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Consultation Input

› 60 day consultation, webinar, survey and excel
› 24 Survey respondents – general assessment
› 12 Excel respondents – detailed criteria feedback

Link to original consultation documents:
https://community.iselalliance.org/online-community/consultations/membership-strategic-review
Survey Respondent Profile

› Good distribution
  • 8 members
  • 6 subscriber standards
  • 3 other standards
  • 2 companies or company associations
  • 3 NGOs
  • 2 technical consultants

› Predominantly senior technical staff or individuals
Key Findings

› Positive but lukewarm response
› Members less favourable
› Lack of clarity in what trying to achieve and how implemented
› Strong diversity of perspectives
› For members – watering down value of Code compliance
› For everyone else – not learning-focused and still too restrictive
› Aimed at the middle ground and failed to make anyone happy
Survey responses - Evaluation Process

4. In your view, would this proposed approach provide applicants with a sufficient point of reference for improving their practices and monitoring their progress?

![Graph showing responses to the question about providing a sufficient point of reference.]

5. To what extent does self-directed progress with second-party checks and transparent communication of this progress create sufficient trust between participants in the learning community?

![Graph showing responses to the question about trust creation.

6. What level of disclosure do you think is necessary to ensure participants’ ongoing commitment to progress and to create trust between participants?

![Graph showing levels of disclosure and their responses.]

- Initial evaluations
- Improvement plans
- Self assessments against improvement plans
- Results of any second party checks
- Disclosure to other participants within the learning community
- Disclosure to subscribers
- Public disclosure
Survey responses - Entry Requirements

9. To what extent do these entry requirements create a level of **rigour that engenders trust** between community participants?

10. How much **alignment** will the entry requirements create among community participants?

11. To what extent will these entry requirements enable a **broader range of organisations** to be part of the ISEAL learning community?
13. To what extent will these ongoing commitments support an organisation's active participation in the learning community?

14. To what extent will these ongoing commitments support an organisation's alignment with ISEAL's core values and obligations?
17. To what extent do these progress criteria provide a **sufficient reference point for organisations to improve** their practices from year to year?

18. To what extent should there be a **mandatory pathway** for all participants to meet specific progress criteria over time versus enabling the organisation to choose which criteria to meet and to be transparent about that?
Recommendations from Respondents

› Finalise categories then return to participation requirements
› Be clear on why you’re proposing new structure
› Define the key value add for each stakeholder group
› Focus more on outcomes, be flexible to size and scope of applicant
Parallel findings: Brand Study

In parallel with the technical consultation, we also conducted a feasibility study that assessed whether ISEAL could develop a brand architecture that supports the membership strategy.

› We learnt that stakeholders support the membership strategy, provided the technical approach allows ISEAL to manage risks and protect its credibility.

› Stakeholders believe that a broader learning and collaboration platform supports ISEAL’s influence and relevance, and that there are significant risks to ISEAL’s influence and relevance without such a change.
Parallel findings: Brand Study

The study concluded that ISEAL can develop a brand architecture that supports the membership strategy, provided it is done right.

› This means being clear and specific, allowing for a strong control of claims

› The value of Code compliance needs to be maintained and unearned credibility should not be conferred

› Creative solutions are likely needed
Conclusions

› The framework for the membership strategy is valid, but we need to revisit the technical approach because the “middle ground” proposed for the entry and progress requirements does not work.

› We need to first advance on the brand work and then better link the brand and technical workstreams.

› As a result, we will not conduct a second consultation at this time. Instead we will redevelop a technical proposal in alignment with a brand architecture proposal.
Next steps

› Independently of the membership strategy, review ISEAL’s organisational brand strategy (Nov-Dec)
› Develop proposed brand architecture (propositions, nomenclature, claims, etc.) and revised technical approach (Dec-Feb)
› Consult on architecture and accompanying technical framework with members and targeted stakeholders (March-April)
› Board decision (tentatively May)