

## Steve Cornish

---

**From:** wieland@fh-konstanz.de  
**Sent:** Monday, June 06, 2005 8:52 AM  
**To:** Mozghan Aliakbari; Neill Allan; Dr. Brennan Allen; Federico Andribet; Michael Atlan; Viroj Na Bangchang; Stefano Bertasi; Dr. Kai Bethke; Sebastián Bigorito; William R. Blackburn; Patrick von Braunmühl; Brun, Emilie; Juan Carrera; Joe Cascio; leonor.ceruti@inn.cl; rse@inn.cl; Dr.Chaiyuth Chavalitnitikul; Kim Christiansen; Jos Claessen; Simone de Colle; Steven P. Cornish; Alicia Duran; Villy Dyhr; Eiichiro.Adachi; Abdelmalek Chafai Elalouei; Mathea Fammels; Daniel Fernandez; Javier Fuenzalida; Shizuo Fukada; Didier Gauthier; Przemyslaw Gorlach; Deni Greene; Adam B. Greene; Mario Font Guido; Sofia Hagman; Wolfram Heger; Jens Henriksson; Clifford Henry; Winistörfer Herbert; Mohd Yusof Hitam; Hans Hofmeijer; Dick Hortensius; Peter A Houghton; Anders Holbech Jespersen; Justice, Dwight; Koh Juan Kiat; Soodan Kim; Dr. Annette Kleinfeld; Andreas Kovar; Ken-ichi Kumagai; Anne Gadegaard Larsen; Jooran Lee; Kyung-Han Lee; Dr K.M Loi; Alejandro Lorea; Cornis van der Lugt; Alicia Ruiz Luna; Patrick Mallet; Christophe Margot; Pierre Mazeau; Roman H. Mesicek; Birgitte Bang Nielsen; Homeira Noroozizadeh; Bjarne Pedersen; Perla Puterman S.; Stan Rodgers; Siriwan Romchatthong; Tom Rotherham; Ryszard Rozek; María Teresa Saccucci; Mariko Sano; Carolyn Schmidt; Dr. Ingo Schoenheit; Masao Seki; Roberto Solarte; Dr. Anant Suwanapal; Angela Tanno; Antonio Tencati; Supachai Tepatanapong; Luis Trama; Tarcila Reis Ursini; Susanna Vahtila; Patricia Ruiz Velasco; Lilia Granillo Vázquez; Halina Ward; Miles Watkins; Kernaghan Webb; Robert George White; Tomosaburo Yano; Rochelle Zaid  
**Cc:** Anabela Vaz Ribeiro; Dineo Shilenge; Veronica Yaji; Yang Zeshi; kristina.sandberg@sis.se; maud@fh-konstanz.de  
**Subject:** Design Specification ITG 6; Proposal for structuring discussion



130505 - 260505  
Documentation ...

Dear friends,

Thanks for the inspiring discussion during the last couple of weeks.

For all experts who did not have the chance to participate in the discussion from the very beginning, please find attached the complete and chronological documentation of this exchange of arguments.

In order to take the next step in the discussion, we should try to structure the results of our efforts. Therefore please find my thoughts on what the results of the discussion are and how we could proceed in the upcoming weeks:

I. These are the points on which we all agree:

A) What is not the purpose of ITG 6? 1. We are not going to develop a Management Systems Standard. 2. We are not going to develop a standard for certification purpose. 3. We are not going to develop a standard, which replace existing inter-governmental agreements with relevance. 4. We are not going to develop an integration toll for other management systems.

B) What is the purpose of ITG 6? 1. We will take into account existing global principles, guidelines, knowledge etc. 2. We want to provide practical guidance for implementation/integration of SR concepts 3. We want this guidance for all types of organizations und and maybe also for specific organizations (government, NGOs etc.)

II. There are some tricky aspects in this seemingly well-defined task.

A) If the result we striving for is not a management systems, what is it then?

Is it a "guidance standard on SR" (mon, 16.5; Stefano Bertasi) or is it a "process standard or performance standard" (thu, 19.5; Cornis Lugt), is it a "model" or a "navigation tool" (fri, 20.5; Miles Watkins) or a "guidance document" (wed, 18.5; Ricky Fukada)?

I think the answer to this question depends on the second aspect.

B) If we really want to give practical guidance for all type of organizations we run quite clear into a bunch of problems because these organizations are quite different. On the one hand they don't share the same practice, and on the other hand they don't play the some role in SR and don't follow the same decision making logic. If our practical guidance is very (triple) practical we will not be in a position to produce something like a "guidance standard" but we will probably end up with a description of diversity. So there must be some sort and level of abstraction and this brings us very close to the logic and language of a management system.

III. With regard to what has been said so far and the content of our first round of discussion I think it might be appropriate to talk about a "guidance document on SR" which explains the minimum requirements for implementing successfully a SR management. Some of the participants (for instance: sat, 14.5; Dick Hortensius / fri, 20.5; Anne Gadegaard Larsen/ mon, 23.5; William R. Blackburn/ tue, 24.5; Cornis Lugt/ thu, 26.5; Peter Houghton) contributed detailed structures and frames for this document. When we try to compare these different models we see that they have three features in common:

A) They all talk about Principles, which define and/or describe the spirit, the attitude, the orientation that every type of organizations needs in order to make SR management a living process. Such principles are for example: sustainability, integrity, leadership, process orientation, stakeholder orientation etc. etc. (The task definition of ITG 5 is to explore Social responsibility core context with issues, definitions, principles,...we will therefore communicate with the ITG 5 secretary to see what they are doing in this point.)

B) A further point in common is that these principles must be realized in the every day business. For these purpose any type of organization needs Basic Elements (we might find another word for "elements"). Examples for these basic elements are: Code of Ethics/Code of Conduct, Communication, Training, Incentives etc. etc. Why don't we discuss these basic elements which every organizations needs in order to implement SR successfully and make the "paper principles" living documents.

C) To give very practical guidance how to realize this principles and basic elements we should add Case Studies. They should reflect (if possible) the diversity of instruments, approaches etc. in organizations and fields of activities.

I think this is one possibility to structure the discussion and the expected output. The core idea is a combination of "practical guidance/any type of organization". This seems to be the really new aspect and function and this is not competitive with existing standards and initiatives.

I would like to learn about your opinion with regard to this evaluation of the results of the discussion so far, especially with regards to the point "I.These are the points on which we all agree" (just to close this point of discussion). Furthermore please let me know your opinion on the proposal to structure the discussion and design specification document ("III").

The leadership of ITG 6 is ready to integrate your proposals and comments to a first draft for such a design specification. Please send your response as soon as possible.

Looking forward to your comments and proposals,

Yours sincerely,

Secretary of Interim Task Group 6

Prof. Dr. Josef Wieland

## Dokumentation of the discussion (ITG 6) (13.05 to 26.05 )

---

EMAIL

Interim Task Group 6: Operationalization (“How”) Aspects

-----

Dear ITG 6 Experts,

in the last email (28.April) I asked to come forward with comments or a draft proposal on how to proceed with the task definition of ITG 6.

“Task Definition: to explore what it would look like for the standard to address (e.g., what language might be used) to provide guidance appropriate for all organizations to understand and apply the SR core context, and guidance appropriate for specific kinds of organizations and how these issues might be reflected in a design specification and how these issues might be worked on thereafter. (9.April, Webb)

Mr. Dr Miles Watkins made one contribution to this discussion suggesting to consider following aspects:

„As a starter, we should have a debate as to why the standard should or should not 'look' like ISO 14001, OHSAS 18001 and ISO 9001. I believe that this is a reasonable starting point as a) most organisations that will use the SR standard are probably already using one or more of the other three and b) this will be a reoccurring debate if we do not get it out of the way now.“ (28,April, Watkins)

In order to speed the discussion I would appreciate comments about Mr. Dr. Watkins’s proposal and/or new proposals.

Looking forward to your contributions.

Best regards,

Prof. Dr. Josef Wieland  
Secretary  
Interim Task Group 6

---

**Am:** Fri, 13 May 2005 12:44:34 -0500

**Von:** "William R. Blackburn" <WRB@wblackburnconsulting.com>

I do not concur that the workproduct should look like a voluntary ISO 14001 or 9001 or OHSAS 18001 standard. ISO's press release of January 28 which launched our current process made it clear that the proposed standard would

- \* “not be a management system”
- \* “not be for certification purposes”
- \* “not replace existing inter-governmental agreements with relevance to social responsibility”; an
- \* “take into account...existing global principles, standards, guidelines and knowledge...”

Our emphasis should be on showing how organizations can select and use various existing standards and practices already developed through global multi-stakeholder processes, knitting them together into a cohesive approach to social responsibility. Our job should be to “connect the dots.” ISO 14032 provides an extensive complementary list of examples of how different companies around the world addressed EPE. We can prepare something similar for the broader objective of sound social responsibility programs.

Bill

William R. Blackburn

---

**Am:** Sat, 14 May 2005 10:24:37 +0800

**Von:** Dr KM Loi [kmloi@streamyx.com](mailto:kmloi@streamyx.com)

Hi all,

I would go along the line with William's suggestion to tackle this "How" aspects as a guideline and NOT as three important points as raised by him. Repeat. It should not be a management system for certification purposes and not to replace the existing global principles, standards, guidelines and others....

I am of a humble opinion that with the existing and equally well established principles, standards and others, we should bring the mammoth task and put it down on a simple expression on paper where all "the dots" are aligned. Based on the NWIP, several references have been made and do we think it is exclusive. Perhaps, there are more similarly approached at regional and national levels.

Let's establish a frame work or term of reference again to help us to have a common approach (rolled up our sleeves) towards tackling the task ahead with a better focus.

Taking a leaf from ISO Secretariat, let discuss whether it is going to be a standard or TS or TR or IWA or what. I understand that some of us would like to work on it now and would discuss at the later stage whether it should be any of the ISO deliverables.

Nevertheless, let's start the ball rolling.  
Regards

KM Loi  
Malaysia

---

**Am:**, 14 May 2005 18:13:12 +0200

**Von:** Kim Christiansen [kc@lca-net.com](mailto:kc@lca-net.com)

Dear all,

As stated in the plenary in Salvador, the ISO managements systems standards are there to help us writing the guideline standard on SR, not to be copy-pasted. But we are writing an ISO-document and almost all national standards on SR use the MS approach. So using a s tructure similar to ISO 9001, 14001 and IHSAS 18001 is not conflicting with the ISO press reelease, and it would be much easier for users of our guidelines to find something familiar to what that have already met. ISO 14032 is a collection of examples that works because they refer to the use of ISO 14031. It will not work without 14031. We don't have a 14031 for SR i.e. we need to write both in our standard guideline. Combining inputs from other international standards and agreements e.g. AA 1000 and SA 8000 is a must in our work- and the guideline standard shall (!) refer any certification or verifications issues to these existing standards - but reducing the guideline to a compilation of examples on how organisations have used AA

1000 and SA8000 is not fulfilling the task we have been given.

See the above as an input for discussion!

regards,  
Kim Christiansen

---

**Am:** Sat, 14 May 2005 13:22:08 -0400

**Von:** Perla Puterman [p.p.s@cantv.net](mailto:p.p.s@cantv.net)

Dear all,

I would go along the line with Kim suggestion, However, The ISO SR Standard will not be for certification purposes, not to replace existing inter-governmental agreements with relevance to social responsibility; and take into account...existing global principles, standards, guidelines and knowledge, as MR William had mentioned. I consider that we can use the same structure of the standards already existing as a frame work to develop the SR items. In the other hand, all the ISO standards, including the standards which include specification are voluntary, which means only the companies, decide whether to apply them or not.

By the way If I understood correctly, Mr. Miles proposal, he is not telling us to developed a new management system, his idea is to take in account or not the existing Standards to develop the new one. As I can remember, in the group 2 we decide not to create new management systems, but we decide too, to take in account the existing standards.

Best Regards,

Perla  
Ing. Perla Puterman S.

---

**Am:** Sat, 14 May 2005 22:33:16 +0200

**Von:** Dick Hortensius [Dick.Hortensius@nen.nl](mailto:Dick.Hortensius@nen.nl)

Dear all,

Please find attached some thought related to the issue to be addressed by ITG 6.

I think that we should not re-write a management system approach to SR, but should acknowledge that many organizations have implemented management systems and that we should provide guidance on how to integrate SR into the organization's management framework (this is what we initially discussed in Salvador).

Attached are:

- ideas presented in Salvador and further developed thereafter;
- an article published in ISO Management Systems in which we draw parallels between SR and the way in which ISO has addressed quality and environment.

best regards,

Dick Hortensius  
Senior Standardization Consultant Management Systems

---

**Am:** Sun, 15 May 2005 16:29:03 +0200

**Von:** Jens Henriksson [jens.henriksson@sverigeskonsumentad.se](mailto:jens.henriksson@sverigeskonsumentad.se)

Dear all,

Just a brief note to say that I support the comment made by Kim Christiansen.

Best regards,

Jens Henriksson

---

**Am:** Mon, 16 May 2005 09:33:19 +0100

**Von:** "Watkins, Miles" [Miles.Watkins@aggregate.com](mailto:Miles.Watkins@aggregate.com)

All

I was simply suggesting that users may appreciate a familiar 'shape' to the document. This will simply mean that they will be able to find what they are looking for easily without having to be conversant with a new document structure.

MW

---

**Am:** Mon, 16 May 2005 18:29:08 +0200

**Von:** BERTASI Stefano [stefano.bertasi@iccwbo.org](mailto:stefano.bertasi@iccwbo.org)

Dear fellow ITG 6 experts,

Please find below my views in response to Prof. Dr. Wieland's e-mail and the proposal by Miles Watkins of having a debate on whether the standard should or should not 'look' like ISO 14001, OHSAS 18001 and ISO 9001.

I agree with Miles that this question is certainly one that will colour the discussions of the entire Working Group unless it can be put to rest in a satisfactory manner, and preferably earlier rather than later in the process, if we are to make substantive progress.

My own perspective on this is that the recommendations of the ISO Advisory Group on Corporate Social Responsibility, the resolutions of the ISO Technical Management Board, and the New Work Item Proposal all state quite clearly that the purpose of the Working Group is not to develop a management system standard on social responsibility, but rather to produce a guidance standard on social responsibility.

Therefore, while the various ISO and other standards referred to by Miles should clearly be taken into account as relevant instruments that organizations can be referred to in offering them guidance on how to approach social responsibility, it would not be appropriate or helpful in my view to model the design of the guidance standard to be developed by our Working Group along the lines of existing management system standards.

For the above reasons, I believe that the proposals made by various speakers at our Salvador meeting, including in particular those by Messrs. Fukada and Greene hold the best prospects for being able to produce a workable and sufficiently flexible design for the guidance standard that we have been tasked to develop.

I take Miles' point that various organizations already using the standards he cites will be familiar with the management system standard approach. However, my feeling is that such an approach and design are not applicable to the guidance standard on social responsibility that we are expected to produce.

I trust that the above is useful.

Kind regards,

Stefano Bertasi

Director and Deputy Head  
Department of Policy and Business Practices  
International Chamber of Commerce (ICC)

---

**Am:** Mon, 16 May 2005 12:04:30 -0500  
**Von:** "Adam B. Greene" [agreene@uscib.org](mailto:agreene@uscib.org)

Dear All:

First, to answer the question posed by Prof. Wieland, we do not need to debate whether or not we should look to existing ISO management system standards (MSS) as a model for the guidance standard on social responsibility for the simple reason that the TMB has already decided that we are NOT to create a MSS. Since the SR guidance standard is NOT going to be an MSS and will NOT be for certification, we do not need to worry about existing MSS in the design of the SR guidance standard. We should therefore concern ourselves with producing useful and practical guidance on SR for all users, not just the relatively small number that already use an ISO MSS.

Second, ITG-6 is looking at issues broader than simply "how". We have been asked to explore the organizational aspects of SR: Guidance appropriate for all organizations as well as guidance appropriate for specific types of organizations, which can include governments, private enterprises, NGO's, trade unions, etc. There is a wide range of practical guidance that can and should be included in this section of the SR guidance standard.

Best regards,

Adam Greene  
Expert Representing the International Organization of Employers (IOE)  
Industry Stakeholder Group

---

**Am:** Mon, 16 May 2005 15:23:27 -0400  
**Von:** Bob White [bob@bri.ca](mailto:bob@bri.ca)

Hello people,

Please accept the following contribution to this extremely important debate.

I believe the SR Guideline should be linked to existing best practice standards and models related to management systems for ISO 9001, ISO 9004, ISO 14001, OHSAS 18001, SA 8000 and AA 1000 with the GRI as the reporting framework.

My reasoning is based on the following:

1. From the direction we received from ISO:

Some of the conditions imposed by the ISO Technical management Board with regard to the SR standard include:

- The standard will apply to all types of organizations, not just the corporate sector
- The standard will be a tool for the sustainable development of organizations
- The standard is not to be used for third-party certification

The standard will be written in a manner flexible enough to support current initiatives, conventions and tools as well as future developments in this field, and in such a way that it does not stifle creativity within



organizations as to how they address social responsibility.

The following wording would be appropriate:

"This International Standard provides guidance to enable an organization to formulate SR systems taking into account communication of stakeholders. It is not intended for certification purpose, or regulatory or contractual use."

Throughout the standard, the verb form "should", shall be used. Only one standard shall be developed. This direction does not preclude or even encourage avoidance of a guidance document that is a Social Responsibility Management System (SRMS).

A Management System is defined by the International Organization for Standardization as "that part of the organization's management system that focuses on the achievement of results, in relation to defined objectives, to satisfy the needs, expectations and requirements of interested parties or stakeholders, as appropriate. The management system objectives complement other objectives of the organization such as those related to growth, funding, profitability, the environment and occupational health and safety."

A SRMS also contributes to the achievement of the New Work Item Proposal which was approved by ISO membership, and states that the proposed standard seeks to:

- Assist organizations in establishing, implementing, maintaining and improving social responsibility frameworks;
- Support organizations in demonstrating their social responsibility through responsiveness and the effective engagement of all stakeholders including employees, which may enhance their confidence and satisfaction;
- Facilitate credible communications on the organization's commitments and performance related to SR; and
- Promote and maintain greater transparency and fairness in organizations.

The standard will be a tool for the sustainable development of organizations while respecting varying conditions related to laws and regulations, customs and culture, physical environment, and economic development.

We must build on the work that has been done by all of the ISO and other committees that have developed voluntary management system standards.

## 2. Use of the Guideline for Certification or Registration

This guideline, as instructed, will have 'shoulds' and no 'shalls' as in the ISO 9004 Quality management System Guideline.

ISO 9004 has been used as a guidance document for TQM by many organizations since 1987 and no one has been registered or certified to it.

Just because the existing voluntary ISO Management System standards have been abused by some users, registrars and customers it does not mean that we should ignore the value in these documents.

Over the last 20 years, I have worked with thousands of organizations, worldwide, that have used these standards to guide the development of a sustainable Integrated Management System (IMS) that has resulted in continual improvement of organizational effectiveness and efficiency and stakeholder satisfaction.

A SRMS does not mean 'registration'.

### 3. Adoption of the SR Guideline

We must create a document that is used widely and in great numbers by every size and type of organization in both the north and the south, developed and developing countries.

This will not happen if we add to the existing confusion by creating another CSR model or guideline that ignores the investment that millions of organizations have already made on their CSR journey toward Sustainable Development, even if they do not know they are on the journey.

The SR Guidance document must allow those organizations that have already implemented management systems based on one or more of the above standards (ISO 9001, ISO 9004, ISO14001, OHSAS 18001, ILO OH&S Guidelines, SA 8000 and AA 1000) to build on their system or they will ignore it.

### 4. An Integrated Management System

In addition, we need a guideline that shows how to develop a SRMS based on the integration of all of the common elements in the above standards.

Too many organizations have implemented separate management systems (QMS, EMS etc) based on each of the above standards and guidelines. These 'silo's' have contributed to the reinforcement of departmental 'silo's' within the organization. This results in 'suboptimization' because the organization often addresses those issues presented by the most powerful MS manager rather than those most important to the organization and its stakeholders.

A SRMS Guideline that could show how to integrate the management systems required for quality, environment, health and safety and social accountability would have great appeal and be widely used.

Attached is a copy of the report I prepared for the stakeholder group I represent, Canadian industry.

All the best,

Bob

---

**Am:** Mon, 16 May 2005 16:36:15 -0500

**Von:** "Adam B. Greene" [agreene@uscib.org](mailto:agreene@uscib.org)

Dear All:

In response to the message from Bob White, I have to disagree on one important point: the TMB very clearly decided that the SR guidance standard will NOT be an MSS.

First, the TMB made clear that no further justification studies were needed, including a Guide 72 Justification Study that would be required if they had intended us to write an MSS. Second, presentations by senior ISO staff on this issue state explicitly that this will not be an MSS. And third, one must only talk with members of the TMB to hear very clearly that they do not want the SR guidance standard to be an MSS.

It is therefore pointless to continue to debate the merits of developing an MSS approach for our work. The MSS approach has been excluded from our mandate, period. We are developing guidance on SR, which can take many forms, but an MSS isn't one of them.

Adam Greene  
Industry Expert representing the International Organization of

Employers

---

**Am:** Tue, 17 May 2005 06:39:06 +0800

**Von:** Stan Rodgers <[mail@avteq.com.au](mailto:mail@avteq.com.au)>

Dear All,

I have read the correspondence offered to date on the work of the Group and believe that this is making a valuable contribution to moving ahead. I would however like to expand upon Dicks work by offering a simplified SR model or approach for your consideration. There are many substeps in the model which I have excluded related to issues such as communication, the identification of and communication with its interested parties etc.

I believe an organisation starts down this path by considering the risk of not assuming its social responsibilities. In my limited experience organisations are rarely 100 altruistic and something triggers an organisation to consider its social responsibilities. This may be the action taken by competitor, a community group or a simply request by its shareholders or its desire to seek further investment.

Once this has occurred the organisation may want to assess its social responsibilities in the context of its operations, its mission, vision, values ethics but also looking at the broader issues as they apply to its business such as the Global Compacts, CERES principles, ICC guidelines, its own corporate standards etc. The output is the identification of its social responsibility risks. (This is similar in concept to the initial review in ISO 14004). These may relate to the environment, competitive advantage, customers/consumers, society (perhaps the local community) financial in terms of investors etc. The organisation may have already addressed some of these by implementing ISO 9001, 14001, SA 8000, adopted International Accounting Standards, AA 1000 etc.

>From this the organisation starts down the familiar path of addressing these social risks by (at this point) setting its Corporate SR policy in conjunction with its interested parties but in the context of its own corporate strategy, budget, future planning etc. This is followed by setting its CSR objectives and targets, putting in place the core elements of a management system such as documentation, records, document control, audits etc. necessary to deliver the organisations CSR policy. It then monitors and measures its performance against its CSR policy and objectives and targets and periodically reviews these against its CSR risks etc. and acts through continual improvement to make any changes.

I look forward to further debate.

Regards  
Stan Rodgers

---

**Am:** 17 May 2005 07:46:14 +0200

**Von:** Kim Christiansen <[kc@lca-net.com](mailto:kc@lca-net.com)>

Dear all,

I am fully in line with Bob - big surprise. The ISO Technical Management Board Working Group on Integrated Use of Management Systems Standards uses a similar approach without setting up a new MS standard i.e. giving guidance based on the acceptance of the validity and usefulness of existing standards and the experiences in using them as basis for a variety of IMS implementations. The ISO SR WG can in a similar manner use the structure and process approach as well as the guidelines and advice on the contents outline in management system standards like ISO 9001 and ISO 14001 and AA1000, SA 8000, GRI etc., respectively. Neither the IUMSS guideline nor the SR guideline are for certification; if organizations want to certify their management systems and similarly get verification of the social responsibility performance, sustainability reporting and alike, they will still have to use the existing standards and similar offers.

best wishes  
Kim

---

**Am:** Tue, 17 May 2005 10:19:15 +0200  
**Von:** Hans Hofmeijer <hofmeijer@ilo.org>

I am afraid that many of the contributions to the ongoing debate that support the idea of developing a standard that looks and feels like other ISO standards reflect a fundamental misunderstanding of the SR concept. They do not seem to recognize that most aspects of SR cannot be treated the same way as for instance quality and environment. I sometimes wonder if everyone has actually read and understood the report of the Advisory Group on which the TMB decision was based. Perhaps we should develop a simple test to check this (just joking). Anyway, the whole discussion only proves Adam's earlier point that we will have to deal with the basics in plenary in Bangkok before deciding on design and format issues.

---

**Am:** Wed, 18 May 2005 11:53:19 +1000  
**Von:** Deni Greene <deni@greene.com.au>

Greetings everyone  
I agree with those who said this is NOT intended to be a management system standard. I believe our guidance on this issue is very clear. Further, the issue of social responsibility is not appropriately handled by a MSS in any case.

We can go round and round on this issue and it appears that those who expressed the view in Brazil that this should be a MSS still hold those views, and those who disagreed in Brazil still disagree. How are we going to reach a consensus so we can move on from this discussion?

Deni Greene

---

**Am:** Wed, 18 May 2005 01:24:04-0500  
**Von:** Tom Rotherham <trotherham@iisd.ca>

Dear all,

There is a way forward, and I think that it lies somewhere in the following:

1. acknowledging that there are two camps who do not want a MSS, but that they have very different reasons for their opposition: one camp does not want a MSS because they believe that there is a need not JUST for process guidance but also for performance guidance (and that the international conventions in particular provide us with a base from which we can draw performance guidance); another camp does not want a MSS because it too easily leads to what they see as a value-negative service: certification of another part of their systems (when in fact they have already paid for certification of their quality system, environmental management system, OH&S system, ... so the added value is marginal even though the cost is the same).
2. we also must recognize that there are some people out there who would like to use the SR standard as a tool/mechanism to further investigate and promote the harmonization of MSSs. I think that these people must drop that ambition because it is the one complication that we cannot deal with in this process.
3. despite this opposition, we must recognize that some of the guidance

that we should provide on SR is process-based and therefore could be considered by some to be systems-based guidance- or the kind of guidance that one might find in a MSS;

4. we must also keep in mind that just because we may have to provide SOME guidance that might be considered systems-based DOES NOT mean that we are developing a MSS. There is nothing wrong with systems-based guidance: there is something wrong with a MSS. The line between too much system-based guidance and not enough is a very grey zone, and probably different in everyone's own mind. But if we can all acknowledge that there is a value, but also a limit, to systems-based guidance - and that the objective is to provide enough to be useful but not so much so that we have effectively created a MSS trojan horse - will help us to take a step forward.

5. As someone who participated in discussions in the SAG recommendations, the Stockholm conference summary, the TMB resolution and the NWIP, I can safely say that all were written in the spirit- if not always the specific wording - of avoiding another MSS. There is absolutely NO WAY that the TMB is going to accept from us anything that looks like a MSS. Anyone who thinks otherwise and tries to proceed otherwise is wasting their time in this WG.

6. the way we proceed is, in my mind, for everyone to stop talking about MSSs and instead to focus on a) what are the systems-based elements that we should really provide guidance on (i.e. that are either not provided in existing sources of guidance, or that are dealt with in existing sources of guidance but not in a way that is appropriate for SR); b) what are the performance-based elements that we should be providing guidance on (and for which we can legitimately do so); and c) very importantly, but so far largely ignored I think, what are the kinds of guidance that we should provide to help organizations work their way through the confusing mess of existing sources of guidance, different SR components with different time-horizons and different levels of influence, different components of society who have to work together differently to pursue different types of SR objectives, different motivations and justifications for investments in SR, ... The longer we spend debating whether or not something is a MSS the less time we spend on this very important third element.

7. Once we have a reasonable draft of the standard we can then proof it against what I believe is the main criteria of the anti-MSS camp: is this standard easily adapted into a certification tool? If not, then everyone can relax. If so, then we have to think about how to change enough to relax these concerns while still ensuring that the guidance is comprehensive and useful.

But the absolute key to being able to move forward is that we need is a common understanding that it is our common objective to develop something that CANNOT be used for certification and that is not limited in scope to the same stuff as the traditional MSSs. Agree to that, stop using the word MSS, and then lets get on with our job.

Best,

Tom

---

**Am:** Wed, 18 May 2005 16:18:07 +0900  
**Von:** [shizuo\\_fukada@omron.co.jp](mailto:shizuo_fukada@omron.co.jp)

Dear all:

I got late to make comments, but I make my comments as follows. And I agree with what Hans(Hofmeijer) said in his mail:

1) (Going through with every members' inputs about the captioned subject)  
I must emphasize that we need to give respect and honor to what our predecessors of the SAG members have contributed to this complex issue in the past for almost two years. The SAG recommendation is full of the advisors'(consisted of different stakeholders and organizations) the whole wisdom, insight and the consensus based on the whole-hearted efforts.

2)AND, ISO TMB have already and officially made a resolution to proceed a guidance document making totally based on this SAG recommendations. 7 recommendations and 9 characteristics. And that followed the NWIP which was approved. No MSS and No certificaion for 26000.

It is done upto this stage.

3) The SAG recommendation clearly states that SR involves a number of subjects and issues that are qualitatively different from any other ISO stds that ISO has dealt in the past. So, this std making is different from any other ISO MSS standards.

Similarly, any terminology or definition used and applied to the past MSS standards could/should not be applicable to this new-age, multi-dimentional design specificaion. The definition of ISO 26000 should be made out of the SAG recommendations and TMB resolutions..

4) We just cannot go round and round in a circle on the same path debating the same subjects, we better make a practical move as members of TG6, and step up our efforts to find how best we, each organizaiton, can and should apply this guidance document to and through our each organization. (Just for your note, I have been involved in this standard making since the COPOLCO days in 2002, and look like coming back to the same path again).

Also just for your note, the Japanese business circle, Keidanren, is collecting our practices and preparing recommendations on TG6 applicaiton methodologies for various organizations.

Ricky Fukada  
Keidanren & Omron

---

**Am:** Wed, 18 May 2005 08:36:24 +0100  
**Von:** "Watkins, Miles" <[Miles.Watkins@aggregate.com](mailto:Miles.Watkins@aggregate.com)>

All

My original comments were from the perspective of those individuals whose desk this will land on after publication. If creating something MSS-like is politically unpalatable, let's not push water uphill any more and move on. I felt that this was an important debate as the first thing that those who have not been involved in this process are going to say is, "it doesn't seem to fit with the other standards that I have to implement".

However, like I said, let's move on.

MW

Dr Miles Watkins  
Group Environmental Manager

---

**Am:** Wed, 18 May 2005 10:01:55 -0300  
**Von:** LUIS TRAMA <ltrama@iram.org.ar>

Dear Sirs

I completely agree with the excellent summary of positions on this issue that Tom Rotherham has made. I believe he has explained very well the 2 positions and which is our way to go ahead

Thanks

Luis Trama  
IRAM  
Argentina

---

**Am:** Wed, 18 May 2005 21:59:38 +0200  
**Von:** Kim Christiansen <kc@lca-net.com>

I am sure that we can learn how to deal with social responsibility issues in a manner using MS as a helping tool and not as a requirement. We had similar arguments when ISO started discussing EMS (you cannot manage environmental aspect in a formalized quality control look alike system...), on Design for Environment (you cannot write guidelines for DFE...), on environmental communication (but 14063 is almost finished) or on occupational health and safety (but we now have OHSAS 18001 and an ISO new work item proposal is on the agenda). I fully support to investigate which aspects of social responsibility we cannot address from af MS perspective (not joking) and I suggest we exchange actual information about this before Bangkok.

I can agree to Joe Casio's argument, that a MS look alike will be used by some certifiers - but is that not OK? It is a free and open market, so anything giving a profit goes... ISO 14040-series is not for certification - that did not stop an italian certifier for setting up a system for certification of LCAs but is quickly died as the market was not interested and a lot of ISO people opted against this. We already have options for certification of (parts of) social responsibility and I think those existing offers will be seen as more trustworthy and credible than an ISO guideline where its specifically stated that the standard is not for certification.

Just some thoughts

Kim

---

**Am:** Fri, 20 May 2005 00:09:24 +0800  
**Von:** yuhiadi <yuhiadi@tm.net.my>

Dear Mr. Greene

I entirely agree with you on the issue of MSS. A definite NO by me on any account, even if TMB had decided to go along the MSS way, which they had not. I believe that in almost all participating countries there exist CSR / SR with various rich characteristics, and which are in conformity with respective laws, national policies, cultures, and practices. Most MNCs adopt these practices in addition to those they carry from their parent countries wherever appropriate.

DMY Hitam.

---

**Am:** Thu, 19 May 2005 17:17:55 +0100

**Von:** Peter Houghton [hconserve@btconnect.com](mailto:hconserve@btconnect.com)

RE: Interim Task Group 6: Operationalization (How) Aspects Dear Colleagues,

1. Reviewing the ITG 6 exchanges on MSS, I declare emphatic support for the positions taken by

Adam Greene & Stefano Bertasi (both of 16.05.05)

Hans Hofmeijer (17.05.05)

Tom Rotherham in his points 2, 4, 5, 6 especially and 7 second para. (18.05.05)

Ricky Fukada in his points 1 and 3 (18.05.05)

The debate instigated by Miles has been useful in flushing out the divergent positions: I recommend we should now get ahead as Tom and Ricky have proposed, viz. in conformity with the TMB's clear directions and with due regard to the wisdom of the SAG's report. The remaining time is short.

2. Kim Christiansen's input of 14.05.05 says, "Combining inputs from other international standards and agreements e.g. AA 1000 and SA 8000 is a must in our work ...". I am not sure what this means exactly.

I draw colleagues attention to ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2 (2004), 6.2.2 (on Normative References) and the Supplement (2001) Annex SM (on IPR).

While there is considerable freedom to mention such documents in a Bibliography, in my view they should not be given a privileged position - and may indeed be quite unsuitable for the many smaller organizations, especially in undeveloped countries. It seems important that ISO 26000 is fully generic, non-overlapping and as self-sufficient as possible, not requiring effectively mandatory acquisition of/reference to, or dependence on, a string of other 'standards' before it can be used, particularly if these have been produced outside the ISO processes and are liable to change in ways which could vitiate 26000.

I wonder if we have consensus on this aspect of 'HOW'?

Best wishes to all,

Peter Houghton

---

**Am:** Thu, 19 May 2005 21:23:58 +0200

**Von:** [Lugt Cornis <Cornis.Lugt@unep.fr>](mailto:Lugt.Cornis@unep.fr)

Dear friends,

I was warned once you join an ISO group your inbox explodes. Now I know what they meant! Any event, I have initial remarks based on some valuable comments made so far and based also on the experience we've had in developing the UN Global Compact Source Book with its Performance Model:

1. I agree; let's not waste more time in discussing MSS (possibly adaptable for certification) "yes / no". Key is to look for the different motivations behind these positions (process standard or performance standard; added costs and duplication; lowest common denominator becoming a de facto international ceiling or floor) and to focus on the impact we seek to have from the end product. Other groups in this process will look at things like issues, principles, stakeholders etc to be addressed. We have the challenge to put the expected actions to be taken by whatever responsible organization in some logical framework. This framework can also suggest, provide guidance on where, in which stages or areas internationally recognized tools (incl certifiable standards of ISO and others) are most relevant / can be consulted or employed.



2. Would it be acceptable to use the word "model" for this framework. In particular, have a look at the UN Global Compact Performance Model (see attached). In preparing the Source Book - edited by WBCSD with BSR, ILO, UNEP and UN GC Office - our experts group agreed on the placing of various internationally tools in different phases / element areas of the Performance Model. Our experts group agreed that the performance model provides a useful starting point or baseline from which knowledge can be shared in a systemic way. For each element area (eg empowerment, processes and innovation, impact on society) it provides a toolbox with relevant "tools" (conceptual instruments), be it principle declarations, codes, or (process, practice, output) standards.

3. At least the performance model addresses the 3d challenge listed by Tom, namely providing guidance through the jungle of tools out there.

4. This approach also makes it clear that you end up with a package that refers to various internationally recognized tools (incl certifiable standards). At the same time, as package it is clearly something that does not lend itself to certification. Yet as a minimum it provides some logical framework for action. If we can not at least provide this, our outcome will be a rather meaningless text that succeeds only in standardizing chaos.

5. Our ultimate goal "shoul d" be to produce something that will have as impact organizations taking action on social responsibility, a model that inspires organizations to act... and act consistently.

Best,  
Cornis van der Lugt  
UN Global Compact

---

**Am:** Thu, 19 May 2005 14:48:22-0500

**Von:** "William R. Blackburn" <[WRB@wblackburnconsulting.com](mailto:WRB@wblackburnconsulting.com)>

Per our charter, there is no place for structuring anything like a management system. Many of us agree with that.

But other initiatives—especially those developed through global multi-s takeholder processes-- must be given a prominent place in our work. I continue to believe we must find constructive ways of connecting these existing dots, of providing organizations with creative ways of using these initiatives together for an overalleffective SR program. Many organizations are doing that now. We just need to articulate a few alternative approaches for how this can be done.

Bill

William R. Blackburn

**Am:** Fri, 20 May 2005 09:28:34 +0200

**Von:** Kim Christiansen <[kc@lca-net.com](mailto:kc@lca-net.com)>

Dear colleagues,

"combining inputs" means combining inputs i.e. taking ideas, approaches, methods, tools etc. from document already being applied; this does not imply that all organisations using 26000 have to get certified to AA1000, SA 8000, ISO 9001, ISO 14001 etc etc - or sign Global Compact - and the Bibliography

will be the natural place to position these reference without any priority

In a similar manner I suggest we look into the national SR standards for inputs on "how".

I would very much appreciate if the active participants in this discussion can confirm that we can use these documents in our work! As in all other ISO standardization work we are not supposed to start on a totally blank piece of paper but to give guidance on how organisations can navigate among existing standards and tools. I have no problems using Global Compact as a framework for this both on the listing of "rights" to be covered (content) and on the modelling and I think it can actually help the process to build on a consensus already reach among a group of international players in the field of SR- as building on consensus on process approach, life cycle approach, continuous improvement and multistakeholder dialogue can help!

best wishes  
Kim

---

**Am:** Fri, 20 May 2005 09:22:00 +0100  
**Von:** "Watkins, Miles" <[Miles.Watkins@aggregate.com](mailto:Miles.Watkins@aggregate.com)>

All

Building on Kim's comments from a practitioner perspective, a 'navigation' tool has great appeal. However, I do agree with a number of other participants in this discussion who have suggested that we need to proceed with caution when outreaching to proprietary 'standards' rather than those developed through a consensus-building approach.

MW

Dr Miles Watkins  
Group Environmental Manager

---

**Am:** Fri, 20 May 2005 06:15:01 -0400  
**Von:** Cascio Joe [cascio\\_joe@bah.com](mailto:cascio_joe@bah.com)

These are excellent suggestions from Peter.  
Joe

From: Peter Houghton [<mailto:hconserve@btconnect.com>]  
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2005 12:18 PM

---

**Am:** Fri, 20 May 2005 16:18:12 +0200  
**Von:** "AGLN (Anne Gadegaard Larsen)" [agln@novonordisk.com](mailto:agln@novonordisk.com)

Dear all,

First of all let me congratulate all participants in the ITG6 for active dialogue; it is good to see and learn from!!! Also representing one of the perhaps too few practitioners, I want to give you my input on what would work for our company.

To us a 'navigational tool' also has great appeal. Whether this tool includes practical guidance on 'how to' in relation to a MSS or not will have to be discussed, but what has to be remembered is that there might be practitioners wanting to work with ISO26000, which have not yet implemented any kind of ISO specified MSS.

I would like to go back to Tom's suggestion on a way forward. For discussion, I propose that

a) the systems-based elements to be given practical guidance on are:

- \* How to get started
- \* How to use materiality as a tool to define where to start and where to end
- \* How to do stakeholder engagement including being responsive to your stakeholders and does all stakeholders have a legitimate demand?
- \* How to communicate internal and external
- \* How to embed in existing management systems.

b) the performance-based elements to be given practical guidance on are:

- \* How to define by using materiality measures the "requirements" (excuse my limited English for not finding a better word) that any organisation should at a minimum consider before the organisation can claim it is social responsible
- \* How to measure performance
- \* How to make performance- and outcome indicators and benchmarks (social responsibility being less mature).

c) what are the kinds of guidance that we should provide to help organizations work their way through the confusing mess of existing sources of guidance, different SR components with different time-horizons and different levels of influence, different components of society who have to work together differently to pursue different types of SR objectives, different motivations and justifications for investments in SR:

- \* I think that the ISO26000 should exactly do this for the practitioner. The practitioner should not have to read 500 other guidance notes, but should be able to by following the guidance in this embed social responsibility in an organisation.

The mantra for the work could be 'practical, practical, practical'. Remembering that when you talk in third person about 'the organisations on which desks this guidance document will land', these organisations will be the soul in the work.

On an end note I just want to make the point though recognising that it was decided that the guidance document should not be eligible for certification, that we can not exclude the discussion of certification. Certification will be offered by consultancies when the guidance document is published and if we do not take an active stand on how a certification could or should be performed, then the credibility of the guidance document would disappear as it would be the certifier setting 'the standard'.

Wishing you all a nice weekend,

Anne

---

**Am:** Fri, 20 May 2005 10:28:58 -0400

**Von:** "Webb, Kernaghan: OCA" <Webb.Kernaghan@ic.gc.ca>

Dear ITG 6 Colleagues. The emails so far have been useful in identifying views on a number of important operationalization issues.

Perhaps we can now move on to find common ground on the issue of what the standard is supposed to do in the area of operationalization.

There may be value in looking for guidance by drawing on the specific wording of the ISO New Work Item Proposal (NWIP), since the NWIP was voted on and approved by ISO member bodies and is therefore a fundamental basis for proceeding.

(1) According to the NWIP, the standard is to provide "practical guidance related to operationalizing social responsibility." The NWIP proposal states explicitly that the standard is intended to "assist organizations in establishing, implementing, maintaining and improving social responsibility frameworks".

Perhaps the issues paper could spend some time discussing:

(i) How can organizations establish social responsibility frameworks (SRFs)? What guidance can the standard give on this?

(ii) How can organizations implement SRFs? What guidance can the standard give on this?

(iii) How can organizations maintain SRFs? What guidance can the standard give on this?

(iv) How can organizations improve SRFs? What guidance can the standard give on this?

(v) What are SRFs? What guidance can the standard give on this?

(2) The NWIP states that the standard is intended to "facilitate credible communications on the organization's commitments and

performance related to SR", and provide practical guidance on "enhancing [the] credibility of reports and claims made about social responsibility." The NWIP also states that the standard should

"emphasize performance results and improvement". The NWIP also states that the standard should "increase confidence and satisfaction in organizations among their customers and other stakeholders".

Perhaps the issues paper could spend some time discussing:

(i) How can organizations best achieve SR performance results and improvement? What guidance can the standard give on this?

(ii) How can organizations communicate their SR commitments in a credible way? What guidance can the standard give on this?

(iii) How can organizations communicate their performance in a credible way? What guidance can the standard give on this?

(iv) How can customer and stakeholder confidence and satisfaction in an organization's SR activities be enhanced? What guidance can the standard give?

(3) The NWIP states the standard is to be "consistent with and not in conflict with existing documents, international treaties and conventions and existing ISO standards". The NWIP also states that the standard is expected "to foster greater awareness and wider observance of agreed sets of universal principles as expressed in United Nations conventions and declarations including the Global Compact principles and particularly the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, The International Labour Organization's Declarations on Fundamental Principles and Right at Work, The Rio Declaration on Environment and Development and The United Nations Convention Against Corruption." The NWIP also states that the standard is expected to "compliment and avoid conflicts with other existing SR standards and requirements."

Perhaps the issues paper could spend some time discussing:

(i) What are the relevant existing documents, international treaties and conventions and existing ISO standards, SR standards and requirements?

(ii) How can the ISO SR standard best align with these existing instruments? Perhaps the model provided by Cornis van der Lugt

of the UN Global Compact can be helpful in this regard.

(iii) Are there any issues with use of or reference to non-inter-governmental standards/instruments/documents in the ISO SR standard (other than ISO instruments, for which presumably there would be no problem with referencing)? What is the status of these non-inter-governmental instruments? Are there issues associated with the "proprietary nature" of some of these standards that need to be addressed? What are they?

(4) The NWIP states that the standard is intended to "promote and maintain greater transparency and fairness in organizations."

(i) How can organizations promote and maintain greater transparency? What guidance can the standard give on this?

(ii) How can organizations promote and maintain greater fairness? What guidance can the standard give on this?

(iii) in the context of SR, what do the concepts of "transparency" and "fairness" mean? What guidance can the standard give on this?

(5) The NWIP states that the standard is to assist organizations in addressing their social responsibilities while respecting cultural, societal, environmental and legal differences and economic development conditions.

(i) what guidance can be given to organizations on how to respect cultural, societal, environmental and legal differences, and economic development conditions?  
(ii) what guidance can be given to organizations when there are conflicts or differences between legal requirements stipulated by domestic governments, and norms set out in international instruments which may or may not have been ratified by the domestic governments in question?

(6) the NWIP states that the standard is intended to "support organizations in demonstrating their social responsibility through responsiveness and the effective engagement of all stakeholders including employees, which may enhance their confidence and satisfaction." For current purposes, it is ITG 4 which is addressing the issue of stakeholder engagement, so for now this particular issue does not have to be addressed by ITG 6, even though there is a strong "operationalization" component to stakeholder engagement.

(7) The NWIP states that "throughout the standard, the verb form "should" shall be used," and that the standard "should provide guidance and shall not be intended for third party certification."

(i) How can the standard address points (1) - (6) above while respecting the need to use "should" language and not be intended for third party certification.

(8) This is just a partial listing of points from the NWIP pertaining to operationalization. As a starting point, I would suggest that we need to identify and agree to all of the points from the NWIP relating to operationalization, and then discuss in the issues paper how the standard could address these points in order to provide useful guidance to all types of organizations, operating anywhere in the world.

I hope this can be a useful catalyst for discussion in ITG 6.

Regards,

Kernaghan

---

**Am:** Fri, 20 May 2005 17:33:46 +0200

**Von:** Hans Hofmeijer [hofmeijer@ilo.org](mailto:hofmeijer@ilo.org)

Just a quick reaction to point 3 (i) of Kernaghan's message below. As per article 2 of the ISO-ILO MoU the guidance document will need to be "fully consistent with the object and purpose of the provisions of international labour standards incorporated in ILO instruments, and their interpretation by the competent bodies of the ILO and in no way detract from the provisions of those standards". Obviously, the same is true for other UN Conventions and instruments that are relevant to SR. The guidance document should further clearly reflect the qualitative difference between inter-governmental instruments and private standards such as those of ISO and other organisations concerned with SR. It will need to explain in clear and simple terms what the SR implications of inter-governmental instruments are for day-to-day management of an organization and distinguish their legal consequences from what organizations can do on a voluntary basis that goes beyond legal compliance.

---

**Am:** Fri, 20 May 2005 16:01:15 -0400

**Von:** [henry.ce@pg.com](mailto:henry.ce@pg.com)

Dear all,

I would like to offer up a way to address the "HOW" and at the same time achieve a couple objectives. These are:

Ensure that the guidance is 'practical, practical, practical' (Thanks Anne for reminding us of this need)

Does not resemble a MSS and can't be abused

Recognizes the complexity of the SR and the varying needs of different organizations

Interestingly, my perspective is that when organizations are trying to initiate a program or improve their performance they find most value in benchmarking versus asking for a description of the management system. I've been on both ends of this and basically one looks at what other organizations like your self have done, pick the aspects that are most applicable and reapply them. Within industry I have seen this occur for supply chain monitoring, code of conduct, reporting, stakeholder engagement, organization structure and SR policy/implement to name a few. Now, I do believe that some of the SR aspects that lend themselves to providing process guidance e.g. stakeholder engagement and reporting. However, if we try and address all the aspects SR in this manner we will find that it might not be useful or practical.

For example, if an organization is struggling with bribery and corruption, they find it very useful to read how other organizations have successfully handled this issue. First, it is will be easier to convince their management to implement an approach that is proven versus some theoretical process that has not yet been applied. Second, no two organizations and their issues are the same. I like the approach of presenting them with a menu of issues/solutions They can look at and select those that are applicable to their organization and implement them.

If you remember, both Adam Greene and Ricky Fukada proposed the concept of providing guidance on the basis of issues at the last WG meeting. I think that if we combine this with topics that are lend themselves to a process description, we will create guidance that is very practical and allows a menu approach versus going down the one size fits all road. Finally. I think the beauty of this approach is no one can use it for certification since there would be portions of the guidance that you can't certify against (e.g best practices or case studies).

Your thoughts?

Clifford Henry  
Industry Expert representing the International Organization of Employers

---

**Am:** Sat, 21 May 2005 01:29:05 +0200

**Von:** Annette Kleinfeld [annette.kleinfeld@kleinfeld-cec.com](mailto:annette.kleinfeld@kleinfeld-cec.com)

Dear colleagues,

I am impressed by your substantial comments which I've been reading now for hours! Entering a discussion late has the disadvantage that most things have been said already, and the advantage that some sort of consensus has developed, at least a common line.

This common line to my mind seems to be summarized quite well by the 3 objectives mentioned below by Clifford Henry. As very helpful I also experienced the comments of Tom Rotherham and those who were referring to his contribution since he very convincingly pointed out the common interest of ALL parties involved to definitely reject anything MSS-like as a result of our work.

If these objectives were consensus indeed – though perhaps not complete yet – I think we should further concentrate on the question what “practical guidance” exactly means, what it should contain, what it should NOT contain, and how the results of our work might look like afterwards against this background?

To the latter respect I also liked the comments of Cornis van der Lugt talking about a "performance model" – what about a "good practice model"? – in the sense of a "logical framework" that refers to all SR-issues and elements identified as relevant respectively a "must" (expected outcome of ITG 5, I suppose), and recommends tools, measures, procedures (including certifiable standards where reasonable), etc. for appropriately dealing with the respective issues. In addition, examples of good practice (taking into account different types, sizes, branches and countries of organizations) could be added according to Cliffords proposal below.

So much for the moment. Have a nice weekend everybody!

Annette Kleinfeld

(on behalf of the president of the German standardization body DIN)

---

**Am:** Sat, 21 May 2005 22:16:55 +0800

**Von:** yuhiadi [yuhiadi@tm.net.my](mailto:yuhiadi@tm.net.my)

Dear all'

I agree with Henry Clifford. This approach has greater promise. We in MEF have been considering this approach for some time with the original CSR. The SR is more complex.

Most developing economies have global agenda which are different from those of developed economies. Their priorities are different, especially in regard to issues of interest to humanity which seem to underline the SR - issues of hunger, poverty, aid, etc. concern the vast number of humanity in developing economies.

Most of these countries do not wish to stand in the way developed economies to persue their priorities; and some will be able to move in the same direction now; others may be persuaded later, and should be encouraged to stay engaged with the efforts.

So the "menu" is available to all organisations (national and international) to pick up and internalised when ready.

So in my mind the approach to SR is best suited to down-up rather than top-down consideration of all pertinent issues of the agenda.

Regards  
DMY Hitam

Dear Henry

I follow your rationale. It seems we may be on the same track, since in the MEF we have been developing this concept of "menu" from the outset when CSR has been turned to SR. This concept has better promise, especially with developing countries, who are grappling with a multitude of issues placed before them as global challenges. Most of us cannot adjust ourselves with priorities of some developed economies (some even doubt these priorities are valid for the greater part of humanity which seems to underline them).

But most developing economies do not wish to be stand in the way of th ose developed economies, or those who can participate in the efforts in the manner they can. Thus the Guideline should encourage them; and others who are not yet ready to come on board be allowed to keep their interest in it.

DMY Hitam

---

Am:Sun, 22 May 2005 10:28:48 +0200  
Von: Simone de Colle <sdecolle@liuc.it>

Dear All,

I do feel that the apparent dichotomy between those who (correctly) say that the new standard is "NOT intended to be a Management System Standard" and..."the others" CAN be reconciled in a common way forward, as someone (Tom Rotherhane and Kernaghan Webb) have already suggested.

My simple 'magic formula' is the following:  
We are NOT going to develop a new, specific management system standard for SR, but we do want to provide practical (even practical, practical, practical!) guidance to organizations in integrating SR concepts and principles in ALL THEIR ACTIVITIES (and by the way, I mean integrating, integrating, integrating!).

The underlying assumption I take for granted is that SR deals with the way organizations are managed. Therefore, if one wants to integrate SR into a organization, one has to be prepared to change/improve (potentially) all management systems in use by that organization: SR it is not about just adding a new, special 'SR department' dealing with 'SR issues'...

If we agree with this mandate, there are some obvious implications for our work. To begin with:

1. We need to clarify first of all what the SR concept means, as a general approach, for any type of organizations.  
- What guidance can the standard provide on this? Maybe an useful starting point is to provide a definition of what we think SR is...and what is NOT (the main point I would like to emphasize here is to explain the SR concept as a general approach - with many, different applications depending on the organization's type, activities, dimension, location... - and not as a list of 'SR issues').

2. We need to explain what are the core values and principles of SR, and what they means for the way organizations are managed.  
- What guidance can the standard provide on this? For example, it could identify a common "SR framework" of values and principles by examining existing SR standards and relevant international documents, and provide 'working definitions' of identified core principles that could include "fairness", "transparency", "accountability", etc...

3. We need to clarify what organizations can do in order to integrate SR values and principles in their strategy and policies.  
- What guidance can the standard provide on this? For example, we might say in the standard something like "any organization should state what its Mission and core values are..." and provide guidance on how Mission and values can be developed and made explicit within organizations...

As you can see, the tasks 1. and 2. are within the mandate of ITG5 "SR core context", where unfortunately there has not been such a rich discussion yet, but an initial collection of relevant papers and documents is being carried out. The Co-Secretary of ITG6, professor Joseph Wieland is the co-author (with Simon Zadek, Christian Brodhag, Lorenzo Sacconi, Emma Baldinand myself) of a research report sent to the EU Commission in March 2005 (which I have sent to the ITG5 Secretary) on the 'convergence' among CSR standards that exactly addressed these 2 initial tasks by benchmarking five different SR standards: AA1000, SIGMA, VMS, SD21000 and Q-RES, and I am sure Josef will be able to provide some useful insights on this for the work of ITG6 as well.



I hope that this is useful.

Best,

Simone de Colle

---

**Am:** Sun, 22 May 2005 20:57:29-0400

**Von:** [Perla Puterman <p.p.s@cantv.net>](mailto:Perla.Puterman@cantv.net)

Dear friend,

I feel the same as Deni from Australia, we are going round and round...and we repeated the same we had said in Brazil...

I think we have three positions, not two....

Some of us consider that the standard should not be a MSS, but should be in relation with...

Others consider that the standard should be a MSS, and others consider that the standard should be a different model...no MSS and no related to the MSS:

In any case, as Tom said the reasons of each point of view are different...

Why we do not read carefully again Dick Hortensius paper, may be, it is a good approach to interconnect the three alternatives.

It is my suggestion

Thanks and regards

Perla

---

**Am:** Mon, 23 May 2005 08:00:27 +0200

**Von:** [michael.a@moital.gov.il](mailto:michael.a@moital.gov.il)

Dear All,

I think Perla's suggestion for TG6 to use Dick's paper is a great idea. It is not a MSS but nevertheless gives some content to the guidance, so that it can be more than just a kind of manual. ISO's guidance should be more than just an information provider. One doesn't really need ISO for gathering all the relevant documents and stuff about SR. If ISO is investing time (3 years?) and money into the process, one can (should?) expect the process to create something new, whatever this is.

Michael Atlan  
Govt. (Israel)

---

**Am:** Mon, 23 May 2005 14:55:10 -0500

**Von:** ["William R. Blackburn" <WRB@wblackburnconsulting.com>](mailto:WRB@wblackburnconsulting.com)

I recognize our efforts must produce something of value on SR for a wide range of organizations, not just companies. Nevertheless, from my perspective as one having lead sustainability programs at Baxter for many years and from the input of a number of my old peers, here is a table of contents for an SR guideline that makes sense to us:

Volume 1. General Guidance

1.1 Purposes of the guideline

1.2 Definition of terms (with background)

- 1.3 Social responsibility trends
- 1.4 Existing SR Codes and guidelines
  - 1.4.1 Codes of behavior (ILO, etc. List by category)
  - 1.4.2 Reporting-related standards (GRI, AA 1000, etc)
  - 1.4.3 Management/process standards (ISO 9001, 14001, etc.)
- 1.5 Processes for prioritizing, selecting and integrating selected sets of complementary codes and standards (this might also discuss enterprise risk management in this context)
- 1.6 Processes and sources of information for staying informed about SR developments

## Volume 2. Case studies

Summaries showing how individual organizations of all types have prioritized, selected and integrated various codes and standards and information sources into a good, overall SR programs.

This does not produce any new management system, and certainly not anything new that is certifiable. Yet it does not ignore the role of existing management systems standards. And it does follow the general pattern of ISO 14031 and 14032 of having guidance in one document and case studies supporting the guidance in another. Moreover, it provides practical guidance on how to operationalize SR, which is the main thrust of our assignment. This is what I mean by "connecting the dots."

Bill

William R. Blackburn

---

**Am:** Mon, 23 May 2005 16:19:42 -0400

**Von:** Cascio Joe <cascio\_joe@bah.com>

Adam,

I have attached recent materials sent by Dick.  
Joe

2 Hort.guidance.pdf application/octet-stream 143,69 KB

3 Hort\_article.pdf application/octet-stream 733,64 KB

4 Hortensius.pdf application/octet-stream 59,36 KB

---

**Am:** 24 May 2005 09:21:09 +0900

**Von:** Jooran Lee <jooran@ksa.or.kr>

Dear All,

I'm resending Dick's papers that he sent all ten days ago.

We can get the good concepts from his papers.

Attached :

- A framework for considering the position and contents of ISO guidance on SR  
(by Dick Hortensius)

- an article titled "Managing SR in a Systematic Way" from ISO Management Systems, March -  
April 2005

(by Louise Bergenhenegouwen and Dick Hortensius)

best wishes,

Jooran Lee  
Korean Standards Association (Others)

---

**Am:** Tue, 24 May 2005 10:11:58 +0200  
**Von:** [Lugt Cornis <Cornis.Lugt@unep.fr>](mailto:Cornis.Lugt@unep.fr)

Dear friends,

I appreciate the value of the model proposed by Dick. However, I would like to suggest that we use the Global Compact Performance Model for this purpose. It highlights explicitly some subelements that are hidden / implicit in the model of Dick, for example impact on employees, on society and the value chain. It also has a very strong focus on stakeholder engagement, but like reporting this is one important tool and there are a number of other key components to SR. If we eg consider corporate environmental responsibility, the element "processes and innovation" in the Compact Performance Model is a key one where tools such as ISO14000 and others such as eco-design belong. The element "impact on the value chain" is again a key one where life cycle analysis as tool is very relevant.

Best,  
Cornis van der Lugt  
UN Global Compact / UNEP

Global-Compact-Perf-Model.ppt

---

**Am:** Thu, 26 May 2005 00:10:59 +0100  
**Von:** [Peter Houghton <hconserve@btconnect.com>](mailto:hconserve@btconnect.com)

Dear Colleagues,

As suggested, I have re-read Dick Hortensius' paper.

Commenting, a fundamental weakness of it for ITG6 purposes is that it is concerned with implementation of a hypothetical SR guidance standard for which we do not yet even have a Design Specification (and with the narrower field of CSR, not, as the TMB has determined, with SR, which is to be applicable to all organizations).

Revealing his standpoint, he says, "When the the ISO decides to develop a guideline for CSR management systems ..." But it has not done so, which rather vitiates his conclusions and leaves his process of induction questionable.

Regards to all,

Peter Houghton

---

**Am:** Thu, 26 May 2005 00:12:23 +0100  
**Von:** [Peter Houghton <hconserve@btconnect.com>](mailto:hconserve@btconnect.com)

Dear Colleagues,

Kernaghan offers some useful thoughts with which I can broadly agree- so long as we are not treating SRF as synonymous with 'management system'. However, there seems to me to be considerable overlap in his questions with ITG5's task.

In all the recent argument, I believe we are in danger of losing sight of the most fundamental WG SR need: for a Design Specification.

As I recall from Salvador, ITGs 5 & 6 were, ultimately, created because those present could not agree

to the Design Specification proposal N4. I draw colleagues' attention to Resolutions 15 and 17, which are complementary and in effect require ITGs 5 & 6 jointly to make progress towards a Design Specification.

The particular contribution of ITG6 is surely to recommend how the output from ITG5 may be expressed and structured and could also be differentiated (for specific kinds of organization).

On a careful reading of the Salvador Resolutions, it is not ITG6's task to determine, or concern itself with, how the WG SR's guidance should be implemented by organizations receiving it; nor is it for ITG6 to make assumptions in that respect; nor to concern itself with the management system solutions that organizations may (or may not) have devised in response to other standards such as ISO 9001 or ISO 14001. Even if such matters fall to a successor TG(s), the prior task (that in which ITGs 5 and 6 need to collaborate) is to arrive at a Design Specification upon which to base subsequent work.

We are not called upon in ITG6 to write guidance text, simply to recommend how guidance is to be structured and imparted. Unless this latter is done there will not be a Design Specification to offer to the WG for approval.

[Please tell me if and how these thoughts are incorrect.]

As a constructive proposal, I presented an outline structure in Salvador but, like much else there, it received little consideration. I repeat the outline in the attached and would be happy to offer expansion of it to help matters forward. As you can see, it is in no danger of being thought a 'management system' proposal!

With best wishes to all,

Peter Houghton

PS: I note Bill Blackburn's own proposal on structure (23.05.05) and am heartened to see attention moving to that subject.

PH

2 A suggested structure for the SR Standard.doc application/msword 26,00 KB 