>GRI 205</p> <p>European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) G2 41, 43</p>
<p>The entity discloses any instances in which it has been found guilty of tax evasion or tax avoidance through aggressive tax planning.</p>	<p>The entity discloses any instances in which it has been found guilty of tax evasion or tax avoidance through aggressive tax planning. The entity discloses any instances where the entity, its directors or its management are convicted of violating the tax laws of the countries in which they operate, as well as the remedial actions taken, including any disciplinary action taken against offending directors or employees in the last 5 years. The entity provides a description of the mechanisms it has in place for people to raise concerns about the entity's business conduct and integrity in relation to taxation.</p>	<p>OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conducts</p> <p>GRI 207-2</p> <p>European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) 2 7</p>
<p>The entity discloses, without prejudice to national laws and requirements, any misconduct related to breaches of anti-trust and fair competition laws and policies, as well as the measures adopted to address such cases.</p>	<p>The entity discloses any confirmed violations of competition laws where the entity or its subsidiaries were named as a participant by a legal authority during the relevant reporting period. The disclosure includes information on legal proceedings and remedial actions implemented to prevent future breaches of anti-trust and fair competition laws and policies, including any disciplinary action taken against offending directors or employees.</p>	<p>OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct</p> <p>GRI 206</p> <p>SASB topic: Pricing integrity & transparency</p> <p>European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) G2 45, G3 47</p>

Human rights

1. The entity has a public policy in place that outlines the entity’s commitment to respecting human rights, in line with the expectations of the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs).

Indicators	Guidance	Alignment with existing standards and frameworks
<p>The entity publicly commits to respecting all internationally recognised human rights, in line with the expectations outlined in the UNGPs.</p>	<p>The entity publicly commits to respecting all internationally recognised human rights, based on the UN Declaration on Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Labour Organization (ILO) Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work.</p> <p>The entity also commits to aligning with the UNGPs. This commitment can be made in a stand-alone Human Rights Policy or integrated into other policy documents.</p>	<p>UNGP 11, 12, 16</p> <p>OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct, chapter IV, commentary para 49</p> <p>GRI 2 2021, disclosure 2-23</p> <p>UNGC CoP G2</p> <p>Corporate Human Rights Benchmark A1.1</p>
<p>The policy commitment is signed off at the most senior level of the entity.</p>	<p>The entity’s highest governance body (e.g., board) or most senior executive (i.e., CEO) signs off on the policy commitment.</p>	<p>UNGP 16</p> <p>OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct, chapter IV, commentary para 49</p> <p>GRI 2 2021, disclosure 2-23</p> <p>UNGC CoP G2</p> <p>Corporate Human Rights Benchmark A2.1</p>
<p>The policy commitment sets out the entity’s expectations of its workers, officers, directors and business relationships in the area of respecting human rights.</p>	<p>The entity’s policy commitment clearly outlines the expectations of its workers, officers, directors and business relationships (including its suppliers, joint venture partners, franchisees and customers) in the area of respecting human rights.</p>	<p>UNGP 16</p> <p>OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct, chapter IV, commentary para 49</p> <p>GRI 2 2021, disclosure 2-23</p> <p>UNGC CoP HR2.1</p>

2. The entity has a human rights due diligence process to identify the actual and potential adverse human rights impacts of their operations and supply or value chains, and account for the way they work to prevent or mitigate these, as appropriate for the entity’s size, circumstances and operating context.

Indicators	Guidance	Alignment with existing standards and frameworks
<p>The entity identifies and assesses its actual and potential adverse impacts on human rights across its operations and value chain.</p>	<p>The entity proactively identifies and assesses its actual and potential adverse impacts on human rights across its operations and supply or value chain, on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>When identifying and assessing its actual and potential adverse impacts on human rights, entities should consider all internationally recognised human rights.</p> <p>While not ignoring other human rights issues when conducting this due diligence, entities should consider actual and potential adverse impacts related to employment, labour and working conditions, occupational health and safety, modern slavery, gender equality, non-discrimination, diversity and equal opportunity, and the rights of iwi/Māori peoples.</p> <p>Having identified the actual and potential adverse impacts on human rights, including considering any actual and potential adverse impacts related to the core social pillars (outlined at the start of this section), the entity prioritises the most salient related issues for action; i.e., the human rights at risk of the most severe negative impact through the entity’s operations and supply or value chain. Saliency is determined by considering the severity – encompassing the concepts of scale, scope and irremediability – and likelihood of an adverse impact on human rights.</p> <p>The process for identifying and assessing actual and potential adverse impacts on human rights should take into consideration factors such as sectoral risks, geographical risks, risks related to at-risk, marginalised or vulnerable populations, and the entity’s business model. It should also be informed by a range of sources including internal and external expertise, as well as meaningful consultation with potential affected stakeholders (see the indicator on stakeholder engagement for further guidance). This process considers both risk of harm to people and risks to the business – though these will often overlap. However, saliency assessments should be based only on risk to people.</p>	<p>UNGP 17, 18, 24</p> <p>OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct, chapter IV, commentary para 50</p> <p>GRI 3 2021, disclosure 3-3</p> <p>UNGC CoP G6, G7</p> <p>Corporate Human Rights Benchmark B2.1, B2.2</p>

3. The entity has processes in place to enable the remediation of adverse impacts on human rights, in line with the expectations of the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs).

Indicators	Guidance	Alignment with existing standards and frameworks
<p>The entity has a grievance mechanism(s) in place that can receive human rights-related complaints and it makes efforts to cooperate with other legitimate grievance mechanisms and processes.</p>	<p>The entity has one or more mechanism(s) through which workers, communities, consumers and other stakeholders whose human rights may be adversely impacted by the entity (including by the entities' suppliers or other business partners, as appropriate and in line with the UNGPs), can raise complaints or concerns in relation to human rights issues. The mechanism(s) may be managed by the company or by third parties. To ensure their effectiveness, the entity's grievance mechanisms should be legitimate, accessible, predictable, equitable, transparent, rights-compatible, a source of continuous learning and based on engagement and dialogue (in line with the UNGPs).</p> <p>This includes establishing safeguards so complaints can be made without fear of retaliation or reprisal (e.g., confidentiality requirements, non-retaliation policy, the option to make a complaint anonymously). The mechanism should not prevent access to other judicial or non-judicial mechanisms, and the entity should make efforts to cooperate with any such legitimate grievance mechanisms or processes. Good practice also includes encouraging business partners to have their own grievance mechanism(s) in place to receive complaints related to human rights.</p> <p>The entity discloses the types of complaints made, including complaints that were not processed and why, as well as the outcomes and follow-up activities for completed cases.</p> <p>This information can be aggregated and anonymised to safeguard complainants.</p>	<p>UNGP 22, 29, 30, 31</p> <p>OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct chapter IV, commentary para 5</p> <p>GRI 3 2021, disclosure 3-3</p> <p>UNGC CoP G8, HR7</p> <p>Corporate Human Rights Benchmark C1, C2, C4</p>
<p>The entity provides for, or cooperates in, remediation where it has identified it has caused or contributed to an adverse impact on human rights.</p>	<p>Where it identifies it has caused or contributed to an adverse impact on human rights (in line with the UNGPs), the entity provides for, or cooperates in, effective remediation through legitimate processes. Remediation can be provided in a variety of forms (e.g., apology, restitution, rehabilitation, financial or non-financial compensation) and should be decided in consultation with the affected stakeholders. The entity also takes actions to prevent similar adverse impacts on human rights in the future.</p> <p>Where adverse impacts to which the entity has not caused or contributed have occurred, but which are directly linked to its operations, products or services by their business relationships, the entity should seek to use its leverage to prevent and mitigate those impacts, and it may choose to take a role in providing for, or cooperating in, remediation.</p>	<p>UNGP 13, 19, 22, 31</p> <p>OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct, chapter IV, commentary para 6</p> <p>GRI 3 2021, disclosure 3-3</p> <p>UNGC CoP HR7</p> <p>Corporate Human Rights Benchmark C7</p>

Iwi/Māori rights

1. The entity has processes in place to recognise the rights of iwi/Māori, in line with Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Treaty of Waitangi).

Indicators	Guidance	Alignment with existing standards and frameworks
Te Tiriti o Waitangi	The United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) can be used to provide detailed guidance and a framework for interpreting and developing processes that align with Te Tiriti o Waitangi.	The United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) Te Tiriti o Waitangi

2. The entity has processes in place for Free, Prior and Informed Consent, in line with the UNDRIP principles and local guidance where available.

Indicators	Guidance	Alignment with existing standards and frameworks
Engagement practices are carried out in line with the UNDRIP principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent.	Good-practice protocols for iwi/Māori engagement, including guidance on appropriately resourcing knowledge holders and iwi/Māori organisations to enable Free, Prior and Informed Consent. The entity may also explore opportunities for benefit-sharing with iwi/Māori communities, where relevant.	IFC Performance Standard 7 Self-determination principle of UNDRIP
The entity adheres to measures that monitor the impacts of its activity on iwi/Māori and maintains compliance standards to minimise risk.	The entity conducts regular assessments to identify and evaluate potential and actual impacts on iwi/Māori communities. Iwi/Māori communities are involved in the assessment process. Assessments lead to the development of mitigation plans to address any negative impacts. The entity undergoes regular independent audits to assess compliance with the criteria. There are clear mechanisms for reporting non-compliance or concerns. The entity promptly addresses any identified non-compliance issues.	IFC Performance Standard 7

3. The entity has processes in place to uphold the rights of Māori to control data about their people, culture and resources.

Indicators	Guidance	Alignment with existing standards and frameworks
Data sovereignty	The entity has processes in place to uphold iwi/Māori data sovereignty by ensuring that all data pertaining to Indigenous cultural values and sites (where applicable) are under the sole ownership of those that have provided it. The entity has processes to securely manage the data. The entity has processes in place to request access for any future uses of the data from the individual that provided it.	CARE principles for Indigenous data governance (as a best-practice guide)

Cultural heritage

1. The entity has processes in place to identify and manage historic and cultural heritage sites.

Indicators	Guidance	Alignment with existing standards and frameworks
<p>The entity consults and collaborates with iwi/Māori to identify Māori cultural heritage sites, artefacts and landscapes within its operations and avoids creating impacts on those cultural heritage sites.</p> <p>Measures are taken to preserve sites.</p>	<p>The entity has processes to work with local iwi/Māori and where available, iwi management plans, to identify any cultural heritage sites, artefacts and landscapes within its operations.</p> <p>Iwi/Māori communities are involved in the identification process to ensure cultural significance is accurately recognised. Traditional knowledge is used to inform the identification of cultural heritage sites.</p> <p>The entity seeks to prevent or minimise impacts on cultural heritage sites.</p> <p>Measures are implemented to preserve and conserve cultural heritage sites.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are monitored and evaluated to ensure their effectiveness.</p>	<p>IFC Performance Standard 1, and IFC Performance Standard 8</p> <p>IRMA Standard for Responsible Mining, chapter 3.7 – cultural heritage</p> <p>Regional iwi management plans (available through regional councils)</p> <p>Cultural impact assessment guidance</p> <p>He Tauira – External Reporting Board (XRB)</p> <p>Aotearoa New Zealand Stewardship Code: Guiding principles for responsible investment stewardship in Aotearoa New Zealand</p>
<p>Cultural heritage</p>	<p>The entity has processes in place to identify and manage historic and cultural heritage sites.</p> <p>The entity seeks to prevent or minimise impacts on cultural heritage sites.</p> <p>Measures are implemented to preserve and conserve cultural heritage sites.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are monitored and evaluated to ensure their effectiveness.</p>	<p>New Zealand Heritage list/Rārangi Kōrero</p>