Stakeholder Engagement Plan

_____

1. Purpose

This describes how the Sustainable Eel Group (SEG) plans to engage with the diversity of stakeholders interested in the European eel during the consultation phases of our Standard and associated Assurance system and Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning system, as we undertake substantial revision of those in 2023.

2. Stakeholder analysis

We have undertaken and an extensive analysis of stakeholders since our formation in 2010. Our current stakeholder analysis is published at 008 SEG Stakeholder Analysis and at Appendix 2 below.

Our stakeholders come from a wide diversity of interests, for example, scientists, conservation organisations, governments, agencies, politicians, fishers, anglers, traders, eel farmers, restocking organisations, local communities, eel smokers and other processors; plus water operators such as water suppliers and power companies.   They cover the wide natural range of the European eel – Europe, Scandinavia, North Africa and beyond.

Our analysis updates our list of stakeholders and re-classifies them according to sustainability categories: Social, Environmental and Economic. Within each of those are the range of those other categories listed above and we highlight those that we particularly seek to gain comments from.

Our stakeholders are from a wide diversity of countries in the European eel's range. We will seek to ensure we have comments from stakeholders in each: Denmark, France, Germany, Morocco, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom,

3. Stakeholder engagement plan 2023

We engage with our stakeholders on a regular basis. For example:

- News and views, including links to papers and news items, via 2140 followers via Twitter,
- Emails via MailChimp to 850 contacts on our subscriber list,
- Direct emails to 100 contacts who have a direct interest in the SEG Standard certification scheme, including certificate holders.

In 2023 we will be holding more structured and co-ordinated engagement as we undertake a substantial revision of our sustainability standard and its supporting systems and procedures. The following describes our intentions for that stakeholder engagement:

3.1   Categories of Stakeholders

As described in 2. above, we have re-classified our stakeholders according to the sustainability principles: Social, Environmental and Economic. We have certain stakeholders groups that are currently under-represented and who we would like to reach out to. Those are indicated in Appendix 1, our Stakeholder Engagement Plan 2023.

3.2 Topics to consult on

Topics that we intend to consult on in 2023 are:

3.2.1 SEG Standard Revision

- The existing standard (V6.1), updated Theory of Change, Terms of Reference for Revision,
- An updated 1st draft standard, Version 7.0
- An updated 2nd draft standard, Version 7.0 before final publication

3.2.2 SEG Assurance System

- Developing and revised policies and procedures to define the governance and assurance in the application of our sustainability objectives and the SEG standard, to include Accreditation, Risk management and Data management systems.

3.2.3 SEG Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning System

- Developing and revised policies and procedures for ensuring that we measure, evaluate and learn from the implementation of our plans.

Each of these are planned and will be designed according to the ISEAL Codes of Good Practice.

3.3 How and when to engage stakeholders

We will seek comments on different topics at different times and in different ways, according to when those topics are ready. Appendix 1 summarises the whole plan for 2023 according to an 'engagement calendar'.

3.4 Engagement targets

We have set targets for the number of stakeholders we would ideally like to have comments from in each category. They vary in number at different times, as we expect a different levels of engagement for different topics at different times. Those targets are in Appendix 1: Stakeholder Engagement Plan 2023.

3.5 System to monitor stakeholder responses and to seek to maintain targets

3.5.1 email

- Most Comments will be received mostly by email to our consultation address: standard@sustainableeelgroup.org.
- We will maintain a log of all comments received, per round of consultation, according to stakeholder category.
- We will use that to monitor if we are receiving the targeted number of comments in each category.
- Reminders will be sent of the request to comment and the deadline for response.
- If there look likely to be, or there is a shortfall in the number of responses, we will send targeted emails to those we particularly desire a response (i.e. rather than 'to all') to seek their comment
- All responses will be recorded. Where we target particular stakeholders, those will be recorded. Their response to that will be recorded, as will any further follow-up action from SEG.

3.5.2   Seminars

- We also intend to hold several seminars to engage with people in conversation.
- Some may be in person but most are likely to be virtual / online, by Zoom.
- We will invite people according to target numbers in each stakeholder category and record those who reply and attend.
- We will send reminders and targeted invites to seek to meet the engagement targets for each seminar.

3.7   Under-represented and new stakeholders

We have a number of under-represented and new stakeholders who, from experience, are unlikely to respond to a general invite to comment by email. We will therefore target those in different ways to maximise the likelihood of them engaging with us, as follows:

Stakeholder Group	Primary method to target	Secondary method to target
France glass eel fishers	Email via collectors, traders and OPs who are the link to this large group and can translate. Email in French	Offer to hold local meetings where can converse and translate in French
Yellow eel fishers	Targeted email to known groups, using contacts in each country, in particular: - Netherlands, Germany, France, Italy, UK, Denmark, Spain, 0thers	User local contacts in each country to contact them as they are more likely to respond to someone they know
Silver eel fishers	Targeted email to known groups, using contacts in each country, in particular: - Netherlands, Germany, France, Italy, UK, Denmark, Sweden, Spain, Others	User local contacts in each country to contact them as they are more likely to respond to someone they know
Recreational anglers	Targeted email to known groups, using contacts in each country, in particular: - Netherlands, Germany, France, Italy, UK, Denmark, Others	
Others?		
Hydropower companies	Email via the Hydropower Sustainability Council (HSC)	Phone call to HSC
Other water operators	Email via the Alliance for Water Stewardship (AWS)	Phone call to AWS

3.8   Records of engagement

Records of all engagement will be maintained. We will record:

- Who responded
- Numbers who responded in each category for each round of consultation and from what country
- The comments that each respondent made
- Our response to each comment and how it was used.

4.   Review

This plan will be reviewed and updated according to learning as the plan progresses in 2023.

_____

Appendix 1. Stakeholder Engagement Plan 2023

Key for different parts of the system: Standard   Accreditation   Assurance   MEL   Risk Data

Month	Topic	SEG seeking comment on	Method	Target No Stakeholders Responding			
				Social	Envmtl	Economic	
Feb	Launch of the SEG Standard Review – comments on existing system for 35 days Accreditation system	• 103 The existing standard (V6.1): experiences and suggested improvements • 009 The new Theory of Change • 114 Revision Terms of Reference • 116 Need for the standard • Seek comments on current Accreditation system	• 1 Feb: Mailchimp to 850 contacts and Twitter to 2140, directing to the web-page for process and comment: https://www.sustainableeelgroup.org/standard-development/ • Targeted emails 8 Feb • Reminders: MailChimp, Twitter and targeted emails on 27 Feb, 1 week before deadline of 5 Mar • Targeted emails to CAB, Auditors,	5 3	3	2	
Mar	Acknowledge and thank for comment Accreditation system Assurance system	• Current documents / processes • Accreditation system V2 draft • Seek comments on current Assurance system	• Email • Record number responses • Prepare to use in preparing next versions • Start developing new versions; in particular draft 1 of Standard V7.0 • Targeted emails to CAB, Auditors, • Targeted emails to CAB, Auditors, certificate holders, other standard owners, NGOs	3 3	2	1	
Apr			• Produce SEG Standard V7.0 draft for consultation • Acknowledge and thank comments on Assurance system • Draft new Assurance system, liaising with contributors as necessary				
May	Launch standard V7.0 d1 consultation for 45 days	• Standard V7.0 d1 • Any changes / relevant support procedures, e.g. Terms and Conditions of Use,	• 2 May: Mailchimp to 850+ contacts and Twitter to 2140, directing to SEG web-page for process and comment. • Targeted emails 4 May • 2 – 4 Zoom workshops on key topics (to be decided)	10	5	3	

	MEL system	• MEL System V1 draft 1	• Possible meetings with under-represented groups if needed – eg. France glass eel fishers, Dutch yellow eel fishers, German anglers, • Reminders: MailChimp, Twitter and targeted emails on 8 Jun, 1 week before deadline of 15 Jun. • Targeted email to certificate holders, fisheries agencies; NGOs, others with an interest in eel sectors and SEG performance	5	3	1
Jun	Acknowledge and thank for comment Risk management system Data management system	Risk management system V1 draft 1 Data management system V1 draft 1	• Email • Record number and content of responses • Prepare to use in preparing next versions • Targeted email to certificate holders, fisheries agencies; NGOs, others with an interest in eel sectors and SEG performance • Targeted email to certificate holders, fisheries agencies; NGOs, others	5 5	3 3	1 1
Jul			• Start developing new versions; in particular draft 2 of Standard V7.0			
Aug			• Respond to all each to say how comments have been used • Complete V.7.0 draft 2			
Sep	Launch standard V7.0 d2 consultation for 35 days	• Launch standard V7.0 d2 • Any relevant associated documents / procedures	• 4 Sep: Mailchimp to 850+ contacts and Twitter to 2140, directing to SEG web-page for process and comment. • Targeted emails 6 Sep • Ask what languages the standard is needed is • Reminders: MailChimp, Twitter and targeted emails on 30 Sep, 1 week before deadline of 8 Oct.	10	5	3
Oct	Acknowledge and thank for comment		• Email • Record number and content of responses • Start developing final versions			
Nov	Finalise **all** supporting systems		• Complete standard V.7.0 and other documents final versions			

| Dec | Publish SEG Standard 7.0 and all associated systems | | • Respond to all each to say how comments have been used
• Launch standard V7.0 Final in different languages
• Associated procedures published in SEG Standard System
• Publish all comments and how used | | | | |

SEG Stakeholder Categories:			
Social	Environmental	Economic	Those groups in our stakeholder engagement plan who we see to have at least one comment from in our consultation

Parties with a special interest in or potentially affected by measures related to eel conservation ('key stakeholder groups')	Nature of interests in SEG and SEG Standard	Sub-divisions of 'key stakeholder groups'	Examples of representatives of important stakeholder groups (black=already engaged by SEG in some way; blue = not yet, green = partners)	Interested/ directly affected by SEG Standard?	SEG Stakeholder Category
Fisheries scientists Marine scientists Research ecologists	Research interests Government advisory roles Public/ private sector advisory roles	Eel specialists at university depts. Government advisers on eels Private sector eels scientists (e.g. employees of water companies, hydropower companies) Freelance consultants/experts	UK DEFRA Natural History Museum **The Institute of Fisheries Management (IFM)** ICES EIFAC, WGEEL **SLU Sweden** Wageningen University Von Thunen Institute	Interested	Social
Politicians with Fisheries Portfolio	National Fisheries Ministers Pech Committee Members		National Fisheries Ministers Pech Committee Members	Interested	Social
Assessors. Auditors, Conformity Assessment Body			Assessors. Auditors **Conformity Assessment Body**	Directly affected	Social
Government agencies			Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC)	Interested	Social
Standard Owners			Marine Stewardship Council Aquaculture Stewardship Council **SeaFood Watch** Good Fish Guide Hydropower Sustainability Council Alliance for Water Stewardship	Interested	Social
Commercial eel fishers, ranchers and aquaculturalists	Operations affect eel mortality. Eel conservation measures may have multiple business implications, including the potential to render businesses redundant/ illegal. Potential to support conservation measures such as translocation, restocking. Commercial interest in maintaining a sustainable eel fishing industry.	Glass eel fishers Silver eel fishers Eel ranchers Aquaculturalists	Seafish Lough Neagh Fishermen's Cooperative Direct Seafoods Eel Fisherman's Association Yellow and Silver Eel Fisherman Scandinavian Silver Eel Gironde Fishermen's Cooperative **DUPAN** Eeline UK Dutch Eel Company NeVePaling NeVeVi (Association of fish farmers in Netherlands) NetViswerk (Association of small and inland fishermen in Netherlands)	Directly affected	Social

	Brand and related risks in being associated with negative conservation impacts.		IFEA (German association of eel fishers) Coastal and Sea Union members of the Eel Stewardship Association c. 60+ SEG certificate holders/ applicants c 30 non certificate holders?		
Traders in live eels, and their customers	As above	Live eel traders Glass eel buyers Eel transporters	5 SEG certificate holders 2 – 3 others	Directly affected	Social
Processors and traders of eel products.	As above	Smokeries	Approx 20 SEG certificate holders 20 Non SEG?	Directly affected	Social
Fisheries agencies			Environment Agency Natural Resources Wales National Comite de Peche Germany Belgium Netherlands Other countries, e.g. Spain, Portugal, Italy, Greece	Interested	Social
Law enforcement agencies	Control illegal fishing, illegal trade in eels and eel products	International police units responsible for CITES, illegal fishing, illegal trade.	**Interpol, Seprona**	Interested	Social
		National police units responsible for CITES, illegal fishing, illegal trade.		Interested	
Political representatives	Public attention, support	European MPs	MPs:	Interested	Social
	Stakeholder attention, support	National MPs	MEPs:	Interested	
Relevant policy experts	Drafting of policy agreements, national policy, law, etc Implementation of policy agreements, national policy, law, etc	CBD experts CITES experts ICES experts IUCN Red-listing experts Water policy experts (European, national) European Commission policy experts Govt department external policy advisers Govt department civil servants	UK DEFRA Traffic CBD Secretariat CITES Secretariat IUCN Specialist Eel Sub-Group	Interested	Social
Recreational fishers	Recreational enjoyment may be affected by eel conservation measures. May have conservation interest in favour of eels, or be negatively disposed towards eels.	Individual fishers Recreational fishing clubs and associations	German association Dutch association Others: France, Denmark, Belgium, etc Angling Trust The National Anguilla Club	Potentially affected	Social

	Potential to support conservation measures such as restocking.				
Consumers	Food (may have cultural as well as nutritional values) Other uses of eel products Environmental concerns	Consumers Groups (International, national)	Consumers International	Interested, directly affected re: product availability	Social
Multistakeholder organisations			ARA - a collection of fisheries associations, fisheries committees and NGOs in France	Directly affected	Social
Illegal sector: illegal fishing of eels; illegal impacts e.g. bycatch; illegal trade in eels and eel products	Financial Cultural? Conservation measures may increase risk/ increase demand/ value of illegal product	Fishermen acting illegally Traders acting illegally Organised crime	NA	Directly affected	Social
Conservation organisations (private/ government)			IUCN Specialist Eel Sub-Group Wetlands International – European Association	Interested	Environmental
	Eel conservation	International conservation organisations	UK Rivers Trusts UK Wildlife Trusts Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust	Interested	Environmental
	Public attention, support	International conservation organisations	ZSL Wetlands International	Interested	Environmental
	Stakeholder attention, support	National conservation organisations	RSPB	Interested	Environmental
	Public policy implementation	Local conservation organisations		Interested	Environmental
	Fundraising for eel conservation	Environment ministries		Interested	Environmental
			Traffic	Interested	Environmental
			WWF International	Interested	Environmental
			WWF Netherlands	Interested	Environmental
			Marine Conservation Society	Interested	Environmental
			Volans/ Sustainability	Interested	Environmental
			IUCN	Interested	Environmental
			Sargasso Sea Alliance (IUCN Initiative)	Interested	Environmental
			Fish2Fork	Interested	Environmental
			National Trust	Interested	Environmental
			Coastal and Sea Union (Europe Wide) Vereniging Kust & Zee (NL)	Interested	Environmental
			Members of the Eel Stewardship Association	Directly affected	Environmental
Restocking organisations			Dupan, Netherlands Aal Initiative, Germany ARA, France	Directly affected	Environmental

Hydropower companies	Operations affect eel habitat, eel migration (upstream and downstream), and eel mortality. Eel conservation measures have operational and cost implications. Stakeholder attention, support/ risk management	Hydropower companies	International Hydropower Association (IHA) – Hydropower Sustainability Council	Potentially affected	Economic
Water supply companies	Operations affect eel habitat, eel migration (upstream and downstream), and eel mortality. Eel conservation measures may have operational and cost implications. Stakeholder attention, support/ risk management	Private water supply companies Public water supply bodies Water supply company associations	To be identified Alliance for Water Stewardship	Potentially affected	Economic
Water extractors (and their customers and other stakeholders)	Operations affect eel habitat, eel migration (upstream and downstream), and eel mortality. Eel conservation measures may have operational and cost implications. Stakeholder attention, support/ risk management	Private water extraction companies Public water extraction bodies Other water extraction licence holders Power companies	To be identified	Potentially affected	Economic
Flood Managers			Draining authorities Flood management agencies		Economic, Social
Navigation authorities	Operators of weirs and locks		To be identified		Economic
Other industries and activities affecting or affected by water quality	Operations affect water quality, with implications for eel habitat and eel mortality. Water quality measures may have operational and cost implications. Stakeholder attention, support/ risk management	Many industries affected by water quality controls	Nature at Work		Economic
Equipment Manufacturers, suppliers	Market impacts (+ve or –ve) of eel conservation measures on supply of specialist equipment to water extractors, water suppliers, etc				Economic
Aquaculture feed suppliers			Biomar Trouw Nutrition		Economic

Geographical analysis

SEG recognises the need to ensure broad European representation across SEG stakeholder categories and, ideally, key stakeholder groups within those categories. Especially important for countries with greatest impacts on eel life cycle (in particular France and Spain) and eel consumption (in particular Germany).

Consideration of Disadvantaged Stakeholders and Proactive Measures for Inclusion

The key disadvantaged stakeholders, or those who are currently under-represented that we want to reach out to are:

Disadvantaged

Group	Why disadvantaged	How we will mitigate / reach out
Yellow eel fishers in all countries, esp. NL, GE, FR, UK, DE, SW, IT, ES	Disorganised, usually work in isolation, no trade representation.	Identify and reach out to those who can 'bridge' to groups of fishers, eg: Traders, Lough Neagh, Nevepaling, IFEA, NetViswerk, local fisheries leaders,
Glass eel fishers	Disorganised, usually work in isolation, no trade representation.	Identify and contact via local fisheries leaders, fisheries agencies, traders

Under-represententeed

Group	Why under-represented	How we will mitigate / reach out
Hydropower companies	Because we haven't attempted to contact them so far – due to focusing on the eel sector	To be identified
Water supply companies		Would the Alliance for Water Stewardship be a good place to start?:-
Power companies		https://a4ws.org/the-aws-standard-2-0/
Flood managers		And hydropower:
Navigation authorities		https://www.hydrosustainability.org/standard-overview
Major dischargers		

Targets

Targets for:

- balance of interests in subject matter
- balance of geographical scope of application
- adequate representation in relation to interests in subject matter
- adequate representation in relation to geographical scope

To be determined

ANNEX: Key ISEAL References to Stakeholders

ISEAL Credibility Principles

Principle 4: Rigour All components of a standards system are structured to deliver quality outcomes. In particular, standards are set at a performance level that results in measurable progress towards the scheme's sustainability objectives, while assessments of compliance provide an accurate picture of whether an entity meets the standard's requirements.	Stakeholders involved in setting the standard need to have a shared understanding of the desired outcomes of the system and a degree of expertise or first-hand experience in the subject matter so that they can set the performance level accordingly…
5. Engagement Standard-setters engage a balanced and representative group of stakeholders in standards development. Standards systems provide appropriate and accessible opportunities to participate in governance, assurance and monitoring and evaluation. They empower stakeholders with fair mechanisms to resolve complaints.	The standard-setter informs stakeholders about why the standard is important and communicates to them how they can participate in the standards development or revision process. T he standard-setter proactively engages with stakeholder groups that are likely to have an interest in the standard or that are likely to be affected by its implementation, and provides them with mechanisms for participation that are appropriate and accessible. Stakeholders feel that their views are represented in the consultation process and in decision-making.
7. Transparency Standards systems make relevant information freely available about the development and content of the standard, how the system is governed, who is evaluated and under what process, impact information and the various ways in which stakeholders can engage.	The standard and information about its development are made freely and publicly available at a minimum via an organisation's website. This includes, at least, draft and final versions of the standard, information on governance (how decisions are made and by whom, and how to participate in decision-making and standards development), and information on consultation (stakeholder input and how it was addressed in standards development).
8. Accessibility To reduce barriers to implementation, standards systems minimise costs and overly burdensome requirements. They facilitate access to information about meeting the standard, training, and financial resources to build capacity throughout supply chains and for actors within the standards system.	Standard-setters provide appropriate opportunities for stakeholders to participate in the standard-setting process. They identify and support disadvantaged stakeholders to participate through appropriate mechanisms, including regional visits and using local languages. The content of the standard is equally applicable to all types of enterprises, is focused on outputs and does not discriminate based on the size of the enterprise. The content of the standard is aligned with other standards where there are shared objectives. There are tools in place to support clear understanding of the requirements and how to meet them, including guidance documents and translations of the standard where appropriate.

Definitions

Consensus

General agreement, characterised by the absence of sustained opposition to substantial issues by any important stakeholder group.

NOTE – Consensus should be the result of a process seeking to take into account the views of interested stakeholders, particularly those directly affected, and to reconcile any conflicting arguments. It need not imply unanimity. (Adapted from ISO/IEC Guide 2: 2004).

Stakeholder

Individual or group that has an interest in any decision or activity of an organisation. (Adapted from ISO 26000).

ISEAL Standards Code

Clause 4.1 Standard-Setting Procedures

Desired Outcome	Requirement	Guidance
The standard- setting organisation follows transparent procedures that are improved over time.	4.1.1. Documented procedures for the process under which each standard is developed or revised shall: a. form the basis of the standard-setting process; and b. shall be made available to stakeholders, at a minimum through the organisation's website.	
	4.1.2. The standard-setting organisation shall conduct a regular review of its standard- setting procedures, taking comments from stakeholders into account.	'Regular' is defined here as being at least every five years OR before the next review of the standard, whichever is sooner.

Clause 5.2 Stakeholder Identification

Desired Outcome	Requirement	Guidance
The standard-setting organisation has an understanding of who its stakeholders are.	5.2.1. At the outset of a standards development or revision process, the standard-setting organisation shall develop or update lists of sectors that have an interest in the standard and key stakeholder groups within those sectors, based on the standard's scope and its social, environmental and economic outcomes.	Key stakeholder groups include directly affected stakeholders (those who will be impacted by implementation of the standard) and may include indirectly affected stakeholders who have an interest in the application of the standard. Scope includes the sector and geographies to which the standard applies.
	Aspirational Good Practice	
	5.2.2. The standard-setting organisation shall: a. seek to achieve representative participation in its standard-setting activities; and	

Clause 5.4 Public Consultation

Desired Outcome	Requirement	Guidance
Stakeholders have sufficient time and opportunity to provide input on the standard and can see how their input has been taken into account.	5.4.2. The standard-setting organisation shall ensure that participation in the consultation process: a. is open to all stakeholders; and ⌊SEP⌋ b. aims to achieve a balance of interests in the subject matter and in the geographic scope to which the standard applies. ⌊SEP⌋	A balance of interests in stakeholder participation cannot be ensured but the standard-setting organisation should make efforts to engage all those stakeholder groups identified in the stakeholder identification process.
	5.4.3. The standard-setting organisation shall provide stakeholders with appropriate opportunities to contribute to the development or revision of a standard.	Appropriate opportunities include the use of consultation mechanisms and tools that are accessible and culturally appropriate for the stakeholder groups in question. For example, an in-person meeting or workshop may be more appropriate than an email or an online survey where a stakeholder group is less likely to have access to the internet.
	4. The standard-setting organisation shall: a. identify stakeholder groups that are not adequately represented; and b. proactively seek their contributions. This shall include addressing constraints faced by disadvantaged stakeholders. ⌊SEP⌋	

Clause 5.6 Decision-making

Desired Outcome	Requirement	Guidance
Stakeholders see that their views are reflected in decision-making.	5.6.1. Participation in governance bodies making decisions on the content of the standard shall: a. be open to all stakeholders; and b. shall be constituted by a reasonable balance of those stakeholders, including those that are directly affected.	Governance bodies making decisions on standards' content are often Technical or Stakeholder Committees. This criterion does not preclude Boards of Directors or other top governance bodies from making decisions on the quality of the standard- setting process followed. A reasonable balance of stakeholders is one in which all stakeholders feel that their views are adequately represented. Directly affected stakeholders are those that will be impacted by implementation of the standard. This can include, among others, enterprises being assessed for compliance against the standard, community and indigenous groups affected by application of the standard, and environmental organisations who have an interest in

		areas affected by the implementation of the standard.
	5.6.2. Where the standard-setting organisation limits decision-making to members only, the membership criteria and application procedures for becoming a member shall be transparent and non-discriminatory.	Limiting decision-making to members does not preclude the standard-setting organisation from meeting other requirements for balanced, multi-stakeholder participation in decision-making (5.6.1).
	5.6.3. The standard-setting organisation shall: a. strive for consensus on decisions on the content of the standard; b. define criteria in advance to determine when alternative decision-making procedures should come into effect, in the event that consensus cannot be achieved; and c. define what the decision-making thresholds will be. Those thresholds shall ensure that no one stakeholder group or type can control decision-making.	A stakeholder type can be all stakeholders representing one of social, environmental or economic interests. Criteria for determining when to consider moving to a vote could include that decision-makers who are not in agreement provide alternative solutions and, if these are not accepted by the majority, nor is a compromise reached, then alternative decision-making could come into effect.

Clause 5.10 Records

Desired Outcome	Requirement	Guidance
Stakeholders can refer to previous consultations to understand the basis for the standard's requirements.	5.10.1. The standard-setting organisation shall: a. keep on file for at least five years the following records related to each standards development or revision process: i. policies and procedures guiding the standard- setting activity; ii. lists of stakeholders contacted; iii. stakeholders involved at each stage of the process; iv. comments received and a synopsis of how those comments were taken into account; v. all draft and final versions of the standard; and b. make these available to stakeholders upon request.	