



**Guidance for ISO liaison organizations**  
**Engaging stakeholders and building consensus**

## ISO in brief

ISO is the International Organization for Standardization. ISO has a membership of 163\* national standards bodies from countries large and small, industrialized, developing and in transition, in all regions of the world. ISO's portfolio of over 18 500\* standards provides business, government and society with practical tools for all three dimensions of sustainable development : economic, environmental and social.

ISO standards make a positive contribution to the world we live in. They facilitate trade, spread knowledge, disseminate innovative advances in technology, and share good management and conformity assessment practices.

ISO standards provide solutions and achieve benefits for almost all sectors of activity, including agriculture, construction, mechanical engineering, manufacturing,

distribution, transport, medical devices, information and communication technologies, the environment, energy, quality management, conformity assessment and services.

ISO only develops standards for which there is a clear market requirement.

The work is carried out by experts in the subject drawn directly from the industrial, technical and business sectors that have identified the need for the standard, and which subsequently put the standard to use. These experts may be joined by others with relevant knowledge, such as representatives of government agencies, testing laboratories, consumer associations and academia, and by international governmental and non-governmental organizations.

An ISO International Standard represents a global consensus on the state of the art in the subject of that standard.

---

\* In October 2010.



**International Organization for Standardization**

1, chemin de la Voie-Creuse  
Case postale 56  
CH-1211 Genève 20  
Switzerland

**Tel.** +41 22 749 01 11  
**Fax** +41 22 733 34 30  
**E-mail** central@iso.org  
**Web** www.iso.org

# Guidance for ISO liaison organizations

## Engaging stakeholders and building consensus



### Why an owl ?

Why an owl to symbolize the work of the ISO/TMB Process Evaluation Group ? Because owls have a reputation for wisdom and seem to have a critical, evaluative look...

## Contents

<b>Section 1</b>	<b>5</b>
About the ISO Technical Management Board Process Evaluation Group (PEG)	
<b>Section 2</b>	<b>6</b>
ISO/TMB PEG Task 2 – Why is it important ? Why is it being pursued ?	
<b>Section 3</b>	<b>8</b>
Principles and guidance on stakeholder engagement and consensus decision-making for ISO liaison organizations	
<b>3.1</b> Stakeholder engagement for approved ISO projects	<b>8</b>
<b>3.2</b> Stakeholder engagement and consensus decision-making on ISO work	<b>9</b>
<b>3.3</b> Participation at ISO standards development meetings	<b>10</b>
<b>3.4</b> Establishment and operations of internal mirror committees (IMCs)	<b>12</b>
<b>Annex A</b>	<b>13</b>
PEG Task 2 – Input collection methodology and summary observations	



# Section 1

## About the ISO Technical Management Board Process Evaluation Group (PEG)

In recent years, to be responsive to both current and new stakeholder needs and to maintain itself as a highly relevant International Standards developer, ISO has seen its work programme expand and evolve into new subject areas. Compelling challenges for ISO regarding its standards development processes have come with this evolution, as stakeholder expectations of the ISO system are changing.

As a result, the ISO Technical Management Board (ISO/TMB) has formed its Process Evaluation Group (PEG) to investigate the responsiveness of the ISO standards development processes to these changing dynamics. The ultimate intent of the PEG's efforts is to safeguard the outcomes of the ISO system and to promote the existing value, strength and authority of International Standards and the processes by which they are produced. Indeed, the ISO/TMB agreed that the PEG, in its work, must uphold the commitment of the ISO system to participation via national standards bodies, as well as through the consideration of the input received from liaison organizations.

Essentially the PEG has two main tasks :

### Task 1

- To review the current situation and consider the possibility of alternative models<sup>1)</sup> of standards development operations and participation in ISO<sup>2)</sup>.

### Task 2

- To examine processes for consensus decision-making and stakeholder engagement within national standards bodies (NSBs) and liaison organizations, which may impact the credibility of resulting ISO standards<sup>3)</sup>.

Please note that this document is a result of the PEG's pursuit of Task 2 above.

---

<sup>1)</sup> It is important to note that, in the majority of cases, the existing ISO model works well, is well defined and is accepted by stakeholders.

<sup>2)</sup> It is anticipated that the PEG will provide recommendations to the ISO/TMB for action on this task by February 2011.

<sup>3)</sup> It was anticipated that the PEG would provide recommendations to the ISO/TMB for action on this item by September 2010.

# Section 2

## ISO/TMB PEG Task 2 – Why is it important? Why is it being pursued?

Any discussion of the rationale for PEG Task 2 must begin by recognizing the following important statements made in ISO governance documents :

*“ISO members are committed to developing globally relevant International Standards by... Organizing national input in a timely and effective manner, taking into account all relevant interests at national level...”*

*“ISO parties are committed to... Communicating in a fair and transparent manner to interested parties when work on new standards is initiated and subsequently on the progress of their development...”*

**From the *ISO Code of Ethics, 2004***

*“For the ISO work in which they choose to participate, ISO members are expected to organize national consultation mechanisms, according to their national needs and possibilities, which prepare national positions that reflect a balance of their country’s national interests...”*

**From the *List of Fundamental Principles of the ISO System, 1999***

*“...National bodies have the responsibility of ensuring that their technical standpoint is established taking account of all interests concerned at national level...”*

**From the *ISO/IEC Directives, Part 1, Foreword, Item C on Discipline***

In addition, ISO/IEC Guide 59:1994, *Code of good practice for standardization*, states the following under clause 6.3 :

*“At international level, national participation in the standardization process is organized under the auspices of the appropriate national standards body which is the member of the relevant international standards organization. National members shall ensure that their participation reflects a balance of national interests in the subject matter to which the international standardization activity relates.”*

Generally, ISO processes and national body engagement have been viewed as successful to result in ISO standards reflecting a double level of consensus – among market players and experts at the drafting stages of the standards, and among countries at the formal voting stages of the standards.

However, **recently within some ISO activities there have been some concerns expressed regarding the integrity of ISO national body processes for stakeholder engagement and consensus decision making. The credibility of these national processes is vital to ensure the credibility of the resulting ISO standards and, ultimately, of the ISO brand in the marketplace.** It is important to recognize that the ISO standards development process is one that is collectively owned and implemented by ISO and its members in accordance with broadly accepted principles and guidance.

It is important to consider that international and some broadly based regional organizations also make active contributions to the development of ISO standards as recognized liaisons. Therefore, **if the credibility of internal processes of national bodies has an impact on the credibility**

**of ISO standards and ISO itself, then in principle, the same is true for the internal processes of organizations in liaison and their input.**

It is for this reason that the PEG has decided to seek input from ISO national bodies and liaison organizations on their internal processes for stakeholder engagement and consensus decision making. The process for collecting input and summary observations of that input is detailed in Annex A to this document. Through consideration of this input, the PEG has developed the principles and guidance presented in Section 3 of this document.

The WTO Committee on Technical Barriers to Trade has established certain principles for the development of international standards that should be observed when international standards, guides and recommendations are elaborated, to ensure transparency, openness, impartiality and consensus, effectiveness and relevance, coherence, and to address the concerns of developing countries. The correct reference for the WTO/TBT document providing these principles is *Decisions and Recommendations Adopted by the WTO Committee on Technical Barriers to Trade since 1 January 1995*. These principles, especially in relation to transparency, openness, impartiality and consensus, communicate important ideas that, if implemented by standards bodies, contribute to the credibility of the internal processes of ISO national standards bodies and international liaison organizations. Therefore, these ideas have been incorporated in the development of the principles and guidance presented in Section 3 of this document.

One of the unique strengths of the ISO system is the diversity that exists among NSBs and liaison organizations. Such diversity is seen not just in geographic location, number of staff or annual budgets of the NSBs or liaison organizations, but also in the array of approaches they employ that may be suitable to support their engagement in ISO standards development.

Differences in approach may occur for many reasons, and may be based on differ-

ing organization operational models, stakeholder dynamics or available resources. Embracing and sharing the range of effective approaches and good practices enriches the total ISO process, while forcing very specific expectations on all parties may inhibit creativity, innovation and the engagement of important market players in ISO's work. **Effective and cooperative consensus standards development must be built on a foundation of mutual respect and constructive collaboration among all parties engaged. Therefore, ISO, NSBs and liaison organizations benefit from diversity of thought and approach and from mutual respect.**

Within the documents developed for this ISO/TMB PEG task, we hope to strike a balance between helpful principles and guidance to benefit the processes of NSBs and liaisons and recognizing and respecting the sovereignty of NSBs and liaison organizations to determine their processes.



# Section 3

## Principles and guidance on stakeholder engagement and consensus decision-making for ISO liaison organizations

### 3.1 Stakeholder engagement for approved ISO projects

This section provides principles and guidance to enable liaison organizations to assess their level of interest in approved new work items and approved new fields of activity in ISO.

#### Principles

- 3.1P1** For new ISO projects, the proposer of the initiative shall indicate the range of organizations/stakeholder groups supporting the initiative, as well as those that, according to their interests and identified needs should as a minimum be involved in its development in order to facilitate the arrangements of national consensus building.
- 3.1P2** Liaison organizations should be committed to informing and seeking input from a broad range of their relevant stakeholders on any new ISO projects once they are approved by the ISO member bodies.
- 3.1P3** **All relevant stakeholders should be given equal access to information and equal opportunity to provide input.**
- 3.1P4** **Liaison organizations should be committed to basing decisions on their level of involvement in the ISO activity on consideration of the collected input from relevant stakeholders.**
- 3.1P5** Information on new ISO projects should be provided to the liaison organization's stakeholders in a timely manner and at the earliest appropriate opportunity to allow all relevant stakeholders to access the information, determine their

interest in it and provide input effectively by any deadlines.

- 3.1P6** Liaison organizations should make provision for a range of approaches to support timely and effective stakeholder engagement and participation based on the needs of the stakeholders.
- 3.1P7** Comments submitted by liaison organization should reflect consensus agreement rather than a compilation of all comments expressed within the liaison organization. Submittal of redundant or even contradictory comments should be avoided.

#### Guidance

To assist in achieving these principles, the following guidance may be helpful :

- 3.1G1** Liaison organizations should conduct a consultation with all relevant stakeholders. This could take place via a step-wise approach such as :
1. Identification of potential stakeholders
  2. Providing stakeholders with information on the approved project
  3. Identifying those stakeholders willing to participate in the ISO work on an ongoing basis
  4. Once relevant stakeholders have been engaged in the process and have contributed views, based on the input received, the liaison organization should assess its support for, and its level of participation interest in, approved new work items and approved new fields of activity in ISO.
- 3.1G2** There are many ways of engaging with the relevant stakeholders, both proactively and passively. For

example, if your organization has a Website, details of the approved project should be placed on the site and a more targeted identification can be made via notices in relevant publications, on-line news items to stimulate discussion, and through already established sectors within liaison organizations. Furthermore, active outreach and communications to identified stakeholders should be pursued. Stakeholders in need of funding to support their participation should seek out sources of such funding.

## 3.2 Stakeholder engagement and consensus decision-making on ISO work

This section provides principles and guidance to support the efforts by liaison organizations related to stakeholder engagement and consensus decision-making in the development of consensus comments on ISO work on an ongoing basis.

### Principles

**3.2P1 The approach by which a liaison organization determines its consensus comments is the decision of the liaison organization.**

**3.2P2** Liaison organizations should establish an appropriate process to develop consensus comments on ISO work, as well as to determine the liaison organizations' representation at ISO meetings. It is recommended that internal mirror committees (IMCs) are formed whenever possible, but some liaison organizations may determine their consensus comments by other means. Some liaisons may already have an internal committee in a field where new international projects are started and the liaison should use these existing structures in its participation in ISO work.

**3.2P3 Differences in approaches may be based on differing operational**

**models, dynamics or available resources. Regardless of the specific approach used, what is vital is that the development of the consensus comments is informed by and responsive to the input collected from the relevant stakeholders.**

**3.2P4** A description of how the liaison organization determines its consensus comments should be publicly available to all its stakeholders or made available to them upon request.

**3.2P5** It is the responsibility of the liaison organization to arrive at consensus comments that reflect and reconcile the views of the range of its stakeholders that have a legitimate interest in the ISO subject.

**3.2P6** Decisions on the comments of liaison organizations should be taken based on the consensus principle, and such decisions should carefully consider the balance of interests across the input collected from relevant stakeholders.

**3.2P7 All relevant stakeholders should have equal access to participation in the liaison organization's process for development of positions, and all stakeholders formally engaged in the liaison organization's process should be assured of fair and equitable treatment and consideration in that process.**

**3.2P8** When consensus is reached among stakeholders within the liaison organization on technical content issues on the ISO work, it is expected that the liaison organization will submit the stakeholder consensus position and technical comments to ISO in accordance with its established procedures. It is recognized that on occasion a liaison organization may need to make editorial revisions for political or legal reasons.

**3.2P9** Comments submitted by the liaison organization should reflect consensus agreement rather than

a compilation of all comments expressed at the organizational level. Submittal of redundant or even contradictory comments should be avoided.

- 3.2P10** When consensus is reached within a liaison organization on comments on ISO work, all relevant stakeholders should respect and support those consensus comments within ISO activities and at ISO meetings, and they should not express views within the ISO activity that may limit the success of the consensus comments.
- 3.2P11** Where consensus cannot be reached and a fundamental objection cannot be overcome, it is important that the liaison organization have a procedure for dispute resolution or appeals.
- 3.2P12** A description of how the stakeholder engagement will be conducted by the liaison organization should be communicated to ISO.
- 3.2P13** ISO committees and their leaders, NSBs and liaison organizations and their delegates and experts should respect the consensus positions and comments submitted by NSBs and liaisons.
- 3.2P14** Liaison organizations should periodically assess their processes and procedures for stakeholder engagement and consensus-decision making on ISO work, and seek to continually improve them as necessary.

## Guidance

To assist in achieving these principles, the following guidance may be helpful :

- 3.2G1** Consensus is defined in the *ISO/IEC Directives, Part 1* as : “ General agreement, characterized by the absence of sustained opposition to substantial issues by any important part of the concerned interests and by a process that involves seeking to take into account the views of all parties concerned and to reconcile

any conflicting arguments. Consensus need not imply unanimity.”

- 3.2G2** When consensus on comments has been established, it is good practice for the liaison organization to communicate these consensus comments to all relevant stakeholders that have been engaged in its development.
- 3.2G3** **Liaison organizations have an obligation to address and make an effort to resolve all views expressed.**
- 3.2G4** Liaison organizations may organize meetings, teleconferences or Web-based discussions to assist in the development of consensus comments. All relevant stakeholders should have an equal opportunity to participate.
- 3.2G5** **Achievement of consensus entails recognizing the wider interest and sometimes making certain compromises. Arguments for and against the existence of an ISO project should be pursued at the stage where the project proposal is considered and action is taken on it. However, once an ISO project has been approved, all liaison organizations and their stakeholders involved in the process should be committed to advancing the global relevance of International Standard(s) within the agreed-upon scope, and they should not seek to hinder its further development. Where a liaison organization sustains a fundamental objection and supports it with sound arguments, these concerns will be taken seriously.**

## 3.3 Participation at ISO standards development meetings

This section provides principles and guidance on selecting and preparing (1) liaison organization delegation members to attend meetings of ISO technical committees, project committees and subcommittees, and (2) liaison organization experts to attend ISO working group meetings.

## Principles

- 3.3P1** Delegations and experts are appointed by the liaison organization, in some cases this will be staff members and in others, the organization members.
- 3.3P2** **All relevant and interested stakeholders who are members of the liaison organization should be afforded fair and equitable consideration to serve as a liaison organization delegate or expert.**
- 3.3P3** The liaison organization delegation should be able to represent all aspects of the agreed consensus comments. This might entail having more than one delegate attend the ISO meeting.
- 3.3P4** **All members of a liaison organization delegation to an ISO TC/PC/SC meeting should be expected to speak with one voice to advocate for the liaison organization's consensus comments.**
- 3.3P5** Experts to an ISO WG should be selected on the basis of their relevant technical expertise.

## Guidance

To assist in achieving these principles, the following guidance may be helpful :

- 3.3G1** Delegations and experts should be selected from the members of the liaison organization and be actively engaged in the work of the liaison organization.
- 3.3G2** The selection criteria may be based on a number of factors, for example technical expertise, effective communication skills in the language of the meeting, and meeting location.
- 3.3G3** Experts should be nominated and selected through the liaison organization. Though selected for their individual technical knowledge and expertise, such experts should be aware of the views of the stakeholders in order to minimize conflict as the project progresses. WG experts should regularly report to their liaison organization on the progress of work within the WG.
- 3.3G4** **Where applicable, liaison organizations may wish to fund the participation of their experts via fund-raising programmes or events to promote the activity. All delegation or WG experts with a financial need should have fair and equitable access to, and consideration for, such funding.**
- 3.3G5** Members of delegations and WG experts should have sufficient language skills to effectively communicate in the environment of the particular ISO committee or WG.
- 3.3G6** Preparation of delegations and experts before meetings should include :
- a) A briefing by the liaison organization on consensus comments (this may occur via a physical meeting, a teleconference or a Web-based discussion)
  - b) Formal or informal training on ISO rules and procedures (e.g. *ISO/IEC Directives*)
  - c) Access to documentation, meeting minutes and any papers that are relevant to the technical subject and meeting.
- 3.3G7** Delegations and experts should maintain close communication, which should include a debriefing by the delegation members or experts to the liaison organization following the international meeting.
- 3.3G8** Liaison organizations should provide their delegates and experts with guidance concerning how much negotiating flexibility they have regarding their consensus comments at an ISO TC, SC or WG meeting. In addition, liaison organizations should advise the delegates and experts as to their positions and negotiating flexibility in relation to positions and comments of other NSBs and liaison organizations.

## 3.4 Establishment and operations of internal mirror committees (IMCs)

This section provides principles and guidance to liaison organizations on IMCs to ISO work, for liaison organizations that choose to use an IMC approach.

### Principles

- 3.4P1 Internal procedures for the establishment and operations of imcs should exist and should be publicly available.**
- 3.4P2** Some liaison organizations may already have internal committees in a field where new international projects are started and the liaison organization should use an existing committee in a capacity as an IMC if it is interested in serving in such a capacity and able to fulfill the requirements of such a role.
- 3.4P3** For those liaison organizations that form IMCs, an IMC should be established as early as possible in the process to ensure that liaison is in a position to respond to the ISO process.
- 3.4P4** The liaison organization should make every effort to identify the relevant stakeholders that should be engaged in the IMC.
- 3.4P5** The composition of the IMC should demonstrate participation of representative organizations across the relevant stakeholders with a legitimate interest in the ISO subject.
- 3.4P6 Attempts should be made to achieve balance with respect to the composition of the IMC. Procedures should exist to safeguard against dominance by any stakeholder or stakeholder category**
- 3.4P7** All members of the IMC should have equal participation rights and equal access to relevant information.
- 3.4P8** Once the IMC has been established, the composition of the committee should be reviewed regularly and

additional stakeholders may be invited to participate throughout the life-cycle of the ISO work.

- 3.4P9** Liaison organizations should provide suitable information, advice or training on ISO standardization to all members of the IMC.
- 3.4P10** IMCS should maintain internal records of their decisions.

### Guidance

To assist in achieving these principles, the following guidance may be helpful :

- 3.4G1** Relevant stakeholders should be contacted and invited to participate will depend on the subject matter of the ISO activity. Examples of how this may be approached may include enquiries, Internet searches, networks, personal approaches, advertisements, etc.
- 3.4G2 For the purposes of openness and transparency, the procedure for the establishment of an IMC should be made publicly available (e.g. Through the liaison organization Website, presentations, experts communicating within the community, etc.)**
- 3.4G3 The consensus development process of liaison organizations and imcs should be open to all who are directly and materially affected by the standardization activity in question. There should be no undue financial barriers to participation. If a fee for participation is charged, then it should be reasonable and fair. A fee waiver or fee reduction option is encouraged. Where potential funding sources for participating (underrepresented) stakeholders are known, such information should be made available as appropriate.**
- 3.4G4** IMC members should be encouraged to develop their knowledge of standardization operations and procedures. This could be achieved via introductory information packages, training and education sessions, mentoring programs, IT tools, etc.

# Annex A

## PEG Task 2 – Input collection methodology and summary observations

To collect input for consideration to produce Section 3 of this document, the ISO Secretary-General issued a letter to a selected group of approximately 100 organizations in liaison with a broad variety of ISO committees, inviting them to submit their input on a series of questions via an online survey tool. Responses were received from 29 liaison organizations. This was regarded as a very good survey response, and in particular, it should be noted that the responses showed a very good distribution of organization size, stakeholder category focus, and ISO subject areas.

The numbered items presented below represent the questions asked of the liaison organizations, and following each question are the PEG's summary observations on the responses received.

### 1) Initiation of new ISO work

- 1.1)** When ISO embarks on a new field of standardization, how does your organization assess the level of interest in and support for this ISO activity?

#### **Summary observations :**

*Generally, most liaisons are responding to work in a niche area of ISO standardizations and few have very broad scopes that would cross many of the subjects addressed by ISO. Therefore, level of interest or support for new ISO activity will depend on whether the subject is relevant to the scope of the liaison organization.*

### 2) Establishment of internal liaison organization mechanisms to address ISO standards activities

- 2.1)** Do you have an internal procedure to develop your organization's input to ISO standards activities ?

#### **Summary observations :**

*Eighteen liaisons responded that they have such a procedure and eight responded that they do not.*

- 2.2)** If yes, please provide details of the procedure.

#### **Summary observations :**

*While in some cases liaison organizations may form internal committees in relation to ISO committees, others simply circulate relevant ISO documents to all members of the liaison organization, and a staff person from the liaison organization coordinates communications and their inputs.*

- 2.3)** Please advise if, and how, this procedure is made publicly available.

#### **Summary observations :**

*Most responses from liaison organizations stated that they do not make such procedures publicly available, but they are available to their members/participants.*

### 3) Internal organizational membership participation in relation to ISO standards activities

- 3.1)** Do you have a procedure for the identification of stakeholders and balance of participation in your organization in relation to ISO standards activities ?

#### **Summary observations :**

*Nine liaison organizations responded that they have such a procedure, but 16 responded that they do not. It is important to note that a number of liaison organizations responded that they do not feel they must engage stakeholders and balance concerns because their membership only comes from one stakeholder category.*

The PEG's observation is that while it may be true that engagement and balance across stakeholder categories is not relevant for all liaison organizations, proper broad engagement and balance within the stakeholder category relevant to the liaison organization is very important. For example, an international industry organization should ensure that engagement and balance exists across large, medium and small companies and across industry sectors relevant to the organization. An NGO should ensure it represents a broad engagement and balance, for example, of developed and developing countries as well as broad geographical diversity.

- 3.2)** If you do not have such procedures, how do you determine which stakeholders will be involved?

**Summary observations :**

The majority of liaison organizations responding indicated that they will provide information on the ISO activity broadly to their members to determine who may like to be involved.

- 3.3)** Do your procedures allow for new stakeholders to become engaged at any time?

**Summary observations :**

Nineteen liaison organizations responded that their procedures allow new stakeholders to become engaged at any time, while only three responded that their procedures do not support this.

- 3.4)** Please describe any special resources or approaches that support the participation of persons in particular stakeholder groups in the decision-making related to ISO standards activities.

**Summary observations :**

Most liaison organizations responded that they provide no special support or programs that support participation. A number of responses indicated that liaison organization staff is made available provide to support. In a very small number of cases some funding may be available for persons to participate. Very little, if any, response was provided on training or orientation programs for participants.

- 3.5)** How do you address the composition of bodies dealing with ISO standards activities in cases where there is limited but strong interest in your country in the outcome of an International Standard?

**Summary observations :**

As this question was not correctly drafted to apply to liaison organizations (see the words "in your country" above), almost all liaison organizations responding did not feel the question was relevant to them.

**4) Addressing differing ISO technical subjects in your internal consensus bodies related to ISO standards activities**

- 4.1)** Do you approach the establishment and membership of your bodies differently dependent upon the subject area?

**Summary observations :**

In response to this question, 11 liaison organizations responded in the affirmative, and 13 responded in the negative.

- 4.2)** If yes, please provide details.

**Summary observations :**

In response, most liaison organizations did not indicate a specific procedure, or indicated that because of their specific niche interest, they do not address multiple subject areas.

**5) Decision-making in your internal consensus bodies related to ISO standards activities**

- 5.1)** Please describe how you take decisions (e.g., by consensus, by voting, requirements to take decisions) in bodies dealing with ISO standards activities.

**Summary observations :**

Most responses indicated use of the consensus principle to take decisions.

- 5.2)** Please describe what happens within such bodies if agreement cannot be reached on a decision.

### **Summary observations :**

*Liaison organization responses varied widely, including taking no position, implementing a voting procedure if consensus is not clear or in question, referring the decision to a higher authority or senior staff within the liaison organization, or they did not regard the question as relevant to their organization.*

- 5.3)** Please describe any procedures for appeals of decisions taken by such bodies related to ISO standards activities.

### **Summary observations :**

*Almost all liaison organizations responding indicated that they have no appeals procedure or regarded the question as not relevant to their organization.*

## **6) Participation at ISO standards development meetings**

- 6.1)** Please describe how you select and approve your delegation members to meetings of ISO technical committees (TCs), project committees (PCs) and subcommittees (SCs), and your experts to ISO working group (WG)s.

### **Summary observations :**

*A variety of approaches were indicated including liaison organization staff deciding, or liaison organization staff serving in these roles rather than member volunteers. In some cases, a call for volunteers will be issued. In many cases, expert knowledge of the ISO subject area is an important consideration.*

- 6.2)** Please describe how you prepare your delegation members to meetings of ISO TCs, PCs, SCs.
- 6.3)** Please describe how you prepare your experts to meetings of ISO WGs.

### **Summary observations :**

*The responses from liaison organizations to questions 6.2 and 6.3 varied widely. Some stated that they made ISO documents available, while other indicated that they held meetings in advance of ISO meetings to prepare their delegates and experts. Still others*

*indicated that they rely on their members also being engaged in ISO NSB mirror committees for such preparation, and some indicated they do no preparation at all.*

- 6.4)** Please describe any special resources or approaches that support the participation of persons in particular stakeholder groups in the international committee meetings.

### **Summary observations :**

*Responses to this question were very similar to responses on question 3.4 above.*

## **7) Leadership of bodies related to ISO standards activities**

- 7.1)** Please describe any procedures you have for the selection and appointment of chairs and secretaries of bodies related to ISO standards activities.

### **Summary observations :**

*Responses varied widely, from no specific procedures, to very detailed procedures implemented within the liaison organizations. In some cases, it was indicated that decisions were taken by senior staff of the liaison organization. Still other responses regarded the question as not relevant to the operations of the organization.*

- 7.2)** Please describe any procedures you have for the qualifications and responsibilities of chairs and secretaries of these bodies.

### **Summary observations :**

*Most responses from the liaison organizations indicated that they did not have any specific procedures, but some did indicate that they assess the candidates in terms of their leadership skill and expert knowledge of the ISO subject.*

- 7.3)** Please describe any programmes or activities you have for training or preparation of the leadership of these bodies.

### **Summary observations :**

*Almost all responses indicated that the liaison organizations had no such programmes or activities.*

