

December 2016

Ranking Oil, Gas and Mining Companies on Indigenous Rights in the Arctic

HIGHLIGHTS

- The top-ranking Arctic company on indigenous rights is Teck Alaska Incorporated.
- Over 60% per cent of companies operating in the Arctic are poorly prepared to respect indigenous rights.
- Petroleum companies have significantly better scores than mining companies, although the best performer is a mining company.
- The ranking indicates that ratification of ILO Convention 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples does not guarantee that a country provides an adequate enabling environment for companies to respect indigenous rights.
- Between the start of work on the ranking in 2014 and its finalisation in 2016, the number of eligible companies dropped precipitously, mirroring a steep decline in Arctic resource extraction.

This ranking evaluates the public commitments, formalised procedures and institutional arrangements of oil, gas and mining companies for handling indigenous rights in the Arctic. The purpose of the ranking is to support norm formation and to contribute to improving the performance of companies on indigenous rights by highlighting which companies have made a public commitment to indigenous rights, and to what extent.

The ranking covers 92 oil, gas and mining companies involved in onshore resource extraction above the Arctic Circle. Each company is assessed according to 20 criteria related to indigenous rights. The criteria were selected by evaluating the main guidelines and legal instruments related to resource extraction and indigenous rights in the Arctic. These criteria include commitments to international standards, the presence of organisational units dedicated to handling indigenous rights, competent staffing, track records on indigenous issues, transparency, and procedures for consulting with indigenous peoples.

The actual performance of companies on indigenous rights is not assessed – only their public commitments, formalised procedures and organisational setup. Companies operating in the Canadian and US Arctic do better overall in the ranking than their counterparts operating in the Asian and European Arctic. This is the first time this ranking has been carried out, and it is therefore experimental. Comments and feedback are welcome, to indra.overland@nupi.no

TABLE 1. Ranking Arctic extractive companies on indigenous rights

| Rank | Company | | Average | Rank | Company | | Average |
|----------------|------------------------------|----|-----------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----|-----------|
| 1 | Teck Alaska Incorp. | US | 3.75 | 17 | Arctic Marine Engineering-Geol. Exp. | RU | 1.26–1.50 |
| 2 | Total E&P | NO | 3.70 | | Aurion Resources | FI | |
| 3 | MMG Resources | CA | 3.60 | | Auryn Resources | CA | |
| 4 | Arctic Slope Regional Corp. | US | 3.55 | | Avalon Minerals | SE | |
| 5 | Statoil | NO | 3.40 | | CGRG | DK | |
| 6 | Doyon | US | 3.30 | | Dalmorneftegeophysica | RU | |
| 7 | Baffinland | CA | 3.00 | | ERIELL | RU | |
| 8 | Kinross Gold | RU | 3.00 | | Geo Mining | NO | |
| 9 | Polymetal Int. | RU | 3.00 | | Hudson Resources | DK | |
| 10 | Imperial Oil | CA | 2.95 | | Kandalashka Al. Smelter (RUSAL) | RU | |
| 11 | ENI | US | 2.76–2.94 | | Kovdorsky GOK | RU | |
| | Exxon Mobil Alaska | US | | | Magnus Minerals | FI | |
| | Gazprom | RU | | | Malmbjerget Molybdenum | DK | |
| 12 | Agnico Eagle Mines | FI | 2.51–2.75 | | Norge Mineral Resources | NO | |
| | ALROSA | RU | | | Norilsk Nickel | RU | |
| | Bashneft | RU | | | Nortec Minerals | FI | |
| | ConocoPhillips Alaska | US | | | Northern Cross | CA | |
| | Repsol | US | | Northern Iron | NO | | |
| 13 | Alyeska Pipeline Service Co. | US | 2.26–2.50 | Northern Shield Resources | DK | | |
| | Boliden | SE | | Novourengoyskaya Burovaya Komp. | RU | | |
| | First Quantum Minerals | FI | | Nussir | NO | | |
| | Gold Fields Netherlands | FI | | PhosAgro | RU | | |
| | Hilcorp Alaska | US | | Platina Resources | DK | | |
| | Novatek | RU | | Skaland Graphite | NO | | |
| | Rosneft | RU | | SK Rusvietpetro | RU | | |
| | Severneft-Urengoy | RU | | The QUARTZ | NO | | |
| 14 | Anadarko Petroleum | US | 2.01–2.25 | YaregaRuda | RU | | |
| | Anglo-Am., Sakatti Mining | FI | | 18 | Arktikmorneftegazrazvedka | RU | 1.00–1.25 |
| | Dragon Mining | FI | | | Beowulf Mining | SE | |
| | Eurasian Minerals | SE | | | Brooks Range Petroleum | US | |
| | LKAB | SE | | | Caelus Energy | US | |
| | Lukoil | RU | | | Commander Resources | CA | |
| | NANA Regional Corp. | US | | | Komnedra | RU | |
| | RN-Shelf-Arktica | RU | | | Lovozero GOK | RU | |
| 15 | Achimgaz | RU | 1.76–2.00 | | North-Western Phosphorus Co. | RU | |
| | Almazy Anabara | RU | | | Norwegian Rose | NO | |
| | BP | US | | | Shahta Intaugol | RU | |
| | Petoro | NO | | | Taranis Resources | FI | |
| 16 | Arctic Gold | NO | 1.51–1.75 | | Tertiary Minerals | FI | |
| | Elkem | NO | | | Usibelli Coal Mine | US | |
| | GDF SUEZ E&P | NO | | | Yamalzoloto | RU | |
| | Ironbank Zinc | DK | | | | | |
| | Nenetskaya Neftyanaya Komp. | RU | | | | | |
| | Nordic Mining | NO | | | | | |
| | Northern Radiance | RU | | | | | |
| | Northgas | RU | | | | | |
| | Nuna Minerals | DK | | | | | |
| | Omya Hustadmarmor | NO | | | | | |
| | Severstal | RU | | | | | |
| Sibelco Nordic | NO | | | | | | |
| Vorkutaugol | RU | | | | | | |

The ranking

The evaluation of ethical guidelines and standards requires an assessment of how far, and in what way, companies have committed to these instruments. This ranking therefore assesses the public commitment, formalised procedures and institutional arrangements for handling indigenous rights of companies involved in onshore oil, gas or mining in the Arctic, in terms of some of the most important industry guidelines and standards. The ranking covers 92 companies. The companies are assessed on 20 criteria, for each of which a company can score from 1 (worst) to 4 (best). (For an overview of the criteria, see below).

Afterwards, an average score is calculated for each company, which can likewise range from 1 to 4.

To limit the list to a manageable size and to ensure clear rules, only those companies operating north of the Arctic Circle were considered for inclusion. Only the top 10 companies are ranked individually, while the rest of the companies are grouped at different levels according to which part of the scale their average score is on (the lowest group comprises those companies with average scores from 1 to 1.25, the second lowest from 1.26 to 1.50 etc.).

Company No 1 in the ranking is Teck Alaska Incorporated. Teck already has an impressive merit list (Teck 2016). It has been classified as one of the one of the Best 50 Corporate Citizens and one of the Global 100 Most Sustainable Corporations for the fourth consecutive year by Corporate Knights, with the top rank in the Metals and Mining category and the second-best of all Canadian companies. It is also assessed by Sustainalytics as being among the top 50 Socially Responsible Corporations and included in the Dow Jones Sustainability World Index (DJSWI) for the past six years, where it is among the top 10% of the world's 2,500 largest public traded companies. This track record did not influence the assessment of Teck for this ranking. However, for a new and experimental ranking such as this one, Teck's track record could be interpreted as showing that the ranking makes sense.

The companies that follow Teck at the top of the ranking are, in rank order: Total E&P, MMG Resources, Arctic Slope Regional Corp., Statoil, Doyon, Baffinland, Kinross Gold, Polymetal International and Imperial Oil. Although none of the top ten companies in the ranking achieve the highest possible score, these do very well and are arguably the least risky companies to carry out resource extraction in Arctic areas with indigenous peoples.

The top-ranked companies operating in each of the various countries are as follows:

TABLE 2. Top company by country of operation

| | |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| Canada | MMG Resources |
| Denmark/Greenland | Nuna Minerals |
| Finland | Agnico Eagle Mines |
| Norway | Total E&P Norge |
| Russia | Kinross Gold |
| Sweden | Boliden |
| USA/Alaska | Teck Alaska Incorp |

It is worth noting that companies have been classified according to the Arctic country in which they operate, not their country of origin. It is also important to emphasise that the ranking does not assess the actual behaviour or track record of the companies, but rather how well equipped they are to take into account indigenous rights in terms of their formal institutional, staffing and communications set-up.

There are several reasons for this approach. The first two relate to practical issues in producing the ranking, whereas the third, fourth and fifth reasons relate to the potential use of the ranking.

1. It is difficult to find factual indicators for actual performance that can be measured across a number of companies in this way, and the element of subjectivity is likely to be considerable in assessing it and it is therefore difficult to compare between cases.
2. Assessing the actual performance of so many companies in so many remote locations across seven countries would be prohibitively expensive.
3. Although an assessment at the formal and discursive level is more superficial than an assessment of actual performance, this ranking goes beyond superficial PR slogans to look comprehensively at the actual public commitments and institutional arrangements of the companies.

4. Formal and public recognition of indigenous rights is the first step towards upholding those rights. If companies are coaxed into committing to rights on paper, it does not guarantee that they will uphold the rights in practice, but it may make it easier to hold them accountable later on.
5. The more companies formally and publicly recognise indigenous rights, the greater the pressure on other companies to do so, and the better the basis for the creation of business norms. Nonetheless, it also means that there may be a considerable gap between the position of a company in this ranking and its actual handling of indigenous rights: the ranking in itself does not guarantee good behaviour of any company, no matter how high its rank.

Further analysis

The results of this ranking exercise indicate that the majority of companies involved in Arctic resource extraction are ill-prepared to respect indigenous rights. As many as 62% of companies are piled up at the lowest four levels of the ranking. This means that their average score is in the lowest third of the ranking scale. These companies fulfil almost none of the 20 criteria listed in Table 5 below; the only two criteria where many of them rise above the minimum score are: “Does the company have any unresolved conflicts with indigenous peoples in the Arctic?” (B3) and “Does the company have a formal procedure for submission of complaints that is accessible to indigenous peoples?” (C2). When companies get a good score on these two criteria, this simply means that no information was found about unresolved conflicts with indigenous peoples and that the companies have a complaints procedure that indigenous peoples could use (although it does not reflect actual usage). On the 18 other criteria, many of which are more demanding, these companies almost consistently get the lowest possible score. This does not put their approach to Arctic indigenous peoples in a positive light. However, on the bright side, it means that for many companies it would be relatively simple to improve their score.

The country where these lowly ranked companies are most over-represented is Denmark/Greenland. In fact, all of the companies operating in Greenland fall into this category. The country where they are second-most over-represented is Norway, where 88% of the companies fall into this category. There are quite a few companies operating in Russia among them too, but Russia is a large country and there are also many companies there that score higher. In Russia, only 31% of the companies score in the lower third of the range. It is not just foreign companies operating in Russia that make up the higher-ranked companies in that country either, as the only foreign company among the higher-ranked companies operating in Russia is Kinross Gold. Many of the others are well-known Russian brands, such as Alrosa, Gazprom, Lukoil, Novatek and Rosneft. Notably, there are also two companies operating in Russia among the Circumpolar top ten.

One might argue that the gap between formal commitments and actual implementation is greater in Russia than in other countries, and that a ranking such as this one is therefore too soft on companies operating in Russia. That may be, but it is difficult to argue that Danish, Norwegian or other companies that pay hardly any attention at all to indigenous rights should perform any better than their Russian counterparts, which at least pay lip service to indigenous rights. This also has implications for which approach is needed to encourage ethical practice among companies operating in Russia – not so much pressure for public commitments, as pressure for the practical implementation of the commitments they have already made.

If one looks at the average scores of all companies operating in each of the countries, a similar picture emerges (see Table 3). Again Denmark/Greenland comes off worst. However, here Norway does slightly better than Russia. This reflects the polarisation of companies operating in Norway: while some have low scores, the remainder are among the better companies in the ranking.

At the top of the ranking are the companies operating in the US and Canada, with average scores well above the rest. Clearly, companies operating in North America are better at committing to upholding indigenous rights than are companies in the other parts of the Arctic. It is not surprising then that the top rank goes to a Canadian company operating in Alaska. It is also noteworthy that two of the countries that have not ratified International Labour Organisation (ILO) Convention 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples have the highest average scores, whereas the only two Arctic countries that have ratified the convention, Denmark and Norway, come out bottom and third from the bottom. This indicates that ratifying ILO 169 alone is not sufficient to create an enabling environment for ethical company practice.

TABLE 3. Averages of companies operating in countries

| | |
|-------------------|------|
| USA/Alaska | 2.42 |
| Canada | 2.24 |
| Sweden | 1.89 |
| Finland | 1.84 |
| Norway | 1.78 |
| Russia | 1.77 |
| Denmark/Greenland | 1.47 |

As Table 4 shows, there is a striking contrast between companies in the petroleum and mining sectors, as the former have significantly better scores than the latter. The ranking does not show why this is the case, therefore at this stage one can only hypothesise. One possibility is that the oil and gas companies have a higher profile in the public domain than the mining companies, and that this leads to greater public scrutiny. This, in turn, forces oil and gas companies to take a more active stance on corporate responsibility issues. There are several potential reasons why companies in oil and gas might receive more attention: their role as the objects of financial speculation; their perceived geopolitical significance; the dramatic visual impact of oil spills, and the fact that consumers personally and regularly fill their cars with gasoline. Modern societies also use large amounts of mined minerals, but many of those minerals, such as aluminium, are built into more complex items that are bought on a one-off basis. In any case, the difference between companies in the petroleum and mining sectors should not be exaggerated; after all, the top-ranked company in this report is a mining company.

TABLE 4. Average score by sector

| | |
|-----------------------|------|
| Oil and gas companies | 2.14 |
| Mining companies | 1.74 |

Methodology

The ranking was created through the following work stages:

- Stage 1. A set of criteria by which to assess the companies was developed.
- Stage 2. The criteria were piloted in two data-gathering test runs and adjusted.
- Stage 3. A detailed definition of companies eligible for the ranking was formulated.
- Stage 4. This definition was used to compile a list of companies in each Arctic country.
- Stage 5. Data were gathered on all of the companies on all of the criteria.
- Stage 6. The data were processed and the final ranking calculated.

Parallel to these stages, the ranking project was presented to expert audiences on several occasions for comment and feedback:

- International workshop at Arran Lule Sami Centre, 18 February 2014.
- Meeting at Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 21 November 2014.
- International workshop with project partners, Hotel Scandic Victoria, Oslo, 2 February 2015.
- Workshop at Nord University in connection with the international conference “High North Dialogue”, 17-18 March 2015.
- Mining and Mineral Cluster Norway conference, Mo I Rana, 2 December 2015.
- International workshop at Scott Polar Research Institute, University of Cambridge, 6-7 January 2016.
- A policy brief on the definition and delimitation of companies engaged in natural resource extraction in the Arctic was circulated to colleagues in several countries, May-June 2016.
- International workshop in Hotel Scandic St. Olavs Plass, Oslo, 22-25 August 2016.

Ranking criteria

In order to create a ranking, it is necessary to have numerical input. There are many questions about extractive industries and indigenous peoples that could be relevant for this ranking, but that nonetheless cannot be used since they do not lead to factual answers that can provide a basis for numerical scores. The criteria used in the ranking needed to fulfil the following conditions:

- They should be factual questions that can be answered “yes”, “no”, or “partially”.
- It should in principle be possible for a company to make public the information providing the answer to the questions.
- In order to be able to distinguish as finely as possible between companies at different levels, some of the questions should concern basic things that one would expect of most companies, whereas others should be more demanding of the criteria that many companies are unlikely to fulfil.

The criteria for the ranking are inspired by a number of existing guidelines and standards. In particular: Equitable Origin (2012), GRI (2013), ICMM (2010), IFC (2012), ILO Convention 169, Mining Association of Canada (2012), the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the UN Global Compact, and World Wildlife Fund (WWF) and Kreon (2015).

TABLE 5. Criteria used to assess companies

| Criterion | Related guidelines and standards |
|--|--|
| A. International standards | |
| 1. Has the company committed itself to ILO Convention 169 on Tribal and Indigenous Peoples? | ILO 169 |
| 2. Has the company committed itself to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples? | UN 2007 |
| 3. Has the company committed itself to any other written national or international rules or guidelines on indigenous rights? | |
| B. Company policy | |
| 1. Does the company have its own written policy on indigenous peoples? | UN Global Compact 2013: 11, 12; WWF and Kreon 2015: 13 |
| 2. Does the company require sub-contractors to follow its policy and principles on indigenous peoples? | |
| 3. Does the company have any unresolved conflicts with indigenous peoples in the Arctic? | |
| 4. Does the company have a workplace anti-discrimination policy that explicitly addresses discrimination against indigenous peoples? | |
| C. Company procedures | |
| 1. Does the company cover indigenous issues in its annual report or some other annual, publicly available report? | UN Global Compact 2013: 20; TSM Protocol |
| 2. Does the company have a formal procedure for submission of complaints that is accessible to indigenous peoples? | UN Global Compact 2013: 11; WWF and Kreon 2015: 20 |
| 3. Are gender issues addressed in the company's policy on indigenous peoples or in another document on the company's approach to indigenous issues? | |
| D. Communication | |
| 1. Does the company have guidelines specifically on how to engage in good faith consultations with indigenous peoples to ensure free, prior and informed consent for its project activities in Arctic areas? | UN Global Compact 2013: 11; 21; EO100 |
| 2. Does the company ensure that information about its work in or near areas inhabited by indigenous peoples is accessible to the indigenous peoples? | UN Global Compact 2013: 14; WWF and Kreon 2015: 19 |
| E. Staffing | |
| 1. Does the company have staff with competence on and experience of work with indigenous peoples? | |
| 2. Does the company have staff formally responsible for handling indigenous rights? | |
| 3. Are the company's policy and procedures on indigenous rights included in staff training? | UN Global Compact 2013: 36 |
| F. Benefits and capacity building | |
| 1. Does the company have a policy of profit or benefit sharing with the indigenous people(s) in the Arctic areas where it works? | ICMM 2010: 61 |
| 2. Does the company build any infrastructure for the indigenous people(s) in the Arctic areas where it works? | |
| 3. Does the company provide grants, scholarships or low-interest credit for the indigenous people(s) in the Arctic areas where it works to get training, education or start companies? | UN Global Compact 2013: 51; ICMM 2010: 93 |
| 4. Does the company provide support for the development of capacity on the part of indigenous peoples to deal with the impact of resource extraction? | |
| 5. Does the company provide support for the cultural heritage of indigenous people(s) affected by the company's activities in the Arctic? | ICMM 2010: 89 |

For each criterion there were four possible answers, each represented by a score between 1 and 4:

TABLE 6. Possible answers and scores

| | |
|-----------|---|
| yes | 4 |
| partially | 3 |
| unclear | 2 |
| no | 1 |

The criteria were piloted in two test runs. In the first test run they were tried through the tentative gathering of data on a sample of four of the companies. After some adjustments, a second test run was carried out on 18 companies. In both test runs, the sample was as diverse as possible to ensure multifaceted testing of the questions (companies from different countries; oil/gas/mining; different size).

Identification of companies

Several questions arose related to the methodology for identifying specific companies for inclusion in the ranking. Again, one might think of this task as relatively straightforward, but in practice it is complex. There exists no central register of such companies at the circumpolar level, or even at the level of individual Arctic states. The data gathering therefore took the form of triangulation, using multiple written and some oral sources to identify relevant companies.

The following sources were examined in order to identify companies involved in Arctic resource extraction: national lists of oil and gas and mining companies; databases of mineral extraction licenses; and maps of oil and gas licenses. Each of these avenues was pursued across the seven Arctic countries: Denmark/Greenland, Canada, Finland, Norway, Russia, Sweden and the USA/Alaska. These written sources were supplemented with Google

searches in English and Russian for the names of Arctic towns and locations (for example Hammerfest, North Slope or Yamal), in combination with relevant keywords (for example, “company”, “mine”, “oil” and “gas”). Searches were carried out in English and, where relevant, Russian. For a list of the sources used to identify companies, see Table 7.

At first, over 180 companies were identified for potential inclusion in the ranking. As the work progressed, this number was reduced by around half. Interestingly, one of the reasons for the reduction of companies was that many of them went bankrupt, or at least called off their Arctic activities during the two years from 2014, when the initial list had 180 companies, and 2016, when the ranking was finalised. This is an indication of the dramatic decline in resource extraction in the Arctic during this period of declining commodity prices (see project paper ‘The Commodity Market Roller Coaster’).

TABLE 7. Sources used to identify companies involved in natural resource extraction in the Arctic

| GLOBAL | |
|---|--|
| World’s Top 100 Mining Stocks | http://www.mineweb.com/archive/top-100-mining-companies-what-a-difference-a-year-makes/ |
| 2014 Top 250 energy companies | http://top250.platts.com/Top250Rankings |
| CANADA | |
| Members of the Mining Association of Canada | http://mining.ca/members-partners/our-members http://www.acareerinmining.ca/en/employers/employersites.asp |
| The 100 largest oil and gas producers in Canada 2014 | http://www.albertaoilmagazine.com/2014/05/100-largest-oil-gas-producers-canada/ |
| Oil and Gas Dispositions Northern Petroleum Resources | https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/DAM/DAM-INTER-HQ-NOG/STAGING/texte-text/le_mp_bsmd_pg_1371579383933_eng.pdf |
| DENMARK / GREENLAND | |
| List of mineral and petroleum licenses in Greenland | http://www.govmin.gl/images/stories/minerals/list_of_licences/list_of_licences.pdf |
| FINLAND | |
| The Finnish Mining Industry: An Overview | https://www.pwc.fi/fi/julkaisut/tiedostot/pwc-mining-overview-october2012.pdf |
| Arctic Review 2013 – Logistics & Mining pdf, p. 40 | http://www.slideshare.net/futurewatch/arctic-review-logistics-and-mining-futurewatchreport |
| ‘Turning prospects into success: Mining Industry’, p. 21-22 | http://www.temtoimialapalvelu.fi/files/1796/Mining_Industry.pdf |
| Mining and exploration companies in Finland | https://web.archive.org/web/20130526022027/ http://en.gtk.fi/information/services/mining_explcomp.html |
| Active metal ore mines and current projects | http://en.gtk.fi/export/sites/en/information/services/maps/GTK_kaivokset_ja_tutkimuskohteet.pdf |
| The Finnish mining industry, and overview 2012 | https://www.pwc.fi/fi/julkaisut/tiedostot/pwc-mining-overview-october2012.pdf |
| Mining, oil and gas companies in Finland | Google search for “oil/gas companies Lapland” |

| NORWAY | |
|--|--|
| Map of the Norwegian continental shelf: the Barents Sea | http://gis.npd.no/factmaps/html_20/ http://www.npd.no/en/Maps/Map-of-the-NCS/ http://www.npd.no/Global/Norsk/4-Kart/Sokkelkart2014/Utsnitt_BH.pdf |
| Map of the Norwegian mineral licences | http://www.ngu.no/upload/Publikasjoner/Rapporter/2014/Mineral%20Resources2013_screen.pdf http://www.ngu.no/prospecting |
| Faktasider Oljedirektoratet | http://factpages.npd.no/factpages/ |
| RUSSIA | |
| Горнодобывающие предприятия России - Горное дело | http://www.gornoe-delo.ru/mining-enterprises/russia/ |
| Горнодобывающие предприятия в России | http://www.orgpage.ru/rossiya/Россиообывающiew.orgpage.ru/ |
| Каталог нефтегазовых сайтов в России | http://www.oilmedia.ru/dir/kompanii/2 |
| Каталог нефтегазовых сайтов в России | http://www.oilru.com/prom/22/ http://www.oilru.com/prom/39/ |
| Google search: Апатиты Горнодобывающий and Нефтегазоперерабатывающий, Мончегорск Горнодобывающий and Нефтегазоперерабатывающий, etc. | The same search with Мурманск и города Мурманской области: Апатиты, Никель, Мончегорск, Кировск, Кола, Кандалакша, Североморск, Полярный, Полярные Зори, Оленегорск, Заполярный, Ковдор, Нарьян-Мар, Воркута, Салехард (полярный круг проходит по городу), Норильск, Игарка, Верхоянск, Дудинка, Тикси, Диксон, Певек, Анадырь, Едарма, Хатанга |
| Database of Russian business news articles as the source to navigate relevant companies | http://polpred.com/?ns=1&cnt=195&sector=8&nIng=1&fo=2&fulltext=on&period_count=1&sortby=date&page=2 |
| SWEDEN | |
| Mining, oil and gas companies in Sweden | Google search: "mining/oil/gas companies Norrbotten" |
| Directory of Public Companies in Sweden | https://info.creditriskmonitor.com/Directory/CountryASE.htm |
| Arctic Review 2013 - Logistics & Mining pdf, p. 41 | http://www.slideshare.net/futurewatch/arctic-review-logistics-and-mining-futurewatchreport |
| Checked the article | http://minerals.usgs.gov/minerals/pubs/country/2009/myb3-2009-sw.pdf |
| USA/ALASKA | |
| Alaska Mining Licenses | http://tax.alaska.gov/programs/programs/queries/mining/license/license.aspx?60610 |
| List of Alaska Oil and Gas Companies/ Alaska producers and explorers | http://oil-and-gas.regionaldirectory.us/alaska.htm http://www.akrdc.org/issues/oilgas/overview.html |
| North Slope Unit Land Working Interest Ownership | http://dog.dnr.alaska.gov/publications/documents/northslope/northslope-wio-201608.pdf |
| State of Alaska, Department of Natural Resources, Division of Oil and Gas, as of August 2015 | |
| North Slope Oil and Gas Activity | |
| State of Alaska, Department of Natural Resources, Division of Oil and Gas, as of May 2015 | http://dog.dnr.alaska.gov/GIS/Data/ActivityMaps/NorthSlope/North_Slope_Oil_and_Gas_Activity_Map_20150505.pdf |

References

- Equitable Origin (2012) *EO100 Standard*.
<https://www.equitableorigin.org/eo100-for-responsible-energy/overview/>, accessed 29 November 2015.
- GRI (2013) *G4 Sustainability Reporting Guidelines*. Amsterdam: Global Reporting Initiative.
- Hanway, J., Holmes, J., Klein, M., Xiyue, M. L., McLean, A., Michaels, J., Paik, E. (2015) *Proposal Concerning the Divestment of Wesleyan University's Endowment from Coal*. Presented to the Wesleyan Investment Committee by the Committee for Investor Responsibility, 26 Feb. 2015.
- International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM)(2010) *Good Practice Guide: Indigenous Peoples and Mining*. London: International Council on Mining and Metals.
- International Finance Corporation (IFC) (2012) *IFC Performance Standards on Environmental and Social Sustainability*.
http://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/c8f524004a73daeca09afdf998895a12/IFC_Performance_Standards.pdf?MOD=AJPERES, accessed 9 June 2016.
- International Labour Organisation (ILO) (1989) Convention 169 concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries.
http://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO::P12100_ILO_CODE:C169, accessed 4 Jan. 2016.
- Mining Association of Canada (2012) *TSM Assessment Protocol: A Tool for Assessing Aboriginal and Community Outreach Performance*. <http://mining.ca/towards-sustainable-mining/protocols-frameworks>
- Secretariat of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (2006) *Backgrounder on Indigenous Peoples – Lands, Territories and Resources*. Prepared for the sixth session of the UNPFII.
www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/6_session_factsheet1.pdf, accessed 15 June 2015.
- Teck (2016) 'Teck Named to the Global 100 Most Sustainable Corporations List.' <http://www.teck.com/news/news-releases/2016-6828/teck-named-to-the-global-100-most-sustainable-corporations-list>, accessed 21 Aug. 2016.
- UN (2007) Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf, accessed 3 July 2015.
- UN (2011) *Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights*. New York: United Nations.
http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/GuidingPrinciplesBusinessHR_EN.pdf
- UN Global Compact (2013) *A Business Reference Guide: United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*.
https://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/issues_doc/human_rights/IndigenousPeoples/BusinessGuide.pdf, accessed 4 Jan. 2016.
- World Wildlife Fund and KREON (2015) *Environmental Responsibility Rating of Oil and Gas Companies in Russia*. Moscow: WWF.

Acronyms and abbreviations

| | |
|-------|--|
| DJSWI | Dow Jones Sustainability World Index |
| GRI | Global Reporting Initiative |
| ICMM | International Council on Mining and Metals |
| IFC | International Finance Corporation |
| ILO | International Labour Organisation |
| TSM | Towards Sustainable Mining |
| WWF | World Wildlife Fund |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

About the author and the project

Author: Research Professor Indra Overland (ino@nupi.no)

Research Professor Indra Overland is Head of the Energy Programme at the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI). He is also Professor II at Nord University and spokesperson for prixindex.net. He did his PhD at the Scott Polar Research Institute of the University of Cambridge and has since worked extensively on the post-Soviet energy sector, including oil, gas and renewables. He is co-author of *Bridging Divides: Ethno-Political Leadership among the Russian Sámi*.

Review: Dr Emma Wilson

Series editor: Professor Piers Vitebsky (pv100@cam.ac.uk)

Design: Eileen Higgins (ehdesign@virginmedia.com)

Copy editing: Niamh O'Mahony

This paper is a product of the project *Indigenous Peoples and Resource Extraction in the Arctic: Evaluating Ethical Guidelines* at the Árran Lule Sami Centre, Ájluokta/Drag, Norway (Project Leader Sven-Roald Nystø, Scientific Leader Professor Piers Vitebsky, Research Coordinator Dr Emma Wilson) and funded by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The project also includes researchers from the Arctic Centre, Rovaniemi; the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow; the Scott Polar Research Institute, University of Cambridge; University of Tromsø, the Arctic University of Norway; ECW Energy Ltd; and Michigan Technological University.

Project contact: Sven-Roald Nystø (sven.roald.nysto@arran.no)

Árran Lule Sami Centre

Árran – julevsáme guovdásj/lulesamisk senter

© Báhko ISBN 978-82-7943-059-9



ÁRRAN