

**NB. Complainant identity anonymised unless they have provided permission.**

Complainant	Reference	Date Submitted	Date Resolved	Summary of Complaint	Status *	Summary of Responses	SEG Learning / Improvements
[Redacted]	19/01	30-9-19	21-12-21	Correspondence received on 30-9-19 was in response to SEG's correspondence of 21-9-19, communicating that their SEG Certification application was much improved, but unsuccessful. The company sought to have further discussions regarding the assessment, however the term 'complaint' was not used and the tone of the letter was convivial. It is registered as a 'complaint' because the perceived lack of response became the subject of a complaint to ISEAL (see 20/01 below).	Closed	<p>SEG was in regular communication with the company soon after this. For example, emails dated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8-10-19</li> <li>• 11-10-19</li> <li>• 15-10-19</li> <li>• 26-10-19</li> <li>• 1-11-19</li> <li>• 2-12-19</li> <li>• 23-12-19</li> </ul> <p>SEG demonstrated that it did reply to the correspondence of 30-9-19. It is apparent that the complainant made the complaint to ISEAL because they did not agree with our response.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SEG Theory of Change amended to reflect the full scope of SEG's work linked to the cessation of illegal trade in the Eel.</li> <li>2. Procedures for the recruitment of auditing companies updated and applied.</li> <li>3. Role of Board in certification decisions updated and applied.</li> </ol> <p>All completed June 2022</p>
[Redacted]	19/02	10-11-19	14-12-21	Email was received 11-10-19 in support of the company referenced at 19/02 seeking explanation of why the certification was unsuccessful. The term 'complaint' was not used. It is registered as a 'complaint' because the perceived lack of response became the subject of a complaint to ISEAL (see 20/01 below).	Closed	Email reply was made on 15-10-19 with information to help explain why the certification had been unsuccessful. Also cc'd in email to the applicant company dated 23-12-19.	See 19/01 above
[Redacted]	20/01	21-01-20	14-12-21	The complaint was made to ISEAL, of which, at the time, SEG was an Associate member. The complainant highlighted: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A perceived lack of consistency on how SEG have applied their decision making process in determining whether to issue a certificate or not.</li> <li>2. That SEG have not responded to two letters of complaint; one from [Redacted] sent on the 30<sup>th</sup></li> </ol>	Closed	<p>ISEAL Investigated the complaint. In their letter to SEG dated 14-12-21 it summarised:</p> <p>No aspects of the complaint have been upheld, though there are recommendations from ISEAL to the Sustainable Eel Group that are aimed to support your ongoing improvement. These are areas that have been identified through the course of our investigation, and would almost certainly</p>	See 19/01 above

				September 2019 and one from the [REDACTED] sent on the 11 <sup>th</sup> October 2019.		need attention, should you decide to proceed towards ISEAL Code Compliant.  SEG has since addressed those recommendations (see right).	
[REDACTED]	23/01	6-12-23		Complainant raised objections about public remarks made by Andrew Kerr, Chairman of the Sustainable Eel Group (SEG) in a number of publications, for example: The Times, 6 March 2023; Gloucestershire Live, 22 March 2023; in which Andrew Kerr mentioned the risks of the export of English glass eels to Russia.	Mediation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Response 18-1-24 concluded that the complaint was not upheld. The investigation concluded that no false information had been provided, and that SEG was entitled to make such comments.</li> <li>2. 30-1-24 complainant replied that he did not agree with the response and wished to appeal it.</li> <li>3. 13-5-24 Appeal Response concluded that the appeal was not upheld.</li> <li>4. 27-9-24 Complainant confirmed the desire to move towards Mediation.</li> </ol>	SEG Complaints procedure under review
[REDACTED]	23/02	23-3-24		Complaint to challenge the content of a notice issued by SEG on 5 January 2024.	Appealed.  Appeal response with complainant	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Response 17-5-24 concluded that the complaint was not upheld. The investigation concluded that the SEG Notice of 5-1-24 was issued legally and reasonably.</li> <li>2. Complainant appealed 26-7-24.</li> <li>3. Appeal Response 15-10-24 concluded that the appeal was not upheld.</li> <li>4. Complainant replied to that response on 20-11-24 describing disagreements with the Appeal Response.</li> </ol>	SEG Complaints procedure under review

\* This status has been communicated to the complainant.