

Comments from ISO TMB Members when they internally voted December 2, 2+017, in favor of interpreting the extended ballot in support of confirming ISO 26000:2010.

COUNTRY 1.

XX approves the confirmation, due to the result of the second round of responses, although the initial SR ballot showed the wish of revision of ISO 26000:2010 among the most active countries. national stakeholders are of the opinion that ISO 26000 should have been revised, because it is not any more up-to-date and important references, such as UN SDGs, are missing. Also, in many countries there has been significant efforts to enhance the use of ISO 26000 and SR issues throughout the entire society - now there's a threat this work will, at least partly, be lost and missed.

COUNTRY 2.

The results of the second systematic review of ISO 26000 and of the additional consultation launched by ISO/TMB on September 25th showed that a short majority of ISO members are in favour of confirming ISO 26000:2010.

However, considering that

- the results do not demonstrate a clear and absolute willingness of the international community to confirm ISO 26000. Indeed, at the end of the first consultation, 52% of member countries voted in favor of the revision of ISO 26000, while at the end of the second consultation, 56% of the countries voted in favor of its confirmation. It should be noted that countries who voted in favor of the revision were slightly more likely to have adopted ISO 26000 as a national standard than countries who voted to confirm it. Moreover, 33 member countries (both developing and developed) said that they were committed to participate in the development of the project should the standard be revised. Thus, despite the short majority of votes in favor of the confirmation of ISO 26000, the interest of ISO member countries for its revision remains strong.
- the short majority in favor of the confirmation should not lead us to ignore the downsides of such a course of action. Considering that ISO 26000 is recognized as the international standard of reference on social responsibility, its confirmation represents a risk for ISO to lose its leadership role on a globally important issue. Indeed, since 2010, international organizations (UN, OECD, ILO, etc.) have developed international reference documents and frameworks on many topics related to social responsibility, i.e. on duty of vigilance, impact of SR on the supply chain and on purchases, CSR reporting, fight against corruption, etc... It is therefore important to update ISO 26000, which was published in 2010 and confirmed in 2014, to take into consideration all these developments. Otherwise, ISO 26000 will become outdated and obsolete.
- in addition, the revision of ISO 26000 would enable companies and all kinds of organizations to rely on a unified social responsibility framework consistent with current issues and needs, and thus to avoid the complexity, confusion and additional costs stemming from the overlap of different reference documents at the national and international level.

I therefore request that ISO 26000:2010 undergoes systematic review not according to the planed timetable but already two years after the 2017 ballot, i.e. in 2019.

COUNTRY 3.

We approve of the suggestion to confirm ISO 26000 as the majority should be respected. We do however feel that the decision is a negative one for ISO as we think that the existing standard is outdated and not in line with the latest developments in the area, especially in connection with the UN sustainable development goals. We hope that future initiatives will open doors for the international standardization to, again, take lead in providing the world with standards within the very important area of social responsibility.

COUNTRY 4.

While I strongly support confirmation, I am concerned about the implications of the TMB deciding to go against the consensus of NSBs and support revision. If it is unfortunately the case that the TMB members support revision, then I believe we must have discussions at our February 2018 in order to (1) determine the rationale to explain why the TMB should go against the NSB consensus, and (2) determine a very strict limitation to the revision given the NSB consensus for confirmation. We must determine the answers to items (1) and (2) mentioned above before any revision could proceed.