



12 March 2007
G-2007/10 (45.46c)

**IOE SUMMARY OF THE 4TH MEETING OF THE
ISO WORKING GROUP ON SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY**

Sydney, Australia : 27 January – 2 February 2007

Dear Sir /Madam,

Please find attached a summary of the above meeting. All documents related to ISO's Social Responsibility activity can be found on the ISO website at www.iso.org/wgsr.

It remains important for members to be engaged with their national ISO body as the work on the guidance document progresses. Please note that the drafting of the guidance standard has now begun and the next meeting to discuss the progress of the Working Group will be held in Vienna (Austria) from 5 to 9 November 2007.

Best regards,

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, which appears to read 'Antonio Peñalosa'.

Antonio Peñalosa
Secretary-General

**Circular addressed to IOE member federations, employer members of the ILO
Governing and members of the IOE CSR Working Group**



SUMMARY OF THE 4TH MEETING OF THE ISO WORKING GROUP ON SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

**Sydney, Australia
27 January – 2 February 2007**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The ISO Working Group on Social Responsibility held its fourth meeting during from 27 January to 2 February 2007 in Sydney (Australia) as part of its multi-year effort to develop an ISO guidance standard on Social Responsibility (SR). Roughly 300 individuals participated in the meeting, with a majority of the participants coming from developing countries.

The main objectives of the meeting were to resolve ten key issues that had been identified where Working Group members had clearly divergent positions and to assess the 5,400 comments that were submitted on the second working draft of the guidance standard. Progress was made on both objectives and the results will feed into the development of the third working draft in advance of the **next meeting from 5 to 9 November 2007 in Vienna, Austria.**

The target date to complete the guidance standard was pushed back to December 2009 to allow for the third working draft. However, even this revised target date is unlikely to be met since it is very likely that a fourth and perhaps fifth working draft will be required, which would push the completion date into 2010 at the earliest.

BACKGROUND

The International Organization for Standardization (ISO) studied the issue of social responsibility for a number of years in order to determine if there was any value in developing material in this area. Following discussions in the ISO Consumer Policy Committee in 2001-2002 and the ISO Advisory Group on CSR in 2003-2004, the ISO Technical Advisory Board (TMB) decided that ISO should develop a single guidance document on social responsibility (SR) that would provide information on SR relevant to all types of organizations. The TMB has mandated that the SR guidance standard not to be used for certification of any kind (self-assessment or third-party) and that it not be a management system standard.

As part of its decision to develop a document in this area, ISO also decided to adjust its normal operating procedures to reflect the many differences between SR and the technical issues ISO normally addresses. First, the Working Group is co-chaired by representatives of a developed and a developing country: Jorge Cajazeira of Suzano Pulp and Paper of Brazil and Staffan Söderberg, of Skanska of Sweden.

Second, the Working Group has been organized according to stakeholder groups rather than national delegations, which is the normal ISO practice. Experts are drawn from six stakeholder groups: industry, government, labor, NGOs, consumers, and other. Each country can nominate six experts (one for each stakeholder group), and international organizations with

liaison status with the Working Group can each nominate two experts. The IOE has liaison status with the ISO SR Working Group and has named **Mr. Adam Greene** of the U.S. Council for International Business and **Mr. Clifford Henry** of the Procter & Gamble Company as its two experts.

The Working Group established six Task Groups (TG's) to carry out the work. TGs 1-3 address organizational issues including participation, communication and procedures, respectively. TGs 4-6 are charged with drafting the guidance standard: TG4 covers introduction, scope, SR definition, context, and principles; TG5 covers SR issues; and TG6 covers SR implementation.

SECOND WORKING DRAFT

The second Working Draft (WD.2) ran to 75 pages and represented a partial step forward in developing a complete draft of the document, which is not likely to be achieved for the next few drafts. WD.2 elicited over 5,400 comments from Working Group experts during the comment period – more than twice as many than were submitted on WD.1 – indicating that a large number of issues remained open for debate at this stage.

Industry concerns: The Industry Stakeholder Group felt that the drafting of WD.2 was complicated by a lack of agreement among WG experts on five fundamental issues that would need to be addressed before further drafting took place:

- *Guidance Standard vs. Minimum Requirements: While the mandate of the WG is to develop a guidance standard, it is clear that there are different views in the WG about what a guidance standard is and is not. While the ISG has consistently expressed the view that ISO 26000 should only offer guidance on SR (i.e. no requirements), many other experts expect the document to contain minimum requirements – a baseline of what it means to be socially responsible. The minimum requirements approach can be seen in the use of words like “must”, “shall” and “ensure” that run throughout the text.*
- *Applicability to All Organizations: While the mandate of the WG is to develop guidance on SR applicable to all organizations, WD.2 has a clear focus on business and industry and does not give equal attention to other types of organizations. This bias toward industry will need to be removed and further drafting will need to include balanced guidance for a wide variety of organizations.*
- *Practical vs. Generic Guidance: Clause 6 includes a large amount of “generic” guidance – broad statements that are made without reference to any particular context, objective or type of organization. For example, section 6.4.2 states that “...an organization should consider banning all discrimination to ensure freedom from discrimination...” More practical guidance would discuss the trends, challenges and opportunities for organizations to address discrimination in a variety of situations and locations.*
- *Management System Standard (MSS) Approach: Contrary to the TMB directive not to use a MSS approach, clause 7 contains almost 90% of the MSS elements included in ISO Guide 72 on MSS. The guidance on implementation will need to replace the MSS elements with practical guidance on implementation related to the core issues.*
- *Size of the Document: It is clear that different experts in WG have different ideas about how long the document should be. Since the length of the document will affect what will be included or not and the type of guidance that will be included, the WG needs to reach agreement on the general size of the document (50 pages, 100 pages, 250 pages, etc.)*

PREPARATIONS FOR THE 4TH WG MEETING - SYDNEY

Due to the very large number of comments received on WD.2, a new group – the Liaison Task Force (LTF) – was established and assigned the task of reviewing the comments to identify key issues or concerns that cut across the entire document and that would need to be addressed before further drafting took place. **Clifford Henry (IOE)**, the Industry Stakeholder Group (ISG) representative on the LTF, coordinated an intensive discussion on these issues within the ISG in advance of the Sydney meeting. The LTF identified the following ten key questions that would need to be resolved in Sydney before any further drafting took place:

- 1) *What are the principal objectives, and who is the identified end-user, of ISO 26000?*
- 2) *Should ISO 26000 contain minimum requirements?*
- 3) *How specific should the guidance in the standard be for it to be sufficiently practical?*
- 4) *Is there added value for the user of ISO 26000 in having a separate section on SR principles?*
- 5) *Should the concept of “organizational governance” be addressed in the standard, and if so, how?*
- 6) *How should Clause 7 (Implementation) be drafted bearing in mind that this is not a Management System Standard?*
- 7) *How do we ensure that there is consistent understanding and application of the concept of “stakeholder”?*
- 8) *How do we address concerns relating to use of the terms “supply chain” and “sphere of influence” (and possible concerns relating to the boundaries applying to SR)?*
- 9) *How will the standard address concerns relating to the perception (of some) that the current draft has an undue focus on business, and how will the standard provide advice that is specific to different types of organizations and stakeholder groups?*
- 10) *How will we ensure more effective integration and better co-ordination between the various clauses of the document?*

The questions identified by the LTF are essentially basic issues that should have been addressed by the Working Group before any drafting took place, but this fundamental step was skipped in an effort to meet the original deadline of finishing the document in three years. Each stakeholder group was instructed to review these questions before the Sydney meeting and be prepared to discuss these issues during the first few days of the meeting.

DISCUSSION OF THE LTF KEY ISSUES

Task Groups 4, 5 and 6 met in a joint session at the start of the WG meeting to review the ten questions identified by the Liaison task Force (LTF). The questions and the consensus outcome for each (in italics) is listed below:

- 1) **What are the principal objectives, and who is the identified end-user, of ISO 26000?**
 - *A statement will be issued clarifying the principal objectives and identified end-users of ISO 26000; the clarification will be based on what is outlined in the NWIP and other relevant documents.*
 - *Elements from this statement will be included in a revised Scope and Introduction with the aim of providing a clear basis for guiding the development of the standard.*

Specific provision will be made in the Introduction for an articulation of the possible benefits for organizations of using this standard.

- *As regards the length of the document, the current priority will be to focus on meeting the objectives and intended end-user of the Standard (as outlined above). In addition, and with due consideration to the mandate that only one document be produced, the feasibility and merit will be assessed of:*
 - *providing a guidance note for using ISO 26000 or using appendices.*
- *Regarding the tone, the document will seek to:*
 - *be easy to read and easily understood by non-specialists; use objective language that, when appropriate and possible, is framed in a positive manner.*

2) Should ISO 26000 contain minimum requirements?

- *In “assisting organizations in addressing their social responsibilities” (NWIP), ISO 26000 will provide guidance and clear recommendations on the scope of what constitutes SR behavior and on identifying the issues that need to be addressed in implementing SR. This may include descriptions of the fundamental expectations relating to performance and process.*
- *In doing so, organizations should be expected to identify and address those issues that are material and appropriate to their activities. As part of the process of identifying material issues, consideration should be given to:*
 - *Legal compliance as a minimum,*
 - *Encouraging adherence to relevant international norms of behavior*
 - *Generally accepted principles of socially responsible behavior*
 - *Understanding the expectations of relevant stakeholders*
 - *The potential significance of SR impacts*
- *Provision will be made in the standard for providing guidance on international norms of behavior that should be considered by organizations; these will be identified on the basis of ‘ international treaties and conventions, and will be limited to certain UN instruments (such as, for example, the Universal Declaration of Human rights and the ILO Conventions) and recognized principles of international law*
- *References to relevant UN instruments (e.g. the Universal Declaration of Human Rights) will not be included as Normative Reference, but as a separate specific category (e.g. “informative guidance references”)*
- *ISO 26000 shall not use language such as “shall” or “ensure” unless this is deemed absolutely necessary for specific purposes (and on the advice of the ISO Central Secretariat), without detracting from the elements contained in the WG/TG leadership statement relating to the MSS issue (see LKT6).*
- *The standard will aim to provide guidance on a consolidated “package” of good practice (as opposed to a series of options) in terms of identifying and addressing the expectations of society regarding the social responsibility behavior of organizations*

3) How specific should the guidance in the standard be for it to be sufficiently practical?

- *The focus throughout the standard will be on providing guidance that is applicable to all organizations (on the basis outlined in the WG/TG Leadership statement on LKT1), including guidance that may be applicable to a specific SR issue. In those*

instances where it is seen to be necessary for the objectives of the standard to be effectively fulfilled, then guidance will be provided that is specific to certain organizations.

- *Where such specific guidance is provided, it will be clearly indicated to which organizations it applies. If appropriate, this specific guidance may be included in a separate annex to the standard, any examples will not refer to implementing organizations by name. References to or examples involving specific SR initiatives should not be expressed in a manner suggesting endorsement of that initiative. Any use of examples and options cannot replace normative wording.*

4) Is there added value for the user of ISO 26000 in having a separate section on SR principles?

- *Agreement will be reached on the definition of principles for use in this standard. For the purposes of further drafting, Clause 5 should initially be retained, but be simplified to focus only on a concise list of core principles with the necessary elaboration for each. Once initial agreement has been reached on such a list, a decision can then be taken on the added value of the section. Further discussion will take place in TG 5 regarding the nature of the possible integration of so-called “substantive” principles in Clause 6.*

5) Should the concept of “organizational governance” be addressed in the standard, and if so, how?

- *Provision will be made for the subject of organizational governance in the standard in the belief that an organization with organizational governance measures in place will not necessarily be a socially responsible organization:*
 - *effective governance, based on SR-related objectives and principles, is necessary for an organization to be able to implement SR*
 - *OG is a core issue on its own, requiring specific SR principles and activities to be considered in its implementation*
- *Organizational governance will be retained in clause 6 in as much as there are seen to be issues related to OG for which an organization has to be accountable for it to be socially responsible. This does not mean that the standard will include details on the nature of specific organizational governance practices, as it is recognized that these may differ significantly depending on the nature and purpose of the organization and the jurisdiction in which the organization is operating.*
- *This issue is being addressed further by TG5 and will be addressed by the TG5 experts. Provision will also be made for the issue of organizational governance in Clause 4, which provides clarity on the context of SR. The nature of this provision will be clarified on the basis of further discussions within TG4.*
- *Clarity will be provided as to what is meant by the concept of organizational governance, (as distinct e.g. from “governance” and “corporate governance”), the existing sub-clause on organizational governance will be amended to avoid addressing issues relating exclusively to “corporate governance” (provision will be made e.g. for issues relating to transparency, but not to issues relating e.g. to the structure of the board).*

- 6) How should Clause 7 (Implementation) be drafted bearing in mind that this is not a Management System Standard?**
- *A statement will be issued by the WG Chairs and the Convenors of TG 4, 5 and 6, clarifying the leadership's current view on the elements relating to the issue of the MSS; this clarification will be based on what is outlined in the NWIP and other relevant documents and with consideration to the experts comments on WD.2 on this subject.*
 - *Although this is not an MSS, it is recognized that some MSS language and concepts can be used if this is deemed necessary and useful in adding clarity, particularly as regards the implementation of the substantive issues*
 - *The standard will focus on performance aspects, and will include guidance in relating specifically to the implementation of the Clause 6 issues.*
 - *A guidance document will be provided to the drafting team on issues to consider to avoid writing a MSS*
 - *TG6 drafting work will continue on self-contained key topics.*
- 7) How do we ensure that there is consistent understanding and application of the concept of “stakeholder”?**
- *A balanced ad hoc group under TG6 will be established to provide clarity on this issue through the provision of:*
 - *a more precise definition of stakeholder and the stakeholder concept based on agreed criteria*
 - *a clearly defined approach for stakeholder identification and prioritization*
 - *guidance on the decision-making principles that should inform when and how to engage with stakeholders*
 - *clarity on the process for responding to stakeholders*
- 8) How do we address concerns relating to use of the terms “supply chain” and “sphere of influence” (and possible concerns relating to the boundaries applying to SR)?**
- *Guidance will be provided on the process to be used by an organization for identifying and setting the boundaries of its social responsibility, with particular reference to those organizations over which it has control and/or significant influence, e.g. upstream and downstream of its core activities.*
- 9) How will the standard address concerns relating to the perception (of some) that the current draft has an undue focus on business, and how will the standard provide advice that is specific to different types of organizations and stakeholder groups?**
- *The standard will emphasize that all organizations have social responsibilities, while recognizing the background for highlighting the SR activities of companies*
 - *Where necessary, the different implications of SR for different organizational types (e.g. public or private sector) will be identified in relevant sections of the document*
 - *This question should be revisited once significant further progress has been made with drafting; thereafter possible concerns relating to the nature of the focus of the document can be addressed.*

10) How will we ensure more effective integration and better co-ordination between the various clauses of the document?

- *This will be addressed in terms of a revised approach regarding the process, a key element of which will include provision for closer integration between Clauses 5, 6, and 7 and the possibility of a change in structure and/or mandate of the LTF*
- *Elements of this approach will be agreed at Sydney where the development of a drafting plan for WD3 will be discussed.*
- *LTF creates a drafting plan taking into account the resolved key liaisons topics and the work done so far in the TGs.*
- *The TG leaders continue to work on the resolved self-contained key topics in drafting the new WD.*
- *Integration members address co-ordination and integration and report to the LTF*

The Industry Stakeholder Group paid particular attention to four of the above issues: (2) minimum requirements; (5) organizational governance; (6) management system approach; and (8) supply chain, sphere of influence. In at least three of these four issues, the above text did not resolve the issues in full.

- In the case on minimum requirements, while the agreed text was an improvement, it was evident in Sydney that a large percentage of the WG support including minimum performance requirements even though that is beyond the scope of a guidance document and most likely beyond the capability of the Working Group in the first instance.
- On the question of organizational governance, a consensus proposal to merge this issue with another core SR issue, fair operating practices, due to their extensive overlap, but the proposal was not supported by the TG5 convenor.
- On the management systems approach, even though the Working Group has been explicitly instructed not to write a management system standard (MSS), many members of the WG still want to write and MSS and are working to do so.

TG4 – SCOPE, SR DEFINITION, CONTEXT & SR PRINCIPLES

Introduction:

TG4 leadership revised the WD 2 Introduction based on comments received by WG SR experts. This proposal was basis for discussions in TG 4 meeting. A new drafting team was established to revise the introduction for WD.3 taking into account the discussion in TG 4 plenary.

Scope:

The comments on the version of the scope in WD.2 were discussed in TG4 and the text was revised to read:

This International Standard provides guidance to all types of organizations, regardless of their size or location, on:

- *principles and issues relating to social responsibility;*
- *integrating, implementing and promoting socially responsible practices;*

- *identifying and engaging with stakeholders;*
- *communicating commitments and performance relating to social responsibility; and*
- *contributing to sustainable development through social responsibility*

This standard encourages organizations to undertake activities that go beyond legal compliance. It promotes common understanding in the field of social responsibility. It clarifies the relationship between social responsibility principles and organizational governance frameworks.

It complements other instruments and initiatives relating to social responsibility. The application of this standard may take account of societal, environmental, legal and organizational diversity, as well as differences in economic conditions, provided international norms of behavior are observed.

This standard is not a management system standard and is not intended for conformity assessment or certification purposes. Use of this standard does not imply governmental endorsement or ratification of any of the conventions, agreements, standards or tools mentioned.

The above text is not final and will serve as the basis for discussion going forward, but it will be included as is in WD.3. The above text on scope conforms to industry positions on many issues (for all organizations, not a management system, etc.) but raises other issues that will certainly be problematic going forward and are not supported by industry, particularly the text regarding the observance of “international norms of behavior”.

SR Definition:

TG4 also reached agreement on a preliminary definition of SR that is also not final but will serve as the basis of discussion going forward. The preliminary definition reads:

Social responsibility: *Responsibility of an organization for the impacts of its decisions and activities on society and the environment, through transparent and ethical behavior that*

- *is consistent with sustainable development and the welfare of society;*
- *takes into account the expectations of stakeholders;*
- *is in compliance with applicable law and consistent with international norms of behavior;*
- *is integrated throughout the organization.*

Note: Activities include products and services.

As with the scope, the preliminary definition of SR conforms to some industry objectives (a short definition applicable to all kinds of organizations), but also contains aspects that are problematic, primarily “consistent with...the welfare of society” and “consistent with international norms of behavior”. In addition, a representative drafting team was established to work on definitions assigned to TG 4 except those relating to the term “stakeholder”.

Context:

The context section in WD.2 was highly subjective and political and will need to be revised in WD.3 to conform to the drafting guidance from LTF item (1) to use objective language. TG4 established a new drafting team to advance the text on the context and a member of the Industry Stakeholder Group put forward a very good proposal for a revised draft.

SR Principles:

Based on the discussion on the Liaison Key Topics in the joint TG 4-5-6 meetings and comments received on WD 2, TG4 agreed that ‘substantive principles’ will be addressed by new TG5 drafting teams. ‘General’ and ‘operative’ principles will be addressed in TG4 and will be combined into one category. In Sydney, TG4 agreed on a provisional “core list” or “fundamental” principles and the need for an introductory paragraph to be drafted and included in WD.3.

The provisional “core list” or “fundamental” principles are:

1. *Respect for internationally recognized instruments*
2. *Compliance with the law*
3. *Recognition of stakeholders' rights*
4. *Accountability*
5. *Transparency*
6. *Sustainable development (provide for systems thinking/ coherence)*
7. *Ethical conduct/behavior*
8. *Precautionary approach*
9. *Primacy of respect for fundamental human rights*
10. *Respect for diversity*

This provisional list will obviously require a considerable amount of further discussion before it will be finalized. Some elements, like respect for “internationally recognized instruments” will need to be defined and narrowed since the current definition does not define “internationally recognized” and could cover practically any “instrument” covering two or more countries.

TG5 – GUIDANCE ON CORE SR SUBJECTS/ISSUES

TG5 has defined SR Issues as: “Specific items that can be acted upon to seek favorable outcomes for the organization and/or its stakeholders”. The agreed list of issues was:

- *Environment*
- *Human rights*
- *Labor practices*
- *Organizational governance*
- *Fair business practices*
- *Community involvement/ society development*
- *Consumer issues*

TG5 established four ad hoc teams to draft the seven headings: 1) Environment; 2) Human Rights & Labor Practices; 3) Organizational Governance & Fair Business Practices; and 4) Consumer Issues and Community Involvement/Society Development.

The drafting group on **environment** is looking at the issues of pollution prevention, climate change, ozone depletion, sustainable consumption, land use, life cycle approaches, ecosystem conservation and restoration, and education and awareness-raising.

The group on **human rights** and **labor rights** is looking at the issues of civil and political rights; economic, cultural and social rights; fundamental rights at work; and community rights. This group has agreed on the need to make a clear distinction between governmental responsibilities and non-governmental responsibilities.

Under **organizational governance**, the group is looking at the issues of inclusiveness; ethical conduct; disclosure of information; respect for the rule of law; and accountability. Under **fair operating practices** it is discussing promotion of ethical and transparent activities; promotion of free competition; application of fair and ethical supply and after-supply practices; respect for intellectual and other property rights, and respect for users' interests; and the fight against corruption. Given the large degree of overlap between these two areas, this group recommended merging organizational governance and fair operating practices into one SR core issue, although that suggestion was not supported by the TG5 convenor.

The group on **consumer issues** is looking at the issues of fair business, advertising and marketing practices; provision of true and adequate information; provision and development of safe and reliable products and services; mechanism for product recalls; provision and development of environmentally and socially beneficial products and services; after-supply service and support and dispute resolution and redress; data protection and privacy; access to essential products and services; education and awareness; and sustainable consumption. The same group is working on **society development** and is looking at the issues of development impacts, community involvement, and social development.

Revised Framework for Clause 6 – Core SR Issues:

TG5 also developed a revised draft framework that will be used for each of the seven Core SR Issues. This section of the guidance standard will have an introduction discussing the linkages between the SR Core Issues and will then apply the following framework for each of the seven SR Core Issues (*Environment, Human Rights, etc.*):

- 1) **Rationale:** *For each SR Core Issue, explain why it is significant in the SR context. Identify and interpret the substantive principles that are specifically relevant for the core issue. Address the linkage of principles to the SR Core Issue and Sub-Issues.*
- 2) **Sub-Issues:** *Issues to act on, e.g. for Environment, a sub-issue is pollution prevention.*
 - a) **Rationale:** *Supplements the Core Issue rationale, if needed (i.e., if adds value).*
 - b) **Key considerations and related actions:** *What are the specific values and fundamental expectations related to this issue? What are the specific actions the organization may need to take?*
 - c) **Key References:** *Include references to relevant international conventions, treaties, and declarations. Possibly include additional references to initiatives, etc. Focus on one, two or three (most key and most global).*
 - d) **Examples:** *Short examples of practice may be integrated in the text; longer illustrative text may require boxes in this clause.*

TG6 – GUIDANCE ON IMPLEMENTING SR

The TG6 meetings in Sydney were rather disorganized and struggled over many of the same issues that it has been debating for some time, including:

Management Systems: Although the clear direction to TG6 from the joint TG4-5-6 session was that the section on implementation in WD.2 was a management system standard (MSS) and that it must be revised to avoid an MSS approach, many members of TG6 immediately questioned this outcome in the TG6 meetings. It is clear that many members of TG6 still want to write an MSS and so are pushing for an MSS approach in the section on SR implementation. An effort has been under way since the Sydney meeting to develop a new

structure for clause 7 that avoids an MSS approach, but the MSS issue is not likely to be resolved in the near future.

Performance Assessment: The group discussed the complexity of assessment tools and SR issues, including making assessments at different levels – overall and/or activities. The section will likely include guidance on criteria and how to integrate different assessments in one model and to include assessment in the planning stage. The group also discussed engaging stakeholders in the organizational procedures for assessment, making assessments on progress towards objectives, with the help of key performance indicators.

Verification and Assurance: The standard is not intended for 3rd party certification or conformity assessment but it was intended to “provide practical guidance related to enhancing credibility of reports and SR claims”. TG6 discussed whether verification of SR claims by organizations was excluded as well. TG6 found that assurance is captured in reporting and that the guidance should consider assurance as it relates to an organizations’ existing organizational systems. Clause 7 would provide guidance on different approaches to assurance which reflects the complexity of the SR concept. The terms verification and assurance should be defined and explained.

Key Performance Indicators: TG6 suggested the use of indicators without determining which those should be in the guidance standard. The indicators should be more on performance than process. The guidance should describe criteria and processes through which each organization can identify its key performance indicators based on stakeholder engagement, e.g. setting targets (‘Formulating actions and performance assessments’). It should focus on improvement and reference GRI and other available resources, e.g. from rating agencies, indexes. It might include guidance on how to set targets.

Stakeholders: TG6 established an ad hoc group to develop guidance on stakeholder definition, identification and engagement.

DEVELOPMENT OF WORKING DRAFT 3

In Sydney, the Liaison task Force developed a Drafting Plan for Working Draft 3 (WD.3) that was adopted by the entire Working Group to provide clear deadlines to the Task Groups and to ensure more uniform and coordinated drafting among the Task Groups. The key deadlines are:

- February-March: Establish drafting groups, develop drafting and commenting guidelines, and draft text;
- April-May: Conduct limited consultations among drafting groups, Task Group conveners and editing committee;
- June-August: LTF reviews drafts, Editing Committee compiles and edits WD.3, and translation;
- September: Full consultation among Working Group experts, comment period, and compilation of comments;
- October: LTF identifies new Liaison Key Topics and develops proposals for consideration by the Working Group; and
- Mid-October to November: LTF distributes Liaison Key topics to the Working Group.
- November 5-9: 5th SR Working Group meeting in Vienna, Austria

ORGANIZATIONAL TASK GROUPS

TG1 – Funding and Participation: The primary objective of TG1 is to raise funding for WG experts that need additional support to attend the WG meetings and to ensure balanced participation among geographic regions and stakeholder groups. TG1 has been active in raising funds from a variety of sources.

TG2 – Communication: TG2 approved a policy on Media Participation on engaging the media in raising awareness about ISO 26000 in a balanced and effective manner.

TG3 – Operating Procedures: TG3 reached consensus on procedural clarifications and also developed a new procedure on the participation of national standards bodies. TG3 also developed an operating procedure on D-liaison organizations that establishes a new process for approving D-liaison organizations and criteria for reviewing D liaison applications and membership.

NEXT WORKING GROUP MEETINGS

The 5th SR Working Group meeting will take place from **5 to 9 November 2007** in Vienna, Austria and will be hosted by Austrian Standards Institute (ON) with the support of the Austrian government and the Austrian Development Agency. The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the Global Compact will also support the meeting.

The 6th SR Working Group meeting will take place in **June 2008** in Santiago, Chile and will be hosted by the National Standards Body of Chile. The exact dates of the meetings have not been confirmed.