# *Draft ITG 5 SR Core Context Issues Paper*

***Version3 - June 30, 2005***

***Background:***
*This document is a second draft of the ITG5 SR Core Context Issues Paper. It synthesizes inputs received from ITG 5 drafting group members and the full ITG 5 membership and draws on the New Work Item Proposal, the ISO SR Advisory Group report and recommendations, as well as inputs made by WG members before and at the Brazil meeting. It will be submitted to the WG Secretariat for circulation to all WG members. All WG members will have an opportunity to comment on it during the period July-August, sending comments to the WG secretariat, who will compile and circulate all comments received.*

*Note that an attempt was made to reflect the comments and suggestions made by ITG 5 members in a neutral way. Thus, phrases such as "The suggestion was made within the ITG that" or "One view expressed within the ITG was that" were used.*

## *1. Interim Task Group 5: SR Core Context*

## *2. Task Definition: to explore Social responsibility core context: issues, definitions, principles (differing types), interface of organization and society, and to make suggestions on how these issues might be reflected in a design specification and how these issues might be worked on thereafter.*

***Suggestion for consideration by Working Group members***:

*that the primary purpose of the social responsibility core context part of the standard is to provide users of the standard with an understanding of what social responsibility is, and how it relates to their organization. This social responsibility core context might consist of:*

- *a background discussion of SR definitions, principles, instruments and initiatives, key issues/subjects, global SR trends, and*
- *an understanding of the relation between the social responsibility of an organization and societal expectations, the law, domestic and inter-governmental political processes, international (inter-governmental) instruments and norms, non-governmental instruments and tools, and philanthropy.*

*This broad SR Core Context then becomes an important foundation for the development of an organization's own commitments, and actions, to be worked out and implemented through a process of internal development and engagement with stakeholders. SR is an activity or process that involves judgment by the decision makers of organizations. Organizations can make bad judgments with respect to understanding or exercising their responsibilities. Other parts of the standard (i.e., the parts pertaining to SR operationalization and stakeholder engagement/communication that are being addressed by ITG 4 and ITG 6) are more directly devoted to SR operationalization and stakeholder engagement, although it is clear that there is considerable overlap between the various sections of the standard. For example, the SR principles and other aspects of the SR Core Context part of the standard should form a basis for any SR decision-making and actions by an organization.*

## *3. Social responsibility core context: issues*

A preliminary question is: what do we mean by "issues." Based on input received, there would appear to be at least two possible interpretations of the word "issues":

(1) ***global trends and developments*** that have led to the rising prominence of and interest in the social responsibility of organizations (e.g., issues such as globalization, trade liberalization, regulatory reform, supply chains, environmental stewardship, poverty alleviation);

(2) ***specific SR subjects or aspects, internal to the organization, that fall within the scope of SR that organizations could or should address as part of their SR approach*** (e.g., human rights, workplace and employee issues, unfair business practices, community and social development, SR products and supply chain matters, etc.) . These issues could be identified at a general level, and/or also for particular types of organizations addressing particular types of issues.

With respect to ***global trends and developments*** relevant to SR, there is a useful base of material included in the ISO SR Advisory Group report that could form the basis for an SR global trends and developments part of the standard, although it might need to be shortened, and re-focused so that it contains information relevant to all types of organizations, and does not focus exclusively on global trends and developments pertaining to business.

With respect to ***SR subjects internal to the organization, that organizations could or should address as part of their SR approach***, a number of drafting group members proposed their own lists. [12]

One view expressed within the ITG questioned the value of non-exhaustive lists of subjects/issues falling within the scope of SR.

One suggestion made within the ITG was that it may be not only impractical but also unhelpful to list all the issues: listing of issues spotlights those issues mentioned, but "blinds" those that are not mentioned. A listing also does not give any justification to the listed items. Therefore the suggestion made is that the list of issues should be kept to a minimum.

One suggestion made within the ITG was that it may be useful to distinguish a "subject" or "issue" on one hand from relevant socially responsible behaviour on the other. For instance, if one subject/issue is air quality/air pollution, then one instance of socially responsible behaviour could be the monitoring and reporting of factory emissions. Thinking is improved if it is understood that a subject per se is not a component of SR but that aspects of subjects (expressed as expectations of relevant socially responsible behaviour) are the stuff of SR.

In articulating SR subjects, there are a number of possible sources that could be drawn on. In a non-consensus working document, the ISO SR Advisory Group identified a non-exhaustive list of SR issues or subjects as including (not in any particular order):

- human rights (Universal Declaration of Human Rights, ILO Core Conventions)[3]

---

[1] One drafting member proposed the following issues: Corporate governance; Transparency and accountability; Working place and employee relations; Environment; Marketplace practices; International relationships; Community development.

[2] Another drafting group member proposed the following: **Social Issues** with respect to employees of the organization like: Guiding principles and corporate policy referring to its commitment to the responsible treatment of its employees; Measures for achieving equal gender opportunities and for integrating foreign employees and ethnic minorities; Measures for promoting and maintaining employees health; Measures for further training of employees; Reporting by the organization about social aspects; **Social issues** with respect to sub-contractors such as Guaranteed use of internationally recognized minimum social standards (ILO Core Conventions); Measures of sub-contractors to select or develop own sub-contractors to be certified for compliance with minimum social standards; Reporting by sub-contractors about own measures of SR; **Environmental issues** like Commitment of the organization to environmental protection; Implementation of an environmental management system or procurement guidelines; Compiling of organization data and quality of reporting on environmental aspects of its activities.

[3] One ITG 5 member noted that, following the ILO Tripartite Declaration of Principles concerning Multinational Enterprises, which also has provisions relating to small and medium sized enterprises, social responsibility should certainly include the ILO fundamental conventions and occupational health and

- workplace and employee issues (including occupational health and safety)
- unfair business practices including bribery, corruption and anti-competitive practices
- organizational governance[4]
- environmental aspects
- marketplace and consumer issues
- community involvement
- social development[5]

Others have proposed slightly different lists.[6] One sub-group within Ad Hoc Group 2 at the Brazil meeting of the Working Group proposed a list of SR issues/subjects that included: human rights; labour standards; environmental duties; anti-corruption; governance; consumer rights; stakeholder approach; transparency; and the supply chain. Another sub-group proposed the following: bribery and corruption; cost of implementing and sustaining SR practices such as capacity for SMEs; cost of not implementing SR for society (social opportunity cost); economic equity and distribution of wealth; consumer issues such as health impact of the product and competition and pricing; human rights; occupational, health and safety; quality of the goods; good industrial relations such as non-discrimination; good environmental practices such as waste, air, solid waste, water/resources; supply chain management SAI, others; ISO guide 71 design for all; rights of children; providers of capital (financial market manipulation); community development issues such as education, poverty eradication, HIV/AIDS.

One suggestion made within the ITG was that SR subjects can be divided into one core list for an organization's internal implementation and behaviour and another for the organization's external strategy and behaviours.

One suggestion made within the ITG was the idea of a "sort out cube model" as a way of assisting organizations in understanding the different types of issues they face (e.g., issues clarifying components required by law from those which are voluntary, those issues emanating from global, regional, or national contexts, and issues for each stakeholder to address).

Although there are differences expressed, there is considerable overlap in the suggestions made by various parties concerning what constitute SR subjects/aspects that fall within the scope of SR that an organization should address. Articulation of the definition of social responsibility (see below) will help shape the full list.

***Suggestion for consideration by Working Group members***:

*that the SR Core Context part of the standard includes discussion of two types of issues:*

- ***global trends and developments*** *that have led to the rising prominence of and interest in the social responsibility of organizations (e.g., issues such as globalization, trade liberalization, regulatory*

---

safety, but should also include other conditions of work, such as wages and benefits, as well as employment promotion, training, and security of employment.

[4] Note that the term "organizational governance" is used as a broader variation on "corporate governance", and refers to the decision-making structure of an organization (e.g., this may include a board of directors, a CEO, managers, in some organizations, or a Minister and Deputy Minister, Director Generals, Directors in others, or something considerably less elaborate in a small organization).

[5] One ITG 5 member noted that "social development" is the function of the State, not of non-state enterprises. Care must be taken not leave the impression that social responsiblilty is to be interpreted as privatization of functions of the State.

[6] For example, the Japanese members, in comments submitted in preparation for the Brazil WG meeting, proposed their own list. The Japanese list included the following elements: legal enforcement/compliance; human rights; employment; quality of products and services; safety/information security; environment; international contribution. The Japanese list of issues was elaborated on in their submission.

*reform, supply chains, environmental stewardship ,poverty alleviation). The ISO SR Advisory Group has useful material that can be drawn on for this section;*

***- specific SR subjects or aspects that fall within the scope of SR that organizations could or should address as part of their SR approach*** *(e.g., human rights, workplace and employee issues, unfair business practices, community and social development, etc.). The SR subjects or aspects could be dealt with both at a general level, for all organizations, as well as for specific types of organizations. Although differences have been expressed by drafting group members and others on what might be included and the value of non-exhaustive lists can be questioned, there is considerable overlap in the suggestions made by various parties concerning what constitute SR subject that fall within the scope of SR that an organization should address. Therefore, it should be possible for the WG (or a task group within the WG) to develop a core list or at least a short list of widely agreed SR subjects that organizations should address. There would be value in having in the SR core context part of the standard a brief elaboration of each subject, so that users of the standard could have a better idea of what is intended by each. The identification and elaboration of subjects should not be done in such a way as to redefine or reinterpret norms more authoritatively and legitimately defined/established elsewhere. In other parts of the standard (e.g., the parts concerning operationalization), it would be possible for there to be more detailed discussion of SR subjects as appropriate.*

## *4. Social responsibility core context: definitions*

- Drafting group members suggested that in the ISO SR Advisory Group's deliberations, as well as in the New Work Item Proposal (NWIP), the importance of clear definitions and terminology is emphasized. The suggestion was made within the ITG that definitions will depend to some degree on what is developed in other parts of the standard, and so a tentative approach to listing of definitions should be adopted at this point.
- One suggestion made within the ITG was that definitions can assist organizations in addressing their social responsibilities (e.g., identifying/engaging with stakeholders, enhancing the credibility of SR claims; and emphasizing performance results and improvement).
- One suggestion made within the WG was that the definitions might not be perfectly comprehensive or exact, but as long as they contribute to meaningful guidance, they could still be useful.
- One suggestion made within the ITG was that a primary purpose of the SR standard is to make understandable what SR is and how it relates to different organizations, including SMEs.

One suggestion made within the ITG was that central concepts and procedures should be defined, including:
social responsibility (see discussion on definition of social responsibility below); SR frameworks (this term is used in the NWIP); stakeholder; stakeholder engagement; organization; and continual improvement.

- The definition of "stakeholder" and "stakeholder engagement" will benefit from the input of ITG 4. The ISO SR Advisory Group report also contains useful discussions concerning the meaning of and issues associated with idea of "stakeholders."

- It was noted that there are different types of stakeholders, with different types of claims (see discussion below under "interface of organization and society").

- The suggestion was made that that many other terms may also need to be defined. For example, if concepts such as "social reporting", "organization mapping" "organization commitment" are used, then they will need to be defined. There may also be a need to define SR-related terms such as CSR, sustainability, citizenship, triple bottom line (these could perhaps be included in another part of the SR Core Context: see "Interface of organization and society" below).

- The suggestion was made that key principles, such as accountability, transparency, integrity, etc. will also need to be defined (see discussion of principles, below).

- The suggestion was made that a base of terms that ISO has already defined that may be relevant to an SR standard, including organization, aspects, impacts, objectives, targets, performance, continual improvement, customer, customer satisfaction, interested party, quality, corrective/preventive action, process and product.

**Definition of Social Responsibility**

- One suggestion made within the ITG was that a definition of social responsibility will need to be culturally[7] and regionally sensitive (see "Interface of Organization and Society" below). Another view expressed was that the definition of SR does not need to be "culturally and regionally sensitive" to be relevant in different cultures. It is important to distinguish between the SR concept which is about organizations taking the impact of their activities on others into account on one hand, and the expectations of society with respect to behaviour of organizations on the other.
- One suggestion made within the ITG was that it is important to emphasize that social responsibility as used in this standard applies to all types of organizations, and not just businesses.
- One view expressed was whether it might be possible to have on overarching definition of Social responsibility, and then separate definitions of corporate social responsibility, government social responsibility, etc..
- One view expressed within the ITG was that ISO continue to use the term CSR instead of SR because it would be very difficult to devise the standard so that it addresses other types of organizations. The word "corporation" could be interpreted broadly to encompass all business oriented enterprises. Also, the ITG 5 member noted that the term CSR is already well established.

- One suggestion made within the ITG was that an organization's approach to social responsibility is closely connected to interactions it has with its stakeholders. Thus, the question of what is meant by stakeholders, stakeholder claims, stakeholder rights, interests, claims, and how to identify, engage, and differentiate among various stakeholders, their rights, claims, etc., will be very important. The work of ITG 4 on stakeholder engagement and communication will be an important contribution to this work, and can draw on numerous sources.

- It was noted that three views were identified in the Advisory Group working paper concerning the need to define social responsibility.
    - an agreed definition of social responsibility is a prerequisite
    - at the very least, a common set of elements or components should be agreed upon; and
    - very basic definitions, even if not free from ambiguity, could be useful starting points upon which elaborate standards have been developed.

- The suggestion was made within the ITG that SR should be defined at the very beginning of the standard and placed in its context. It should be distinguished from other concepts such as "what society wants organizations to do" or "what is good for society." It should also be clarified up front that SR is not a suitable means to answer certain questions that can only be legitimately answered through democratic or representative political processes. SR should also be presented as an activity or process that involves judgment by the decision-makers of organizations but this also implies that organizations can make bad judgments with respect to understanding or exercising their responsibilities.

- In the ISO SR Advisory Group's deliberations, there was considerable discussion concerning the definition of social responsibility. ITG members also had suggestions as to how SR could be

[7] One ITG 5 member noted that the meaning of "culturally sensitive" should be clarified. Universally recognized aims, such as abolition of child labour, do not vary between countries, although the way in which they are implemented may vary somewhat in a particular country. Concerning labour issues, this is why involvement of organizations of workers and employers in the national context is so important; they can help to strike the right balance between universality and cultural sensitivity.

defined. The ISO SR Advisory Group developed a non-consensus working definition of "organizational social responsibility" (OSR). OSR was defined as: "a balanced approach for organizations to address economic, social and environmental issues in a way that aims to benefit people, communities and society." One view expressed within the ITG was that a truly workable definition would need to be more descriptive, less value-loaded and less similar to the public relations style slogans and mission statements used by companies. Such a definition would more likely be achieved if it were based on the points used to describe CSR/SR that were identified by the ISO SR Advisory Group.

The need to reflect regional/cultural differences in the understanding of SR will be important (see discussion of "Interface of organization and society" below.

- The ISO SR Advisory Group, in its report, notes that, while the terms and definitions used to describe the phenomenon of CSR vary somewhat, "several key points emerge":

  - "CSR is about the role of business in society and the expectations of society concerning firms;"
  - "CSR is seen as a voluntary concept and is about activities that assume or include compliance with the law and also societally beneficial activities that are beyond compliance with the law;"
  - "CSR is concerned with the role of management and management initiatives, managing social impact and management systems;";
  - "CSR includes a major focus on the impact of business activities and the results of those impacts, both positive and negative, on society;"
  - "CSR is about the ongoing or regular activities of a business, and not unrelated philanthropic activities. However, some question whether philanthropy even qualifies as CSR;"
  - "CSR is about measuring and improving performance on social, environmental and economic dimensions and can contribute to furthering the goal of sustainable development;"
  - "CSR is about identifying, engaging and reporting performance to those who are impacted by the activities of the business."

- Many of these points could be said to apply equally to a notion of social responsibility that extends to organizations of all types.
- One suggestion made within the ITG was that a reference to the EU Green paper definition of CSR would also be useful.
- One view expressed within the ITG was that it was confusing to state that SR is voluntary but that it also includes compliance with the law.
- One view expressed was that it will be important to distinguish in the SR core context and in the standard as a whole between compliance with domestic and international law, given that the two types of law are quite different.
- One suggestion made within the ITG was that if a working definition of SR cannot be agreed to, perhaps a chart comparing the strengths and weaknesses of the competing notions would be useful.

- It was noted within the ITG that national standards pertaining to social responsibility have been developed, and that these include definitions of social responsibility that could be useful.

***<u>Suggestion for consideration by Working Group members</u>***:

*- that the above-noted terms be defined and/or discussed in the ISO SR standard, in the definitions section, or in the sections of the ISO SR standard that pertain to principles, issues, or the interface of organizations with society, drawing, where relevant, on terms and definitions from existing ISO standards, national standards and other sources.*

*- that a working definition of social responsibility be developed, drawing on the work of the ISO Advisory Group and other sources, and be re-considered later in the deliberations of the WG, once the WG has more experience. The same approach could be adopted with respect to other key concepts such as SR frameworks, stakeholder, and stakeholder engagement. The definitions of stakeholder and stakeholder engagement will benefit from the input of ITG 4.*

## *5. Social responsibility core context: principles*

What do we mean by "principles"? Drawing on dictionary definitions, principles might be described as: *guides to action that should animate or inform an organization's decision-making and conduct.* . Principles need to be flexible enough to reflect different cultural and other operating conditions. This is in keeping with one drafting group member's comments that in view of the fact that SR is complex and multi-faceted, "its individual realization by organizations has to be kept flexible."

In approaching the question of what principles could or should be included in the SR standard, the Advisory Group's report and recommendations and New Work Item Proposal includes several useful points:

- - The AG in its recommendations notes that "ISO does not have the authority or legitimacy to set social obligations or expectations." Thus, for the purposes of the ISO SR guidance standard, a principle cannot set social obligations, but it can guide in a flexible way an organization in understanding and implementing its SR responsibilities. .
- - The NWIP 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 Rights at Work, the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, and the United Nations Convention Against Corruption." Thus, it would be possible, in a principles section of the ISO SR guidance standard, to reflect principles contained in inter-governmental instruments of this nature. It was noted within the ITG that there were other relevant intergovernmental instruments, including the OECD Multinational Enterprise Guidelines, and the UN convention of the rights of the child).
- The AG in its recommendations indicates the need to recognize the difference between on the one hand, instruments adopted by authoritative global inter-governmental organizations (such as the UN Universal Declaration on Human Rights, international labour convention and other instruments adopted by the ILO and relevant UN Conventions) and on the other hand, private voluntary initiatives that may or may not reflect the universal principles contained in the above instruments. Thus, it will be important in any principles part of an ISO SR guidance standard to respect the qualitative difference between instruments adopted by inter-governmental organizations and private voluntary instruments. One view expressed within the ITG was that the danger or organizations using SR to redefine or reinterpret their responsibilities to society should be recognized and addressed.
- - The NWIP also notes that the standard is intended "to assist organizations in effectively addressing their social responsibilities in various cultures, societies and environments." Thus, it will be important in any principles part of an ISO SR guidance standard to be sensitive to different cultures, societies and environments.
- - The NWIP states that the standard should be compatible with and/or complementary to nongovernmental international SR initiatives such as the Global Reporting Initiative, the Forest Stewardship Council, and the Fair Labor Association [NWIP Annex D]. One view expressed within the ITG stated that the issue of whether the guidance in the standard should be extended to endorsing or otherwise promoting existing CSR/SR initiatives, organizations or activities should not be treated as settled. There should be no uncritical consideration of any such initiatives, organizations, or activities. An SR guidance standard should help organizations distinguish or choose from among SR initiatives, organizations or activities. The standard should provide questions/considerations etc. that could be used organizations in deciding whether to join initiatives or organizations or engage in activities. Another view expressed

> within the ITG was that, among international nongovernmental SR initiatives, those that have been developed through global collaborative multi-stakeholder processes should be given special recognition.

In view of this guidance from the New Work Item Proposal and the ISO Advisory Group, a suggestion was made within the ITG that one basis for articulating global SR principles might be to derive them from (or take into account) widely accepted SR-relevant international conventions and declarations, standards and guidelines, particular reference should be made to those international conventions and declarations that have been established by United Nations bodies (e.g., the ILO) and widely ratified by governments, and other widely accepted private international instruments (codes, standards, guidelines) that are compatible with these international conventions and declarations. However, it should be noted that there is a clear distinction between authoritative intergovernmental instruments and private voluntary initiatives. However, it was noted within the ITG that even international conventions and declarations established by the UN and ratified by governments are not necessarily endorsed or ratified by ***all*** countries of the world. However, it was also noted within the ITG that this may not be especially relevant as such international instruments do not require universal endorsement or ratification to become the most authoritative norms and that many of these instruments are applicable for countries that have not ratified or otherwise endorsed them. Note: it was suggested that a more full discussion of the meaning of ratification is needed here. It was also noted that a discussion of customary international law (as opposed to international treaty law) should be kept in mind in this area. In this regard, there is also the challenge of determining the relationship between global SR principles and local laws. These points (because they touch on the issue of the relation of an organization with society) are discussed in “Interface of Organization with Society” below.

One view expressed within the ITG was that lists of principles (and also lists of issues and instruments) should be divided into those that are required by law and those that are additional and voluntary.

One view expressed within the ITG was that there is a need to distinguish between a section on principles related to the guidance document itself and the very different issue of SR principles. According to this view, the possible opening sections of the guidance standard (introduction, scope, definitions, and principles) refer to principles related to the document itself. It might include the following:

> General Principles (for the guidance document)
>
> - promote SR in all organizations, providing effective guidance as a means of self-improvement and creating new added value;
> - identify and exemplify the core subjects and issues necessary for raising the effectiveness of SR activities, while respecting differences in national, regional and local cultures and other contexts
> - respect the autonomy of an organization, its constraints, objectives and achievements, its economic conditions, vision and culture and its ability flexibly to develop and implement its SR-related activities in the most appropriate way
> - are compatible and consistent with, and complementary to, existing SR initiatives, guides and standards, thus avoiding confusion at implementation level
> - place importance on communication with stakeholders as the organization develops its SR activities (identification of stakeholders,
> understanding of their expectations, communication of SR results).

According to this view, the issue of SR principles is, of course, very different from the issue of principles to animate the document. One way to address SR principles would be to provide guidance on SR principles in the sections on particular issues (human rights, industrial relations, etc.) and/or in the sections on organizations, where guidance could be provided on existing documents that contain such principles.

According to this view, the working group should avoid seeking to draft or restate principles as this crosses into the political area, and instead the document should simply provide guidance on the array of existing sets of such principles.

If the document were to include SR principles for application by organizations, then drawing on ITG member suggestions, international conventions such as those listed above, other compatible instruments and tools, the ISO SR AG deliberations, the NWIP, and submissions of ISO SR WG members in preparation for the Brazil WG meeting, the following are examples of SR principles that could potentially be included within the ISO standard:

- respect for human rights and dignity,
- respect for law and the legal system
- respect for worker rights and labour standards
- respect for the environment
- fairness
- equality or equity
- polluter pays principle
- precautionary principle
- ethical behaviour
- transparency (including recognizing the different information needs of all stakeholder groups)
- accountability
- inclusiveness, dialogue and engagement of affected/interested stakeholders/parties
- honesty
- integrity
- commitment
- keeping of promises
- avoidance of harm
- sustainable development[8]
- continual improvement[9]
- trustworthiness
- humility
- flexiblity

Note: the suggestion was made within the ITG that it is not clear that the WG will be able to agree to "global SR principles."

Note: the suggestion was made within the ITG that one serious concern is that, in attempting to provide guidance through "derived principles," the WG may devote an inordinate amount of time redefining or reinterpreting existing standards using an inappropriate process. Moreover, it will be difficult to agree to a list of genuine principles.

Note: the suggestion was made within the ITG that some of these (e.g., fairness, honesty, integrity could perhaps be more properly described as virtues rather than principles.

Note: the suggestion was made within the ITG that some of these might not even be properly described as virtues.

Note: the suggestion was made within the ITG that some of the principles could be distinguished from SR issues if they focused on procedural aspects. For example, according to one ITG member, human rights and sustainability are an SR issue, while fairness and transparency are SR principles.

Note: the suggestion was made within the ITG that it might be useful to distinguish substantive SR principles derived from authoritative inter-governmental instruments such as those of the UN, ILO or OECD, and procedural categories. This would not be an easy task, and care would need to be taken to ensure that the principles did not end up looking like a management system process or a set of social obligations or expectations, both of which it was felt might be beyond the scope of the standard.

Note: the suggestion was made within the ITG that the standard should be based on a very short list of issues or principles: obey the laws of the jurisdiction where the organization operates; adhere to the universal declaration of human rights; adhere to the ILO core labour standards; adhere to the Rio environmental declaration; adhere to the OECD guidelines for multinationals.

[8] Sustainable development was defined by the Brundtland Commission as development that meets the needs of current generations without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs.
[9] Continual improvement is defined in ISO 9001 as the recurring activity to fulfill requirements.

Note: as well that the suggestion is not being made here that this is a comprehensive list of principles, that the principles here are identified in the most appropriate way, that all the principles are of the same weight, or that principles cannot be combined, removed or added. It is provided in order to give WG members some idea of what a list of principles might include. It should also be noted that possibly some principles could be combined, removed or added. Working definitions for or descriptions of each of these principles should be developed, as the WG develops other parts of the standard.

Note: the suggestion was made within the ITG that it might be possible to have general SR principles in one part, and more specific principles and roles for particular types of organizations in another part of the standard.

Note: the suggestion was made within the ITG that sustainable development should be given a pre-eminent position, and that sustainable development could be the overall perspective which comprises all others. The ecological dimension could be seen as the precondition for development, the social dimension is the aim of development, and the economic dimension is the means of achieving the aims.

***<u>Suggestion for consideration by Working Group members</u>***:

- *that a list of principles be developed for inclusion in the ISO SR Guidance standard,*
    - *taking into account the guidance provided by drafting group members, the ISO SR Advisory Group, the NWIP, and submissions made by members at or before the Brazil meeting;*
    - *noting the distinction between principles for the document, and SR principles for organizations, and that it would be possible to simply have principles for the document without having any SR principles for organizations;*
    - *noting the distinction between authoritative intergovernmental instruments and private instruments, drawing on widely accepted SR-relevant international conventions and declarations, standards and guidelines, in particular those international conventions and declarations that have been established by United Nations bodies (e.g., the ILO) and widely ratified by governments, and other widely accepted non-governmental international instruments (codes, standards, guidelines) that are compatible with these international conventions and declarations,*
- *that it may prove difficult to develop and agree on a list of SR principles, and that the exercise of deriving principles from existing instruments may be very time consuming and may leave ISO open to challenges that it used in appropriate processes to develop its principles. The identification and elaboration of SR principles, if it is done at all, must not be done in such a way as to redefine or reinterpret norms more authoritatively and legitimately defined elsewhere. The principles included can be limited to a small number;*
- *that the above-noted list of SR principles is provided to illustrate the types of principles that might be included. This list is not intended to be comprehensive, the principles might not be identified in the most appropriate way, not all the principles are necessarily of the same weight, and principles could be combined, removed or added. It is provided in order to give WG members some idea of what a list of SR principles could include*;
- *that if SR principles are to be articulated, working definitions for or descriptions of each of these principles should be developed, as the WG develops other parts of the standard.*

## *6. Social responsibility core context: interface of organization and society*

The suggestion was made within the ITG that it is essential to distinguish social responsibility, which is a concept about organizations taking the impact of their activities on others into account on one hand, with the expectations of society with respect to the behaviour of organizations or what society considers socially responsible, on the other hand. Without making this distinction it will not be possible to put SR in any meaningful context. Without first making this distinction it will be very difficult to address many important issues (relationship to law, cultural differences, etc.) in a coherent and intelligent manner.

The suggestion was made within the ITG that there is the danger of organizations and interests using the SR concept to redefine or reinterpret their responsibilities to society is a major issue that should be raised in this issue paper and in the standard.

The suggestion was made within the ITG that it is important in this issues paper and in the standard not to blur the distinction between authoritative intergovernmental instruments and widely held private initiatives.

The suggestion was made within the ITG that one purpose of the guidance document should be to assist organizations in making appropriate choices with respect to principles, issues or subjects, stakeholders, activities or initiatives, and to avoid making bad choices.

The suggestion was made within the ITG that neither in this issues paper nor in the standard should there be uncritical endorsement of SR initiatives or "of the industry of enterprises offering CSR services that has emerged in recent years."

A number of suggestions were made within the ITG for SR core context material to be included in the ISO SR Guidance standard that relate to the interface of organizations and society but that didn't fit easily or entirely within the "principles," "issues", and "definitions" headings.

The suggestion was made within the ITG that there should be in the introduction to the standard a discussion of the "global SR background" with a short review of key developments and initiatives.

The suggestion was made within the ITG that the following aspects should be covered: means for a dialogue between the organization and stakeholders; and information given to the general public by the organization about SR aspects.

The suggestion was made within the ITG that, in addition to a listing and summarizing of existing important inter-governmental instruments such as those described in the "principles" section above, there should be a listing and summarizing of existing, widely accepted international non-governmental SR standards, codes and guidelines and other tools (classified into categories such as general SR/sustainability; environmental; human rights, labour and other social; marketing and advertising; anti-corruption; governance; industry-specific and sector specific), existing management system standards, and reporting related standards, and an overview of the organizations that developed these codes, and the nature of the processes used to develop them. The view was expressed within the ITG that care should be taken to ensure that this cannot be used as an endorsement of these private activities. In another part of the standard (within the purview of ITG 6, operationalization), guidance could be provided with respect to the advantages and disadvantages, as well as the practicalities and impracticalities, of these existing standards, codes, guidelines, etc., or how they can be used in a coordinated way. Note: the view was expressed within the ITG that the difference between authoritative intergovernmental instruments on the one hand and private voluntary instruments on the other should be maintained in the standard. An alternate or additional approach suggested within the ITG was to provide guidance to organizations on how to make appropriate choices concerning use of existing private instruments and initiatives.

The NWIP states expressly that:

- the standard is not intended to reduce government's authority to address the social responsibility of organizations;
- the standard is to assist organizations in addressing their social responsibilities while respecting cultural, societal, environmental and legal differences and economic developing conditions; and
- the standard is to be consistent with and not in conflict with….international treaties and conventions;
- the standard should be compatible with and/or complementary to private nongovernmental international SR initiatives such as the Global Reporting Initiative, the Forest Stewardship Council, the Fair Labor Association.

There is considerable potentially useful material in the ISO SR Advisory Group report on:

- the relation of organizations and society, regional and cultural differences
- the relation of organizations, social responsibility and philanthropy
- the relation of organizations, social responsibility and the legal system
- the relation of organizations, social responsibility and the political process
- the relation of organizations, social responsibility and international norms/instruments
- the relation of organizations, social responsibility and private codes, standards, guidelines, and other tools (including those of ISO).

At a practical level, as noted in the ISO SR Advisory Group report and by ITG members, processes of stakeholder identification, engagement, communication, reporting, and techniques for weighing the claims of various stakeholders can play an important role in assisting organizations in understanding their relations with society. The input of ITG 4, charged with the responsibility exploring stakeholder engagement issues, should be of considerable assistance in better understanding the stakeholder aspects of the ISO SR guidance standard.

The suggestion was made within the ITG that it will be important in the SR Core context of the standard and elsewhere in the standard to be careful to specify when using the term law whether it refers to national or international law, because these types of law are quite different. The suggestion was made that the discussion of the legal framework may need to be separated from discussion of other norms, principles and initiatives that are of voluntary character.

The suggestion was made within the ITG that conceptual issues relating to voluntary behaviour need to be addressed, including whether responsibilities are always optional where the law is silent.

The suggestion was made within the ITG that another area giving rise to much of the interest in SR concerns what constitutes responsible behaviour in situations where governments do not permit respect for human rights or where laws are not applied.

The suggestion was made within the ITG that the meaning of “society”, “civil society”, and “non-governmental organizations” should be explored and contrasted.

***Suggestion for consideration by Working Group members***:

- *that SR should be placed in its context ( and defined) as early as possible within the standard. SR as a concept is centrally concerned with organizations taking into account of (and making judgments on) the interests of others and the impacts of organization activities on others, and this concept should be distinguished from other concepts, such as “what society wants organizations to do,” and “what is good for society.” As a contextual matter, it should also be made clear as early as possible within the standard that SR is not a suitable means to answer certain questions that can only be legitimately answered through properly constituted representative political processes;*
- *that in addition to the introduction and sections of the standard pertaining to definitions, principles, and issues, a section be included in the ISO SR Guidance standard entitled “The Social Responsibility Context in Which Organizations Operate”;*
- *that this section include discussions of global issues and trends related to SR, the relation between organizations, SR and: societal expectations, the law, international norms, domestic and inter-governmental political processes, regional and cultural differences, philanthropy, the potential value to organizations of private, non-governmental SR-related codes, standards, and tools, and the value of SR activities to organizations (note: the distinction between authoritative intergovernmental instruments and private instruments should be made clear;*
- *that this section include a listing and summary of important inter-governmental instruments relevant to SR, and international non-governmental SR instruments, classified into appropriate categories (e.g., general SR/sustainability, environmental, labour, reporting, management systems, etc.). Alternatively, or in addition, guidance on how organizations can make appropriate choices concerning existing SR instruments could be provided, although this might be more appropriate in the part of the standard pertaining to operationalization that is being developed by ITG 6;*

- *that this section draw on the useful material included in the ISO SR Advisory Group report, as well as material concerning stakeholders derived from ITG 4, pertaining to the relation of organizations with society, the law and domestic and inter-governmental political processes, philanthropy, etc.;*
  *that in separate national standards documents, national standards bodies may wish to provide supplementary local material as appropriate, but it should be emphasized that ISO 26000 is self-sufficient and can be fully effective without such optional local supplementation.*

## *7. How SR Core Context aspects might be reflected in a design specification*

***Suggestion for consideration by Working Group members:***

*The above-identified SR Core Context aspects could be reflected in specific sections in a general part of the standard (e.g., introduction, scope, definitions, principles, SR subjects/aspects, and SR core context in which organizations operate) and/or in specific sections pertaining to specific types of organizations.*

*At a minimum, the SR core context could be reflected in the following parts of the ISO SR Guidance standard:*

- ***Introduction*** *(which could include general background information concerning the concept of SR and its relevance to organizations)*
- ***Scope*** *(which could indicate what was within the parameters of the standard given that it is a guidance standard, not designed for certification, and is intended to complement authoritative intergovernmental instruments) ,*
- ***Definitions*** *(which could include definitions of social responsibility, organization, stakeholder, etc., drawing as appropriate on the work of other ITGs, such as that of ITG 4 concerning terminology associated with stakeholder engagement and communication),*
- ***principles*** *(which may be limited to principles intended to animate the document, or it may include SR principles, and if so,such SR principles could possibly be divided into substantive and procedural principles),*
- ***SR subjects/aspects*** *(which could include a part concerning SR subjects that fall within the scope of SR that organizations should address),*
- ***SR Context in Which Organizations Operate*** *(which could include a discussion of global trends, as well as the relation of organizations and society, the legal system, domestic and inter-governmental political processes, and private initiatives).*

*One view expressed within the ITG was that the standard be organized into two major parts, with the first being of general application (e.g, : purpose and scope; terms and definitions; general principles; SR components; fundamental SR issues; and stakeholder communications/engagement), and the second part addressing stakeholder-specific guidance, including organizational roles, subjects, principles tailored to specific types of organizations, and case studies and practices. This suggestion in part goes beyond SR core context to include both SR stakeholder engagement elements that are the subject of ITG 4, and operationalization aspects that are the subject of ITG 6.*

## *8. How SR Core Context issues might be worked on within the WG (e.g., organization of Task Groups and sub-groups)*

A separate task group could be assigned the responsibility of drafting a preliminary version of the general social responsibility core context. If the WG decides to develop specific sets of guidance for particular types of organizations, some SR core context work could also be undertaken by task groups assigned with the responsibility of developing guidance for each particular type of organization. In case there is a need at some point for separate sub-task groups to undertake certain SR Core Context responsibilities, the SR core context task group should be provided the authorization to create such task groups.

*Note: it will be important to integrate the work of ITG 5 with ITG 4 & 6, to deal with the overlaps in scope, as identified earlier in the paper.*

## *9. Summary of Key Recommendations and Outstanding Issues*

This consists of a collation of the "Suggestions for consideration by Working Group members" parts above.

***Suggested articulation of the SR core context part of the ISO SR guidance standard for consideration by Working Group members***:

*that the primary purpose of the social responsibility core context part of the standard is to provide users of the standard with an understanding of what social responsibility is, and how it relates to their organization. This social responsibility core context might consist of:*

- *a background discussion of SR definitions, principles, instruments and initiatives, key issues/subjects, global SR trends, and*
- *an understanding of the relation between the social responsibility of an organization and societal expectations, the law, domestic and inter-governmental political processes, international (inter-governmental) instruments and norms, non-governmental instruments and tools, and philanthropy.*

*This broad SR Core Context then becomes an important foundation for the development of an organization's own commitments, and actions, to be worked out and implemented through a process of internal development and engagement with stakeholders. . SR is an activity or process that involves judgment by the decision makers of organizations. Organizations can make bad judgments with respect to understanding or exercising their responsibilities. Other parts of the standard (i.e., the parts pertaining to SR operationalization and stakeholder engagement/communication that are being addressed by ITG 4 and ITG 6) are more directly devoted to SR operationalization and stakeholder engagement, although it is clear that there is considerable overlap between the various sections of the standard. For example, the SR principles and other aspects of the SR Core Context part of the standard should form a basis for any SR decision-making and actions by an organization.*

***Suggested articulation of the "issues" part of the SR Core Context, for consideration by Working Group members***:

*that the SR Core Context part of the standard includes discussion of two types of issues:*

- ***global trends and developments*** *that have led to the rising prominence of and interest in the social responsibility of organizations (e.g., issues such as globalization, trade liberalization, regulatory reform, supply chains, environmental stewardship ,poverty alleviation). The ISO SR Advisory Group has useful material that can be drawn on for this section;*

- ***specific SR subjects or aspects that fall within the scope of SR that organizations could or should address as part of their SR approach*** *(e.g., human rights, workplace and employee issues, unfair business practices, community and social development, etc.). The SR subjects or aspects could be dealt with both at a general level, for all organizations, as well as for specific types of organizations. Although differences have been expressed by drafting group members and others on what might be included, and the value of non-exhaustive lists can be questioned, there is considerable overlap in the suggestions made by various parties concerning what constitute SR subject that fall within the scope of SR that an organization should address. Therefore, it should be possible for the WG (or a task group within the WG) to develop a core list or at least a short list of widely agreed SR subjects that organizations should address. There would be value in having in the SR core context part of the standard a brief elaboration of each subject, so that users of the standard could have a better idea of what is intended by each. The identification and elaboration of subjects should not be done in such a way as to redefine or reinterpret norms more authoritatively and legitimately defined/established elsewhere. In other parts of the standard (e.g., the parts concerning operationalization), it would be possible for there to be more detailed discussion of SR subjects as appropriate.*

***Suggested articulation of the "definition" part of the SR Core Context for consideration by Working Group members***:

- *that the above-noted terms be defined and/or discussed in the ISO SR standard, in the definitions section, or in the sections of the ISO SR standard that pertain to principles, issues, or the interface of organizations with society, drawing, where relevant, on terms and definitions from existing ISO standards, national standards and other sources.*
- *that a working definition of social responsibility be developed, drawing on the work of the ISO Advisory Group and other sources, and be re-considered later in the deliberations of the WG, once the WG has more experience. The same approach could be adopted with respect to other key concepts such as SR frameworks, stakeholder, and stakeholder engagement. The definitions of stakeholder and stakeholder engagement will benefit from the input of ITG 4.*

***Suggested articulation of the "principles" section of the SR Core Context, for consideration by Working Group members***:

- *that a list of principles be developed for inclusion in the ISO SR Guidance standard,*
    - *taking into account the guidance provided by drafting group members, the ISO SR Advisory Group, the NWIP, and submissions made by members at or before the Brazil meeting;*
    - *noting the distinction between principles for the document, and SR principles for organizations, and that it would be possible to simply have principles for the document without having any SR principles for organizations;*
    - *noting the distinction between authoritative intergovernmental instruments and private instruments, drawing on widely accepted SR-relevant international conventions and declarations, standards and guidelines, in particular those international conventions and declarations that have been established by United Nations bodies (e.g., the ILO) and widely ratified by governments, and other widely accepted non-governmental international instruments (codes, standards, guidelines) that are compatible with these international conventions and declarations,*
- *that it may prove difficult to develop and agree on a list of SR principles, and that the exercise of deriving principles from existing instruments may be very time consuming and may leave ISO open to challenges that it used in appropriate processes to develop its principles. The identification and elaboration of SR principles, if it is done at all, must not be done in such a way as to redefine or reinterpret norms more authoritatively and legitimately defined elsewhere. The principles included can be limited to a small number;*
- *that the above-noted list of SR principles is provided to illustrate the types of principles that might be included. This list is not intended to be comprehensive, the principles might not be identified in the most appropriate way, not all the principles are necessarily of the same weight, and principles could be combined, removed or added. It is provided in order to give WG members some idea of what a list of SR principles could include*;
- *that if SR principles are to be articulated, working definitions for or descriptions of each of these principles should be developed, as the WG develops other parts of the standard.*

***Suggested articulation of the "interaction of the organization with society" part of the SR Core Context, for consideration by Working Group members***:

- *that SR should be placed in its context (and defined) as early as possible within the standard. SR as a concept is centrally concerned with organizations taking into account of (and making judgments on) the interests of others and the impact of organization activities on others, and this concept should be distinguished from other concepts, such as "what society wants organizations to do," and "what is good for society." As a contextual matter, it should also be made clear as early as possible within the standard that SR is not a suitable means to answer certain questions that can only be legitimately answered through properly constituted representative political processes;*

- *that, in addition to the introduction and sections of the standard pertaining to definitions, principles, and issues, a section be included in the ISO SR Guidance standard entitled "The Social Responsibility Context in Which Organizations Operate";*
- *that this section include discussions of global issues and trends related to SR, the relation between organizations, SR and: societal expectations, the law, international norms, domestic and inter-governmental political processes, regional and cultural differences, philanthropy, the potential value to organizations of private, non-governmental SR-related codes, standards, and tools, and the value of SR activities to organizations (note: the distinction between authoritative intergovernmental instruments and private instruments should be made clear;*
- *that this section include a listing and summary of important inter-governmental instruments relevant to SR, and international non-governmental SR instruments, classified into appropriate categories (e.g., general SR/sustainability, environmental, labour, reporting, management systems, etc.). Alternatively, or in addition, guidance on how organizations can make appropriate choices concerning existing SR instruments could be provided, although this might be more appropriate in the part of the standard pertaining to operationalization that is being developed by ITG 6;*
- *that this section draw on the useful material included in the ISO SR Advisory Group report, as well as material concerning stakeholders derived from ITG 4, pertaining to the relation of organizations with society, the law and domestic and inter-governmental political processes, philanthropy, etc.;*

  *that in separate national standards documents, national standards bodies may wish to provide supplementary local material as appropriate, but it should be emphasized that ISO 26000 is self-sufficient and can be fully effective without such optional local supplementation.*

***Suggested SR core context elements of design specification, for consideration by Working Group members.*** See Point 7, above.

***Suggested approach to developing SR core context within working group.*** See point 8, above.

***Outstanding Issues***

One outstanding issue is: how to integrate the work of ITG 5 SR core context with that of the work of ITG 4 (stakeholder engagement and communication) and ITG 6 (operationalization), given that there is overlap between the three.

## *10. Key Methodological References*

To be filled in later. Will include NWIP, Advisory Group recommendations, and Advisory Group Report.

## *11. Annex A: Convenors and Secretariats*

## *12. Annex B: ITG Members (sign-ups from WG)*

## *13. Annex C: Dialogue Record (summary of process and content, including reference to document containing record of email traffic on content)*

## Convenors and Secretaries of the ISO TMB WG on SR/ITG 5

**Convenor:** Dr. Kernaghan Webb, Gov't of Canada, Canada

**Co-convenor:** Adriana Alonzo, ICONTEC, Colombia

**Co-convenor:** Thierry Dedieu, CFDT, France

**Co-Secretary:** Michael Chiam, Malaysia

**Co-secretary**: David Zimmerman, CSA, Canada

# ISO/SR Interim Task Group 5 - Core Context
# Membership

*June-05*

| Contact Details | | | | | Experts | | | | | | Observers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| # | First Name | Last Name | Country/Liaison | Email | Industry | Govt | Consume | Labour | NGO | Other | |
| 1 | Federico | Andribet | Argentina | fandribet@arnet.com.ar | | | x | | | | |
| 2 | Sebastián | Bigorito | Argentina | sbigorito@ceads.org.ar | x | | | | | | |
| 3 | Juan | Carrera | Argentina | jcarrera@elotro.org.ar | | | | | x | | |
| 4 | Daniel | Fernandez | Argentina | secgremial@sind- luzyfuerza-cap.org.ar | | | | x | | | |
| 5 | Mario | Font Guido | Argentina | mfg@mfgconsultoressa.com.ar | | x | | | | | |
| 6 | Luis | Trama | Argentina | ltrama@iram.org.ar | | | | | | x | |
| 7 | Deni | Greene | Australia | deni@greene.com.au | | | x | | | | |
| 8 | Stan | Rodgers | Australia | mail@avteq.com.au | | | | | | x | |
| 9 | Elisabeth | Beer | Austria | elisabeth.beer@akwien.at | | | | x | | | |
| 10 | Christian | Friesl | Austria | c.friesl@iv-net.at | x | | | | | | |
| 11 | Karl | Kollman | Austria | karl.kollmann@akwien.or.at | | | | x | | | |
| 12 | Martin | Neureiter | Austria | martin.neureiter@chello.at | x | | | | | | |
| 13 | René | Schmidpeter | Austria | rene.schmidpeter@bmsg.gv.at | | x | | | | | |
| 14 | Verena | Proksch | Austria | verena.proksch@casinos.at | x | | | | | | |
| 15 | Cláudio | Guerreiro | Brazil | claudio.guerreiro@abnt.org.br | | | | | | | x |
| 16 | Joanne | Petrini | Canada | jpetrini@ecologi-co.com | | | | | | x | |
| 17 | Kernaghan | Webb | Canada (Convenor) | webb.kernaghan@ic.gc.ca | | x | | | | | |
| 18 | David | Zimmerman | Canada (Co-Secretary) | david.zimmerman@csa.ca | | | | | | x | |
| 19 | Stephen | Loke | Centre for Corporate Social Responsibility | stephen.loke@centreforcsr.org.sg | | | | | | x | |
| 20 | Leonor | Ceruti | Chile | leonor.ceruti@inn.cl | | | | | | x | |
| 21 | Javier | Fuenzalida | Chile | jfuenzalida@suseso.gov.cl | | x | | | | | |
| 22 | Stefan | Larenas | Chile | stefanl@odecu.cl | | | x | | | | |
| 23 | Ana Maria | Muñoz | Chile | amunozc@aguasandinas.cl | | | | x | | | |
| 24 | Gilberto | Ortíz | Chile | rse-chile@codeff.cl | | | | | x | | |
| 25 | Chen | Yuanqiao | China | chenyq@cnis.gov.cn | | | | | x | | |
| 26 | Ramón | Madriñán | Colombia | ramonm@mincomercio.gov.co | | x | | | | | |
| 27 | Ramiro | Restrepo | Colombia | ramiro.restrepo@comfenalcoantioquia.com | | | | | x | | |
| 28 | Roxana | Segovia | Colombia | rsegovia@andi.com.co | x | | | | | | |
| 29 | Roberto | Solarte | Colombia | rsolarte@javeriana.edu.co | | | | | | x | |
| 30 | Adriana | Alonso Rozo | Colombia (Co-Convenor) | aalonso@icontec.org.co | | | | | | x | |
| 31 | Jorge | Nowalski | Costa Rica | jorgenowalski@yahoo.com | | | | | x | | |
| 32 | Kim | Christensen | Denmark | kc@lca-net.com | | | | | x | | |
| 33 | Villy | Dyhr | Denmark | vd@fbr.dk | | | x | | | | |
| 34 | Anne | Gadegaard Larsen | Denmark | AGLn@novonordisk.com | x | | | | | | |
| 35 | Christian | Honoré | Denmark | dkchr@coloplast.com | x | | | | | | |
| 36 | Arne | Jensen | Denmark | arne@danskmetal.dk | | | | x | | | |
| 37 | Anders Holbech | Jespersen | Denmark | ahj@di.dk | x | | | | | | |
| 38 | Pia | Olsen | Denmark | po@dn.dk | | | | | x | | |
| 39 | Kirsten | Schmidt | Denmark | ksc@force.dk | | | | | | | x |
| 40 | Carolyn | Schmidt | Ecologia | cschmidt@ecologia.org | | | | | x | | |
| 41 | Susanna | Vahtila | Finland | susanna.vahtila@sfs.fi | | | | | | x | |
| 42 | Christian | Brodhag | France | christian.brodhag@ecologie.gouv.fr | | x | | | | | |
| 43 | Emmanuel | Laduree | France | emilie.brun@afnor.org | | | | | | | x |
| 44 | Dominique | Saitta | France | dominique.saitta@cnamts.fr | | | | | | x | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 45 | Thierry | Dedieu | France (Co-Convenor) | tdedieu@cfdt.fr | | | | x | | | |
| 46 | Franz | Burger | Germany | Franz.Burger@bmwa.bund.de | | x | | | | | |
| 47 | Frank | Ebinger | Germany | f.ebinger@ife.uni-freiburg.de | | | | | x | | |
| 48 | Peter | Sieber | Germany | P.Sieber@stiftung-warentest.de | | | x | | | | |
| 49 | Patrick | von Braunmühl | Germany | braunmuehl@vzbv.de | | | x | | | | |
| 50 | Halina | Ward | IIED | halina.ward@iied.org | | | | | x | | |
| 51 | Jason | Potts | IISD | jpotts@iisd.ca | | | | | x | | |
| 52 | Tom | Rotherham | IISD | trotherham@iisd.ca | | | | | x | | |
| 53 | Hans | Hofmeijer | ILO | hofmeijer@ilo.org | | | | | | x | |
| 54 | Tarcila | Reis Ursini | InterAmerican CSR Network | tarcila@uniethos.org.br | | | | | x | | |
| 55 | Mathea | Fammels | International Chamber of Commerce | mathea.fammels@mcm.be | | | | | x | | |
| 56 | Stefano | Bertasi | International Chamber of Commerce | sbi@iccwbo.org | x | | | | | | |
| 57 | Dwight | Justice | International Confederation of Free Trade Unions | dwight.justice@icftu.org | | | | x | | | |
| 58 | Wolfram | Heger | International Federation of Standards Users | Wolfram.Heger@DaimlerChrysler.com | x | | | | | | |
| 59 | Henry | Clifford | International Organization of Employees | henry.ce@pg.com | x | | | | | | |
| 60 | Adam | Greene | International Organization of Employees | agreene@uscib.org | x | | | | | | |
| 61 | Aliabari | Mozhgan | Iran | mgn1343@yahoo.com | | | | x | | | |
| 62 | Patrick | Mallet | ISEAL Alliance | pmallet@isealalliance.org | | | | | x | | |
| 63 | Joe | Cascio | ISO/TC207 | Cascio_joe@bah.com | | | | | | x | |
| 64 | Tami | Zilberg | Israel | zilbergt@netvision.net.il | | | | | x | | |
| 65 | Ornella | Cilona | Italy | coeisine-mezzogiorno.ue@mail.cgil.it | | | | x | | | |
| 66 | Simone | deColle | Italy | sdecolle@liuc.it | | | | | | x | |
| 67 | Lucina | Mercadante | Italy | l.mercadante@inail.it | | | | | | x | |
| 68 | Stefano | Sibilio | Italy | stefano.sibilio@uni.com | | | | | | x | |
| 69 | Angela | Tanno | Italy | a.tanno@abi.it | x | | | | | | |
| 70 | Antonio | Tencati | Italy | antonio.tencati@uni-bocconi.it | | x | | | | | |
| 71 | Pia | Valota | Italy | piavalota@libero.it | | | x | | | | |
| 72 | Alessandro | Bressan | Italy | abressan@welfare.gov.it | | x | | | | | |
| 73 | Eiichiro | Adachi | Japan | adachi@ird.jri.co.jp | | | | | | x | |
| 74 | Shizuo | Fukada | Japan | shizuo_fukada@omron.co.jp | x | | | | | | |
| 75 | Ken-ichi | Kumagai | Japan | kumagai@sv.rengo-net.or.jp | | | | x | | | |
| 76 | Mariko | Sano | Japan | m-sano@shufuren.gr.jp | | | x | | | | |
| 77 | Masaoi | Seki | Japan | MSeki1@sompo-japan.co.jp | x | | | | | | |
| 78 | Yano | Tomosaburo | Japan | yano-tomosaburo@meti.go.jp | | x | | | | | |
| 79 | Soodan | Kim | Korea | sdkim@ats.go.kr | | x | | | | | |
| 80 | Han-Kyun | Rho | Korea | h.rho.97@cantab.net | | | | | | x | |
| 81 | Lee | Jooran | Korea | jooran@ksa.or.kr | | | | | | x | |
| 82 | Lup Bong | Choy | Malaysia | lbchoy@mohr.gov.my | | x | | | | | |
| 83 | Michael | Chiam | Malaysia (Co-Secretary) | m.chiam@ponl.com | x | | | | | | |
| 84 | Lilia | Granillo Vazquez | Mexico | clgv@correo.azc.uam.mx | | | | | | x | |
| 85 | Alejandro | Lorea | Mexico | alorea@cce.org.mx | x | | | | | | |
| 86 | Alilcia | Ruiz Luna | Mexico | alicia_ruiz@idecaquif.com | | | | | x | | |
| 87 | Patricia | Ruiz Velasco | Mexico | pruizv@profeco.gob.mx | | | x | | | | |
| 88 | Chafai | Abdelmalek | Morocco | abdelmalekc@mcinet.gov.ma | | x | | | | | |
| 89 | William | Blackburn | Netherlands | WRB@WBlackburnConsulting.com | | | | | | x | |
| 90 | Dick | Hortensius | Netherlands | dick.hortensius@nen.nl | | | | | | x | |
| 91 | Brennan | Allen | New Zeland | ballen@waikato.ac.nz | | | | | | x | |
| 92 | Pavel | Castka | New Zeland | pavel.castka@canterbury.ac.nz | | | | | | x | |
| 93 | Jacob | Bomann-Larsen | Norway | Jacob.bomann-larsen@bfd.dep.no | | | x | | | | |
| 94 | Victoria | Thoresen | Norway | Victoria.thoresen@luh.hihm.no | | | | | | x | |
| 95 | Kathryn | Gordon | OECD | Kathryn.gordon@oecd.org | | | | | | x | |
| 96 | Thomas | Thomas | Singapore | Thomas.thomas@shell.com | | | | x | | | |
| 97 | Rochelle | Zaid | Social Accountability International | rochelle@sa-intl.org | x | | | | | | |
| 98 | Friede | Dowie | South Africa | friede.dowie@busa.org.za | x | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 99 | Nkosithabile | Ndlovu | South Africa | nkosi@aiccafrica.org | | | | | x | | |
| 100 | Norah Sheillah | Segoati | South Africa | Norah.Segoati@bhpbilliton.com | x | | | | | | |
| 101 | Luis | Gomez Martinez | Spain | luisgomez@comfia.ccoo.es | | | | x | | | |
| 102 | Alicia | Duran | Spain | aduran@ing.uc3m.es | | | | | | x | |
| 103 | Jens | Henriksson | Sweden | jens.henriksson@sverigeskonsumentrad.se | | | x | | | | |
| 104 | Elenore | Kanter | Sweden | elenore.kanter@foreign.ministry.se | | x | | | | | |
| 105 | Alberto | Gandolfi | Switzerland | alberto.gandolfi@supsi.ch | | | | | | x | |
| 106 | Christophe | Margot | Switzerland | christophe.margot@neosys-ag.ch | x | | | | | | |
| 107 | Chaiyuth | Chavalitnitikul | Thailand | Chaiyc@mozart.inet.co.th | | x | | | | | |
| 108 | Viroj | Na Bangchang | Thailand | Virojn@hotmail.com | | | x | | | | |
| 109 | Anant | Suwanapal | Thailand | anant@tisi.go.th | | x | | | | | |
| 110 | Supachai | Tepatanapong | Thailand | supachai@tisi.go.th | | x | | | | | |
| 111 | Manuel | Escudero | UNGC/UNEP | Manuel.Escudero@ie.edu | | | | | | | x |
| 112 | Edward | Clarence-Smith | UNIDO | E.Clarence-Smith@unido.org | | x | | | | | |
| 113 | Peter | Houghton | United Kingdom | hconserve@btconnect.com | x | | | | | | |
| 114 | Steven | Cornish | USA | scornish@ansi.org | | | | | | x | |
| 115 | Perla | Puterman | Venezuela | p.p.s@cantv.net | x | | | | | | |
| 116 | María Teresa | Sacucci | Venezuela | msaccucci@fondonorma.org.ve | | | | | x | | |
| 117 | Randall | Richards | WBCSD | richards_r_r@cat.com | x | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Total*** | | | | | ***24*** | ***18*** | ***13*** | ***12*** | ***19*** | ***28*** | ***4*** |

## David Zimmerman

**From:** Darryl Neate
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 19, 2005 6:15 PM
**To:** 'fandribet@arnet.com.ar'; 'sbigorito@ceads.org.ar'; 'jcarrera@elotro.org.ar'; 'secgremial@sind-luzyfuerza-cap.org.ar'; 'mfg@mfgconsultoressa.com.ar'; 'ltrama@iram.org.ar'; 'deni@greene.com.au'; 'elisabeth.beer@akwien.at'; 'c.friesl@iv-net.at'; 'karl.kollmann@akwien.or.at'; 'rene.schmidpeter@bmsg.gv.at'; 'verena.proksch@casinos.at'; 'jpetrini@ecologi-co.com'; 'webb.kernaghan@ic.gc.ca'; 'aalonso@icontec.org.co'; 'ramon@mincomercio.gov.co'; 'ramiro.restrepo@comfenalcoantioquia.com'; 'rsegovia@andi.com.co'; 'rsolarte@javeriana.edu.co'; 'kc@lca-net.com'; 'vd@fbr.dk'; 'AGLn@novonordisk.com'; 'dkchr@coloplast.com'; 'arne@danskmetal.dk'; 'po@dn.dk'; 'ksc@force.dk'; 'cschmidt@ecologia.org'; 'susanna.vahtila@sfs.fi'; 'christian.brodhag@ecologie.gouv.fr'; 'emilie.brun@afnor.org'; 'tdedieu@cfdt.fr'; 'dominique.saitta@cnamts.fr'; 'f.ebinger@ife.uni-freiburg.de'; 'halina.ward@iied.org'; 'jpotts@iisd.ca'; 'trotherham@iisd.ca'; 'hofmeijer@ilo.org'; 'tarcila@uniethos.org.br'; 'mathea.fammels@mcm.be'; 'sbi@iccwbo.org'; 'dwight.justice@icftu.org'; 'Wolfram.Heger@DaimlerChrysler.com'; 'henry.ce@pg.com'; 'agreene@uscib.org'; 'mgn1343@yahoo.com'; 'pmallet@isealalliance.org'; 'Cascio_joe@bah.com'; 'zilbergt@netvision.net.il'; 'sdecolle@liuc.it'; 'piavalota@libero.it'; 'adachi@ird.jri.co.jp'; 'shizuo_fukada@omron.co.jp'; 'kumagai@sv.rengo-net.or.jp'; 'm-sano@shufuren.gr.jp'; 'MSeki1@sompo-japan.co.jp'; 'yano-tomosaburo@meti.go.jp'; 'h.rho.97@cantab.net'; 'jooran@ksa.or.kr'; 'M.Chiam@ponl.com'; 'abdelmalekc@mcinet.gov.ma'; 'dick.hortensius@nen.nl'; 'ballen@waikato.ac.nz'; 'pavel.castka@canterbury.ac.nz'; 'Kathryn.gordon@oecd.org'; 'rochelle@sa-intl.org'; 'Norah.Segoati@bhpbilliton.com'; 'luisgomez@comfia.ccoo.es'; 'aduran@ing.uc3m.es'; 'jens.henriksson@sverigeskonsumentrad.se'; 'elenore.kanter@foreign.ministry.se'; 'christophe.margot@neosys-ag.ch'; 'alberto.gandolfi@supsi.ch'; 'E.Clarence-Smith@unido.org'; 'hconserve@btconnect.com'; 'WRB@WBlackburnConsulting.com'; 'p.p.s@cantv.net'; 'msaccucci@fondonorma.org.ve'; 'richards_r_r@cat.com'
**Cc:** CAMPOS DE SÃO THIAGO Eduardo; 'cmunck@volvocars.com'; CAJAZEIRA Jorge E. R.; Kristina Sandberg; 'Sara Ellström'
**Subject:** ISO Social Responsibility - ITG5 SR Core Context - Welcome & Path Forward

Dear ITG5 Experts,

On behalf of the ITG5 leadership, I'm pleased to welcome you to the work of ITG5 on SR Core Context.

1. Attached is the list of registered experts received to date. Please review your details and advise if there are any errors in the list (email addresses and stakeholder categories in particular).

2. A brief summary of the current ITG5 membership is as follows:
- A total of 25 countries and 15 liaison organizations are currently represented
- The group currently includes 18 Industry, 9 Government, 6 Consumer, 9 Labor, 15 NGOs and 20 Other stakeholders

3. The draft SR Core Context Issues Paper template is attached for your reference (ITG5 N1). Please note that this draft template was developed in conjunction with the other ITG leaders and is proposed to ensure coordination and consistency across each of the groups.

4. It is proposed that the process outlined below be followed to develop the Issues Paper:

*Task 1 - Identification of Volunteers to Draft Issues Paper*
Experts interested in drafting the initial version of the SR Core Context Issues Paper are asked to email me by **April 29th**. Please indicate in your email back to me which issues/clauses within the template you are interested in contributing to. These experts will form the "SR Core Context Issues Drafting Group". In view of the fact that the paper will need to be completed by the end of June, Drafting Group members should note that they will be expected to work on a fairly tight schedule.
(NOTE: The ITG5 leadership will help coordinate the work of the drafting group, and seek to ensure that the group has as balanced a representation as possible, but is also small and focused enough to complete its task).

*Task 2 - Issues Paper Draft 1*

Clauses will be developed by interested drafting group members. Each clause will have an identified leader (assigned by the ITG5 leadership). The deadline for completing the first draft of each clause will be **May 27th**. As a starting point, we encourage all ITG5 Experts, and particularly those involved in drafting the Issues Paper, to draw on the ISO SR Advisory Group's report and recommendations, the new work item proposal, and related material generated for the Brazil meeting and at the Brazil meeting as a basis for drafting the issues paper. This material is available at ISO livelink www.iso.org/wgsr . The ISO SR Advisory Group report and recommendations and New Work Item Proposal are available under "General Documents". The other material is available under the various other headings. Material specific to ITG 5 will be added to this site as it is accumulated.

*Task 3 - Submit Draft Issues Paper to ITG5 for Review*
The Co-Secretaries will complete an edit of the first draft by **June 3rd** and send out to ITG5 members for review and comment by **June 17th**.

*Task 4 - Issue Paper Draft 2*
The drafting group will review comments received and finalize a draft for the WG Secretariat by **June 30th**.

*Task 5 - Submission to WG Secretariat*
The draft ITG5 discussion paper will be submitted to the WG Secretariat who will then submit it to all WG experts for comment.

5. It is important to remember that the Issues Paper will act as a starting point for broader discussion at the first ITG5 meeting in Thailand. In other words, the drafting group and initial ITG5 review are preliminary steps. The starting point of the formal and complete review of the paper will occur once it is circulated to all WG experts and discussed by ITG5 at its first meeting in Thailand.

Please don't hesitate to contact me with any questions or concerns.

regards,
Darryl Neate
Co-Secretary ITG5 - SR Core Context
Project Manager
Business Management & Sustainability
Canadian Standards Association
5060 Spectrum Way
Mississauga, Ont L4W 5N6
Ph: + 1 416 747 2539
Fax: + 1 416 401 6832
Email: darryl.neate@csa.ca
Web: www.csa.ca

ISO SR ITG5 Membership List - ...

ITG5 N1 - Draft Issues Paper T...

## David Zimmerman

**From:** Darryl Neate
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 04, 2005 9:39 AM
**Subject:** ISO Social Responsibility - ITG5 SR Core Context - Drafting Group Details & Next Steps

Dear ITG5 Experts,

1. Thank you to those Drafting Group Volunteers that stepped forward. Including the ITG5 leadership, the Drafting Group currently looks as follows:

- Adriana Alonso Rozo - Columbia, Other [co-convenor]
- William Blackburn - Netherlands, Other
- Michael Chiam - Malaysia - Industry [co-secretary]
- Thierry Dedieu - France, Labour [co-convenor]
- Arne Jensen - Denmark, Labour
- Darryl Neate - Canada, Other [co-secretary]
- Han-Kyun Rho - Korea - Other
- Kernaghan Webb - Canada, Government [convenor]

2. Given the current balance, we are particularly seeking additional NGO, Industry or Government Representatives that would like to join the group (up to 2 NGO's and up to 1 each for Govt and Industry).

3. If you are interested, please kindly email me by end of day **May 9th**.

4. In accordance with previous correspondence, the Drafting Group will circulate a first draft of the issues paper to all ITG5 experts by **June 3rd** for a two week review/comment period.

regards,
Darryl Neate
Co-Secretary ITG5 - SR Core Context
Project Manager
Business Management & Sustainability
Canadian Standards Association
5060 Spectrum Way
Mississauga, Ont L4W 5N6
Ph: + 1 416 747 2539
Fax: + 1 416 401 6832
Email: darryl.neate@csa.ca
Web: www.csa.ca

## David Zimmerman

**From:** Darryl Neate
**Sent:** Friday, May 27, 2005 5:01 PM
**Cc:** 'm.chiam@ponl.com'
**Subject:** ISO Social Responsibility - ITG5 Core Context - Co Secretary Transition - Follow Up

Dear ITG5 Experts,

1) Please note the following clarifications regarding the ITG5 Co-Secretary position:

David Zimmerman from CSA is the proposed replacement for me as Co-Secretary of ITG5. David has extensive ISO standards development experience, excellent project management skills, and a good understanding of SR issues.

In accordance with guidance from the WG Secretariat, ITG5 experts are asked to communicate to both co-secretaries - myself and Michael Chiam (m.chiam@ponl.com) - by **June 17, 2005** to advise whether or not you have a sustained opposition to the nomination of Mr. Zimmerman as Co-Secretary of ITG5. Responses should be either:

(a) I do not have a sustained opposition; or
(b) I have a sustained opposition. If you have a sustained opposition, please also provide an explanation of your position.

Please note that non-responses will be interpreted as absence of sustained opposition. It will then be at the discretion of the ITG5 Convenors to determine whether any indications of sustained opposition constitute, in their opinion, either "a substantive issue" or "an important part of the concerned interests".

I will remain as Co-Secretary of ITG5 during the transition.

2) On behalf of the WG Secretariat, please see the below email (regarding the issue raised by Adam Greene).

regards,
Darryl

==========

Dear experts,
As ITG 5 and 6 experts know, Adam Greene has sent an email to ITG 5 and 6 colleagues, which in relevant parts states the following:

"Point number 9 [from the ITG5 Issues paper template] on Key Discussion Points includes issues related to the mandate of the entire WG, including the definition of an ISO guidance standard, the TMB's instructions to the WG, the scope of the activity set out in the NWIP, and the need to differentiate the guidance standard to different types of organizations. While these are important issues, they should be addressed at the WG level and not by each interim task group independently (the same issues are also included in the other Interim Task Group's draft templates). In order to ensure consistency across the WG, these issues should be removed from the draft templates for the interim task groups and addressed by the entire
WG in plenary."

We would first like to thank Adam for bringing this matter to our attention. The objective of the "key discussion point" clause in the ITG 4, 5, and 6 templates was to alert ITG issues paper drafters of the need to take into account the pre-determined parameters of the work as set out by TMB in its New Work Item Proposal and other communications when they
prepare their issues papers. It was not included to suggest that each ITG address these parameters. Any such discussion would properly take place by the WG as a whole.

However, based on Adam's email, we recognize that the clause has caused confusion. Therefore we ask that the "key discussion point" clause in the three templates be removed. Instead, we ask ITG experts in 4, 5 and 6 to develop their issues papers following the template points provided (with the exception of the "key discussion points clause), but that ITG experts

do so while taking into account the parameters of the work as set out by TMB in its New Work Item Proposal and other communications, notably:

a. Definition of Guidance Standard
b. TMB instructions set out in New Work Item Proposal
c. Identification of aspects/issues in the Advisory Group report that need to be addressed in the standard
d. Location of various aspects of topics identified above in the ISO SR Guidance Standard (including linkages to other parts)
e. Need if any to differentiate application to different types of organisations
f. Other

We hope that this removes any confusion on this point.

Regards,
Secretariat of ISO/TMB/WG SR, Social Responsibility
Kristina Sandberg

_____
Secretariat of ISO/TMB/WG SR, Social Responsibility
SIS, Swedish Standards Institute
Postal address: SE-118 80 Stockholm, Sweden
Office address: Sankt Paulsgatan 6
Office: +46 8 555 520 00
Telefax: +46 8 555 521 76
www.sis.se

Kristina Sandberg
Phone +46 8 555 520 61
mailto:kristina.sandberg@sis.se

## David Zimmerman

**From:** Darryl Neate
**Sent:** Monday, June 13, 2005 11:23 AM
**Cc:** David Zimmerman; 'm.chiam@ponl.com'; Darryl Neate
**Subject:** ISO Social Responsibility - ITG5 Core Context - 1st Draft Issues Paper

Dear ITG5 Experts,

1. Attached for your review is a first preliminary draft of the ITG5 Core Context Issues Paper (N2). The slight delay in getting this to you reflects the hard work put in by drafting group members to get to this point.

2. Please kindly review the draft and submit any comments on it by end of day **Wednesday June 22nd**.

NOTE: Remember that this is still a preliminary draft and that all ITG5 experts will have the full ability to comment on the first official draft that is sent out to the full WG membership in July. Given this fact - and the tight comment period - we would ask you to limit your comments at this time to major issues of concern only.

3. Comments (quoting the relevant line number) should be sent to David Zimmerman, Michael Chiam and myself (all of our emails are included in the cc line).

4. A revised draft will be developed by the ITG5 leadership/drafting group based on your feedback. It will be submitted to the WG Secretariat (as the first official draft) for circulation to all WG experts in July.

5. A background document was also developed by the drafting group (including raw inputs from DG members for the issues paper). To help avoid any confusion, this document is not included to this email, but is available upon request from the Co-Secretaries.

regards,
Darryl Neate
Co-Secretary ITG5 - SR Core Context
Canadian Standards Association
Ph: +1-416-747-2016
Fax: +1-416-401-6832
Email: darryl.neate@csa.ca

ITG5 N2 - Draft Issues Paper.p...

ITG5 N2 - Draft Issues Paper.d...

## David Zimmerman

**From:** Darryl Neate
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 28, 2005 5:23 PM
**To:** 'fandribet@arnet.com.ar'; 'sbigorito@ceads.org.ar'; 'jcarrera@elotro.org.ar'; 'secgremial@sind-luzyfuerza-cap.org.ar'; 'mfg@mfgconsultoressa.com.ar'; 'ltrama@iram.org.ar'; 'deni@greene.com.au'; 'mail@avteq.com.au'; 'elisabeth.beer@akwien.at'; 'c.friesl@iv-net.at'; 'karl.kollmann@akwien.or.at'; 'martin.neureiter@chello.at'; 'rene.schmidpeter@bmsg.gv.at'; 'verena.proksch@casinos.at'; 'claudio.guerreiro@abnt.org.br'; 'jpetrini@ecologi-co.com'; 'webb.kernaghan@ic.gc.ca'; 'stephen.loke@centreforcsr.org.sg'; 'leonor.ceruti@inn.cl'; 'jfuenzalida@suseso.gov.cl'; 'stefanl@odecu.cl'; 'amunozc@aguasandinas.cl'; 'rse-chile@codeff.cl'; 'chenyq@cnis.gov.cn'; 'ramonm@mincomercio.gov.co'; 'ramiro.restrepo@comfenalcoantioquia.com'; 'rsegovia@andi.com.co'; 'rsolarte@javeriana.edu.co'; 'aalonso@icontec.org.co'; 'jorgenowalski@yahoo.com'; 'kc@lca-net.com'; 'vd@fbr.dk'; 'AGLn@novonordisk.com'; 'dkchr@coloplast.com'; 'arne@danskmetal.dk'; 'ahj@di.dk'; 'po@dn.dk'; 'ksc@force.dk'; 'cschmidt@ecologia.org'; 'susanna.vahtila@sfs.fi'; 'christian.brodhag@ecologie.gouv.fr'; 'emilie.brun@afnor.org'; 'dominique.saitta@cnamts.fr'; 'tdedieu@cfdt.fr'; 'Franz.Burger@bmwa.bund.de'; 'f.ebinger@ife.uni-freiburg.de'; 'P.Sieber@stiftung-warentest.de'; 'braunmuehl@vzbv.de'; 'halina.ward@iied.org'; 'jpotts@iisd.ca'; 'trotherham@iisd.ca'; 'hofmeijer@ilo.org'; 'tarcila@uniethos.org.br'; 'mathea.fammels@mcm.be'; 'sbi@iccwbo.org'; 'dwight.justice@icftu.org'; 'Wolfram.Heger@DaimlerChrysler.com'; 'henry.ce@pg.com'; 'agreene@uscib.org'; 'mgn1343 @yahoo.com'; 'pmallet@isealalliance.org'; 'Cascio_joe@bah.com'; 'zilbergt@netvision.net.il'; 'coeisine-mezzogiorno.ue@mail.cgil.it'; 'sdecolle@liuc.it'; 'l.mercadante@inail.it'; 'stefano.sibilio@uni.com'; 'a.tanno@abi.it'; 'antonio.tencati@uni-bocconi.it'; 'piavalota@libero.it'; 'abressan@welfare.gov.it'; 'adachi@ird.jri.co.jp'; 'shizuo_fukada@omron.co.jp'; 'kumagai@sv.rengo-net.or.jp'; 'm-sano@shufuren.gr.jp'; 'MSeki1@sompo-japan.co.jp'; 'yano-tomosaburo@meti.go.jp'; 'sdkim@ats.go.kr'; 'h.rho.97 @cantab.net'; 'jooran@ksa.or.kr'; 'lbchoy@mohr.gov.my'; 'm.chiam@ponl.com'; 'clgv@correo.azc.uam.mx'; 'alorea@cce.org.mx'; 'alicia_ruiz@idecaquif.com'; 'pruizv@profeco.gob.mx'; 'abdelmalekc@mcinet.gov.ma'; 'WRB@WBlackburnConsulting.com'; 'dick.hortensius@nen.nl'; 'ballen@waikato.ac.nz'; 'pavel.castka@canterbury.ac.nz'; 'Jacob.bomann-larsen@bfd.dep.no'; 'Victoria.thoresen@luh.hihm.no'; 'Kathryn.gordon@oecd.org'; 'Thomas.thomas@shell.com'; 'rochelle@sa-intl.org'; 'friede.dowie@busa.org.za'; 'nkosi@aiccafrica.org'; 'Norah.Segoati@bhpbilliton.com'; 'luisgomez@comfia.ccoo.es'; 'aduran@ing.uc3m.es'; 'jens.henriksson@sverigeskonsumentrad.se'; 'elenore.kanter@foreign.ministry.se'; 'alberto.gandolfi@supsi.ch'; 'christophe.margot@neosys-ag.ch'; 'Chaiyc@mozart.inet.co.th'; 'Virojn@hotmail.com'; 'anant@tisi.go.th'; 'supachai@tisi.go.th'; 'Manuel.Escudero@ie.edu'; 'E.Clarence-Smith@unido.org'; 'hconserve@btconnect.com'; 'scornish@ansi.org'; 'p.p.s@cantv.net'; 'msaccucci@fondonorma.org.ve'; 'richards_r_r@cat.com'; David Zimmerman; 'clovis@dieese.org.br'
**Subject:** ISO Social Responsibility - ITG5 Core Context - Additional Comments on Preliminary Draft Issues Paper (N4)

Dear ITG5 Experts,

1. Additional comments on the preliminary draft issues paper from Argentina, S. Bertasi (ICC) and P. Houghton (UK) are attached for your reference (N4).

2. Please note that all ITG5 N-Documents are now posted on the ISO SR Website (under the ITG5\General Documents folders) for your quick reference. You will also find the comments included in N3 & N4 posted individually for your reference.

regards,
Darryl Neate
Co-Secretary ITG5 - SR Core Context
Canadian Standards Association
Ph: +1-416-747-2016

Fax: +1-416-401-6832
Email: darryl.neate@csa.ca

TG5 N4 - Additional Comments ...

## David Zimmerman

**From:** David Zimmerman
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 29, 2005 10:08 AM
**To:** 'fandribet@arnet.com.ar'; 'sbigorito@ceads.org.ar'; 'jcarrera@elotro.org.ar'; 'secgremial@sind-luzyfuerza-cap.org.ar'; 'mfg@mfgconsultoressa.com.ar'; 'ltrama@iram.org.ar'; 'deni@greene.com.au'; 'mail@avteq.com.au'; 'elisabeth.beer@akwien.at'; 'c.friesl@iv-net.at'; 'karl.kollmann@akwien.or.at'; 'martin.neureiter@chello.at'; 'rene.schmidpeter@bmsg.gv.at'; 'verena.proksch@casinos.at'; 'claudio.guerreiro@abnt.org.br'; 'jpetrini@ecologi-co.com'; 'webb.kernaghan@ic.gc.ca'; 'stephen.loke@centreforcsr.org.sg'; 'leonor.ceruti@inn.cl'; 'jfuenzalida@suseso.gov.cl'; 'stefanl@odecu.cl'; 'amunozc@aguasandinas.cl'; 'rse-chile@codeff.cl'; 'chenyq@cnis.gov.cn'; 'ramonm@mincomercio.gov.co'; 'ramiro.restrepo@comfenalcoantioquia.com'; 'rsegovia@andi.com.co'; 'rsolarte@javeriana.edu.co'; 'aalonso@icontec.org.co'; 'jorgenowalski@yahoo.com'; 'kc@lca-net.com'; 'vd@fbr.dk'; 'AGLn@novonordisk.com'; 'dkchr@coloplast.com'; 'arne@danskmetal.dk'; 'ahj@di.dk'; 'po@dn.dk'; 'ksc@force.dk'; 'cschmidt@ecologia.org'; 'susanna.vahtila@sfs.fi'; 'christian.brodhag@ecologie.gouv.fr'; 'emilie.brun@afnor.org'; 'dominique.saitta@cnamts.fr'; 'tdedieu@cfdt.fr'; 'Franz.Burger@bmwa.bund.de'; 'f.ebinger@ife.uni-freiburg.de'; 'P.Sieber@stiftung-warentest.de'; 'braunmuehl@vzbv.de'; 'halina.ward@iied.org'; 'jpotts@iisd.ca'; 'trotherham@iisd.ca'; 'hofmeijer@ilo.org'; 'tarcila@uniethos.org.br'; 'mathea.fammels@mcm.be'; 'sbi@iccwbo.org'; 'dwight.justice@icftu.org'; 'Wolfram.Heger@DaimlerChrysler.com'; 'henry.ce@pg.com'; 'agreene@uscib.org'; 'mgn1343@yahoo.com'; 'pmallet@isealalliance.org'; 'Cascio_joe@bah.com'; 'zilbergt@netvision.net.il'; 'coeisine-mezzogiorno.ue@mail.cgil.it'; 'sdecolle@liuc.it'; 'l.mercadante@inail.it'; 'stefano.sibilio@uni.com'; 'a.tanno@abi.it'; 'antonio.tencati@uni-bocconi.it'; 'piavalota@libero.it'; 'abressan@welfare.gov.it'; 'adachi@ird.jri.co.jp'; 'shizuo_fukada@omron.co.jp'; 'kumagai@sv.rengo-net.or.jp'; 'm-sano@shufuren.gr.jp'; 'MSeki1@sompo-japan.co.jp'; 'yano-tomosaburo@meti.go.jp'; 'sdkim@ats.go.kr'; 'h.rho.97@cantab.net'; 'jooran@ksa.or.kr'; 'lbchoy@mohr.gov.my'; 'm.chiam@ponl.com'; 'clgv@correo.azc.uam.mx'; 'alorea@cce.org.mx'; 'alicia_ruiz@idecaquif.com'; 'pruizv@profeco.gob.mx'; 'abdelmalekc@mcinet.gov.ma'; 'WRB@WBlackburnConsulting.com'; 'dick.hortensius@nen.nl'; 'ballen@waikato.ac.nz'; 'pavel.castka@canterbury.ac.nz'; 'Jacob.bomann-larsen@bfd.dep.no'; 'Victoria.thoresen@luh.hihm.no'; 'Kathryn.gordon@oecd.org'; 'Thomas.thomas@shell.com'; 'rochelle@sa-intl.org'; 'friede.dowie@busa.org.za'; 'nkosi@aiccafrica.org'; 'Norah.Segoati@bhpbilliton.com'; 'luisgomez@comfia.ccoo.es'; 'aduran@ing.uc3m.es'; 'jens.henriksson@sverigeskonsumentrad.se'; 'elenore.kanter@foreign.ministry.se'; 'alberto.gandolfi@supsi.ch'; 'christophe.margot@neosys-ag.ch'; 'Chaiyc@mozart.inet.co.th'; 'Virojn@hotmail.com'; 'anant@tisi.go.th'; 'supachai@tisi.go.th'; 'Manuel.Escudero@ie.edu'; 'E.Clarence-Smith@unido.org'; 'hconserve@btconnect.com'; 'scornish@ansi.org'; 'p.p.s@cantv.net'; 'msaccucci@fondonorma.org.ve'; 'richards_r_r@cat.com'; 'clovis@dieese.org.br'; 'sims@ilo.org'
**Subject:** RE: ISO Social Responsibility - ITG5 Core Context - Additional Comments on Preliminary Draft Issues Paper (N5)

Dear ITG5 Experts,

Additional comments on the preliminary draft issues paper from E. Sims of the ILO are attached for your reference (N5 ). All ITG5 N-Documents are now posted on the ISO SR Website (under the ITG5\General Documents folders) for your quick reference.

Regards,
David Zimmerman
Co-Secretary ITG5 - SR Core Context
Canadian Standards Association

Ph: +1-416-747-2479
Fax: +1-416-401-6909
Email: david.zimmerman @csa.ca

TG5 N5 - Additional Comments ...