

Company–Community Agreements, Gender and Development

J. C. Keenan · D. L. Kemp · R. B. Ramsay

© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2014

Abstract Company–community agreements are widely considered to be a practical mechanism for recognising the rights, needs and priorities of peoples impacted by mining, for managing impacts and ensuring that mining-derived benefits are shared. The use and application of company–community agreements is increasing globally. Notwithstanding the utility of these agreements, the gender dimensions of agreement processes in mining have rarely been studied. Prior research on women and mining demonstrates that women are often more adversely impacted by mining than men, and face greater challenges in accessing development opportunities that mining can bring. Nonetheless, there is currently little guidance for companies, government or communities in bringing a gender perspective to the fore in mining and agreement processes. It is undisputed in human development literature that investment in women and sensitivity to gender delivers long-term health, education and local development outcomes. In mining and development, a number of key factors remain unexplored. These include: women’s participation in agreement processes, the gendered distribution of agreement benefits, and the extent to which impacts and benefits influence women’s development and economic inclusion. This paper presents the results of the first phase of an applied research project undertaken by the Centre for Social Responsibility in Mining (CSRMI) at The University of Queensland and funded by the Minerals Council of Australia (MCA) and the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT). The project sought to connect with experienced

practitioners who had been directly involved in mining and agreement processes to document and analyse grounded perspectives on gender dynamics and agreements, and connect those experiences with the broader literature. Findings from this study have implications for the role of mining companies and governments in promoting gender equality and empowerment as part of their commitments to sustainable development. They also have implications for community groups and their representatives in terms of how they might engage in agreement processes to maximise women’s participation and influence. In many social contexts, a key challenge will be navigating the territory of cultural norms and gender equality, particularly in cultures where women’s influence in the public sphere is not strong. The authors argue that without consideration of a gender perspective, including gender’s intersection with other factors such as class, race, poverty level, ethnic group and age, mining agreements will not be inclusive, may exacerbate gender inequalities, and fail to contribute to long-term sustainable development.

Keywords Agreements · Community · Gender · Development · Social inclusion · Mining · Corporate social responsibility

Introduction

Gender and mining company–community agreements are fundamentally interconnected. Company–community agreements determine how and to whom mining-derived benefits will flow and how some negative impacts are managed. Gender influences how women and men access, negotiate and experience both the positive and negative changes generated by mining development. This paper examines the gender dimensions of agreement processes,

J. C. Keenan (✉) · D. L. Kemp · R. B. Ramsay
Centre for Social Responsibility in Mining, Sustainable Minerals
Institute, The University of Queensland, St Lucia, QLD 4072,
Australia
e-mail: j.keenan@uq.edu.au

as they relate to inequalities in impact and benefit, and the implications for sustainable development.

Agreements are becoming an increasingly common mechanism for framing the relationship between mining companies and communities, particularly in jurisdictions with legal recognition of customary land rights (O’Faircheallaigh 2013), including Australia, Canada, Papua New Guinea and Peru. Agreements engage the concerns of mining impacted communities; that is, those people who face direct and indirect environmental, social and economic effects of mining development. Agreements also have the potential to elevate community interests and influence the design and operation of mining projects.

In some cases, agreement legislation provides State recognition of the rights of Indigenous or Aboriginal peoples to share in wealth derived from their traditional homelands, and to be consulted over the conditions for land access and mine development (O’Faircheallaigh 2010). Our discussion employs a broad characterisation of agreements that extends beyond legally mandated agreements to include any form of company–community engagement that incorporates: a negotiation process; identification of beneficiaries; formalisation of commitments; and a process for implementation. These agreements have a variety of names, structures and process. Some common terms include: community development agreements, Indigenous Land Use Agreements, impact and benefit agreements, participation agreements, benefits sharing agreements, partnership agreements and so on (Brereton et al. 2011).

Existing research suggests that, in general, women are largely excluded from sharing in the benefits of mining, and are often disproportionately negatively impacted. While there is no disputing the overarching point, several researchers call into question interpretations of women as “passive” experiencers or “victims of mining impacts” (Lahiri-Dutt 2011a; Lahiri-Dutt and Macintyre 2006; Langton and Mazel 2008; O’Faircheallaigh 2012b). These researchers argue that the generalised interpretation homogenises women’s experiences, and denies women’s agency in responding to mining development (Mahy 2011). This paper provides a nuanced exploration of the gendered dimensions of agreements, women’s participation and the implications for communities, companies and governments and aims to represent a diversity of perspectives and experiences.

Background

Gender and Mining

There are few industries that generate the rapid social, environmental and economic changes that mining does

(Hilson 2012). These changes are largely investigated and measured at a ‘community’ level, obscuring differences between men’s and women’s experiences (Eftimie et al. 2009; for a discussion of the use of the term ‘community’ in the mining sector, see RET 2006, p. 4). Furthermore, social impact assessment does not always pay attention to changes in the social dynamics that contribute to the construction of gender (Lahiri-Dutt and Ahmad 2011, p. 118). This ‘blindness’ to gender renders disproportionate impacts on women or men invisible, and can prevent inclusive and equitable access to development, or indeed impact mitigation measures. Without attention to gender dynamics, company claims of contribution to sustainable development should be called into question.

There is an expanding body of research on the intersection between gender and mining. This work has raised awareness of the roles and experiences of women and men in a range of mining contexts: within mining companies, in the communities affected by mining, and in the informal mining sector (Lahiri-Dutt 2011b). Women have always been linked to the mining industry in a variety of ways: as miners in small scale or artisanal operations; in direct and indirect employment in industrial-scale mining operations; as community representatives and leaders; as regulators, advocates and activists. Furthermore, women are family and carers of miners, and members of mining impacted communities (Gibson and Kemp 2008). Nonetheless, mining remains a characteristically ‘masculine’ industry, where the power and profit tends to reside with elite males. The industry and its related institutions (e.g. regulatory bodies) tend to reproduce this inherent gender bias, which reinforces a male-centric view of development (Macintyre 2011; Robinson 1996) and can exclude women from exercising agency in relation to mining developments and their impact on livelihoods (Lahiri-Dutt 2011b).

By using gender as a ‘lens’ to look at the changes brought about by mining, we can begin to differentiate some of the impacts experienced within a community, and how these impacts change the roles, responsibilities and relationships between women and men in different contexts, although a gender lens must be applied with other lenses to be most effective. Hankivsky (2005); Squires (2005); Walby (2005) all warn that a binary male–female distinction is limited in effectiveness in that it can overlook difference among women and men. We believe that the concept of ‘gender’ should be understood in its fullest sense as a dynamic and mutable social construction of the relationships between women and men, where power and opportunity inequalities exist. And further, that, the discursive, cultural and ideological construction of gender allows that gender is experienced and performed differently by individuals within a community depending on intersecting systems, rather than being a generic division of

women and men (Dankelman 2002; Mikkelsen 2005; Parmenter 2011).

Several researchers have applied a gender lens to the social changes brought about by mining development, and the realities of women’s experience in these contexts. Gerritsen and Macintyre (1991); Gibson and Kemp (2008); Lahiri-Dutt and Macintyre (2006); Moretti (2006), among others, provide substantial reviews of the literature, which we will not reproduce here, other than to draw attention to the overwhelming evidence that there is a gender bias in terms of the distribution of risks and benefits in the context of mining. Women are more likely to be negatively impacted by mining (e.g. loss of land for home gardens), while at the same time being less likely to access benefits (e.g. employment and small business opportunities). These differences are argued to impact the ability of women to advance and support sustainable community development. As Eftimie et al. (2009, p. 1) suggest, “better understanding of these gender aspects of the extractive industries could improve development outcomes in impacted communities, as well as improving the economic and social sustainability of extractive industry projects”.

Successful engagement with women requires consideration how women’s rights and interests are incorporated into mine–community relationships. Gender inequality and marginalisation of women are considered to be some of the most persistent challenges to poverty (Duflo 2012), yet the mining industry does not have a clear strategy for engaging gender, despite it being a central focus in development debates. Development theorists provide several ideas about why women may be marginalised in the mining context, and how this may be overcome. For example, (Agarwal 2010) suggests that a women’s capacity to meaningfully participate in public forums requires both presence and voice. Mohanty (2002) emphasises that even where women do have voice within decision making processes, without genuine male support, women’s input will not necessarily be influential. Cornwall (2003) agrees that the act of women raising their voices within the group context is important, but stresses that someone must be listening. Quantitative measures of women’s representation and participation in formal processes can be poor measures of equality or empowerment as they can simplify and render invisible other factors contributing to gender-based inequality (Hancock et al. 2011). This paper explores how women’s presence and voice is expressed and received in agreements.

Company–Community Agreements in Mining

Mining company–community agreements are increasingly seen as a key component of sustainable development in the context of mining (O’Faircheallaigh 2012a). Supporters of

agreements see that they provide an opportunity for Indigenous and land-connected peoples to shape the conditions for resource extraction on their lands, therefore redistributing the balance of power that has served to undermine and marginalise Indigenous peoples, ignoring their rights and excluding them from opportunities for development (O’Faircheallaigh 2013). From the company perspective, having an agreement in place is (ideally) seen to secure land access and stability for the development of the project; to satisfy regulatory or legislative requirements; define expectations and mutual obligations; and reduce exposure to legal actions from Indigenous groups (ICMM 2010).

The challenge of negotiating and implementing an agreement that is capable of delivering local development outcomes while also ensuring that risks and impacts are successfully managed is a difficult task, particularly when communities, companies, governments or other actors lack the will or capacity to engage meaningfully. Leading practice guides position ‘inclusion’ as a guiding principle on the basis that it contributes to building strong and resilient relationships which help to ensure that development benefits are sustainable beyond the life of the mine (ICMM 2010). While essential, the notion of inclusivity (or lack thereof) is a contested concept in agreement negotiation and implementation, particularly in terms of representation (O’Faircheallaigh 2013).

The agreement space is rapidly developing. Early agreements (in Australia and Canada) focussed mainly on compensation for land access and acquisition. More recently, agreements have been moving to a focus on relationship building, alongside benefit sharing and impact management. Other emerging trends include stronger requirements for transparency and accountability, as well as improvements in governance structures and on long-term planning (Brereton et al. 2011). These trends can be linked to the industry’s commitment towards sustainable development and corporate social responsibility agendas, and a response to criticisms of wasted opportunities. In this evolving space of agreement processes in mining, there is potential to better integrate gender as an intersectional frame of analysis, and gender equality as a strategic goal.

Conceptualising the Gender Dimensions of Agreements

The gender dimensions of agreement processes in mining are under-researched, and there is currently little guidance for companies, government or communities in terms of using a gender lens or how they might engage in agreement processes to maximise women’s participation and influence. The scholarly literature that does exist on the specific topic of mining, gender and agreement making suggests that women’s participation in company–community

agreement processes is diverse and determined by a number of contextual factors, including local culture, socio-economic environment, social status, historical precedent, and legal, political and organisational settings (Gibson and Kemp 2008; Hemer 2012; Macintyre 2002, 2007; O’Faircheallaigh 2011, 2012b; Weitzner 2002, 2006). While there are several standout exceptions that have been documented in the literature (e.g. Doohan 2008; O’Faircheallaigh 2012b), the weight of evidence suggests that in the context of mining, these and other organisational and industry-related factors work together to exacerbate gender inequality, including in agreement processes. It is women whose rights, needs and priorities are more often excluded (Gibson and Kemp 2008).

In reading agreements through a gender lens, it is important to conceptualise them as an ongoing process rather than simply the conditions that are reached in the agreement contract (O’Faircheallaigh 2002, 2004). The process of agreement making includes both formal and informal processes of agenda setting, consultation, consensus building, awareness-raising, and planning, alongside the formal discussions that occur at the negotiation table. Negotiation does not end at the signing of an agreement. In fact, negotiation between company and community will continue to shape and reshape the agreement as it is implemented. Understanding this is critical to understanding the utility of agreements and their impact on sustainable development (AIATSIS 2008, pp. 36–38; Allbrook and Jebb 2004; Langton and Mazel 2008).

Methodology

This paper reports on findings from an applied research project undertaken by the Centre for Social Responsibility in Mining (CSRSM) at The University of Queensland and funded by the Minerals Council of Australia (MCA) and the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT). The research team sought to connect with practitioners who had been directly involved in agreement processes to document and analyse grounded perspectives on gender dynamics and agreements, and connect those experiences with the broader literature. A total of 22 practitioners were interviewed, each with a diverse range of experience across different mining agreements in a variety of countries and cultural contexts. Almost half of the interviewees were female and two self-identified as Indigenous.

Interviewees were identified through CSRSM and MCA networks and also by referral from interviewees and other contacts, and selected on the basis that they had first-hand experience negotiating, advising, implementing and/or researching at least one agreement. Interviewees had different levels of focus on gender in their work. For some,

gender was not previously considered, while for others, gender was one of the factors that they considered, but not a specific focus. Only a few interviewees reported having a specific gender focus or a special gender advisory role.

The geographic spread of interviewees includes individuals based in Australia (10), Canada (8), the United States of America (USA) (2) and Peru (2). Interviewees had mainly worked with agreements in Australia, Canada and Papua New Guinea (PNG), and to a lesser extent in Latin America (particularly Peru), the USA, the Solomon Islands, Indonesia, Laos, Mongolia and Ghana. This distribution reflects the fact that Australia, Canada and PNG have an established agreement-making approach to land access and benefit sharing between mining companies and communities. Interviewees had a variety of professional experience including industry, academia, Indigenous representative bodies, consultant advisory or representative services, and as employed representatives of their own Indigenous communities.

Discussion

This section provides a thematic exploration of the gendered dimensions of agreements women’s participation as understood by practitioners involved in agreements. Using gender as a lens, interviewees identified a number of contextual factors that contribute to the construction of gender in the context of agreements.

Contextual Factors: Cultural, Socio-economic and Industry

Interviewees agreed that women’s participation in agreement processes was a product of existing gender dynamics in the local culture, as well as the dynamics of the dominant society and the culture of the organisations involved, both company and community. Women’s overall participation in agreement processes (formal and informal, during negotiation and implementation) was described as lower in contexts where the local culture had a highly patriarchal gender dynamic and higher in more equitable cultures, although there were exceptions. A number of interviewees mentioned particular cases where, despite the patriarchal culture, women had played significant and direct roles at the negotiation table. Some of these cases, such as Voisey’s Bay in Canada and Argyle in Australia, have been documented in the literature, for example O’Faircheallaigh (2012b); Doohan (2008).

In contexts where local culture the gender roles of women and men were well-defined and distinct (though not necessarily unequal), interviewees perceived that women still tended to be excluded from agreement processes and

outcomes. In some cases this construction of gender was reflected in the negotiation and engagement activities, with parallel processes for women and men so that each group may raise their priorities and concerns. Still, interviewees indicated that separate processes were not always sufficient for men's and women's views to be considered equally in decision making, and often that men's views were prioritised over women's, even though separate processes had been undertaken.

Interviewees working with Indigenous or ethnic minority groups indicated that, for these groups, the gender roles of the dominant society influenced agreement processes through the involvement of company personnel and other parties. Interviewees observed gender dynamics in patriarchal post-contact, missionary or post-colonial culture being reproduced in mining agreements, limiting women's participation. This included women's loss of traditional rights to make decisions about land. Interviewees also mentioned the church as a significant influence on gender relations in some contexts, particularly in the Pacific.

Interviewees mentioned a number of sub-groups of women, where the intersection of gender with other factors resulted in exclusion from agreement processes. Groups that were excluded included: middle-aged women who had yet to acquire the status of 'elder'; young women and young mothers; women (and their families) who have married or migrated into the community; women in male-headed households; and female-headed households (e.g. widows and single mothers).

Gender dynamics were also related to the socio-economic status of women and among women, which in turn can inhibit women's equal involvement in agreement processes. Many of these factors are mentioned in the 'gender and development' and 'gender and mining' literatures, and include lack of education, language fluency, poor health, early motherhood, carer responsibilities (for children, grandchildren and elders) as well as lack of time, autonomy and recognition of women's economic roles (Dankelman 2002; Mikkelsen 2005). In particular, personal economic independence was identified as a key factor influencing women's inclusion/exclusion in mining and agreement processes. Interviewees described instances whereby women without economic independence tended to be less active in public life and in agreement processes.

The culture of the mining industry and mining companies also influences the gender dynamics of agreement processes. Mining companies have been historically male-dominated and tend not to be diverse, particularly in relation to gender, which itself can limit company understanding of the benefits of diversity. Several interviewees thought the gender composition of the employee population could be a factor that influenced women's participation in a range of agreement processes and outcomes. For

example, some interviewees observed that members of the negotiation team (including barristers and senior lawyers) were predominantly male, although there was usually a mix of male and female professional staff involved in the agreement more broadly. Interviewees generally felt that diverse teams were more likely to bring a balanced perspective to agreement processes than teams that were almost exclusively male. Many interviewees suggested that the configuration of negotiation teams was changing, and that female representation in company staff was increasing, which they surmised may eventually have some spill-over effects on agreement processes.

Participation and Formal Representation

There was general agreement among interviewees that women's participation was influenced by whether engagement processes associated with the agreement were participatory. Interviewees suggested that women were more able to get involved when there was a commitment to ensuring open and participatory engagement because these processes were more likely to include women of all backgrounds. Interviewees who had worked with a range of companies observed that company use of participatory methods was driven by company attitudes towards relationships and building a broad base of support. Some companies approach agreements as long-term mechanisms for engagement that provide structured processes and explicit terms for dialogue between parties based on agreed principles. These companies see relationship-building as integral to all phases of the agreement process, not just in terms of signing the agreement itself. Interviewees observed that companies with a commitment to relationship building tend to have been more inclusive of women in their engagement practice.

Most agreement processes require the selection or election of a smaller group of community negotiators to coordinate and lead interactions with company representatives. The process of selecting these representatives varies, which can in turn influence the range of community viewpoints incorporated into the agreement negotiation process. Selection of representatives was frequently seen by interviewees to reflect the cultural norms of the host community. Interviewees observed that in situations where men traditionally held the leadership roles in communities, men also tended to be better represented at the negotiating table. In some cases interviewees explained that women would "let the men do the talking" and the women would take an advisory type of role that did not necessarily involve them being at the forefront of discussions.

Several interviewees emphasised that women's non-involvement in representative structures did not necessarily indicate exclusion. They gave specific examples of women having strong influence outside of formal negotiations.

Although the power that they exert internally may not be easily expressed due to cultural expectations about gender roles, women frequently do play an integral role in shaping community views and values, including in relation to agreement processes.

Interviewees described cases where men were able to represent and advocate for women's rights and interests, at least in terms of their practical needs. Where women were not directly involved, interviewees indicated that the conversations about women's interests did not generally extend to considering women's strategic gender interests, such as involvement in decision making or empowerment.

Legal Recognition of Women's Rights

The legal context provides the basis for upholding the rights of Indigenous and land-connected peoples as well as women's rights. Currently, there is no known jurisdiction whereby gender equity is a specific requirement for land use agreements in mining. Some mining legislation does specify requirements for consultation with all landowners or group consent, which provide a basis for including women (see Macintyre 2007 for discussion of women's rights in PNG).

Legal requirements for a particular governance or representative structure could encourage gender bias, as discussed earlier. Additionally, agreement-associated processes, such as the Environmental Review process in Canada, can also be "gender blind" in that they can fail to identify gendered impacts or opportunities, precluding women's issues from being brought to the table in negotiations. On the other hand, there are examples of these processes surfacing gendered impacts which are then recognised in agreements, as was the case in Voisey's Bay in Canada (further discussed in O'Faircheallaigh 2012b).

Interviewees suggested that where women's rights are not upheld by law more generally, it is difficult to bring gender considerations to the fore in mining and agreement processes (see also Macdonald 2006; Macintyre 2007). For example, agreement negotiations are often based on land ownership (i.e. those who own land have voting rights) which may prevent women's participation if land is held in men's names. Conversely, though the legal context sets an important backdrop, it does not guarantee that either Indigenous and/or women's rights are upheld in practice. For example, even where there is an equitable system of property rights, men can, and often do, dominate 'land-owner councils' or other bodies involved in agreements.

Tension Between Cultural Norms and Gender Equality

One of the key tensions spoken about by interviewees was between respect for traditional cultural practices and

practices that embody equality and human rights. Gender relations and cultural change is a difficult space for companies to work in because it is not seen as a company's role to challenge culture. Attempts to do so could be perceived as being patronising or lacking respect, or could cause conflict. However, interviewees generally also noted that mining companies have an ethical responsibility to operate responsibly, and respect human rights. Interviewees suggested that this would mean pushing for gender equality in agreement processes, or at least consideration of women's priorities.

Several interviewees suggested that the 'cultural argument' has been used by some groups to marginalise others and preserve their own power, so needs to be considered carefully by companies rather than accepted outright. Some interviewees suggested that the cultural argument should not extend so far as to limit women's participation broadly. Instead, there should only be limited and specific areas of cultural responsibility that may mean that men have a responsibility to discuss and decide among themselves and, conversely, there are some particular areas of women's responsibility where it would be appropriate for women to discuss and decide themselves.

Women's Benefit

Interviewees generally acknowledged that men probably receive a greater share economic benefit from mining agreements than women. These benefits largely include employment and business development. They also noted that men tend to control revenue from compensation monies and other 'rents' that flow from companies to communities. Where there was an existing culture of domestic violence against women, interviewees reported that cash distribution to community members could result in increased violence against women, with severe detrimental effects.

Interviewees noted several outcomes that benefitted some women, such as the development of institutional capacity in some communities, largely as a result of participation in agreements. In some cases, women's involvement in agreement processes has triggered subsequent involvement in community decision-making more broadly, even in areas where women had not previously been active. Several interviewees suggested that women have been influential in discussions about how benefits should be distributed, such as pushing for education, health or scholarship funds rather than new trucks or community buses, but noted that this did not necessarily lead to gender-equitable distribution of benefits.

Some agreements do include specific provisions for women, such as quotas for employment and training programs, for cultural and environmental monitoring and for

family health projects. Several interviewees noted that women’s employment was a good example of an area where some companies and operations had achieved significant outcomes with concerted effort. They also noted that, in part, these efforts were motivated by a lack of skilled tradespeople in the mining industry generally. The focus on female employment in mining was also said to be driven by the mining industry’s ‘boom’ cycles.

Conclusions

The findings outlined in this report confirm that a gender lens offers important insights into agreement processes and their contribution to development and benefit sharing at the local level. It also shows that, while the use of an intersectional gender lens is widely accepted and practiced in the development sector, consideration of gender is often absent in community-level practice in mining. This is highly concerning as gender differences and gender relations are invariably linked to social inequality, marginalisation and exclusion from development opportunities.

Although there are pockets of innovative, gender-sensitive practice, agreement processes are frequently ‘gender blind’ where disproportionate impacts on women remain invisible, and women do not have inclusive and equitable access to development opportunities. This research identified participatory development as one potential avenue for inclusive and equitable practice; however participatory processes can still be unaware of gender and, likewise, a gender aware process is not necessarily participatory. Both participatory and gender-sensitive practices require highly skilled practitioners, and participatory processes may be unsuitable in some contexts (Mansuri and Rao 2012). Further investigation of the application of participatory processes in the mining context is required.

At the current juncture, a deep understanding of gender in mining agreements is the domain of a small group of specialists, and empirical evidence is scarce. In order to advance equality in mining, agreements and local-level development, industry policy and practice must be informed by research that applies an intersectional gender lens to issues such as implementation, governance, and women’s development. Gender in community-level practice also reaches well beyond agreement processes. There are a range of related issues where the gender dimensions have yet to come to the fore. Gender is central, for example, to issues of Free Prior Informed Consent. Community consent can only be achieved through inclusion, where women and men have an opportunity to participate, and be heard. Similarly, gender is central to effective conflict resolution processes. If women are not able to raise or report grievances and concerns, then the accessibility

and effectiveness of grievance mechanisms is substantially diminished. Other mining-related issues, such as resettlement and livelihood restoration, also need careful consideration from an intersectional gender perspective.

A crucial topic for debate is the use of the ‘business case’ to prioritise engagement with local stakeholders, including women. Throughout this research, we found that gender equality in community engagement and agreement processes does not always have a strong business case. Where women are marginalised, they are unlikely to cause disruption to business operations (e.g. through protest, or public demonstration). Under these circumstances, it is uncommon for engagement with women to be a high priority, because the immediate risk to the business is low. A business case built on enhancing local stability and establishing long-term local community support may be stronger, but also difficult within the context the short-term planning and budget cycles that characterises much of the mining industry. To add to the challenge, even when the long-term case is accepted, there can still be avoidance on the basis that active engagement with women may exacerbate internal community conflict. This may mean that “in name of social cohesion the interests of the less powerful are forgone and existing inequalities are reinforced” (Ahluwalia 1997, p. 33).

With the lack of research in this area, there is little guidance for companies, governments and communities on how tensions between cultural norms, gender equality and sustainable development ought to be approached. At a fundamental level, questions about the differences between taking a short-term business case or a long-term development approach remain unanswered. The continual sidelining of gender, despite growing evidence of its importance to relationships and development equity, raises critical questions about business commitment to sustainability and the ongoing tensions between the business case, development case and moral case.

References

- Agarwal, B. (2010). *Gender and green governance: The political economy of women’s presence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ahluwalia, M. (1997). Representing communities: The case of a community-based watershed management project in Rajasthan, India. *IDS Bulletin*, 28(4), 23–35.
- AIATSIS. (2008). *Native title payments and benefits: Literature review*. From <http://www.aiatsis.gov.au/ntru/docs/researchthemes/developmenttax/taxation/taxlitreview.pdf>.
- Allbrook, M., & Jebb, M. A. (2004). *Implementation and resourcing of native title and related agreements*. Perth: National Native Title Tribunal.
- Brereton, D., Owen, J., & Kim, J. (2011). *Good practice note: Community development agreements*. *EI SourceBook*. Dundee:

- Centre for Energy, Petroleum and Mineral Law and Policy (CEPMLP), University of Dundee.
- Cornwall, A. (2003). Whose voices? Whose choices? Reflections on gender and participatory development. *World Development*, 31(8), 1325–1342.
- Dankelman, I. (2002). Gender, environment and sustainable development: Understanding the linkages. In Gender Society and Development Editorial Team (Ed.), *Natural resource management and gender: A global source book* (pp. 13–21). Amsterdam: KIT (Royal Tropical Institute).
- Doohan, K. (2008). *Making things come good: Relations between Aborigines and miners at Argyle*. Broome: Backroom Press.
- Duflo, E. (2012). Women's empowerment and economic development. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 50(4), 1051–1079.
- Eftimie, A., Heller, K., & Strongman, J. (2009). *Gender dimensions of the extractive industries. Extractive Industries and Development Series No. 8*. Washington: The World Bank.
- Gerritsen, R., & MacIntyre, M. (1991). Dilemmas of distribution: The Misima gold mine, Papua New Guinea. In J. Connell & R. Howitt (Eds.), *Mining and indigenous peoples in Australasia* (pp. 35–53). Sydney: Sydney University Press.
- Gibson, G., & Kemp, D. (2008). Corporate engagement with indigenous women in the minerals industry: Making space for theory. In C. O'Faircheallaigh & S. Ali (Eds.), *Earth matters: Indigenous peoples, the extractive industries and corporate social responsibility* (pp. 104–122). Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing.
- Hancock, P., Parker, I., Middleton, I., Moore, J., & Edirisinghe, I. (2011). *Re-thinking gender, empowerment and equity-policy brief*. Perth: Australia Social Justice Research Centre, Edith Cowan University.
- Hankivsky, O. (2005). Gender vs diversity mainstreaming: A preliminary examination of the role and transformative potential of feminist theory. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 38(4), 977–1001.
- Hemer, S. (2012). *Gender and mining, strategies for governing the development of women in Lihir, PNG*. Adelaide: University of Adelaide.
- Hilson, G. (2012). Corporate social responsibility in the extractive industries: Experiences from developing countries. *Resources Policy*, 37(2), 131–137.
- International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM). (2010). *Good practice guide: Indigenous peoples and mining*. London: International Council on Mining and Metals.
- Lahiri-Dutt, K. (2011a). The megaproject of mining: A feminist critique. In S. D. Brunn (Ed.), *Engineering earth: The impacts of megaengineering projects* (Vol. 1, pp. 329–351). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Lahiri-Dutt, K. (Ed.). (2011b). *Gendering the field: Towards sustainable livelihoods for mining communities*. Canberra: ANU E Press.
- Lahiri-Dutt, K., & Ahmad, N. (2011). Considering gender in social impact assessments. In F. Vanclay & A. M. Esteves (Eds.), *New directions in social impact assessments: Conceptual and methodological advances*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Lahiri-Dutt, K., & Macintyre, M. (2006). *Women miners in developing countries: Pit women and others*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing.
- Langton, M., & Mazel, O. (2008). Poverty in the midst of plenty: Aboriginal people, the 'resource curse' and Australia's mining boom. *Journal of Energy & Natural Resources Law*, 26(1), 31.
- Macdonald, I. (2006). Women miners, human rights and poverty. In K. Lahiri-Dutt & M. Macintyre (Eds.), *Women miners in developing countries: Pit women and others* (pp. 307–328). Burlington: Ashgate Publishing.
- Macintyre, M. (2002). Women and mining projects in Papua New Guinea: Problems of consultation, representation and women's rights as citizens. In I. Macdonald & C. Rowland (Eds.), *Tunnel vision: Women, mining and communities* (pp. 26–29). Melbourne: Oxfam Community Aid Abroad.
- Macintyre, M. (2007). Informed consent and mining projects: A view from Papua New Guinea. *Pacific Affairs*, 80(1), 49–65.
- Macintyre, M. (2011). Modernity, gender and mining: Experiences from Papua New Guinea. In K. Lahiri-Dutt (Ed.), *Gendering the field: Towards sustainable livelihoods for mining communities* (pp. 21–32). Canberra: ANU E Press.
- Mahy, P. (2011). Sex work and livelihoods: Beyond the 'negative impacts on women' in Indonesian mining. In K. Lahiri-Dutt (Ed.), *Gendering the field: Towards sustainable livelihoods for mining communities* (pp. 49–66). Canberra, Australia: ANU E Press.
- Mansuri, G., & Rao, V. (2012). *Localizing development: Does participation work?* Washington: World Bank Publications.
- Mikkelsen, C. (2005). *Indigenous peoples, gender, and natural resource management*. Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies, DIIS.
- Mohanty, R. (2002). Women Participation in JFM in Uttaranchal Village: Mimeo.
- Moretti, D. (2006). The gender of the gold: An ethnographic and historical account of women's involvement in artisanal and small-scale mining in Mount Kaindi, Papua New Guinea. *Oceania*, 76(2), 133–149.
- O'Faircheallaigh, C. (2002). Implementation: The forgotten dimension of agreement making in Australia and Canada. *Indigenous Law Bulletin*, 5(20), 14–17.
- O'Faircheallaigh, C. (2004). Evaluating agreements between indigenous peoples and resource developers. In M. Langton, M. Tehan, L. Palmer, & K. Shain (Eds.), *Honour among nations? Treaties and agreements with indigenous people* (pp. 303–328). Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- O'Faircheallaigh, C. (2010). Aboriginal-mining company contractual agreements in Australia and Canada: Implications for political autonomy and community development. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies/Revue canadienne d'études du développement*, 30(1–2), 69–86.
- O'Faircheallaigh, C. (2011). Indigenous women and mining agreement negotiations: Australia and Canada. In K. Lahiri-Dutt (Ed.), *Gendering the field: Towards sustainable livelihoods for mining communities* (pp. 87–110). Canberra: ANU E Press.
- O'Faircheallaigh, C. (2012a). Community development agreements in the mining industry: An emerging global phenomenon. *Community Development*, 44(2), 222–238.
- O'Faircheallaigh, C. (2012b). Women's absence, women's power: Indigenous women and negotiations with mining companies in Australia and Canada. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(11), 1789–1807.
- O'Faircheallaigh, C. (2013). Extractive industries and indigenous peoples: A changing dynamic? *Journal of Rural Studies*, 30, 20–30.
- Parmenter, J. (2011). Experiences of indigenous women in the Australian mining industry. In K. Lahiri-Dutt (Ed.), *Gendering the field: Towards sustainable livelihoods for mining communities* (pp. 67–86). Canberra: ANU E Press.
- RET. (2006). Community engagement and development. *Leading Practice Sustainable Development Program for the Mining Industry (LPSD)*. Canberra: Department of Resources, Energy and Tourism (RET).
- Robinson, K. (1996). Women, mining and development. In R. Howitt, J. Connell, & P. Hirsch (Eds.), *Resources, nations and indigenous peoples* (pp. 137–151). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

- Squires, J. (2005). Is mainstreaming transformative? Theorizing mainstreaming in the context of diversity and deliberation. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 12(3), 366–388.
- Walby, S. (2005). Gender mainstreaming: Productive tensions in theory and practice. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 12(3), 321–343.
- Weitzner, V. (2002). *Through indigenous eyes: Toward appropriate decision-making regarding mining on or near ancestral lands*. Ottawa: The North–South Institute.
- Weitzner, V. (2006). *Dealing full force: Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation's experience negotiating with mining companies*. Ottawa: North–South Institute.