ISEAL Credibility Principles V1.1 consultation comment log

This document contains a log of the feedback received on the first draft of the Credibility Principles (V1.1) during the consultation period from 14 May to 31 July 2020, as well as how the ISEAL secretariat responded. We would like to thank all the respondents who took time to share feedback in the first round of consultation. We believe that your input and suggestions have made the principles clearer and stronger, and we are looking forward to your views on version 1.2 of the principles. If you would like to discuss any of your earlier inputs and how these were taken into account please contact consultation@isealalliance.org.

Comment number	Stakeholder group	Principle	Type of comment	Comment and suggestions for improvement	Observations of the secretariat
7	Accreditation bodies/CBs	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	Without adding too much more language, it would be good to acknowledge what other "less significant" or unintended impacts may result.	The definition of impacts is now detailed. See also the principle Continual improvement.
24	Government bodies	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	It is recommanded to specify timely targets and actions to take according to the defined TOC rather than the broad perspective of strategy and objectives.	See the principle Measurable progress.
25	Government bodies	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	International norms	Noted. Examples of relevant international norms will be more suited to the guidance to be developed.
26	Government bodies	1. Sustainability impacts	Technical (future trends)	More importantly for credibility purposes and the way to prove it easily. More verified positive sustainability impacts	See the principles Measurable progress and Continual improvement.
33	Consultants & researchers	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	add "specific" before strategies not just "most significant", include the terms negative and positive impact to ensure learning and accountability	Amended; see also amendments to Continual improvement.
44	Accreditation bodies/CBs	1. Sustainability impacts	Technical (general)	it is suggested to introduce the concept of "materiality", which is normally utilised in the sustainability domain to define significance and relevance	Amended
45	Accreditation bodies/CBs	1. Sustainability impacts	Technical (general)	Focus should be also on externalities, and not only on "positive impact"	Amended; see also amendments to Continual improvement.

59	Donors	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	Important to mention the three dimensions, including economical dimension	Definition for sustainability now added.
71	Consultants & researchers	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	Include Impacts that are material to stakeholders and the organisation	Amended
80	Finance sector	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	To the principle I would add that if negative impacts are identified, the organization MUST do whatever is in its hands to correct them as soon as possible.	Amended: the reference to remediation of negative impacts can now be found here (rather than Measurable progress as previously).
90	Finance sector	1. Sustainability impacts	Other (general)	By organising sensitisation programs Such activities help to achieve sustainability	See amendments to the principle Added value.
102	Standards and standards-like	1. Sustainability impacts	Technical (general)	completely satisfied	Noted with thanks
106	Consultants & researchers	1. Sustainability impacts	Technical (general)	It is great to see that the Credibility Principle is focusing on impact. Although it is implied, it may be helpful if we can define for who and what the sustainability impact should be. This doesn't have to be defined in the principle itself but could be defined in a guidance document.	Noted for guidance to be developed and for Code revisions.
112	Standards and standards-like	1. Sustainability impacts	Other (general)	I really like the component of adapting to local or sectoral conditions	Noted with thanks
131	Consultants & researchers	1. Sustainability impacts	Technical (general)	There is no principle or condition that corrects for past wrongs the organization or community may have participated in and benefitted from	Amended: the reference to remediation of negative impacts can now be found here (rather than Measurable progress as previously).
135	Accreditation bodies/CBs	1. Sustainability impacts	Other (general)	Satisfied with this principle	Noted with thanks
149	Standards and standards-like	1. Sustainability impacts	Technical (general)	"most significant sustainability impacts and outcomes" is somewhat subjective and things that are less significant individually become more significant at scale.	Amended to clarify

		1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	suggest to add a the perspective of "avoiding negative impacts". Specifically from a human rights perspective	Amended: the reference to remediation of negative impacts can now be found here (rather than Measurable progress as previously).
157	Companies	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	suggest to add a the perspective of "avoiding negative impacts". Specifically from a human rights perspective	
162	Consultants & researchers	1. Sustainability impacts	Technical (general)	Improving quantification Ensuring the quality of assessments	See the principle Accuracy.
168	Standards and standards-like	1. Sustainability impacts	Other (general)	we support the adjustments in the principle 1.	Noted with thanks
178	Companies	1. Sustainability impacts	Technical (general)	Promote collaboration among private sustainability standard schemes : The organisation collabores with other certification organisation to share best practices and impact results. This collaboration could further support scientific communities (university, tropical research centers,...) in new impact methodologies and tools.	See the amendments to the principle Collaboration.
184	NGOs	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	While we understand the need for international criteria to be "adapted to local or sectoral conditions where this is necessary to improve its potential impact"; from our experience, in practice, such adaptations have enabled and resulted in a weakening of standard criteria. We recommend including language such as "...to improve its potential impact and without compromising scientific rigour".	Amended to clarify. Comment also noted for Code revisions.
185	NGOs	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial (definitions)	"Most significant sustainability impacts and outcomes" should be further defined so that it is clear that the intent is for the system to address the most relevant sustainability issues for that particular product/sector and not just selective issue(s).	Amended to clarify
204	Government bodies	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial (definitions)	Sustainability impacts can mean a lot of things. There are also some schemes that focus more on social or environmental impacts though it can be open to debate which one is more "significant". Maybe a definition of sustainability could be included to the glossary.	Definition of sustainability added.

222	Standards and standards-like	1. Sustainability impacts	Technical (general)	Whilst I don't think it needs definition, there might be some who will argue and will therefore not be clear what a 'positive' impact is. Also, scientific 'norms' are not necessarily always correct - they are and should be open to scintific challenge.	Definition of sustainability added; definition of impacts expanded; scientific evidence will evolve as will international norms; adaptation in the face of change made more explicit in Continual improvement.
223	Standards and standards-like	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial (definitions)	Possibly: - Positive sustainability impacts - Scientific norms	Definition of sustainability added; definition of impacts amended.
243	Standards and standards-like	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial (definitions)	Can "clearly communicates" be more specifically defined both in time (frequency?) and space (to whom and how ?) ? See also my comment to "Improvement"	Specific requirements re communication can be found more explicitly in the Impacts Code. See also the principle Transparency for further context.
250	Accreditation bodies/CBs	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	"The organisation's system focuses on the most significant sustainability impacts and outcomes" - it could be stated more clearly that these are impacts and outcomes as applicable to the specific organization's system rather than generic	Amended to clarify
251	Accreditation bodies/CBs	1. Sustainability impacts	Technical (general)	"be fit for the future" - that's what revision process is for, future can be very unpredictable (look at 2020!)	Agreed! Also, adaptation in the face of change is made more explicit in Continual improvement.
267	Standards and standards-like	1. Sustainability impacts	Technical (future trends)	How to measure sustainability impacts?	Noted for guidance to be developed and for Code revisions
276	Accreditation bodies/CBs	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial (definitions)	Potential impact	Amended to clarify
282	NGOs	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	- Strategies are mentioned for achieving objectives, but missing the concept of the Theory of Change, which to me is wider than a strategy or approaches to reach objectives. - I would also say: the organisation's purpose and focus is on driving... - Even though I like the part about materiality, I do find it important that all 3 components of sustainability are necessary to consider. - I would also say: the organisation's purpose and focus is on driving...	Amended to reference theory of change. Definition of sustainability added.

283	NGOs	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial (definitions)	- Definition of sustainability and its 3 (or 4) components necessary to consider together, since they are in an interplay (see previous page).	Definition of sustainability added
284	NGOs	1. Sustainability impacts	Technical (future trends)	To be more encompassing, to specify why the organisation exists (its purpose)	Amended
310	Standards and standards-like	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	Potentially reads as offering various levels of compliance (low compliance - high compliance)- just having a focus being the first level to which all operating in this arena can claim	Amended to clarify
311	Standards and standards-like	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial (definitions)	Focused on programmes only offering 'sustainability'. Maybe need to add in and define 'Responsible' too	Definition of sustainability added
312	Standards and standards-like	1. Sustainability impacts	Technical (future trends)	Benchmarking of standards is becoming pressing to answer stakeholder questions of why to choose one over another - moving towards 'broader' compliance blurs the lines even further and will drive a race to the bottom	The principles are intended to define credible practice while remaining content neutral (i.e. encompassing a range of strategies whether these are low bar or high bar).
325	Standards and standards-like	1. Sustainability impacts	Technical (general)	Not always the most significant impacts are reflected in science and norms or made visible through mainstream science and norms. A system's role could indeed be to highlight the importance of an impact and let science and norms find their inroads to it as the systems becomes successful in drawing attention to it. Depending level of detail of final version we may skip the local adaptation, this could go in guidance or similar supporting docs.	Reference to theory of change added so as to make clearer the fact that, in some cases, it will be about establishing a hypothesis whose effectiveness can then be evaluated.
339	Standards and standards-like	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	it would be useful to replace the word sustainability with other terms which help define a little more clearly what is meant by sustainability - eg driving positive social and environmental impacts…	Definition of sustainability added
350	Standards and standards-like	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial (definitions)	MOST SIGNIFICANT. As each organisation can determine which are their most significant sustainability impacts and outcomes, it is important each can "show their working" behind this. Essentially, demonstrate how they prioritised	Amended to clarify; specific requirements suggested noted for Code revisions.

				and arrived at these being the most significant impacts and outcomes.	
378	Government bodies	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	I would add "hotspots", to illustrate relevance.	Amended to include reference to materiality.
397	NGOs	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	"They make decisions that best advance these objectives": not necesary to include. Decisionmaking is another topic	Noted (we understand that this comment relates to v1 as opposed to v1.1).
398	NGOs	1. Sustainability impacts	Technical (future trends)	Always dynamic	Noted. Adaptation in the face of change made more explicit in the principle Continual improvement.
408	NGOs	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	I would add the life cycle perspective here: most significant sustainability impacts throughout the life cycle	Amended to include reference to scope so as to be clearer that the principle can equally apply to production standards and life cycle standards.
424	Standards and standards-like	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial (definitions)	We think it would be good to define and give examples of what "clearly communicates".	See transparency for more context. Request for examples noted for guidance materials.
455	Standards and standards-like	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial (definitions)	"positive" impact - how can positive be defined?	Definition amended to clarify
492	Companies	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	1.The organisation defines and clearly communicates its sustainability objectives and its strategies for achieving these objectives, including the possible guidelines for implementing the strategies. 2.The organisation's system focuses on the most significant sustainability impacts and outcomes, and meanwhile, it also focuses on not so significant impacts and outcomes; reflects current scientific evidence and relevant international norms; and is adapted to local or sectoral conditions where this is necessary to improve its potential impact.	Amended. See also the principles Measurable progress and Continual improvement.

511	Companies	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	Does "clearly communicate" here requires external communication?	See amendments to transparency.
515	Standards and standards-like	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	Could also include something on ensuring the organisation does what it can to mitigate environmental impact of its own operations (e.g. staff travel, investments etc.) – demonstrating leadership	Amended to include reference to negative impacts
541	Standards and standards-like	1. Sustainability impacts	Technical (general)	First of all, I agree that the inclusion with greater force of issues aimed at measuring and demonstrating impacts and conflict management are essential. In this sense, the new principle of Stakeholder Engagement seems to be a shift to lesser ones by removing the requirement for engagement, since engaging is more than engaging. Engaging - I simplify complexity.	Stakeholder engagement has been amended.
571	Companies	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	The boundary between "added value" and "sustainability impacts" needs to be defined.	Sustainability impacts is intended to address the public good generated; added value addresses the benefits to users. Added value amended to clarify.
574	Companies	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	"Impact", as a neutral term, does not seem to be able to accurately convey core ideas, because the impact may be adverse. Therefore, sustainability impacts can also be negative effects, and do not embody short-term impacts either.	Definition expanded
605	NGOs	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	Sustainability impacts – strategies are mentioned, but I am missing the Theory of Change. "Strategies for achieving objectives", surely should be a ToC?	Amended to include reference to theory of change
606	NGOs	1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial (definitions)	What kind of definition do we use for "sustainability"?	Definition of sustainability added
618		1. Sustainability impacts	Editorial	Social impacts – is it evident enough that these are becoming more and more material and encompassed in the definition of sustainability impacts?	Definition of sustainability added

619		1. Sustainability impacts	Technical (general)	Would we value multi-attribute over single attribute systems? We need to be sure that systems are clarifying which hotspots are addressed and aren't, and which aspects of the lifecycle are addressed and not	Amended to include reference to scope so as to clarify. See also truthfulness and transparency.
2	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Technical (general)	"Remediation of harm" this feels like it could be interpreted as the 'bare minimum' which isn't what we believe ISEAL Full Members should be aiming forEncourage the best of the best. Be aware of negative phrasing "remediation of harm".	Now addressed in Sustainability impacts. See also the definition for remediation that was added. While we appreciate concerns about framing, we also had strong feedback that effective remediation is critical to system credibility and an area where we must still raise the bar when it comes to performance.
8	Accreditation bodies/CBs	2. Measurable progress	Editorial	Remediation of harm caused by the scheme itself, or more broadly, or both?	Now addressed in Sustainability impacts. See also the definition for remediation that was added.
9	Accreditation bodies/CBs	2. Measurable progress	Technical (future trends)	Metrics and KPIs should converge over time with other schemes to enable a clearer focus on the most pressing global changes.	See the principle Collaboration. Noted also for the guidance to be developed / Code revisions.
27	Government bodies	2. Measurable progress	Technical (general)	The promoter's application should comprise both a baseline and a target situation laying out mesurable compensation and claim indicators.	See the Impacts Code. Noted for the guidance to be developed / for Code revisions.
28	Government bodies	2. Measurable progress	Editorial (definitions)	Remediation of harm	Definition added
29	Government bodies	2. Measurable progress	Technical (scope)	Fit for verification purpose	Accuracy amended to better reflect "auditability"
34	Consultants & researchers	2. Measurable progress	Editorial	we find that "high quality" can be very subjective - suggest adding other terms such as "neutral" "reasonably rigorous", "science-based", or "representative"	Reworded and definition added

46	Accreditation bodies/CBs	2. Measurable progress	Technical (general)	measurability has 2 dimension in auditing: "auditability" = ability to measure/assess a performance and "measuring progress", which is more connected with expected outcome. this principle does not clearly address the first part, which is important in an accreditation perspective	Accuracy amended to better reflect "auditability"
60	Donors	2. Measurable progress	Editorial (definitions)	Further clarify or change the term remediation of harm. remediation of harm - better define scope and perspective.	Now addressed in sustainability impacts. See also the added definition.
81	Finance sector	2. Measurable progress	Editorial (definitions)	High quality data MUST be clearly defined to prevent misuse of the term.	Amended and definition added
91	Finance sector	2. Measurable progress	Other (general)	We provide bio fertilizers,, ask sugar cane growers to use harmless herbicides , and not to pollute environment etc .We organise training sessions regularly.	See Added value for references to capacity-building.
103	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Technical (general)	Emphasis should be given to the means and methods to procure the correct and dependable results. Some guidelines on the ways to do so.	Further requirements and guidance can be found in the Impacts Code. Comment also noted for the guidance to be developed / for Code revisions.
118	Government bodies	2. Measurable progress	Editorial (definitions)	Important to take consideration civil society vs. private sector organisations definitions of measurable progress.	See Stakeholder engagement for question of balancing stakeholder views. Noted also for the guidance to be developed / for Code revisions.
129	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Editorial	Remove the specific reference to "remediation of harm" as this may not apply in all cases. "Progress towards the organisation's sustainability objectives" is sufficient, however we also suggest that it be broadened to "Progress towards industry or global sustainability objectives" because the organisation's own sustainability objectives may not be robust enough.	Remediation now addressed in Sustainability impacts. See also the definition added. For alignment with broader goals, please also see Collaboration.

136	Accreditation bodies/CBs	2. Measurable progress	Editorial	May be can use "positive" word rather than use of remediation of "harm".. try remediation of "improvement". We should not have negative implied words in principles.	Remediation now addressed in sustainability impacts. See also the definition. While we appreciate concerns about framing, we also had strong feedback that effective remediation is critical to system credibility and an area where we must still raise the bar when it comes to performance.
150	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Technical (general)	Some standards have things that are just improvements, not remediation of harm. If important to add remediation, maybe change to "remediation of harm and/or measurable progress...". Our programs are entirely voluntary and are more of enhancements than remediation of harm. Perhaps it makes sense to have remediation of harm be seperate as it does not really fall under measurable progress unless there was measure of the harm initially.If important to add remediation, maybe change to "remediation of harm and/or measurable progress...".	Remediation now addressed in sustainability impacts. See also the definition. While we appreciate concerns about framing, we also had strong feedback that effective remediation is critical to system credibility and an area where we must still raise the bar when it comes to performance.
158	Companies	2. Measurable progress	Editorial	Is it useful to add that both qualitative and qualitative measurment can be applied. May be more applicable from a social perspecive	Definition of data quality added and this point clarified there
169	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Technical (general)	We would suggest to add the point, that you need a baseline first to measure progress.	Noted for the guidance to be developed / for Code revisions.
174	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Other (general)	Re-consider the requirements ISEAL has on measuring impact. Often impact studies as required by ISEAL are not feasible neither useful for standard organisations and companies.	Noted for the guidance to be developed / for Code revisions
177	Accreditation bodies/CBs	2. Measurable progress	Technical (general)	I would probably give some kind of guidance on what is consider as high quality data.	Reworded and definition added

186	NGOs	2. Measurable progress	Technical (general)	We recommend requiring user performance metrics for data collection in order to meaningfully measure progress. Organisations or standards that use 'best practices' or 'management objectives' criteria, without requiring user performance metrics, make high quality data collection near impossible and, in turn, can result in the inability to meaningfully demonstrate outcomes and impacts.	See the Impacts Code for more specific requirements. Comment also noted for the guidance to be developed / for Code revisions.
205	Government bodies	2. Measurable progress	Editorial	I find the wording of "remediation of harm" could be improved. As a non-native speaker I have never used the term "remediation" and am not familiar with it. Though one can guess the meaning from the context, I would suggest to rephrase.	Now addressed in Sustainability impacts. See also the definition.
233	Consultants & researchers	2. Measurable progress	Editorial (definitions)	High-quality data - Does each organisation define what they believe to be high-quality data?	Reworded and definition added
252	Accreditation bodies/CBs	2. Measurable progress	Editorial (definitions)	I wonder if "remediation of harm" is intentionally vague for broader applicability, or if it could be further defined	Now addressed in sustainability impacts. See also the definition.
285	NGOs	2. Measurable progress	Technical (general)	- The notion of creating positive change (at scale) is missing. - Include rigour as a word and notion in the principle - Minimum Benchmark needs to be set. In the V1 performance level is mentioned. Relates to benchmarking your initiative in relation to others to show that you are achieving sustainability impacts in relation to others. Relates to sustainability impacts and measurable progress	Amended to reintroduce the reference to performance levels
286	NGOs	2. Measurable progress	Editorial (definitions)	- high quality data and evidence - remediation of harm	Definitions added (NB, remediation now addressed in Sustainability impacts).
287	NGOs	2. Measurable progress	Technical (future trends)	To make explicit the "more" ambitous performance level than others/BAU and rigour needed to measure progress	See amendments to Sustainability impacts and Measurable progress.
307	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Editorial	Add another sentence: "The organisation clearly communicates it measurable progress in terms that are vadit and transparent"	Reference to verifiability introduced. See also Transparency.

313	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Editorial	Users' application of the standard or tool results in measurable remediation of harm and progress... The organisation's standards require the collection of high quality data…	Amended and definitions added (NB, remediation now addressed in Sustainability impacts).
326	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Editorial	First sentence starts complicated and is not worded as a requirement to a system. It could be as short as: The system is organized so that progress on positive sus outcome sis maximized. I would fold the measurement into the next principle: improvement.	Amended to clarify the distinction between measurable progress and system improvement
340	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Editorial (definitions)	remediation? not an easy word. is this reduction of harm? or more than that? remediation suggests backward looking to a certain extent?	Now addressed in Sustainability impacts. See also the definition.
341	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Editorial (definitions)	not sure what is meant by remediation of harm	Now addressed in sustainability impacts. See also the definition.
351	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Editorial	Unless "high quality" is defined, suggest not using. It's almost unnecessary to state "high quality" because by virtue of enabling measurement and demonstrating progress, it will be high quality. Poor quality data does not enable measurement or demonstration of progress.	Amended and definition added
352	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Editorial (definitions)	See above comment on "high quality data".	Amended and definition added
369	Donors	2. Measurable progress	Editorial (definitions)	It should be further defined what "high quality data" entails to ensure sufficient accuracy in measuring progress. This could also be added to the glossary.	Amended and definition added
379	Government bodies	2. Measurable progress	Editorial	Is it worth mentioning "going beyond what is required by legislation"?	This amendment was discussed but it was concluded that tools can also play a role in supporting actors to meet regulatory or legal requirements.
388	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Editorial (definitions)	Definition/guidance on 'high quality data' needs to be provided.	Amended and definition added

400	NGOs	2. Measurable progress	Technical (future trends)	Must be outcome related more than performance based	Noted. Second paragraph is intended to capture this aim. V1.2 attempts to increase distinction between accuracy (assessments of performance) and measurable progress (progress towards outcomes and impacts).
409	NGOs	2. Measurable progress	Editorial	I would add that the tool needs to reflect the best sustainability performance among similar products, services, producers. Because here we compare the user's achievements with it's own performance (progress), but it is also important to define the user's of best performance among the others. Otherwise user can have a path for improvements, but in absolute terms it is for example not good enough compared to other users.	The principles are intended to define credible practice while remaining content neutral (i.e. encompassing a range of strategies whether these are low bar or high bar).
421	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Editorial	1. I would suggest to acknowledge that it may not be possible to fully remediate negative impacts (harm) in all cases and systems should be allowed to look for ways to minimizing harm in consultation with affected stakeholders where full remediation is not possible. 2. 'High quality data' and 'accurate measurements' are pretty loaded terms and can be little subjective. I would suggest to rephrase these terms.	Amended and definitions added (NB, remediation now addressed in Sustainability impacts).
426	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Editorial	For demonstration of progress we think that consistent verification of data by competent and independent assessment bodies is key for the credibility, and that this should be included in this principle.	Verifiability referenced. See also Accuracy and Impartiality for question of assessments.
427	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Editorial (definitions)	We think it would be good to define and give examples of "high quality data and evidence".	Amended and definition added

428	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Technical (general)	More clarity about what this principle means in practise.	Noted for the guidance to be developed / for Code revisions (in the interim please see the Impacts Code for further detail on implementation).
429	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Technical (future trends)	The term "tool" has been defined as "Standards and similar initiatives that define sustainability performance levels or improvement pathways.", so we suggest that the term "standard" is removed from this text. Otherwise we think it becomes confusing what is really meant by "tool".	Amended
445	Accreditation bodies/CBs	2. Measurable progress	Technical (general)	Measuring progress is difficult when standards are designed in different ways and for different sectors of the industry. For fisheries, those wealthy and politically well connected have the ability to engage with the high-level sustainability programs do very well financially and gain a favorable reputation. However, small scale or low impact fisheries (local community) do not have the economic or technical ability to engage in such programs. When progress needs to be measured the metrics designed to measure this has to be carefully considered to ensure that there is a fair and balanced approach to what is considered sustainable and progressive.	See also Added value for questions of accessibility. Comment also noted for the guidance to be developed / for Code revisions. NB, the principles are intended to define credible practice while remaining content neutral (i.e. encompassing a range of strategies whether these are low bar or high bar).
456	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Technical (general)	if there a sense of priority as: standard or tool should first work on remediation of harm and then on measurable progress? If AND a necessary condition? I see remediation of harm as a complex action which new system might not be equipped for.	Amended and definition added (NB, remediation now addressed in Sustainability impacts).
457	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Editorial (definitions)	"harm" "high quality" data	Amended and definitions added (NB, remediation now addressed in sustainability impacts).

471	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Editorial (definitions)	Clarify what "high quality data" means	Amended and definition added
475	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Editorial	I suggest re-phrasing 'remediation of harm' as it's difficult to understand to something like 'the stopping of harmful practices'	Amended and definition added (NB, remediation now addressed in Sustainability impacts).
493	Companies	2. Measurable progress	Editorial (definitions)	What do "high quality data and evidence" specifically mean? I'm not clear about them. However, I believe that, first of all, they must objectively exist, and that the data and evidence captured by credibile and correct tools are all valid. Therefore, it is not advisable to use the attribute "high quality" to limit the data or evidence.	Amended and definition added
494	Companies	2. Measurable progress	Editorial	The organisation collects objective,authentic and valid data and evidence that allows it to accurately measure and demonstrate the progress its users make towards expected sustainability outcomes and impacts.	Amended and definition added
512	Companies	2. Measurable progress	Technical (general)	Changes in many forestry data can be visible only in the medium- and long-term. Will ISEAL check these data and evidence?	ISEAL does not act as a data verifier; however, the Impacts Code does define expectations for impact and outcome evaluations
516	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Editorial	The way it's written suggests that the remediation of harm does not need to be measurable. Is that intentional?	It was not intended. Remediation is now addressed in Sustainability impacts and hopefully this lack of clarity is now resolved.
517	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Editorial	Does there need to be anything included on collecting data on the most significant potential obstacles to progress, e.g. how climate change impacts the industry/context which the organisation is focusing on? Or something along the lines of being able to pinpoint/understand when progress is not as expected?	Continual improvement has been amended to better capture adaptation in response to evidence.
518	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Technical (general)	The remediation part is quite interesting, it depends on how it's defined on whether we would comply or not.	Amended and definition added (NB, remediation now addressed in Sustainability impacts).

543	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Other (general)	Does ISEAL have examples of tools to measure impact and measure progress? If so, can we have access?	The ISEAL Impacts Code provides requirements on monitoring and evaluation.
549	Consultants & researchers	2. Measurable progress	Technical (general)	On the question of data, the issue takes a differnt dimension in case of small holders, and also in cultures where documentation or data recording is not a big priority.	Noted for the guidance to be developed / for Code revisions.
550	Standards and standards-like	2. Measurable progress	Editorial (definitions)	What is ISEAL definition of 'high quality data'? How ISEAL foresee the balance between ensuring 'transparency' and 'high quality data' with 'country sovereignty"?	See amendment and also the definition added (and also amendments to Transparency).
557	Consultants & researchers	2. Measurable progress	Editorial (definitions)	I see the principles as a whole moving in the right direction. The devil is in the details. Something that has come out in my colleagues' work is that it's not just the system credibility but how its implemented that makes the difference. I see the work for ISEAL and its members is not so much on the principles itself but on the guidance and the implementation that surrounds them. For examples of ambiguity to resolve, under the new criteria of measurable progress there's a suggestion that orgs should be collecting high quality data. It's not really clear from the principles what high quality means. There's some assumption that high quality data has to be quantitative in nature. It's just as important to talk to stakeholder on the ground about impacts. It would be great to see ISEAL acknowledge this more explicitly and provide some guidance on what constitutes high quality data.	See amendment and also the definition added. The comment is also noted for the guidance to be developed / for Code revisions.
560	Consultants & researchers	2. Measurable progress	Technical (general)	What I saw in the field working quite well was having high enough standards and having support to reach those standards. I found those two points quite explicitly in the old principles. In the rigour category it stated that standards are set at a performance level that results in measurable progress towards the schemes sustainability objectives. So there is quite explicitly a goal of goal setting. This I couldn't find as much in the new ones.	Amended

572	Companies	2. Measurable progress	Editorial (definitions)	"Measurable progress" is not an inclusive principle, and some progresses are difficult to measure or cannot be measured in the short term. Therefore, how to define "measurable" remains a question.	The comment is noted for the guidance to be developed / for Code revisions. (In the interim, the ISEAL Impacts Code provides detailed requirements on monitoring and evaluation that may be helpful).
593	Consultants & researchers	2. Measurable progress	Editorial	duplication Issues around Accuracy and measurable progress, high quality data, Accuracy accurate assessment- Does consistency mean the Information is reliable? Quality of data collection is important, nature of data and reliability not "just consistency"- Is the Data collected appropriate with best practice and methods, use of knowledge, indigenous knowledge? In other words, rigour of the process is important. Sometimes high-quality data won't capture all the local nuance, so it needs to be captured rigorously.	See amendments and definition of data quality. V1.2 also attempts to increase distinction between Accuracy (assessments of performance) and Measurable progress (evaluating progress towards outcomes and impacts). Comment also noted for the guidance to be developed / for Code revisions.
595	NGOs	2. Measurable progress	Editorial	Being explicit about the types of collaboration.	See Collaboration.
607		2. Measurable progress	Other (general)	what is measurable progress? Need for guidelines or best practices.	Noted for the guidance to be developed / for Code revisions. (In the interim, the ISEAL Impacts Code provides detailed requirements on monitoring and evaluation that may be helpful).
30	Government bodies	3. Improvement	Editorial (definitions)	Continuai improvement	Principle is renamed to clarify
35	Consultants & researchers	3. Improvement	Editorial	is there perhaps a range to improve the catch-all / catch nothing term "regularly" e.g. usually within 5 years	Noted for Code revisions. (In the interim, please note that the ISEAL Codes do provide specific requirements regarding timeframes for most review activities.)

47	Accreditation bodies/CBs	3. Improvement	Technical (general)	the definition applies to "continual (or continuous) improvement", which has a slightly different meaning than "improvement" change title into Continual improvement	Principle is renamed to clarify
72	Consultants & researchers	3. Improvement	Editorial	evaluate activities and outcomes	Amended
82	Finance sector	3. Improvement	Editorial (definitions)	The term "Improvement" should be further defined. Improvement could be applied to the standard itself or to the operation pursuing the certificate. It could be social and environmental improvement or financial sustainability of the operations.	Amended to clarify the distinction between Measurable progress and Continual improvement.
119	Government bodies	3. Improvement	Editorial	Recognized different models for continued improvements (capacity building, certification process).	Amended to clarify the distinction between Measurable progress and Continual improvement
132	Consultants & researchers	3. Improvement	Technical (general)	Similar to my comment on "sustainability impacts" - this principle may need clarity for the baseline or starting point of continuous improvement	Amended to clarify the distinction between Measurable progress and Continual improvement
137	Accreditation bodies/CBs	3. Improvement	Other (general)	Satisfied with this principle	Noted with thanks
151	Standards and standards-like	3. Improvement	Technical (general)	Explaination/e;aboration of the performance of the system vs impacts of the tools. Performance of the system measures XXXX? Impacts of the tools measures the collective impact made by all of the users using the tool, as measured by the organizations impact measures.	Amended to clarify the distinction between Measurable progress and Continual improvement
170	Standards and standards-like	3. Improvement	Other (general)	We support the adjustment of the principle.	Noted with thanks
172	Companies	3. Improvement	Editorial	continual' could benefit from setting a timeline and reporting: 'yearly'	Noted for the guidance to be developed / for Code revisions. (In the interim, please note that the ISEAL Codes do provide specific requirements regarding timeframes for review.)

179	Companies	3. Improvement	Technical (general)	give example of pratical implementation of improvements	Noted for the guidance to be developed
188	NGOs	3. Improvement	Editorial	Incorporate that improvements to their system and tools may be required in response to unsolicited input, ideas and/or unexpected circumstances (i.e., outside of scheduled reviews and evaluations).	Amended to be more explicit about adaptation in response to new evidence, stakeholder input or other changes.
234	Consultants & researchers	3. Improvement	Editorial (definitions)	Continuous improvement - does this mean that organisations must always be raising the bar (e.g. raising the bar at each revision, making it more and more difficult for medium size enterprises to comply) or is it more about organisations making sure that any new developments are being considered and integrated in a regular manner.	The latter was intended. Amended to clarify.
244	Standards and standards-like	3. Improvement	Editorial	Here are also words referring to time: "continual" and "regularly"; are they too general ? Should it be added something like: "Improvements are reported in public." or is this included in the more general principle of "Transparency" ?	Yes, some of this point is intended to be captured in Transparency. The comment is also noted for the guidance to be developed / for Code revisions. (In the interim, please note that the ISEAL Codes do provide specific requirements regarding timeframes for review.)
268	Standards and standards-like	3. Improvement	Technical (general)	It is important to mention some types of continuous improvement tools (share internally) that institutions use. (e.g Internal Management System, SWOT analysis ?)	Noted for the guidance to be developed / for Code revisions.
288	NGOs	3. Improvement	Technical (future trends)	- The formulation is vague in talking about "new ideas". Replace "ideas" with scientific evidence, stakeholder input and concerns. - we have seen where standards have failed because the improvement was not actioned. If you are talking about improvement, you must mention the action which has been recommended. And reporting back on the prescribed measures.	Amended
314	Standards and standards-like	3. Improvement	Editorial	Currently reads as potentially offering tiered compliance	Amended to clarify

315	Standards and standards-like	3. Improvement	Editorial (definitions)	Evaluation - what does credible evaluation necessitate?	Noted for the guidance to be developed / for Code revisions. (In the interim, the ISEAL Impacts Code provides detailed requirements on monitoring and evaluation that may be helpful.)
327	Standards and standards-like	3. Improvement	Editorial	This should be named as Continual improvement. Not state "committed to" but "is organized to maximize cont improvement. Sub elements of that organization are: measurement (from previous principle) review/evaluate learn and apply learning, including innovation	Amended and the principle has been renamed.
335	Standards and standards-like	3. Improvement	Technical (general)	testing, evaluating and integration of 'new ideas' might be difficult to prove and may be difficult to carry out. There may not always be 'new ideas' and approaches available. Provided the aim of this is broad, and not limited to proving this on an annual basis, this principal is fine. However, it MUST be realistic.	Amended to clarify the purpose/context of adaptation
342	Standards and standards-like	3. Improvement	Other (general)	just to say I like the strengthened emphasis on systems and the ongoing development of the whole system	Noted with thanks
353	Standards and standards-like	3. Improvement	Editorial	Continual improvement is therefore not related to the standard users?	Amended to clarify. This is intended to focus on system improvements, while Measurable progress is intended to focus on the performance improvements of users.
354	Standards and standards-like	3. Improvement	Editorial (definitions)	Who continual improvement applies to - see comment above. Please do not use "learnings" and substitute with "lessons".	Amended
370	Donors	3. Improvement	Editorial	Perhaps talk about "Organisational Improvement" to more clearly show the difference to "Measureable Progress" already at the level of the Principles themselves.	Amended

380	Government bodies	3. Improvement	Editorial	the organization stays updated with international and local legislation, to keep pushing for improvement over time.	Amended to capture the importance of adapting to changing conditions
389	Standards and standards-like	3. Improvement	Editorial (definitions)	Perhaps guidance need to be provided on what would qualify as 'regular reviews' (e.g. annual, quarterly etc.).	Noted for the guidance to be developed / for Code revisions (in the interim, please note that the ISEAL Codes do provide specific requirements regarding timeframes for review.)
422	Standards and standards-like	3. Improvement	Editorial	The inclusion of requirement to test, evaluate and integrate new ideas to improve impacts is interesting one. It would be helpful to understand whether this testing and integration of new ideas is only expected if performance evaluation demonstrates that system is not on right pathway to achieve desired impacts or is this required in all cases to increase the ambition of desired impacts over time.	Amended to clarify the purpose/context of adaptation
430	Standards and standards-like	3. Improvement	Editorial (definitions)	We think it would be good to define "regularly".	Noted for the guidance to be developed / for Code revisions (in the interim, please note that the ISEAL Codes do provide specific requirements regarding timeframes for review.)
446	Accreditation bodies/CBs	3. Improvement	Other (general)	There is definitely a need to review the credibility of the auditing process paricularly in fisheries. I for one are worried about the role of the scheme holder, accreditor and certifier that I see blurring that is often causing issues for credibility for the various standards that I audit against. In light of this there has to be a tightening of the requirements that the various parties follow. When we have ISO standards available, we must use them and ensure that all parties involved are accountable. The risks come when one or more of the aforementioned parties are not fully versed in one or	Noted for the guidance to be developed / for Code revisions (in the interim, please note that the ISEAL Assurance Code does provide more specific requirements on this point)

				more of these critical standards and reputationally /credibility risks start to surface.	
472	Standards and standards-like	3. Improvement	Editorial	Who should be involved in the performance review? Include stakeholders perspective in the improvement process	Amended
476	Standards and standards-like	3. Improvement	Editorial	I suggest re-wording the last phrase, 'approaches to improve its impacts' to 'increase or deepen its impacts in line with its sustainability objectives'	Amended
484	NGOs	3. Improvement	Editorial	improve your impacts = reduce negative impacts OR improve your positive impacts	Amended (see also amendments to Sustainability impacts.)
485	NGOs	3. Improvement	Editorial (definitions)	impacts	See amendments to definition.
495	Companies	3. Improvement	Editorial	The organisation also tests, evaluates and integrates new ideas and approaches to improve its impacts. The boundaries for new ideas and approaches need to be specified.	Amended to clarify the purpose/context of adaptation
496	Companies	3. Improvement	Technical (general)	Improvement is not limited to that of the system. Meanwhile, the interests of all the interested parties/ stakeholders should be considered. Without the benefits for the interested parties/ stakeholders, there could be no benefit for standard-setting organizations or systems. Therefore, we need to engage more implementation groups.	Amended to clarify the distinction between this principle and Measurable progress (which is intended to capture the performance improvements of users).
497	Companies	3. Improvement	Editorial	The organisation needs to test, evaluate and integrate new ideas and approaches, and actively gives feedbacks to the interested parties/ stakeholders, to improve its impacts.	Amended (see also amendments to Stakeholder engagement)

				It is recommended to be revised as: The organization is	
505	Companies	3. Improvement	Editorial	committed to reality-based continual improvement.	Amended to clarify
519	Standards and standards-like	3. Improvement	Editorial	Name of principle should be "Continual improvement"	Principle is renamed to clarify
520	Standards and standards-like	3. Improvement	Technical (general)	How would this expansion to specifically mention the system as well as the tool be reflected in the evaluation scorecard? Does this mean we'll need to show evidence in considerably more items in the checklist or scorecard? That would those even be? Not saying that this is bad or good, just want it considered.	It is intended to create a stronger linkage between the review/revision/improvement requirements that are found across all 3 Codes; this comment is also noted for consideration during Code revision.
603	NGOs	3. Improvement	Editorial	Improvement – the formulation is vague in talking about "new ideas". Replace "ideas" with scientific evidence, stakeholder input and concerns.	Amended to clarify the purpose/context of adaptation
604	NGOs	3. Improvement	Editorial	What we have seen where standards have failed because the improvement was not actioned. If you are talking about improvement, you must mention the action which has been recommended. Reporting back on the prescribed measures.	Amended; see also amendments to Stakeholder engagement.
10	Accreditation bodies/CBs	4. Collaboration	Editorial	Needs a more concrete directive. The first sentence is fine but rather gene ral. Perhaps include terms such a "commonality" in terms of measurement and baseline sustainability aspects, ie common goods (natural capital), and humans' quality of life. The terms in there are ok, but additional clarifying terms are needed; see 23 above. Also, change "where this creates efficiency or..." to "to create efficiency or..."	Amended
11	Accreditation bodies/CBs	4. Collaboration	Technical (future trends)	I could imagine that as schemes evolve over time along with the entire global situation that this will warrant revision - but that could happen in the future.	Agreed!
31	Government bodies	4. Collaboration	Editorial	It undestands the juridictional framework in which....	Amended to be more explicit about public partnership

36	Consultants & researchers	4. Collaboration	Editorial	In "recognises that system-wide change requires collaboration and partnership", recognizes is not a very useful term as it can accomodate any outcome. Perhaps add ...recognizes "and agrees to seek"	Amended
61	Donors	4. Collaboration	Editorial (definitions)	collaboration is a vague term that is difficult to grasp and measure (assessment is always very qualitativ)	The principle has been amended to clarify.
73	Consultants & researchers	4. Collaboration	Editorial	there are shared objectives, goals, projects and outcomes with partners/other actors	Amended
83	Finance sector	4. Collaboration	Technical (general)	I believe that, in addition to collaboration and partnership, involvement is also important. Operations pursuing any sustainability standard MUST involve stakeholders (e.g. surrounding communities) in their decision making.	Amended to clarify. See also Stakeholder engagement.
84	Finance sector	4. Collaboration	Editorial (definitions)	I would like to know what collaboration involves or means in the context of this principle.	Amended to clarify
92	Finance sector	4. Collaboration	Other (general)	By providing certain items free of charge to workers and farmers Thus sustainability is achieved	This is too specific for the principles but is noted for the guidance to be developed. See also Added value.
113	Standards and standards-like	4. Collaboration	Editorial	in addition, the scheme should encourage that stakeholders collaborate amongst themselves	Amended
130	Standards and standards-like	4. Collaboration	Technical (general)	It may also be worth adding something on standardisation and discouraging a proliferation of new standards. This is a further benefit of collaboration.	Amended
133	Consultants & researchers	4. Collaboration	Editorial	.. prioritizing collaboration with the smaller, diverse or less advantaged groups	Amended. See also Stakeholder engagement.
138	Accreditation bodies/CBs	4. Collaboration	Editorial	efficiency "or" improves, better if efficiency "and" improves. Both words implies different meaning, rather than "or", better "and"	Amended
180	Companies	4. Collaboration	Editorial	include specifically collaboration with similar standard organisations	Amended

189	NGOs	4. Collaboration	Technical (general)	Such collaboration initiatives have the potential to exclude affected stakeholders. Any partnerships and collaborations should foster inclusivity and opportunities for stakeholder engagement.	Amended, see also the amendments to Stakeholder Engagement
206	Government bodies	4. Collaboration	Technical (general)	The first sentence is only about recognition. Shouldn't the organisation also be committed or at least open to collaboration if this is needed for system-wide change?	Amended
207	Government bodies	4. Collaboration	Technical (general)	Maybe clarify what kind of collaboration/partnership. Between organisations/scheme owners (as before)?	Amended
208	Government bodies	4. Collaboration	Technical (future trends)	As there is an increasing number of systems and tools, collaboration instead of competition becomes more and more important. If competition remains, systems/tools should at least be comparable so that consumers can make an informed choice. Maybe adding something about avoiding unnecessary competition between schemes or duplication of efforts as well as the need for comparability (agreement on system boundaries/definitions/measurements etc.) could be needed in the future.	Amended
253	Accreditation bodies/CBs	4. Collaboration	Technical (general)	It's a tricky principle - the intent is good but it's difficult to enforce as "where it creates efficiencies" is subjective, and standard setting for voluntary schemes can be pretty political.	Amended
270	Standards and standards-like	4. Collaboration	Editorial	In this principle I see two types of collaboration: a) collaboration between ISEAL member institutions and b) collaboration between an ISEAL institution and its "customers". I suggest making a little clearer what the proposed level of collaboration is.	Amended
277	Accreditation bodies/CBs	4. Collaboration	Editorial (definitions)	Sustainability objectives.	See definitions.

289	NGOs	4. Collaboration	Technical (general)	- Be clearer about the purpose of collaboration. - Link Collaboration and Stakeholder Engagement – ensure these adhere to the 3 pillars of sustainability. Be clear: what are we collaborating for? What is the main aim of the standard we are collaborating for? To ensure the collaboration is built around the correct purpose. Ensure that the collaboration is about the purpose of the standard and its envisioned vision and impacts. Anything that is not providing against that goal is not credible. Rather than just saying "we have a collaboration with 15 standards…". What does it actually mean? - Also: Collaboration to what extent?	Amended
290	NGOs	4. Collaboration	Editorial (definitions)	- Purpose of collaboration: impact at scale in line with the purpose and the 3 pillars of sustainability - Be more specific, that actors are public and private entities	Amended
291	NGOs	4. Collaboration	Technical (general)	Focus on purpose	Amended
316	Standards and standards-like	4. Collaboration	Editorial	Not immediately clear what you are asking of standards to be able to evidence this	Amended
328	Standards and standards-like	4. Collaboration	Editorial	Replace "recognize" by a request to seek collaboration and partnership. If wanted at the end to reduce number of principles we could fold this into the principle of "progress" as partnerships shall be considered to maximize progress (as described here above in your draft).	Amended
336	Standards and standards-like	4. Collaboration	Technical (general)	This clause also needs to be realistic. Whilst collaboration is key, collaboration needs to be with good and applicable parties. In addition, collaboration can sometimes slow the process of development for example while consensus is agreed. Agree with this principal of collaboration, however, requirements for implementation of this MUST be realistic.	Amended. Comment also noted for guidance to be developed and for Code revisions.
343	Standards and standards-like	4. Collaboration	Editorial	given the term system has just been used in relation to standards systems and here it refers to much wider sectoral and supply chain systems, I think the term system wide should be altered here - maybe to "sector and supply chain wide", or "systemic change"	Amended

371	Donors	4. Collaboration	Technical (future trends)	"Improve consistency" could be adopted from version 1 as well.	Improved efficiency has been considered the larger concept, which would include improved consistency.
381	Government bodies	4. Collaboration	Editorial	to be more specific: the organization shall engage stakeholders in the development and revision of their system.	See Stakeholder engagement
390	Standards and standards-like	4. Collaboration	Editorial (definitions)	Perhaps guidance needs to be provided on what denotes 'collaboration and partnership' in this context (e.g. peer review, collaboration with other schemes or all stakeholders involve in the industry)?	Amended to clarify. Comment also noted for guidance to be developed and for Code revisions.
431	Standards and standards-like	4. Collaboration	Editorial	However, we think the barr is too low according to below.	Amended
433	Standards and standards-like	4. Collaboration	Editorial	We think it's important that organisations are "engaged" in collaborations, and not only "recognise" them as in the proposed text.	Amended
447	Accreditation bodies/CBs	4. Collaboration	Other (general)	I believe there has to be more collaboration between the various industries and the standards that service them. We are essentially silo'ed and very little cross pollination of best practice or efficiencies occur as a result. I would also like to see more interaction with professional bodies and an alignment of competencies and expectation for the various roles of the Iseal members, (schemes holders, accreditors and certifiers)	Amended
458	Standards and standards-like	4. Collaboration	Editorial	We might want to encourage system to reduce burden of implementing the tools through partnership and collaboration, to specifically remove to sense of competition between systems.	Amended
473	Standards and standards-like	4. Collaboration	Other (general)	How to demonstrate compliance with this principle? Please include some additional explanation.	Amended to clarify. Comment also noted for guidance to be developed and for Code revisions.
477	Standards and standards-like	4. Collaboration	Editorial	Suggest re-wording the last phrase 'improves results against its sustainability objectives' to 'increases impacts against its sustainability objectives'	Amended

498	Companies	4. Collaboration	Editorial	The approaches and tools for collaboration need to be specified. The term "broader" is difficult to understand. It may refer to the approaches and contents.	Amended
499	Companies	4. Collaboration	Editorial	The organization understands its own operations, and its cooperation with other actors is based on an environment with smooth consultation, exchanges and feedbacks. It has access to the data and evidence that create efficiency or improve results against its sustainability objectives.	Amended
506	Companies	4. Collaboration	Editorial	The organisation recognizes that system-wide change requires collaboration and partnership, and is committed to strengthening mutual recognition and cooperation between standards, to prevent duplication of efforts and excessive audits.	Amended
521	Standards and standards-like	4. Collaboration	Editorial	There are three things here: (1) avoiding competition with other schemes, (2) working with stakeholders to co-create and build agency and (3) convening the different players/experts so that the right skills and experiences mesh together to create an effective and practical solution. (3) realises that system-wide change cannot be achieved by one organisation alone, it must involve bringing the system together. Should standard setters play a central, leadership role in convening players within the system to achieve change? The second half of this statement does not follow from the first. This needs to be clear as to what exactly it is trying to achieve.	Amended
522	Standards and standards-like	4. Collaboration	Editorial	Maybe this is better phrased at avoiding competition/inefficiency rather than forcing collaboration/efficiency through collaboration. I know this is negative phrasing, but I gear it's possible to get confused or miss the point otherwise.	Amended

523	Standards and standards-like	4. Collaboration	Editorial	Agreed in that "collaborating with" and "not duplicating effort" are two separate things. Both enable efficiency. I can't think of an eloquent way of putting "avoiding duplication of effort" but there must be one… Unless "avoiding duplication of effort" would actually belong under "Sustainability impacts (relevance)" or even "added value"?	Amended
567	Companies	4. Collaboration	Editorial	"Collaboration" should also include mutual recognition and coordination between different standards.	Amended
573	Companies	4. Collaboration	Editorial	"Collaboration" may not cover standard collaboration/ coordination. It is suggested that standard collaboration/ coordination be added.	Amended
590	NGOs	4. Collaboration	Editorial	risk mitigation (partners > what if partners do something to diminish credibility that destroy the reputation of the whole process?), needs to come out clearly, risk mitigation plan should be in place	Amended to more clearly specify the need to base collaboration on shared sustainability objectives. This should provide a basis for due diligence / risk mitigation.
599	NGOs	4. Collaboration	Editorial	Collaboration to what extent?	Amended
600	NGOs	4. Collaboration	Technical (general)	Collaboration and Stakeholder Engagement – need to be linked back to a "safeguard", based on the nature of the standard. Will be difficult to have collaborations. We see a lot of examples of where there are no traceability or accountability, in order to fault the collaboration and the stakeholders. There are too many ways that people can wriggle out. Collaboration and Stakeholder Engagement – adheres to the three pillars of sustainability.	Amended
608	Consultants & researchers	4. Collaboration	Editorial	Collaborations - unclear what quality collaboration look like? A lot of them list all their partners, but what does it mean? what does quality collaboration look like? Beyond listing partner, what is a true collaboration, what would ISEAL see as quality?	Amended

611		4. Collaboration	Technical (future trends)	efficiency is important, particularly as we expand into to more areas. To have an impact, efficiency is needed, otherwise change is too slow and expensive. Not sure if this is fully covered in the elements of the previous efficiency principle that are reflected in other parts now.	Amended
624	Standards and standards-like	4. Collaboration	Editorial	Re collaboration Encouraged to see focus on systemic change, but we need to be clearer about the scale of change necessary and the human responsibility for this. It's not that we need to centre scale, but collaboration as it is written falls a bit short and feels unfulfilling. What are we really asking for? What is the change we want to see with this? It needs to be more forceful. Schemes tend to be very good at stakeholder management but very weak at collaboration. Does this come down to the financial model? This tendency to compete for market share instead of growing the success of the model? The framing of collaboration is not yet at the level of a principle. Maybe the quality of a collaboration comes down to being respectful of other organisations who might be coming to the same challenge with different strategies. There's a difference between "collaboration" and "a collaborative organisation". Their approach needs to be conducive to collaboration – designing to be open. More openness, engaging respectfully, more constructive engagement with critics, more exchange and dialogue with positive intent.	Amended
12	Accreditation bodies/CBs	5. Added value	Editorial	What counts as "value?" It shouldn't only devolve to money. "Benefits" might be a better term.	Amended
48	Accreditation bodies/CBs	5. Added value	Technical (general)	more than "added value", if the target are "all users" probably better use the concept of "shared value" or similar. Added value it itself does not implies the impact to other users. Focus on accessibility should be maintained, we suggest to keep the definition/concept of accessibility	Amended

49	Accreditation bodies/CBs	5. Added value	Technical (general)	shared (or similar) value, focusing on the value for all the stakeholders in auditing, another term utilised id "meaningfulness", so the need to ensure that the standard is meaningful for stakeholders.	Amended
74	Consultants & researchers	5. Added value	Editorial	All users of its tools, products and services	Amended
107	Consultants & researchers	5. Added value	Technical (general)	The revised text does not include training and capacity-building which is crucial for effective implementation of standard and the organisation must facilitate access to training and capacity-building measures to ensure effective uptake and implementation of the standard.	Amended
116	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Editorial	add reference to Ecolabeling/market access?	Amended
120	Government bodies	5. Added value	Editorial	The concept of added value means different things to different stakeholders. Needs to be further explained.	Amended
121	Government bodies	5. Added value	Editorial (definitions)	Added value from business perspective vs. society perspective.	Amended to clarify; note that the public value is intended to be captured in Sustainability impacts.
122	Government bodies	5. Added value	Editorial	As explained above. The concept needs to be a bit more clear.	Amended
139	Accreditation bodies/CBs	5. Added value	Other (general)	Satisfied with this principle	Noted with thanks
152	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Technical (general)	Accessibility is a key tenet for many standards where work happening on the ground is done by people without formal training in the subject matter. As a result, I think it is a key consideration and should not be lost under Added value. Perhaps slight rewording and calling it Accessibility would be a better match for this. Added Value seems like other values users can get from use of the tool (i.e. transferrable metrics, increased customer loyalty etc.)	Amended

190	NGOs	5. Added value	Editorial (definitions)	The term "added value" is ambiguous and is likely to be misinterpreted by some (e.g. marketing or financial benefits). Further definition is required. "Reducing barriers" should not include weakening of sustainability standards and/or requirements.	Amended
209	Government bodies	5. Added value	Technical (general)	I don't think the second sentence fits into the principle of added value. I liked the initial principle of accessibility. The costs of implementation, burdensome requirements are no longer mentioned. I think it is challenging to combine accessibility and efficiency into one coherent principle.	Amended
210	Government bodies	5. Added value	Editorial (definitions)	value. In the sentence it should also speak about "added" value. Could also remove "strives to" if we want to be more ambitious.	amended so that value is more clearly "benefits that fairly reward users' efforts"
211	Government bodies	5. Added value	Technical (general)	Second sentence does not match principle	Amended
212	Government bodies	5. Added value	Technical (general)	I think accessibility and efficiency should remain separate.	Amended to clarify intent
224	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Editorial (definitions)	Create value' might need definition - it can mean many things to many people (to some, eg businesses it might mean just financial value).	Amended so that value is more clearly "benefits that fairly reward users' efforts".
225	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Technical (future trends)	Being a little clearer about the meaning of 'value'	amended so that value is more clearly "benefits that fairly reward users' efforts"
245	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Other (general)	An important new principle.	Noted with thanks
254	Accreditation bodies/CBs	5. Added value	Editorial	I suggest adding back "build capacity" - it is important and is not clearly implied in "access resources"	Amended
259	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Technical (general)	What does 'added value' look like specifically? Clear examples should be provided. Old version was clearer.	Amended
260	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Editorial (definitions)	added value'	Amended so that value is more clearly "benefits that fairly reward users' efforts".

261	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Technical (general)	Be more specific	Amended
292	NGOs	5. Added value	Editorial	- include capacity building - include the notion of sound revenue models	Amended
293	NGOs	5. Added value	Editorial (definitions)	- operate efficiently	Amended so that the meaning is clarified in the sentence.
317	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Editorial	Added value is a commercial term - the benefits beyond cost - which could prove confusing as many stakeholders are commercial. 'Removal of barriers to entry' is clearer in its intention and focus, and understood as being critical to the broader objectives	Amended to clarify intent
329	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Editorial	Ma be rather "value creation" or fully different. Not only about "strive to" but is organized to maximize value.	Amended
344	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Editorial	maybe add "gain meaningful validation" as a final added value?	Amended so that value is more clearly "benefits that fairly reward users' efforts".
355	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Editorial	Please see below - nature of resources unclear. Think we should avoid committing to providing/facilitating access to financial resources for standards users.	"Such as" introduced to better allow for different contexts.
356	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Editorial (definitions)	RESOURCES. It would be helpful to describe the nature of user resources - are these technical, e.g. information, training, or financial?	"Such as" introduced to better allow for different contexts.
372	Donors	5. Added value	Editorial	The terms as such are clear. However, the aspect of "added" as used in the name of the Principle should be more clearly taken up in the description of the Principle. Maybe adding "… while avoiding duplication but striving for synergies instead." to the first sentence. Furthermore, "to build capacity" from V1. could be included in version 1.1 of "Added Value" or alternatively in other principles such as "Measurable Progress" or "Sustainability Impact" in order to further support the anticipated progress and impacts.	Amended

382	Government bodies	5. Added value	Editorial	Collaborate with users in promoting the system to consumers.	Amended to more specifically reference markets
391	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Editorial (definitions)	Guidance needs to be provided on what denotes 'operates efficiently'. The previous principle provided more clarity on how to achieve efficiency.	Amended
401	NGOs	5. Added value	Editorial	it's too much in different aspects. reduce to focus on value chains	Amended
402	NGOs	5. Added value	Editorial (definitions)	access to information	Amended; see also Transparency.
403	NGOs	5. Added value	Technical (future trends)	reduce and more focus	Amended
410	NGOs	5. Added value	Technical (general)	I like the previous term Accessibility, because it is more clear. Also accessibility is an important principle in ISO standards. The organisation strives to create value for all users of its tools. - I don't understand, what kind of value is meant here? If it is about supporting users so that they get not only the assesement through the tool, but also another value, like risk management, more data, more possibilities to clear communication - then this is added value. Also added value cannot be measured clearly, and it doesn't come from some certain actions, but from the definition of sustainability standard and its implementation itself. I cannot see how accessibility principle can be replaced for added value principle. From my perspective, these are different principles, and accessibility is more important one.	Amended to clarify intent
411	NGOs	5. Added value	Editorial (definitions)	added value in this particular case	Amended so that value is more clearly "benefits that fairly reward users' efforts".
435	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Technical (general)	We think the organisations should include all stakeholders and not only the users (businesses who implement or adopt standards or tools) in this.	Sustainability impacts is intended to address the public good generated; added value addresses the benefits to users. Added value amended to clarify.

448	Accreditation bodies/CBs	5. Added value	Technical (general)	Technology has to be better utilised, the increase in remote auditing and conferencing and the use of online databases and development of blockchain, all has to feature in the development of future platforms and support to improve monitoring, accountability, resource access etc.	Amended
459	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Editorial	Supporting users to "manage risks and monitor AND IMPROVE performance" System should also add value to the stakeholders not directly using the tools	Sustainability impacts is intended to address the public good generated; added value addresses the benefits to users. Added value amended to clarify.
460	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Editorial (definitions)	value	Amended so that value is more clearly "benefits that fairly reward users' efforts".
474	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Editorial	include also "operates effectively"	As the principles are intended to "define and communicate the core values of credible and effective sustainability systems", we are trying to avoid the use of "effective" in defining the principles.
500	Companies	5. Added value	Editorial	"It operates efficiently and reduces barriers to implementation, supporting users to access resources, manage risks, and monitor performance." The wording causes confusion. It is not correct to manage risks and monitor performance as the result of "accessing resources". Accessing resources, managing risks and monitoring performance are mutually interfering.	Amended
501	Companies	5. Added value	Editorial	Added Value: The organisation strives to create value service with added value for users of its tools. It operates efficiently and reduces barriers to implementation, supporting users to access resources, reduce management risks, and enhance performance monitoring.	Amended

524	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Editorial	I think this is somewhat clear. It is trying to cover the Improvement space and making provision for the utility of the tools to help any interested organisation, by providing value. BUT, it is important that recognition of trying to improve is not the same as recognition for achieving outcomes.	Amended so that intent is clearer
525	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Technical (future trends)	Needs to be changed to be fit for the future. I'm concerned that some of the important substance of this principle has been lost (note part in bold in particular): "They facilitate access to information about meeting the standard, training, and financial resources to build capacity". I know the wording above is written with traditional standards in mind but it could surely be updated to be more inclusive of other systems. "Supporting users to access resources" seems to me a watering-down, and implies less proactive effort on the organisation's part. I would also add "building resilience" as a key sub-element of this principle, e.g. "supporting users to… manage risks and build resilience". Climate change and catastrophes like COVID-19 being the elephants in the room here. This also feels like a step away from a SMART objective in to things that are more vague and less measurable. Good idea in principle, but clumsily executed.	Amended
542	Accreditation bodies/CBs	5. Added value	Technical (general)	Just a comment: I see a challenge regarding the principles of added value and impartialityAdded value. What about partiality?	See amendments to impartiality.
544	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Editorial (definitions)	how do they interpret the 'added value' principle i.e. added value to whom (internal to organisation, or communities, or for clients / customers) and what kind of value (is this interpreted financially or as other kinds of value?)	Amended

546	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Technical (general)	Can we make a link between the added value and the living income assessment and would it convenient to commission an independant parti to disclose sustainability positive impacts?	It is a good example to consider as progress towards a living income is a positive impact and depending on the context it could also fall in the scope of Added value. Requirements for independent impact evaluations are addressed in the Impacts Code.
561	Consultants & researchers	5. Added value	Editorial	I also found that the explicit expectations set out in the accessibility category, which was to facilitate access to information about meeting the standards, training and financial resources to build capacity throughout supply chains and for actors within the standard system. I found that more clear and explicit especially with regard to providing sufficient financial resources than the new language which said that different standards should support different end users to access resources in this added value category. A little bit more of the detailed expectations could be moved back in without taking away from the generalisability that has been achieved by making it more broadly applicable to lots of different types of standards and tools.	Amended
562	Consultants & researchers	5. Added value	Editorial	I think in terms of being more detailed, added value gives me the impression that everyone is meant to benefit when in truth there may be certain users or actors - producers in particular - who require more assistance than others so the idea of ensuring everyone has added value might lead to compromises that ultimately undermine or exacerbate inequalities rather than directly addressing them. Some of the language that was more explicit about those points in the previous version was helpful on that issue.	Amended
570	Companies	5. Added value	Editorial	The boundary between "added value" and "sustainability impacts" needs to be defined.	Amended to clarify
576	Government bodies	5. Added value	Editorial (definitions)	What is "added value"? Please explain it in detail.	Amended to clarify

610	Government bodies	5. Added value	Technical (future trends)	Accessibility, costs, ways of trying to factor these moving things in, not static. Something that allows for flexibility. keep built-in flexibility to reflect long run innovation, or other market changes (maybe under collaboration?)	Amended (see also amendments to Collaboration.)
625	Standards and standards-like	5. Added value	Editorial	This needs to go further and address the proportionality of that added value. Efforts need to be rewarded and shared responsibility recognised. Equity is not the right word for this as equity speaks to public responsibility. Proportionality is more commercial. Or fairness would be better than equity and also fall in the frame of commercial language	Amended
3	Standards and standards-like	6. Accuracy	Editorial (definitions)	Need a little more clarity on the definition of users' performance. This currently could be interpreted to be a performance wider than what the Standard is trying to achieve. For example, we try to improve environmental performance on farm; but this could be interpreted that we should be assessing all levels of performance on a farm (e.g. productivity, social capital etc). This could exclude Standards who can't (and shouldn't) be collecting all this information. As above - make performance specific to what the Standard is trying to achieve, not the whole performance of the certificate holder. Perhaps something like "The organisation's system produces accurate assessments of users' performance, as it relates to the system's sustainability impacts"	Amended to clarify
13	Accreditation bodies/CBs	6. Accuracy	Editorial	"The organisation's system produces accurate assessments of users' performance and these are accurately reflected in any claims made."	Amended
14	Accreditation bodies/CBs	6. Accuracy	Technical (general)	You must link claims to accuracy, even if claims are mentioned in other principles.	Amended
37	Consultants & researchers	6. Accuracy	Technical (general)	not sure I understand what consistency means here and why it is so vital. Would be ideal in terms of credibility to suggest "The implementation ... the assessments carried out against these, are consistent and competent and can be	Amended to clarify

				validated by highly credible external evaluators. Or even "annually engage highly credible external evaluators".	
50	Accreditation bodies/CBs	6. Accuracy	Technical (general)	we do not see a direct connection between "accuracy" and "competence". based on the description, it seems that is more a matter of "reliability" and "completeness" rather than accuracy, which is a term that refers mainly to "precision"reliability, completeness. replace accuracy with other terms more connected with the need of relying on the right competence.	Amended to clarify
62	Donors	6. Accuracy	Technical (general)	accuracy might be subsumed by other principles (which can be assessed more clearly)	Amended to clarify
69	NGOs	6. Accuracy	Editorial	Authenticity: The quality of tools, and genuity of information gathered on user assessments.	Amended to clarify
75	Consultants & researchers	6. Accuracy	Editorial	Assessment tools are evidenced based to ensure their validity	Amended to clarify
85	Finance sector	6. Accuracy	Editorial (definitions)	I would like to see specific guidance of whom will be in charge of performing the assessments.	The Assurance Code does contain more specific requirements. Comment also noted for guidance to be developed and for Code revisions.
97	Standards and standards-like	6. Accuracy	Editorial	I would add "transparent", in addition to the mentioned qualities of consistency and competency. As currently stated, if the organization states that it's system is accurate, we have to take it for a fact. Transparency means that this system should also be open to external scrutiny.	See amendments to Transparency.
104	Standards and standards-like	6. Accuracy	Technical (general)	Guidelines for assessment to be made available	The Assurance Code does contain more specific requirements. Comment also noted for guidance to be developed and for Code revisions.

123	Government bodies	6. Accuracy	Technical (general)	Please specify more the difference between accuracy and rigor of the certification process.	Accuracy is intended to apply to a certification approach and also a broader range of methodologies.
140	Accreditation bodies/CBs	6. Accuracy	Other (general)	Satisfied with this principle	Noted with thanks
145	Standards and standards-like	6. Accuracy	Editorial	Adding to the statement: "The organisation's system produces accurate assessments of users' performance ... and make them available for them in a confidential way"	The Assurance Code does contain more specific requirements. See also Added value for the idea that the users should derive value from the assessments themselves. Comment also noted for guidance to be developed and for Code revisions.
159	Companies	6. Accuracy	Technical (general)	Should there be an elelment of external review included to ensure consistency and competence. This also goes into transparency	See amended version of Impartiality for clearer reference to oversight.
163	Consultants & researchers	6. Accuracy	Editorial (definitions)	Better define the qualities of an accurate evaluation	The Assurance Code does contain more specific requirements. Noted also for guidance to be developed and for Code revisions.
173	Companies	6. Accuracy	Editorial	synchronizing an organization's tool kit with providing 'best practices'?	Amended to clarify
191	NGOs	6. Accuracy	Technical (general)	We recommend adding that organizations should have a system in place to monitor the accuracy and quality of the assessments.	See amendeded version of Impartiality for clearer reference to oversight.
213	Government bodies	6. Accuracy	Editorial	Add compliance: The organisation's system produces accurate assessments of user's performance and compliance.	Accuracy is intended to apply to compliance and a broader range of approaches.
235	Consultants & researchers	6. Accuracy	Editorial	Accurate assessment users' performance in relation to...? standard requirements?	Amended to clarify

294	NGOs	6. Accuracy	Technical (general)	- An assessment of the performance can only be done against a baseline/standard/requirement that has a certain performance level. Is it really against the organisation's tools that the assessments are carried out? This is not clear enough. - include verifiable: the assessments are consistent, verifiable and competent.	Amended to clarify
295	NGOs	6. Accuracy	Editorial (definitions)	Assessment against what?	Amended to clarify
308	Standards and standards-like	6. Accuracy	Editorial	Add a sentence: "The organisation uses valid, proven and understood methods to demonstrate performance improvement" The reason for this sentence is that there is currently a very high level of the use of indicators such as energy intensity or carbon intensity with are really valid in terms of demonstrating performance improvement.	See Measurable progress.
318	Standards and standards-like	6. Accuracy	Editorial (definitions)	Accurate - what is required in the standard to be classed as delivering 'accurate' data/assessments eg 'targeted','time-bound'?	Amended to clarify. Comment also noted for Code revisions / guidance.
330	Standards and standards-like	6. Accuracy	Editorial	Not sure about this at all as too abstract. Pls make this more concrete or simply worded eg The organization assesses user performance with demonstrated competence leading to consistent and accurate assessments and confirmations (of conformity).	Amended to clarify
357	Standards and standards-like	6. Accuracy	Editorial	The measurable progress principle refers to "standard or tools", whereas here only "tools" are referred to.	Amended Measurable progress to be more consistent in the use of "tool" as the umbrella term.
358	Standards and standards-like	6. Accuracy	Technical (future trends)	Why has impartiality not been mentioned? It is one of the main pillars for the assurance code of good practice.	See amendeded version of Impartiality for clearer reference to oversight.
359	Standards and standards-like	6. Accuracy	Technical (future trends)	Adding impartiality as a target characteristic for assessments	See amendeded version of Impartiality for clearer reference to oversight.

373	Donors	6. Accuracy	Technical (general)	In terms of consistency and competency it would be interesting to see in how far oversight mechanism could be integrated into this principle as it helps to ensure accurate and competent assessments	See amendeded version of Impartiality for clearer reference to oversight.
383	Government bodies	6. Accuracy	Editorial	The assessments should be peer reviewed (sampling) to allow for consistency.	Amended to clarify the organisation's responsibility to ensure consistency.
412	NGOs	6. Accuracy	Technical (scope)	I would use here the word "Verification" and write clear principles for verification. The tools must include a clear verification methodology that is repeatable (consistent). The verification procedure in organisation should be clear and can be also verified by the third party (accreditation). Accreditation could be a recommended option that is desirable for a good competent organisation. Also it is important to mention, that organisation can develop the tool and set principles, but verification could be done by another competent bodies (certification bodies), and they also need to follow this principle.	Accuracy is intended to apply to a certification approach and also a broader range of methodologies. Please see also the ISEAL Assurance Code for requirements at this level of detail.
423	Standards and standards-like	6. Accuracy	Editorial	Wondering if its really possible to demonstrate 'accuracy' in users' performance. May be slightly less loaded term like 'reasonable' could be used in place.	Amended to clarify
436	Standards and standards-like	6. Accuracy	Technical (general)	We think consistent assessments by competent and independent assessment bodies is key for the credibility and the accuracy of a system, and that a system which doesn't implement this is meaningless from a credibility perspective.	Accuracy is intended to apply to a certification approach and also a broader range of methodologies. Please see also the ISEAL Assurance Code for requirements at this level of detail.
437	Standards and standards-like	6. Accuracy	Editorial (definitions)	We think that "assessment" needs to be further defined. We think that the whole sentence "The implementation of the organisation's tools, and the assessments carried out against these, are consistent and competent." is unclear.	Amended to clarify

449	Accreditation bodies/CBs	6. Accuracy	Technical (general)	This is simply not the case, there are plenty of members of Iseal that are not accountable and not monitored for accuracy or precision of service delivery. This simply has to be sharpened up and made a priority to enure that the credibility of the organisation is maintained	Please see also the ISEAL Assurance Code. (Please note that concerns with implementation of existing Code requirements can be raised with ISEAL members or directly with ISEAL.)
461	Standards and standards-like	6. Accuracy	Editorial	"The implementation of the organisation's tools, and the assessments carried out against these, are consistent and competent" should come 1st can an assessment be competent? Or does it better refer to the people carrying out these assessment?	Amended to clarify
462	Standards and standards-like	6. Accuracy	Editorial (definitions)	accurate - does it also include "substantiated"	See Truthfulness.
478	Standards and standards-like	6. Accuracy	Editorial	The last word competent needs a bit more explanation I think.	Definition added
486	NGOs	6. Accuracy	Editorial (definitions)	What is competent?	Definition added
507	Companies	6. Accuracy	Editorial	The organisation's system produces accurate quantitative or qualitative assessments of users' performance.	Amended to clarify (see also definition of data quality which specifies that data is both qualitative and quantitative.)
526	Standards and standards-like	6. Accuracy	Other (general)	The dogged pursuit of consistency denies CABs the flexibility they need to apply the intent of the Standard in the vast range of contexts that exist. That said, accuracy and consistency are incredibly important from a credibility point of view. My point is that what you do here should be considered closely alongside what's feasible and we don't end up with a one size fits all approach when that doesn't match reality and can actually be unfair. So to be clear, I'm not advocating one way or the other, I just want to raise this complexity to make sure it is considered.	Noted. Do the amendments to clarify address this?

527	Standards and standards-like	6. Accuracy	Technical (general)	I think this principle is very clear, but is double-barrelled. I think accuracy (i.e. rigour) and consistency (i.e. precision in terms of consistency between assessments) should be two separate principles. They are very different things that require different outputs to achieve.	Noted. Do the amendments to clarify address this?
535	Standards and standards-like	6. Accuracy	Editorial	This criteria is not clear. I don't understand if the objective is to analyse the performance of the users or the effectiveness of the tools. I don't think that the improvement of a user is necessarily directly related to my tools…	Amended to clarify
596	NGOs	6. Accuracy	Editorial	include verifiable	Amended
620		6. Accuracy	Technical (future trends)	I would consider reliance on science or latest technology - I would want to ensure that the label organization uses the best science to establish their standards	See Sustainability impacts.
15	Accreditation bodies/CBs	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial	"...It makes particular efforts to engage disadvantaged stakeholders - clearly acknowledging and expressing their perspectives - and has fair mechanisms for resolving conflicts."	Amended
16	Accreditation bodies/CBs	7. Stakeholder engagement	Technical (general)	There needs to be some kind of provision that respects certain disadvantaged stakeholders' worldview. This is especially poignant for certain indigenous peoples, whose entire lifestyle is not predicated on the mainstream economic model, who have a longer-standing spiritual connection to the earth and cosmos and who live in ways that do not succumb to the economic hegemony and which is categorically different from we who "benefit" from the schemes of ISEAL members. There should be a prohibition for schemes to interfere where disadvantaged stakeholders' worldview is totally different from the scheme owner's.	Amended
38	Consultants & researchers	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial (definitions)	what constitutes a stakeholder? Do stakeholders have a say in that?	Amended
63	Donors	7. Stakeholder engagement	Technical (scope)	No only refer to standard-setters; assurance less central to this principle	However, other decisions (such as those relating to M&E) are also relevant.

86	Finance sector	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial	Instead of "meaningfully involves" I would like to se "MUST involve".	Amended
93	Finance sector	7. Stakeholder engagement	Other (general)	We provide additional facilities to disadvantaged stakeholders, to help and support them	Noted
98	Standards and standards-like	7. Stakeholder engagement	Technical (general)	Maybe be too obvious, but the organization should start by identifying and disclosing who its stakeholders are in the first place.	Amended
108	Consultants & researchers	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial (definitions)	It may be helpful to define what "disadvantaged stakeholders" mean in a Guidance Note. Disadvantaged stakeholders. This should not necessarily be defined in the principle statement but in a Guidance document.	See the definitions. Noted also for the development of guidance / Code revisions.
124	Government bodies	7. Stakeholder engagement	Technical (general)	Stakeholder engagement is important indeed in the standard of development process, but it is also important in the standard implementation process (dispute mechanism, capacity building etc.).	Noted for the development of guidance / Code revisions.
141	Accreditation bodies/CBs	7. Stakeholder engagement	Other (general)	Satisfied with this principle	Noted with thanks
147	Government bodies	7. Stakeholder engagement	Technical (general)	Sustainability requires a successor generation being able to carry on the organisation's activities and impact. There should be a coaching/mentoring an training effort for young people and women.	Noted for the development of guidance / Code revisions
164	Consultants & researchers	7. Stakeholder engagement	Technical (general)	Include risk and conflict management	Noted for the development of guidance / Code revisions
171	Standards and standards-like	7. Stakeholder engagement	Technical (general)	How to define particular efforts? To be assessed against this principle a clear understanding what this means is needed.	Noted for the development of guidance / Code revisions

192	NGOs	7. Stakeholder engagement	Technical (general)	Meaningful stakeholder engagement that is inclusive, deliberative and transparent is a must for any sustainability system. We have concern with the removal of V1's clearly defined stakeholder opportunities (i.e., three components: governance, assurance and monitoring and evaluation). Instead, V1.1 leaves the onus on the organisation to decide what "decisions" affect stakeholders. Based on the current and drafted credibility principles, organisations should have these three components (i.e., not just standard holders) and therefore are still relevant and significant to prioritize for stakeholder engagement. We recommend adding the need for conflict and complaints to be handled through a procedurally fair, independent, third-party dispute resolution mechanism. Currently the principle is worded to allow for internal complaint mechanisms which can enable conflict of interest to arise. We also recommend adding that engagement is relevant to and considerate of local context and stakeholders.	Amended
193	NGOs	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial (definitions)	Further define "meaningful" engagement (i.e., inclusive, deliberative, transparent) to remove any ambiguity. Further define "fair mechanism" (i.e., procedurally fair, independent) for complaints and disputes.	Amended
214	Government bodies	7. Stakeholder engagement	Technical (general)	I think stakeholders or representatives should also be allowed to participate even if some decisions do not directly affect them (e.g. NGOs or advocacy groups engaging on behalf of someone). I like the more specific wording from V1 "meaningful and accessible opportunities to participate in governance, assurance and monitoring and evaluation"	Amended
236	Consultants & researchers	7. Stakeholder engagement	Technical (general)	"Balanced and representative group of stakeholders" should have stayed in the text. Same goes for "empowering stakeholders" -> takes away a level of stakeholder agency. Gone from "fair mechanisms to resolve complaints" to "fair mechanisms to resolving conflicts". Important detail as it seems to allow users to wait until conflict arises instead of	Amended

				having a mechanism to avoid conflict (preventions vs treatment)	
255	Accreditation bodies/CBs	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial	Suggest adding "fair and accessible mechanisms for resolving conflicts". If they are not accessible, it doesn't matter how fair they are.	Amended
271	Standards and standards-like	7. Stakeholder engagement	Technical (scope)	Efforts to engage disadvantaged stakeholders must be ongoing. In countries where family farming predominates (such as Brazil), these producers should be heard and should not be left out of discussions on sustainability (standards, guidelines, meetings, definitions of standards, etc.).	Noted for the development of guidance / Code revisions.
278	Accreditation bodies/CBs	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial	The organization is responsible to its stakeholders and involves them significantly in the decisions that will affect them. It makes particular efforts to involve stakeholders and has fair and adequate mechanisms to resolve conflicts.	Amended
296	NGOs	7. Stakeholder engagement	Technical (general)	- Notion of engaging balanced and representative groups of stakeholders in standard setting, governance, decision making, assurance, monitoring and evaluation mission. The heart of multi-stakeholder approaches - I also like the notion of "empowerment". Maybe under added value or here? - See also comments under "Collaboration"	Amended
297	NGOs	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial (definitions)	- meaningfully?	Amended
319	Standards and standards-like	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial (definitions)	Accountable - currently implies there needs to be some recourse available to stakeholders or that they have the final judgment on decisions	Amended
331	Standards and standards-like	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial	May be adding to conflicts also offering complaints and allegations processes.	Amended

345	Standards and standards-like	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial	perhaps change the first sentence - "the organisation operates in a way that is accountable to..." I worry about lack of clarity around stakeholder engagement. too vague and of course stakeholder engagement may suffer, but too tight and definitive and I worry that innovation, dynamism, creativity and drive can be sapped from them. I think this is a subject worthy of deeper conversation - and this principle needs to get the wording right to emphasise there is a balance of leadership and decision making between stakeholders and the organisations that are leading / stewardship / running the systems.	Amended
360	Standards and standards-like	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial (definitions)	1. What constitutes a disadvantaged stakeholder? 2. Conflicts. Conflicts can have quite a different meaning to complaints, and this change could affect the interpretation	See definitions, also amended to specify both complaints and conflicts.
374	Donors	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial	Following part of V1 should also be added to V1.1 to clarify for which aspects of a standard system stakeholder involvement is key to a credible and transparent VSS: "…to participate in governance, assurance and monitoring and evaluation."	Amended
384	Government bodies	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial (definitions)	I am not sure what you mean with stakeholders in this context. Is it mainly users?	See amended definitions; it is intended that stakeholders are a broader group than users.
392	Standards and standards-like	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial (definitions)	Meaningfully involves' and 'disadvantaged stakeholders' needs to be clearly defined. The previous principle provides more clarity on how all parties are represented in decision making (e.g. balanced and representative group of stakeholders are involved in standards development).	Amended
450	Accreditation bodies/CBs	7. Stakeholder engagement	Other (general)	I need to know more about this, it has to be pushed forward to the forefront of that these mechanisms exist.	Noted. See the Standard-Setting and Impacts Code for further details on stakeholder identification and consultation.

463	Standards and standards-like	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial	"particular efforts to engage disadvantaged stakeholders" - the burden is on the mean and not on the result; i would try to find a wording that shows that disadvantaged stakeholders are taking an active part to the various process where stakeholders are involved.	Amended
464	Standards and standards-like	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial (definitions)	stakeholders should also include those that might influence the uptake of the tool (including government) even if they are not directly impacted by the tool	See amended definitions; it is intended that stakeholders are a broader group than users.
479	Standards and standards-like	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial	I'd like to see wording closer to the original as the new version seems to have lost the key balance between different stakeholder groups. E.g. 'the organisation engages a balanced and representative group of stakeholders, ensuring meaningful and accessible opportunities to participate in decision making that affects them. It makes particular efforts to engage disadvantaged stakeholders and has fair mechanisms for resolving conflicts and complaints.'	Amended
487	NGOs	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial	Exclude meaningfully (maneira significativa)	Amended
488	NGOs	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial (definitions)	fair mechanisms	Amended to provide more context (accessible, impartial)
529	Standards and standards-like	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial	"has fair mechanisms for resolving conflicts" What do you mean? This conflates resolving conflicts in decisions against the standard with conflicts in decisions on how to set the Standard. Needs to be clarified what is meant.	Amended to refer to both complaints and conflicts
530	Standards and standards-like	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial (definitions)	Accountable. What does this mean in practise? We previously had a stakeholder council with veto powers and this led to politicised outcomes that arguably reduced our impact. We exist to be an independent authoritative arbiter of competing stakeholders with overlapping interests and we need that prerogative in order to be effective.	Amended

554	NGOs	7. Stakeholder engagement	Technical (general)	Industry purports to be responding to the marketplace. So, this translates into speaking for consumers, a.k.a. citizens. Farmers and ranchers are not driving this but largely are not driving the process; rather reacting. This dynamic seems likely to always be true. How do you think you can get better representation given this dynamic?	Amended to clarify. Comment noted also for guidance development / Code revision. See also the Standard-Setting and Impacts Code for further details on stakeholder identification and consultation.
558	Consultants & researchers	7. Stakeholder engagement	Technical (general)	I think there's more room for guidance around what balanced participation and impartiality looks like now. In some current research we've constructed a databases of 8000 comments made in multiple different public forums on 7 different ISEAL members standards. Our initial findings are that industry actors are over represented and tend to comment on sustainability standards far more than other groups and are more likely to have their comments reflected in the final revised version of the standards. There's an opportunity for ISEAL to develop some further guidance on how to ensure that some stakeholder groups don't dominate those stakeholder engagement exercises by virtue of the resources or perhaps technical expertise.	Amended to clarify. Comment noted also for guidance development / Code revision. See also the Standard-Setting and Impacts Code for further details on stakeholder identification and consultation.
565	Consultants & researchers	7. Stakeholder engagement	Technical (general)	In the engagement principle, I like the addition which emphasises disadvantaged stakeholders but I found the old principle asking for balance and represented representation was more precise. I felt that in the new principles this language was too vague and opened up too much room for interpretation. I think a little bit more detail and guidance here would be helpful.	Amended
588	NGOs	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial	safeguards, e.g. some data cannot be shared, how do we address that, privacy and data protection?	See amendment to Transparency.
589	NGOs	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial	Language including local communities, keeping them engaged, capture gender balance, equity	Amended

592	Consultants & researchers	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial	language needs to be adjusted - "organization and its stakeholders"à an organisation might define their stakeholders narrowly, but might not recognise all stakeholder such as Stakeholders who are affected, e.g. indigenous people, different rights holders. The language may not intentionally be about the organisational alone defining its stakeholders, but that's how it sounds. Intentional? E.g. indigenous people in Australia have a strong objection to that term Stakeholder. They would prefer the term rightsholder.	Definition amended
594	NGOs	7. Stakeholder engagement	Editorial	Stakeholder engagement: more about the engagement, meaningful participation. "meaningful engagement". 2 levels e.g. government, experts, etc. and on the other hand indigenous people	Amended
17	Accreditation bodies/CBs	8. Impartiality	Technical (general)	Include concepts of transparency and recourse in the principle.	Amended
39	Consultants & researchers	8. Impartiality	Editorial	mitigates conflicts of interest is a loose term and what about mediation or means for addressing conflicts?	Amended to clarify
51	Accreditation bodies/CBs	8. Impartiality	Technical (general)	greater focus on "transparency and accessibility" as a way to manage conflict of impartiality. the statement in the v.1 "Transparency, accessibility and balanced representation contribute to impartiality" worked very well	Amended
52	Accreditation bodies/CBs	8. Impartiality	Technical (scope)	greater clarity	Amended
64	Donors	8. Impartiality	Editorial (definitions)	operations (scope). operations suggest a limited scope.	Amended
76	Consultants & researchers	8. Impartiality	Editorial	Mitigates and avoids conflicts of interest	Amended
94	Finance sector	8. Impartiality	Other (general)	All decisions are taken in board meetings to avoid conflict of interest	Amended

99	Standards and standards-like	8. Impartiality	Technical (general)	How can an observer tell if an organization is mitigating conflicts of interest? Does it suffice if an organisation says it does? I would add an element that makes this observable and "scrutinizable", e.g. "the organization explains / discloses how it mitigates conflicts of interest"	Reference to transparency included
142	Accreditation bodies/CBs	8. Impartiality	Other (general)	Satisfied with this principle	Noted with thanks
153	Standards and standards-like	8. Impartiality	Editorial	Maybe instead of mitigates conflicts of interest something like "has clear ways to identify and processes to address potential conflicts of interest throughout its operations" Identifying the conflicts of interests seems to be a key part or V1 that shouldn't be lost in the revision. Without fully identifying, mitigation has less meaningful impact.	Amended
165	Consultants & researchers	8. Impartiality	Technical (general)	Transparency Reports	We are not sure we've understood the intended reference.
181	Companies	8. Impartiality	Editorial (definitions)	Further define Impartiality in practice (take example of ISO-17021 norm)	Practical implementation is further defined in the Assurance Code.
182	Companies	8. Impartiality	Technical (general)	include a reference to ISO-17021 norm	The principle is intended to apply both to a certification approach and also a broader range of methodologies. A reference to ISO 17021 would narrow the scope too much.
194	NGOs	8. Impartiality	Technical (general)	The removal of specifics (i.e., "...particularly in the assurance process and in governance. Transparency, accessibility and balanced representation contribute to impartiality") can lead to ambiguity and subjectivity. We recommend the reinstatement of these as they give clear expectations to organisations.	Amended
195	NGOs	8. Impartiality	Editorial (definitions)	Impartiality is currently not defined.	The language of the (amended) principle should provide the necessary definition.

215	Government bodies	8. Impartiality	Editorial	Could keep the second sentence from V1.	Amended
221	Government bodies	8. Impartiality	Technical (general)	For the Impartiality section, mitigating conflicts of interest is not strong enough language to reduce it. Mitigate means to lessen or make bearable. It should be more strongly worded and add descriptive language to minimize conflicts of interest.	Amended
237	Consultants & researchers	8. Impartiality	Technical (general)	A lot of the text seems to have been taken out – there is much more room for interpretation of how to be transparent in the new version which could lead to misinterpretation/misuse of the principle.	Amended
238	Consultants & researchers	8. Impartiality	Editorial (definitions)	"Throughout its operations" – is this just in terms of sustainability or all of an organisation's operations?	Amended
256	Accreditation bodies/CBs	8. Impartiality	Editorial	Suggest adding back "identifies" - not every conflict of interest can be mitigated, some are accepted or avoided, and it's important that they are still identified to enable the organization to explain their position to stakeholders on those conflicts.	Amended
279	Accreditation bodies/CBs	8. Impartiality	Editorial	Impartiality The organization is committed to impartiality and mitigates conflicts of interest throughout its operations and with the stakeholders.	Amended
298	NGOs	8. Impartiality	Editorial	Be clearer about what "being committed to" means: identifying COIs, making them transparent, even ranking them? And of course mitigating them. Some of the auditors have a conflict of interest. If a CB is also promoting business, it cannot be neutral. How to minimize that conflict. Could add, that if there are conflicts, it could be listed by the organizations.	Amended
299	NGOs	8. Impartiality	Editorial (definitions)	"committed to"	Amended
320	Standards and standards-like	8. Impartiality	Technical (general)	It would d be useful to have a line in the sand of minimum requirements e.g. independent assessment, certification and monies received from these services.	Practical implementation is further defined in the Assurance Code.

332	Standards and standards-like	8. Impartiality	Editorial	Replace "committed" by "is organized to maximize impartiality". Separate as supportive measure it offers processes to mitigate conflicts of interest.	Amended
346	Standards and standards-like	8. Impartiality	Editorial	I like the way this is worded	Noted with thanks
361	Standards and standards-like	8. Impartiality	Editorial	Improved, clear, and concise wording in v1.1	Noted with thanks
385	Government bodies	8. Impartiality	Editorial	To assure peer review and transparency.	Peer review would be one approach. Reference to transparency now included.
393	Standards and standards-like	8. Impartiality	Technical (general)	More clarity will be needed on how to achieve impartiality. The previous principle provides more clarity on how impartiality can be achieved.	Amended
404	NGOs	8. Impartiality	Editorial	include accountability	See Stakeholder engagement. In the context of impartiality the question would become accountability to whom.
405	NGOs	8. Impartiality	Editorial (definitions)	governance	Amended
440	Standards and standards-like	8. Impartiality	Technical (general)	We think the independence of the "organisation" is key for credibility of a system, and don't think being "committed to impartiality and mitigates conflicts of interest" is sufficient.	Amended to strengthen
451	Accreditation bodies/CBs	8. Impartiality	Other (general)	This is a major area of concern for me. I do believe that this is the biggest risk to ISEAL and its members. As indicated before the lines between the various roles in a auditing/certification process is blurring and this factors around impartiality and also anti-competetion that is becoming more widespread in this industry	Amended
465	Standards and standards-like	8. Impartiality	Editorial	The organisation should make specific effort to communicate around these rules	Reference to transparency included
482	Accreditation bodies/CBs	8. Impartiality	Editorial	The previous version had a more explicit commitment to transparency and accessibility, it was better.	Amended

531	Standards and standards-like	8. Impartiality	Editorial (definitions)	Impartiality in terms of what. We will definitely be partial in terms of favouring whatever best realises our Theory of Change in the design of the Standard (and any clarifications/interpretations that need to be issued thereafter). I would not want this sort of thinking to lead to false equivalences, that two parties are given equal weight because they each represent 50% of the stated positions. So I'm presuming this means that we are impartial in how CABs do assessments or the outcome of any particular objections. Either way, maybe needs tightening up.	Amended
556	Consultants & researchers	8. Impartiality	Technical (general)	Forest certification has faced criticism that allowing companies to select and hire their preferred certifying body directly introduces inherent conflict of interest and undermines credibility. Independent accreditation is helpful, but does not address this underlying conflict. How do the Credibility Principles address this? Have other sectors solved this problem?	Amended. See also the Assurance Code for detailed requirements.
587	NGOs	8. Impartiality	Editorial	Impartiality: mechanism build in, audits, need to have declarations of conflicts of interest included	Amended. See also the Assurance Code for detailed requirements.
617		8. Impartiality	Editorial	mitigate is not strong enough language	Amended
18	Accreditation bodies/CBs	9. Truthfulness	Editorial	I am not clear what "proportional to the nature of the system" is supposed to mean.	Amended to clarify
19	Accreditation bodies/CBs	9. Truthfulness	Other (general)	The changes that are needed are not so much in the principle, but the degree to which ISEAL enforces it!	Noted for Code revisions. (Please note that concerns with implementation of existing Code requirements can be raised with ISEAL members or directly with ISEAL.)
40	Consultants & researchers	9. Truthfulness	Editorial	perhaps "credibly" or scientifically substantiated	Amended

53	Accreditation bodies/CBs	9. Truthfulness	Editorial	it would be good to further explain the sentence of "Claims about sustainability impacts are substantiated". substantiated should mean: supported by evidence, meaning that the organisation must be in the condition to provide evidence to "measure" the different elements to support the claim.	Amended
54	Accreditation bodies/CBs	9. Truthfulness	Editorial (definitions)	substantiated	Amended
65	Donors	9. Truthfulness	Technical (general)	Important, but a bit difficult to capture and measure (similar challanges than with accuracy)	Amended
77	Consultants & researchers	9. Truthfulness	Editorial	Claims are substantiated with evidence and research	Amended
87	Finance sector	9. Truthfulness	Editorial (definitions)	The word substantiated needs to be defined to include the means (e.g. data) of proving the authenticity of the claims.	Amended
100	Standards and standards-like	9. Truthfulness	Editorial	Is it possible to include a reference to "" evidence" to the substantiation. Claims need to be evidence-based.	Amended
109	Consultants & researchers	9. Truthfulness	Editorial (definitions)	The statement "Claims are proportional to the nature of the system" is a bit ambiguous and may be opened to different interpretations. It may be helpful to explain or define what "proportional" means in a Guidance document	Amended and noted for development of further guidance.
110	Consultants & researchers	9. Truthfulness	Editorial (definitions)	Proportional to avoid different interpretations	Amended
125	Government bodies	9. Truthfulness	Technical (general)	There seems to be a bit of overlap with accuracy.	Amended and the link made more explicit in accuracy
143	Accreditation bodies/CBs	9. Truthfulness	Other (general)	Satisfied with this principle	Noted with thanks
166	Consultants & researchers	9. Truthfulness	Technical (general)	Investigate complaints, provide solutions and transparency to the process.	See Stakeholder engagement.
196	NGOs	9. Truthfulness	Technical (general)	Claims should also be substantiated by providing publicly accessible evidence.	Amended
197	NGOs	9. Truthfulness	Editorial (definitions)	Define what a "claim" is and give examples (e.g. logo, label, written statement, etc.).	See definitions.

198	NGOs	9. Truthfulness	Technical (general)	That claims are substantiated with publicly available evidence.	Amended
216	Government bodies	9. Truthfulness	Editorial	"If the organisation makes claims, or allows users to make claims, these are clear, relevant and truthful." "Claims about sustainability impacts are substantiated and verifiable."	Amended
217	Government bodies	9. Truthfulness	Editorial	Are we sure the sentence "Claims are proportional to the nature of the system." is clear to everyone? What is the nature of the system?	Amended
218	Government bodies	9. Truthfulness	Technical (future trends)	It is implied in truthfulness but we may need to spell out that claims should enable an an informed choice and not be misleading.	Amended
226	Standards and standards-like	9. Truthfulness	Editorial (definitions)	The definition of 'Clear and truthful; might need defining elsewhere, or being retained in the description. Their meaning is in the old description, but in shortening the new, that level of definition has been lost.	Amended
227	Standards and standards-like	9. Truthfulness	Editorial (definitions)	Clear and truthful To define clear and truthful, as you did in V1	Amended
239	Consultants & researchers	9. Truthfulness	Editorial	Taken out "Claims […] are verifiable, not misleading, and enable an informed choice". This seems like a crucial sentence that should have remained in the new principle version.	Amended
240	Consultants & researchers	9. Truthfulness	Editorial (definitions)	"Proportional" -> needs better defining to avoid misinterpretation of what a proportional claim should look like	Amended
257	Accreditation bodies/CBs	9. Truthfulness	Editorial	Claims are proportional to the nature of the system - the intent could be inferred, but the wording is not clear at all, needs to be re-written (not suggesting new language because not 100% sure what is meant here).	Amended
272	Standards and standards-like	9. Truthfulness	Editorial	Is not clear, in my opinion, what kind (or how) the users can make claims.	Amended. See also the definition of claims.
300	NGOs	9. Truthfulness	Editorial	- Include notion of of verifiable, commensurate and the purpose of claims: to enable an informed choice	Amended

301	NGOs	9. Truthfulness	Editorial (definitions)	- "proportional to the nature of the system": To me, it is proportional to the ambition and performance level, which is a relative issue.	Amended
321	Standards and standards-like	9. Truthfulness	Editorial	proportional to the nature of the system' - meaning not clear to me but I think the summary of changes text you used is clearer 'Claims about sustainability impacts are substantiated by the measurable data collected in the standards and process of certification'	Amended
333	Standards and standards-like	9. Truthfulness	Editorial	Unclear whose responsibility it is to have proportional claims (if the org: phrase it like this), the same for substantiating the claims.	Amended
362	Standards and standards-like	9. Truthfulness	Editorial	Improved, concise, clear wording in V1.1	Noted with thanks
386	Government bodies	9. Truthfulness	Editorial	claims should be substantiated (reliable), relevant (focus on key aspects that go beyond legal compliance) and clear. For easy reference check	Amended
413	NGOs	9. Truthfulness	Technical (general)	I would refer here to the UNEP Guidelines for Providing Product Sustainability Information or the principles that are included into this document, because the requirements for claims are very clearly expressed there.	Noted with thanks
441	Standards and standards-like	9. Truthfulness	Editorial	We think the content of "Truthfulness" in the current version (V1.0) of the principles is more complete and relevant than the proposed, but that the current language is difficult to understand. We suggest something like: "If the organisation or its stakeholders make a claim or other communication in connection to the tool or system, it should be clear, proportional and verifiable."	Amended
452	Accreditation bodies/CBs	9. Truthfulness	Other (general)	This goes back to impartilaity and transparency. This goes together with truthfulness and whether the members and stakeholders truely believe in the value of ISeal and what it represents. Timely responses to incidents and claims and at this level full transparency is key	Noted. See also amended Stakeholder engagement.

466	Standards and standards-like	9. Truthfulness	Editorial	"truthful" - i think substantiated is clearer and more implementable than truthful. Defining truthful can be achieved using the concepts of scientifically rooted, peer-reviewed or others	Amended
467	Standards and standards-like	9. Truthfulness	Editorial	truthful nature of the system	Amended
508	Companies	9. Truthfulness	Editorial	It is recommended "Truthfulness" is revised into "Reliability": If the organisation makes claims, or allows users to make claims, these are clear and truthful. And the organization is held accountable for the claims it makes.	Amended
569	Companies	9. Truthfulness	Editorial	"Truthfulness": the organization should be held accountable for the claims made on standards, and should not shirk its responsibility or take back the standard certification once any problem occurs.	Amended. See the amended principle Accuracy for a clearer connection to claims.
20	Accreditation bodies/CBs	10. Transparency	Editorial	In addition to "providing them the information they need to engage" there should be clearer language about ability to raise a concern, complaint, or dispute.	Amended. See also amended principle Stakeholder engagement.
41	Consultants & researchers	10. Transparency	Editorial	what constitutes important?	Amended to clarify
55	Accreditation bodies/CBs	10. Transparency	Editorial	description in V1 was cleared. it is extremely important to list the domains in which the concept of transparency should be applied: - 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	Amended. However, while the reintroduction of details was discussed, it was decided that the list of specific applications is more suited to Code requirements. See the ISEAL Codes for the specific requirements on publicly available information.
66	Donors	10. Transparency	Technical (scope)	Not only refer to standards	Noted. See definition of "tool".
78	Consultants & researchers	10. Transparency	Editorial	Information they need to understand and engage	Amended
88	Finance sector	10. Transparency	Editorial (definitions)	What kind of information has to be available? and by what means?	Amended

144	Accreditation bodies/CBs	10. Transparency	Other (general)	Satisfied with this principle	Noted with thanks
160	Companies	10. Transparency	Technical (general)	It may be useful to be more specific about what information is "important"	Amended
167	Consultants & researchers	10. Transparency	Technical (general)	Fighting like false news	See Truthfulness.
176	Standards and standards-like	10. Transparency	Technical (general)	What should be public and allow for no-publication when confidential	Amended
199	NGOs	10. Transparency	Technical (general)	We recommend adding that decision making (the process, outcomes, how input is utilized or not, etc.) should be made transparent to stakeholders.	Amended. However, while the reintroduction of details was discussed, it was decided that the list of specific applications is more suited to Code requirements. See the ISEAL Codes for the specific requirements on publicly available information.
200	NGOs	10. Transparency	Editorial (definitions)	The term "important information" is ambiguous. This needs to be defined.	Amended
219	Government bodies	10. Transparency	Editorial	Wording of second sentence could be improved.	Amended
228	Standards and standards-like	10. Transparency	Technical (general)	I think the original was clearer	Amended
229	Standards and standards-like	10. Transparency	Editorial (definitions)	Important information	Amended
230	Standards and standards-like	10. Transparency	Editorial (definitions)	Define what is 'Important Information', or maintain the original, which gave a shortlist of what those were.	Amended
241	Consultants & researchers	10. Transparency	Technical (general)	How does an organisation decide what "important information" is? Need for more guidance on this.	Amended. See also the ISEAL Codes for the specific requirements on publicly available information.
246	Standards and standards-like	10. Transparency	Technical (general)	Why adding "to its stakeholders" for the accessibility ? Shouldn`t that be public too ?	Amended to clarify

273	Standards and standards-like	10. Transparency	Technical (general)	It is important for the institution to define a clear communication channel between itself and its stakeholders.	Amended to clarify
302	NGOs	10. Transparency	Editorial	- Be clearer on "important information": maybe replace with "material" and give examples as in V1 - Traceability and Accountability need to be included in this principle - include: information easily accessible and understood	Amended to clarify
322	Standards and standards-like	10. Transparency	Editorial (definitions)	Important' - too vague and different stakeholders will have different requirements	Amended to clarify
334	Standards and standards-like	10. Transparency	Editorial	May be to add that the org offers easy ways for stakeholders to engage (beyond that one can find information).	Amended to clarify
363	Standards and standards-like	10. Transparency	Editorial	Improved, clearer wording in v1.1	Noted with thanks
375	Donors	10. Transparency	Editorial	Important or relevant information should not only be accessible to stakeholders but also to the broad public. However, we appreciate the fact that an organization might share certain information only with its stakeholders. In line with question 55. We suggest the following: The organisation makes important information in relation to their tool publicly available and easily accessible.This refers to information about the development and content of the standard, how the system is governed, who is evaluated and under what process. The organisation supports users and stakeholders to understand and evaluate the system and its impacts, providing them the information they need to engage.	Amended. However, while the reintroduction of details was discussed, it was decided that the list of specific applications is more suited to Code requirements. See the ISEAL Codes for the specific requirements on publicly available information.
376	Donors	10. Transparency	Editorial (definitions)	The term "important information" is not accurately defined, importance can be interpreted differently depending on the reader/user. It should be clarified that "information" relates to all aspects around a tool employed by an organization.	Amended to clarify

387	Government bodies	10. Transparency	Editorial	confidential information should be made available for the relevant authorities.	Amended to reflect the importance of confidentiality; however, disclosure to authorities is a legal requiement and not introduced to the scope of the principle.
394	Standards and standards-like	10. Transparency	Technical (general)	'…makes important information publicly available' - What denotes important information and what if the important information is private and confidential information? How will this be addressed? There needs to be consideration for a balance between transparency and confidentiality	Amended
414	NGOs	10. Transparency	Editorial	I like the previous version of the principle because it is more clear. It is more effective to have certain requirements for the information that needs to be opened for public, like here: "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." This is very important to avoid greenwashing.	Amended. However, while the reintroduction of details was discussed, it was decided that the list of specific applications is more suited to Code requirements. See the ISEAL Codes for the specific requirements on publicly available information.
415	NGOs	10. Transparency	Editorial (definitions)	to define, what particular information is meant	Amended
442	Standards and standards-like	10. Transparency	Editorial (definitions)	We think it would be good to define and give examples of "important information".	Amended. However, while the reintroduction of details was discussed, it was decided that the list of specific applications is more suited to Code requirements. See the ISEAL Codes for the specific requirements on publicly available information.
468	Standards and standards-like	10. Transparency	Editorial (definitions)	important information - important for who, for what?	Amended
489	NGOs	10. Transparency	Editorial (definitions)	Necessary information	Amended

509	Companies	10. Transparency	Editorial	The organisation, while considering the necessary information security, makes important information publicly available and easily accessible to its stakeholders.	Amended
547	Standards and standards-like	10. Transparency	Editorial	Is transparency important in terms of operations/processes of sustainability standards/tools? Or is it referring to transparency of supply chains taking part in standard systems? It is a challenging principle in light of growing regulations around confidentiality and data protection.	Amended
563	Consultants & researchers	10. Transparency	Technical (general)	I feel as though recognising that the systems operate in a competitive environment where disclosure, information etc informs other strategies and activities. I think there's an important recognition that an evaluation can serve two purpose: improving performance - often an internal function - and it can improve accountability - e.g. claims in the media that a programme lacks credibility or is doing fraudulent behaviour. Those two purposes are intentions. If we're devising M&E for the internal improvement we want to know more about our failures than our successes. If we are having all our dirty laundry out in public then it can create disincentives for us to do the things we should be doing. So I think some kind of explicit discussion about the value of privacy. Not to say that we want every programme not to be transparent, but I was struck by the principle of sustainability impacts and being explicit about your sustainability objectives and strategies for achieving those. Sometimes maybe it's important to have some of that stuff internal where it's not all out publicly available. This is an open question to me and I think it's something that hasn't really been thought about. How do we value privacy in this context? When is privacy valuable? Is it important to think about the role of privacy when once information is out it can inform competitors' programme.	Amended

591	Consultants & researchers	10. Transparency	Editorial (definitions)	What information should be public, how is publicly available information defined? There needs to be a clearer definition about limits and constrains, e.g.: Evidence we ask from applicants, getting the balance right between availability and privacy?	Amended
597	NGOs	10. Transparency	Editorial	Transparency seems vague. What exactly are we looking for when we say transparency? Clarify "Important", maybe replace with "material" and give examples.	Amended. However, while the reintroduction of details was discussed, it was decided that the list of specific applications is more suited to Code requirements. See the ISEAL Codes for the specific requirements on publicly available information.
598	NGOs	10. Transparency	Editorial	Accountability or traceability would help with the wording.	See amendments to Truthfulness and Stakeholder engagement; comment re traceability also noted for the development of guidance / Code revisions.
616	Government bodies	10. Transparency	Editorial	Question about corporate programmes like benchmarking, mapping programmes, and whether "important information" was enough or whether it should be "material information" that needs to be shared.	Amended to clarify
1	Consultants & researchers	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	Would like a better definition of Disadvantaged Stakeholders.	Amended
5	Accreditation bodies/CBs	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	It would help to be more explicit about the 'similar initiatives' referenced in Tool. What is the difference between Sustainability objectives and Impacts? Is the former intended, and latter actual? The separate distinction of Disadvantaged stakeholders is useful and important.	Re tools, need for examples noted for supporting materials. We have tried to ensure distinct usage when referring to objectives (the intended outcomes and impacts) vs actual outcomes and impacts within the text.

6	Accreditation bodies/CBs	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	Users - are not only businesses. For example, a governmental agency could adopt a scheme. Other NGOs could also... Disadvantaged stakeholders - should not only refer to participation in consultation or decision making. It must also refer to their position with respect to ongoing implementation of the scheme and have particular attention paid to them in terms of impact. Furthermore, the assessment of impact should be more weighted to THEIR perception of the impact of the scheme on them.	Definition of users amended
23	Government bodies	Definitions	Editorial	Program guide instead of tool Standard setting instead of organization Program of action instead of stratégies Promoters instead of users	Other approaches to naming and defining tool considered, but tool retained given overall feedback.
32	Consultants & researchers	Definitions	Other (communicati ons)	good job keeping it both simple and clear	Thank you!
43	Accreditation bodies/CBs	Definitions	Technical (general)	Tool: not clear the meaning of "similar initiatives" , it is too vague System: we suggest to refer to ISO definition of system: System A system is defined as a set of interrelated or interacting elements. A management system is one type of system. It is a set of interrelated or interacting elements that organizations use to formulate policies and objectives and to establish the processes that are needed to ensure that policies are followed and objectives are achieved. Claim: we suggest to refer to the definition recently developed by ISO: "statement, symbol or graphic that declares one or more (SUSTAINABILITY) aspect of a product, process, service or organization". we believe that the claim should be related to "Sustainability", so we suggest to define the term "Sustainability claim" instead of "claim", which risks to appear too vague	Re tools, need for examples noted for supporting materials. Re system, the context is more specific than a generic management system and is more akin to the concept of a scheme: some amends made to clarify. Claims in this context is meant to include a somewhat wider range of communications (as outlined in ISEAL's existing claims guidance), but the ISO reference is also noted for future revision of this guidance.

					We have tried to ensure distinct usage when referring to objectives (the intended outcomes and impacts) vs actual outcomes and impacts within the text.
58	Donors	Definitions	Editorial	Sustainability objectives may overlap a bit with outcomes and impacts	
68	NGOs	Definitions	Editorial	Strategies: The approaches and methodologies that defines the organization's activities greaed towards creating sustainable solutions to create change.	Amended
79	Finance sector	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	One of the key elements of the revision is the provision of "High Quality Data"; however, I do not see the definition of "Quality Data".	Definition of data quality added
115	Standards and standards-like	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	The definitions of "tool" and "system" may be fine as they are, but I wonder if you've considered elaboration of "similar initiatives" in the tool definition and "similar tools" in the system definition. We have moved to working with programs that are similar to standards, are committed to the approach, and want to be clear for ourselves and ISEAL on terminology. We're now using the term "system" to describe a standards-like tool. We're committed to this because we're convinced that the growth in application of standards systems (including certification) are currently limited in tourism because non-standards systems have not been integrated with standards systems. We're concerned about future questions about what constitutes "similar initiatives" and "similar tools". Again, we're fully committed to your moving in this direction....just wondering if further explanation is required for those two.	Re tools, need for examples noted for supporting materials.
148	Standards and standards-like	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	Maybe provide context on "sustainability" part of "Sustainability objectives" (e.g. Intended outcomes and impacts that impact environmental, social or other sustainability aspects guaged through the tool)	Definition for sustainability now added
249	Accreditation bodies/CBs	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	Not very clear why scheme owner is defined as "organization", this may cause confusion as in many	Amended

				standard systems use the term "organization" to define certificate holders.	
258	Standards and standards-like	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	A definition for sustainability should be added.	Definition for sustainability now added
265	Standards and standards-like	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	Tool = I would include: tools that also collect data from producers in the field (like an App for example) and measure progress and improvment continuous	Re tools, need for examples noted for supporting materials.
275	Accreditation bodies/CBs	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	I suggest. responsible consumption circular economy	Terms not referenced specifically in the text therefore not added to the definitions
281	NGOs	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	Please also include "sustainability" and be clear, that it encompasses at least the 3 components of: social/human rights, ecology/biodiversity and economy/viability. Maybe add governance as a fourth aspect. It is important for the first principle. I somehow like, that the producers/producer groups fall under Businesses, since that is what they are. However, I would still separate users into: producers/producer groups as well as corporate businesses, otherwise it gives the notion of being very corporate business oriented	Definition for sustainability now added. Definition of user amended.
309	Standards and standards-like	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	Objectives' is used in project management in a very short term time span, immediate, measurable results rather than also taking on the meaning of the longer term results of Outcomes and Impacts	The usage here draws more on management system terminology where objectives do represent the longer-term goals.
338	Standards and standards-like	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	I think the word tool is increasingly used to refer to specific elements within systems - such as GIS tool; eco-calculator tool; scorecard tool; pesticide log; water budgeting etc etc…	Re tools, need for examples noted for supporting materials noted to avoid confusion.

367	Donors	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	As sustainability is one of the key terms and used as one of the principles but also for the definition of other terms, a definition of "sustainability" could be added. + The definition of "tool" to include "similar initiatives" like standards might not be clear enough for the (potential) user. In order to support the vision for the Principles to refer to wider range of "tools" there needs to be further clarity in that regard. Furthermore, the phrasing around the Principles should be adjusted accordingly and use either only "tool" or "tools like standards" or the like to ensure consistency (e.g. "Meassurable Progress" speaks of "… standard or tool …" as if these are different aspects).	Definition of sutainability added; re tools, need for examples noted for supporting materials noted to avoid confusion; Measurable progress amended.
396	NGOs	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	Impacts and outcomes need to be clearer distinguished, e.g.: Impacts: indirect effects related to strategy and environment Outcomes: direct effects of the system	Definition of impacts expanded to clarify
407	NGOs	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	Regarding the "Claim" definition - it is unclear here, is this a self-declaration? ISO clearly distinguishes claim from environmental label and ecolabel. Claim is self-declared, and label needs to be verified. The third party verification is an important part in avoiding greenwashing, so I would better divide these two options (verified and self-declared claims) Regarding the definition "organisation" - we have not only system owners, but also certification (verification) bodies, who can just do verification but not setting the standards. It is important to include them here, because they need to follow some of the principles in order the whole system work correctly.	The principles are intended to apply both to certification and a broader range of approaches/methodologies so the definition of claims is not restricted to those that are third-party verified. Truthfulness amended to make the intention clearer. Definitions of system and organisation amended to make the scope of responsibility clearer.

454	Standards and standards-like	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	ISO26000 defines stakeholders as: individual or group that has an interest in any decision or activity of an organization - should this definition not be taken into account in the credibility principles - even if not affected, views of (non affected) stakeholders is important - especially if they are key in making decision to support or not a scheme "System: The collective set of activities" - does it also include the governance structure? Using activities is very linked to the idea of concrete action when items like governance are less "active" but nonetheless important to be well designed and defined. It should also include all activities related to engagement (campaigning, recruiting new stakeholders, lobbying)	Definitions of stakeholder, system and organisation amended to make the scope of responsibility clearer.
481	Accreditation bodies/CBs	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	System: the organized and collective set of elements and/or interconnected activities that interact among themselves carried out by an organization to define a standard or similar tool; to measure, monitor, or verify performance or progress against this tool, in addition to allowing complaints.	Apologies, this was a translation error.
483	NGOs	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	Complaints, at least in Portuguese, don't make any sense and you can't understand them.	Apologies, this was a translation error.
491	Companies	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	1. Stakeholder is more about the interested party. 2. The definition of interested party/ stakeholder. The interested party,or stakeholder refers to the group or individual that experiences the impacts that standard-setting organizations' decisions or activities have on its interests in the supply chain, including production, service, business and trade, and logistics, and that may influence such decisions or activities.	Amended
513	Standards and standards-like	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	Disadvantaged Stakeholders. This is a somewhat strange concept – does this mean groups who do not meet the standard – disadvantaged relative to what? And what is to be done about it? How does this link to Added Value? Improvement work would fit in there – the question is, what are you doing for those that do not meet your standard (yet)?	See Stakeholder engagement for the intent.

514	Standards and standards-like	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	Impacts and outcomes definition depart from normal nomenclature in this area. I.e. outputs and outcomes are more commonly used and clearly different things.Why are impacts split in to direct and indirect, but not outcomes?Short, medium and long term are vague and difficult to apply in practice. Making them specific (e.g. defining them in months or years or whatever) would not help solve this.Suggest using outputs and outcomes and ditching long, medium and short term as concepts.	Definitions have been derived from those established in the Impacts Code (derived from the OECD glossary); do you have an alternative reference we could consider?
534	Consultants & researchers	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	In the definition of impacts, results and objectives are using tautological arguments. I suggest that they use definitions from, for example, the logical framework for the design of World Bank projects.	Definitions have been derived from those established in the Impacts Code (derived from the OECD glossary.)
545	Standards and standards-like	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	What do you incorporte into the organisational understanding of sustainability	Definition of sustainability added
577	Companies	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	In terms of cases, based on the Credibility Principles, we hope to see some comments and analysis of existing sustainability standards in the world. Thus, we can draw on these standards while formulating our own relevant standards. Besides, the definition of sustainability standard is expected to be clearer.	See the ISEAL Codes of Good Practice for technical requirements that support the implementation of the principles.
579		Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	Stakeholders: should also include the individuals or groups who will affect the decisions or activities of the organization?	Amended
580		Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	Claim: should also include the communication by consumers, news media, advertisers, and etc.?	The definition is intended to reflect the scope of control of the organisation so entirely external parties (e.g. journalists) are not included.
581		Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	Organization: the organization responsible for the system (Also known as scheme owner)?	Amended

623	Standards and standards-like	Definitions	Editorial (definitions)	Re definition of system & organisationWe need to be clear about the scope and boundaries. How do we think about the users and uptake? Whether the system is designed for uptake is critical – what does it change in the real world? We should be careful not to use system too narrowly. Maybe the answer is to make the definition of organisation better, more encompassing of the responsibilities of a scheme owner, e.g. "organisation responsible for the uptake, integrity and effectiveness of a system"	Amended
4	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (what's missing)	Has the reference to "people and the environment" been lost? Will this cause ISEAL to lose focus and its USP?	Definition of sustainability added for clarification
21	Accreditation bodies/CBs	Overall	Other (overlaps)	A little overlap is good to have, especially with regard to claims/truthfulness and impacts, but also ok for other aspects. Trying to eliminate all overlap would probably be a detraction overall.	Noted with thanks
22	Accreditation bodies/CBs	Overall	Other (general)	In addition to ISEAL Code compliance reviews there should be an overall assessment of a member's adherence to these high-line principles.	The intent is that future revisions of the Codes will more clearly link to the revised Credibility Principles as intended outcomes so that ISEAL Code compliance can be more clearly interpreted/understood at this more strategic level.
42	Consultants & researchers	Overall	Other (general)	nice job in keeping them highly relevant and usefully simple - my suggestions are monor but putting a bit of further clarity or teeth into such things may help get more out of them	Noted with thanks
56	Accreditation bodies/CBs	Overall	Other (what's missing)	- more focus on transparency and accessibility. as a users of standard and systems, often processes are not transparent if not to a small pool of stakeholders, access is ensured only to those "direct" stakeholders. - competence seems not addressed: organisation must ensure competence on the process and on the subject matter, it is extremely important to address this concept in one principle	Transparency and Added value amended. See also definition of competence added.

57	Accreditation bodies/CBs	Overall	Other (general)	more guide to the "identification of stakeholders". in the past we face situation where ISEAL recognized members did not apply a balanced approach to stakeholder engagement and consultation, prioritizing some categories. this situation affected transparency.	Please see the ISEAL Impacts and Standard-Setting Codes for more specific requirements. (Please note that concerns with implementation of existing Code requirements can be raised with ISEAL members or directly with ISEAL.)
67	Donors	Overall	Other (communications)	fewer principles would be easier to communicate	Noted - we had explored a number of options for simplifying more radically but it was felt that we would lose too much of the specificity that people also value. It is a difficult balance!
70	NGOs	Overall	Other (general)	I believe this principles are solid and its going to go a long way to supporting future systems.	Noted with thanks
89	Finance sector	Overall	Other (general)	Almost all standards address social and environmental issues; however, some of them have a weaker position on deforestation. It would be important for us that ISEAL evaluated standards based on this specific threat to our primary and secondary forests.	While ISEAL does undertake issue-focused work with members, the principles are intended to define credible practice while remaining content neutral (i.e. encompassing a range of strategies).
95	Finance sector	Overall	Other (what's missing)	Accountability	See amendments to Stakeholder engagement.
96	Finance sector	Overall	Other (general)	Encourage youngsters and gender equality	Noted for guidance to be developed (particularly re Stakeholder engagement.)
101	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (communications)	I think it is great that you have kept it so concise and in plain language.	Noted with thanks

105	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (general)	Some guidelines, template for each principle would be helpful for the small organisation like us. This would help to take up the credibility principles more accurately and effortlessly.	The intent is that future revisions of the Codes will more clearly link to the revised Credibility Principles as intended outcomes to support adoption of the Codes and so that ISEAL Code compliance can be more clearly interpreted/understood at this more strategic level.
111	Consultants & researchers	Overall	Other (general)	It may be helpful if different Guidance materials could be developed for different users eg Certification schemes, private companies and initiatives (eg jurisdictional or landscape).	Noted for future development
114	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (general)	I know this is part of the assurance code, but would you need to be more specific about the methodologies (e.g. data systems or 3rd party audits or other oversight) that enhances all of these credibility principles?	Noted for future guidance
117	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (communications)	perhaps reference to the market benefits of eco labeling	See amended Added value.
127	Government bodies	Overall	Other (general)	There might be benefit in identifying more clearly the targeted user of the principles (private sector, governments, standard organisations).	See amended definition of users.
128	Government bodies	Overall	Other (overlaps)	Accuracy vs. truthfulness.	See amendments that make the link more explicit.
134	Consultants & researchers	Overall	Other (what's missing)	A principle that calls for a proactive approach to correcting past injustice and places greater responsibility on those in more powerful positions to do so is needed. Perhaps another principle that favours smaller entities and keep growth/size in check is needed too.	See amendments to Sustainability impacts and Added value.

146	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (what's missing)	Independence	The principles are intended to apply to a broad range of approaches/methodologies and not only third-party certification. However, please review strengthened principles Impartiality, Accuracy and Truthfulness to see if this addresses some of the concern.
154	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (communications)	Maybe some sort of infographic to show interrelationships or benefits to stakeholders or relative importance would help communicate a lot of information in a more digestible (marketable) way.	Noted for development of supporting materials.
155	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (what's missing)	Potentially some sort of transparency about finances for the organizations and the systems? As noted in the survey, I think Accessibility is key (currently not very clearly deliniated within added value)	See amendments to Transparency and Added value.
156	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (communications)	Aside from notes, think there are some good revisions. Great work presenting all of the information in digestible way for clear and consistent feedback!	Noted with thanks
161	Companies	Overall	Other (what's missing)	It could be included under transparency or truthfulness...the importance of disclosing challenges in implementation and performance, or where negative impacts have occured.	There was been mixed feedback on this point as some have also pointed to the importance of allowing internal learnings without necessarily airing all "dirty laundry". Please do review amendments to Continual improvement and also the more explicit reference to the balance between confidentiality and transparency within the amended principle Transparency and share feedback on this approach.

183	Companies	Overall	Other (communications)	more link to existing good/best practices of European Accreditation recommendations and ISO norms related to verification (ISO-17021 / ISO-17065 norms)	The principles are intended to apply both to certification and a broader range of approaches/methodologies. References to ISO 17021 or 17065 would narrow the scope too much.
202	NGOs	Overall	Other (overlaps)	There is overlap that is inevitable as one principle is often reliant on another, or more, in order to be met (e.g. you can't have truthfulness without transparency; nor successful stakeholder engagement without impartiality). We recommend these reliance relationships within the principles should be made clear when further guidance (i.e., the "What this looks like in practice") is developed.	Noted as input for future guidance.
203	NGOs	Overall	Other (general)	While we understand the Credibility Principles are not normative references, however, there is a need to demonstrate to supporters and stakeholders how the Credibility Principles are working in practice – not just on paper. Right now, we have real concerns that ISEAL members are not fulfilling the principles - particularly engagement and transparency. Therefore, we recommend that ISEAL conducts its own monitoring and evaluation of members' adherence with the current Credibility Principles to determine its effectiveness in practice. Understanding the effectiveness of the Credibility Principles' current use would help inform how best to expand it to other sustainability tools and organizations, as well as identify potential new principle(s) and where further 'characteristics' and/or guidance is needed.	Please see also the ISEAL Codes of Good Practice for the specific requirements. (Please note that concerns with implementation of existing Code requirements can be raised with ISEAL members or directly with ISEAL.)

220	Government bodies	Overall	Other (overlaps)	Not necessarily a duplication but I guess "measurable progress" and "improvement" and also "collaboration" and "stakeholder engagement" are somewhat related. But I think they do work as separate principles. I also don't think combining accessibility and efficiency under the principle of added value works. Maybe they should be kept separate. Efficiency could possibly be added to Improvement. I prefer "relevant" information over "important" information.	See amendments to Added value and please do let us know if there are still concerns.
231	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (general)	To ensure they are covered in the Codes of Practice and the assessment spreadsheets, and to possibly 'tag' them in those, so that it is clear and obvious when and Credibility Principles are incorporated and being assessed.	The intent is that future revisions of the Codes will more clearly link to the revised Credibility Principles as intended outcomes to support adoption of the Codes and so that ISEAL Code compliance can be more clearly interpreted/understood at this more strategic level.
232	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (general)	Just to say that: 1. The principles are excellent driving forces and underpinning to a sustainability system 2. It is good and timely to have reviewed and consulted on them and 3.The consultation method (online questionnaire) and very clear reference and comparison of the changes made the process very simple, clear and efficient - thank you	Noted with thanks

242	Consultants & researchers	Overall	Other (what's missing)	Will the new version include guidance? The previous version consisted of the principle followed by some guidance on how to apply in practice. This seem very important to us, especially as your aim is to broaden the scope of users. New users might need this guidance.	The intent is to support the Credibility Principles with further communications materials (e.g., examples, case studies) and that future revisions of the Codes will more clearly link to the revised Credibility Principles as intended outcomes to support adoption of the Codes and so that ISEAL Code compliance can be more clearly interpreted/understood at this more strategic level.
247	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Editorial	In general: The revised version is written addressing "the organisation". I would prefer using "the scheme owner", as you also refer to as an alternative in the definitions.	Noted. This was discussed, but given that the intent is to show broader application and scheme owner is more associated with traditional certification schemes, organisation was retained.
248	Companies	Overall	Other (general)	Relevance and materiality? Aggregating relevance in sustainability impacts is OK, but this might be clearer that impacts are different from an organisation to another and that not a "one size fits all" to avoid non material impacts to be reported on and fade the power of the communication of progress	See amendments to Sustainability impacts.
262	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (overlaps)	Yes, but it is a good thing. It shows the importance of all of these principles, all mentioned topics are important to be included in the principles.	Noted
263	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (communications)	Adding more visuals, examples and case studies, digital templates (for blogs, social media etc., see Sustainable Development Goals)	Thank you - the intent is to support the Credibility Principles with further communications materials (e.g., examples, case studies.)

264	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (general)	To us, a link to ISO 14024 is important.	The principles are intended to apply both to certification and a broader range of approaches/methodologies.
274	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (communications)	Is not clear to me whether ISEAL principles have synergies with the UN SDGs? If so, it is important to make it clear in communications (website for example)	Noted for development of communications materials.
280	Accreditation bodies/CBs	Overall	Other (general)	Congratulations on this initiative	Thank you
303	NGOs	Overall	Other (what's missing)	Additional principle needed: Verifiability To verify all the ten principles. Describe what is needed to achieve verifiability, what are the tools to use? Tricky balance, not to make it a normative document/assessment tool.	The intent is that future revisions of the ISEAL Codes of Good Practice will more clearly link to the revised Credibility Principles as intended outcomes to support adoption of the Codes and so that ISEAL Code compliance can be more clearly interpreted/understood at this more strategic level.
304	NGOs	Overall	Other (overlaps)	- Collaboration and Stakeholder Engagement - Measurable Progress and Improvement	See amended principles where links are strengthened. Is this a concern?
305	NGOs	Overall	Other (communications)	We are considering to use them in the preamble of our contracts with corporate partners	Noted with thanks
306	NGOs	Overall	Other (general)	Thank you for guiding us very professionally through this important process to get to a widely recognized set of credibility principles!	Noted with thanks
323	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (communications)	To ensure standards are developed and are regularly reviewed and revised to reflect latest scientific research and current understanding of best practice	See amended Sustainability impacts and Continual improvement.

324	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (general)	If the ISEAL principles (requirements) apply broader there will be no-one offering confirmation of 'best practice' 'highest standards' ' credible and effective solutions'	The principles (and Codes) have been intended to define credible practice while remaining content neutral (i.e. encompassing a range of strategies whether these are low bar or high bar). The broader application intended in this revision relates to models and approaches rather than any change in ISEAL's approach to content neutrality.
337	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (what's missing)	there could be the addition of availability to ensure that standards don't become a 'gold standard' that is only attainable for a select few. For example, cost being a barrier so only the richer companies can access the scheme.	See amendments to Added value to make link to accessibility clearer.
347	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (general)	is there a reason why the principles are listed in the order they are? how about rearranging them to follow a bit more of the chronology of developing and operating systems? e.g sustainability impacts; Collaboration; stakeholder engagement; impartiality; truthfulness; added value; accuracy; transparency; measurable progress; improvement?	Principles have been partially reordered.
348	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (communications)	I think the words used here, including the principles themselves are quite dry and theoretical sounding. id support some efforts to see them switched up for communications material - for example: at ISEAL the tings we and our members value are..... or As an ISEAL member we - focus on sustainability impacts; collaborate; engage stateholders; ensure impartiality; etc etc - turning them into verbs and sense of doing - makes them more tangible and real somehow...	We had considered a first-person formulation which is powerful, but then decided that this could be less inclusive of the users of the principles that have been identified by stakeholders (e.g. in the context of establishing an approach to procurement).

349	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (communications)	well done on the update - overall more streamlined, easier to understand, a bit more felxibility in some which is helpful given the evolutions in what make systems effective...good job. I would like to see the language adjusted slightly in public facing / promotional material so that they land with more immediate and obvious impact and value with people.	Noted with thanks
364	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (overlaps)	Inevitably there are some overlaps, but no duplications which is more important.	Noted with thanks
365	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (communications)	When these are published, it would be useful to have available an infographic version that summarises the ten principles, with a longer document that goes into the detail. The infographic version would be used for clear, concise communication of the principles internally and externally.	Noted for development of communications materials.
366	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (general)	Overall significant improvements to the clarity of the principles - thank you for all the hard work that must have gone into this, and of course for the opportunity to feedback.	Noted with thanks
377	Donors	Overall	Other (overlaps)	There are certain overlaps, for instance, "measurable Progress" and "improvement". These principles however still complement each other well as both focus on two different important aspects.	Noted with thanks
395	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (general)	(1) The new principles seem to be more vaguely worded and thus, more open to interpretation. Perhaps more guidance or clear definitions is needed. (2) How will new principles affect the acceptance framework or schemes? Will it be made easier for other schemes who are doing less than what has been required of the current ISEAL member organisations?	The intent is that specific requirements remain identified in the Codes. And that future revisions of the ISEAL Codes of Good Practice more clearly link to the revised Credibility Principles so as to support adoption of the Codes and so that ISEAL Code compliance can be more clearly interpreted/understood at this more strategic level.
406	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (general)	really great principles! thank you	Noted with thanks

416	NGOs	Overall	Other (general)	I would look to the principles in the Guidelines for Providing Product Sustainability Information and check if all the principles that are mentioned there are studied and analysed for the possibility to be included into ISEAL principles. From my perspective, following the principle of collaboration, it is important that different Guidelines should complement each other. Principles from the UNEP Guidelines: Reliability, Relevance, Clarity, Transparency, Accessibility, Three dimensions of sustainability, BEHAVIOUR CHANGE AND LONGER TERM IMPACT, MULTI-CHANNEL AND INNOVATIVE APPROACH, COLLABORATION, COMPARABILITY. I think that most of the principles overcross, and this is good. Also I would check ISO 14024 principles and refer to them, too. It is important to collaborate and to be consistent.	Thank you. Yes, in the course of the review we have looked at necessary alignment with other similar efforts and we will look at this again.
417	NGOs	Overall	Other (overlaps)	Sustainability impacts and improvement. On the other hand, Added value should be divided from Accessibility. Maybe it is not very clear sometimes, who is the target group for each principle. Somewhere this is organisation-standard setter. Somewhere it is standard itself, somewhere - claim, somewhere - verifier. So I would clarify in the describtion of principles, who, what market players can use and follow these principles.	See amendments to clarify - has this been improved?
418	NGOs	Overall	Other (communicati ons)	I use them to develop the standrads in the ecolabelling program and believe, that ISO 14024 principles, this Principles and UNEP Guidelines should reflect the same ideas and be added value to each other and recognize each other. This also includes terms and definitions, it is important to have similar definitions from big policy makers and international organisations, such as ISO, GEN, ISEAL, UNEP to avoid misleading and misunderstanding among stakeholders.	Thank you. Yes, in the course of the review we have looked at necessary alignment with other similar efforts and we will look at this again.

419	NGOs	Overall	Other (what's missing)	Standards should reflect best performance in the product or service group. Life cycle perspective Requirements for verification bodies.	The principles (and Codes) have been intended to define credible practice while remaining content neutral (i.e. encompassing a range of strategies whether these are low bar or high bar). The broader application intended in this revision relates to models and approaches rather than any change in ISEAL's approach to content neutrality. Specific requirements are defined in the Codes. The Assurance Code does contain more detailed requirements regarding the relationship with certification/verification/conformity assessment bodies.
420	NGOs	Overall	Other (general)	I appreciate the work you are doing and wish more collaboration between the policy makers, and reflection of these principles in ISO standards.	Noted with thanks
443	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (communications)	The principles are quite theoretical, and especially for people who don't have much experience of "tools" and "systems", so we think it's valuable to have lots of examples of what the different principles means in practise.	Noted for development of communications materials
444	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Editorial	We think the suggested updates in general are good, but in a couple of cases (as specified earlier in the survey) we think that simplifications and generalisations have made principles less clear and credible.	See amendments to clarify and strenghten the principles - has this been improved?
453	Accreditation bodies/CBs	Overall	Other (general)	I would welcome further conversations on this topic	Noted with thanks

469	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (general)	Overall I think the criteria behave too much in a close bubble of scheme owners and their direct users - they don't seem to really engage with 2nd tier of stakeholders when in reality they might be the most important to engage with as their leverage power is important and they often decide of the future of a scheme. So scheme should include them in their stakeholders and we need to explore what they expect.	See amendments to Stakeholder engagement and Collaboration.
470	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (communications)	It has to become the "mantra" of all ISEAL members, repeated over and over as ISEAL's key differentiation point. ISEAL should also asks its members to report against these principles and be part of membership evaluation.	The intent is that specific requirements remain identified in the Codes. And that future revisions of the ISEAL Codes of Good Practice more clearly link to the revised Credibility Principles so as to support adoption of the Codes and so that ISEAL Code compliance can be more clearly interpreted/understood at this more strategic level.
480	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (general)	Overall I think the draft principles are clearer, more specific and concise and have replaced some of the vaguer concepts like efficiency and rigour with more targeted concepts.	Noted with thanks
490	NGOs	Overall	Other (what's missing)	include more complex application terms in the glossary or provide application examples	Noted for development of communications materials.
502	Companies	Overall	Other (what's missing)	It is recommended to add the principle of compliance and anti-bribery,as non-compliance and bribery are harmful for any system and the opearting environment in any country.	See the principle Impartiality. However, some of these specific examples are legal requirements that are beyond the scope of the principles and ISEAL's Codes (while certainly critical).

503	Companies	Overall	Other (communications)	I believe that, in addition to the Principles, the implementation guide or sample approaches also need to be in place for the use of the interested parties/ stakeholders, to prevent any difference in interpreting the Principles. Only in this way can the implementation be based on correct interpretation of the Principles, to enhance performance.	Noted for the development of communications materials. Also, to clarify: the intent is that specific requirements remain identified in the Codes. And that future revisions of the ISEAL Codes of Good Practice more clearly link to the revised Credibility Principles so as to support adoption of the Codes and so that ISEAL Code compliance can be more clearly interpreted/understood at this more strategic level.
504	Companies	Overall	Other (general)	There need to be more channels for exchanging and accessing information. People at grass-roots-level organizations need to be engaged in developing standards. The participants should not be limited to the industry or associations. More participants at the grass-roots level should be engaged. Don't underestimate their ability to develop standards. It's only that they don't have opportunities. Many standards are not up-to-date, because only so-called experts have been invited to engage in the development process.	See amended Stakeholder engagement.
510	Companies	Overall	Other (what's missing)	The mutual recognition between standards should be emphasized to reduce duplicated audits.	See amended Collaboration.

532	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (overlaps)	They do so by nature. I think I'd rather overlaps than gaps. I think that what is burdensome in practise regarding overlaps will become apparent when you set up the evaluation framework for this. You should definitely try to do that now, if you're not already. Maybe collaboration and stakeholder engagement have some redundancy.	Noted for Code revision. Also, to clarify: the intent is that specific requirements remain identified in the Codes. And that future revisions of the ISEAL Codes of Good Practice more clearly link to the revised Credibility Principles so as to support adoption of the Codes and so that ISEAL Code compliance can be more clearly interpreted/understood at this more strategic level.
533	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (communications)	I think this is on us to make better use of what ISEAL provide on this already.	Noted with thanks

				Generally, we feel that the newly presented CPs are weaker than the existing ones as there is less accountability on the organization itself. For example, "improvement" has lost the reference to "intended outcomes" as well as "benefit to people and the environment". We believe that is a real loss and has weakened the proposed new principle. The CPs "impartiality" and "stakeholder engagement" need to become much stronger, especially considering the input from the MSI report. Also, we are not unhappy with the current CPs and would, therefore, recommend no further dilution or other major changes. We advocate for credible, reliable, and trustworthy claims made by organizations that wish to be part of the ISEAL community and we feel this is not guaranteed with the current proposed list of CPs. See especially "sustainability impacts" and "measurable progress" as well as "improvement". We understand that this consultation is purely focussed on the identification of the CPs. For the next consultation round, we hope to see the complete document as well as a tracked changes version. This consultation only provided parts of version 1.0 which in our view does not represent a clear and transparent picture of the proposed changes.	Please review the amended principles (and definitions) and advise if further strengthening is still needed. The review did conclude that revision was needed, but we do want to retain the strengths of version 1. Also, to clarify: the intent is that illustrations or examples of the principles in practice are developed as communications materials that can remain more dynamic over time while specific requirements for implementation are defined in the Codes. Future revisions of the ISEAL Codes of Good Practice will more clearly link to the revised Credibility Principles so as to support adoption of the Codes and so that ISEAL Code compliance can be more clearly interpreted/understood at this more strategic level.
536	Accreditation bodies/CBs	Overall	Other (general)		
537	NGOs	Overall	Other (what's missing)	In general, I believe that apart from the 10 principles you have highlighted from Sustainability to Efficiency, you may like to consider at least 3 more significant issues that I have come across in most of the standard development and standard management exercises so far across Asia. They are: a) A transparent mechanism to demonstrate the business case for the producers & workers from the certification; b) Evaluation of the business model of the standard organisation and its potential conflict of interest with the most prominent clientsc) Inclusivity: In the standard	See amendments to Added value, Impartiality, and Stakeholder engagement.

				governance system and in the standard itself. More so, in today's world and what is happening in the USA.	
538	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Technical (future trends)	I have been thinking about innovation trends as I consider the credibility principles. We have been thinking a lot about social justice, racial inequality and access to healthy food with the Black Lives Matter movement and the inequalities that were highlighted through Covid in the US. Many of these issues are being discussed and tackled at the local community level. We talk about local vs. landscape, and I think we sometimes think about change being mandated by some larger entity with deep pockets. I am now thinking of future proofing to include broadening my thinking of how stakeholders may define sustainability in the future, how supply chains may change, where and how change occurs, and how the principles might add value to small organizations poised to become mid-sized organizations as well as the current players. Perhaps smaller, more local entities have perceived credibility by virtue of being local? https://sustainablebrands.com/read/walking-the-talk/research-shows-business-imperative-for-authentic-action-to-address-social-injustices?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl_200625	See amendments to Stakeholder engagement.

539	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (communications)	Meant to say I really like the changes - some subtle but important subtleties for reasons I mention in the survey.Good jobHappy to discuss the points I made about how wording might be tweaked to give them real impact in public facing / comms outputs - I suggested a few ideas in the survey on how to develop them into verbs for promotional materials - like "We collaborate"; "We focus on real sustainability impacts" etc etc. I'd really like to see ISEAL's next generation of core documents have a powerful external presence (without departing from the substance)	Thank you and noted for the development of communications materials.
540	NGOs	Overall	Other (what's missing)	Another important part is to have clear approach to handle conflicts and crisis.	See amendments to Stakeholder engagement.
548	Consultants & researchers	Overall	Other (general)	Do you intend to address sustainable supply by means of plant selection and cultivation?	This is a level of detail that is not in scope of the principles. The principles (and ISEAL's Codes) have been intended to define credible practice while remaining content neutral (i.e. encompassing a range of strategies whether these are low bar or high bar). The broader application intended in this revision relates to models and approaches rather than any change in ISEAL's approach to content neutrality.
551	Consultants & researchers	Overall	Other (general)	Can we have the evaluation of ISEAL members ? And/or operationnal quantified requirements and operational criteria requested from the labels	The ISEAL Codes of Good Practice define the operational requirements.

552	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (general)	in terms of smallholder, especially those from developing countries, is it real that you can expect to apply globally consistent standards to them?	See Sustainability impacts for the question of local adaptation and Stakeholder engagement for references to disadvantaged stakeholders.
553	NGOs	Overall	Other (general)	How about the long sustainability of private standards ? It mostly donor driven for small scale farmers, can it be scaled up considering the cost?	See added value for references to uptake.
555	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Technical (future trends)	From my observation, the role and power of major retailers and cooperation betwen them is increasingly important which results in many sustainability criteria being defined by retailers. The consequence is that the space for sustainability standards systems to be influential is much less than it was in the past.	See amended Stakeholder engagement.
559	Consultants & researchers	Overall	Editorial	I really appreciated the revisions as a whole especially the more inclusive language that signal that the principles apply to a wider range of tools. I would be careful in shortening text too much from an impetus to streamline and make it more generalisable as I found that some of the language in the original principles was quite helpful and explicit in spelling out what was meant was now being made more general and less helpful.	Noted with thanks
564	Consultants & researchers	Overall	Other (general)	I'm supportive of the ambition of this version of the principles and their scope but I think there is a risk that if they become too broad that they might also become more ambiguous and lack precision and open up too much room for interpretation and reduce their effectiveness to steer institutional design choices.	Noted. To clarify: the intent is that specific requirements remain identified in the Codes. And that future revisions of the ISEAL Codes of Good Practice more clearly link to the revised Credibility Principles so as to support adoption of the Codes and so that ISEAL Code compliance can be more clearly interpreted/understood at this more strategic level.

566	Consultants & researchers	Overall	Other (what's missing)	1. The Principles should address the alignment of standards, because an increasing number of standards will result in an increasing number of problems related to standard application. 2. The Principles should focus on the actual effectiveness of standards. 3. ISEAL Credibility Principles should focus on solving core problems.	See amendments overall as these points should be clearer. See particularly Collaboration for explicit reference to alignment between standards
568	Companies	Overall	Other (what's missing)	"Adaptability " should also include standard localization and reflection of local circumstances.	See Sustainability impacts.
575	Companies	Overall	Other (general)	1. The Principles should embody how they encourage certification systems to solve existing environmental and social problems, and how they encourage brands to undertake responsibilities. 2. The Principles should encourage certification systems to certify the small-group users (e.g. smallholders) that are difficult to certify, but not merely focus on large enterprises that are easy to certify. Otherwise, smallholders could not be certified for ever, and will be eliminated by their respective industries.	See more explicit framing for Added value.
578		Overall	Editorial	The Chinese term "用户" is not accurate for the English term "user", and is recommended to be revised as "使用方/者" (which literally means the party/ person who uses);	Thank you
582		Overall	Other (general)	ISEAL Credibility Principles should be able to help promote the mutual recognition and coordination of different standards, and can help the relevant organizations in China to formulate national or local standards and guides.	Thank you. Noted for development of communications materials.
583		Overall	Editorial	The Chinese translation needs to be further improved.	Thank you, noted for v1.2
584		Overall	Other (general)	One issue that was raised with respect to the Credibility Principles is the fact that there are currently three projects on how to create credible consumer information: the Guidelines [Efficacy of Voluntary Sustainability Standards in Providing Product Sustainability Information to Consumers Post-COVID-19], ISEAL's Credibility Principles and the ISO	Thank you, we have reviewed similar efforts in order to establish alignment where possible and will do so again.

					guidance. These projects should be aligned to be most effective.	
585	NGOs		Overall	Other (general)	Traceability, how do we ensure accountability in traceability?	See amended Truthfulness.
586	NGOs		Overall	Other (what's missing)	Guidance is available but there should be a checklist and Indicators available for each Principle. Principles need to be verified, Room for verifiability as cross cutting factor.	Noted for Code revision. Also, to clarify: the intent is that specific requirements remain identified in the Codes. And that future revisions of the ISEAL Codes of Good Practice more clearly link to the revised Credibility Principles so as to support adoption of the Codes and so that ISEAL Code compliance can be more clearly interpreted/understood at this more strategic level.
609			Overall	Other (what's missing)	Will there be guidelines / examples (experience with Guidelines for Providing Product Sustainability Information, good practices and examples were included and it was useful)?	To clarify: the intent is that specific requirements remain identified in the Codes. And that future revisions of the ISEAL Codes of Good Practice more clearly link to the revised Credibility Principles so as to support adoption of the Codes and so that ISEAL Code compliance can be more clearly interpreted/understood at this more strategic level.

612		Overall	Other (what's missing)	The word "scale" - how do we know that sustainability is making it through the supply chain. – visibility of the supply chain. Is this embedded in one of the principles?	Scale is not explicitly introduced, but the principles of Collaboration and Added value have been amended to make the connection of these principles to systemic change and uptake clearer.
613		Overall	Other (what's missing)	Broad descriptions of the principles - how do you get into the details? Need more precise guidelines	To clarify: the intent is that specific requirements remain identified in the Codes. And that future revisions of the ISEAL Codes of Good Practice more clearly link to the revised Credibility Principles so as to support adoption of the Codes and so that ISEAL Code compliance can be more clearly interpreted/understood at this more strategic level.
614		Overall	Other (what's missing)	Giving feedback to stakeholders (perhaps it's included in engagement?). Efficiency needs to be covered. It is good to engage and collaborate - but needs to be room for giving feedback.	See amended Stakeholder engagement.
615	Government bodies	Overall	Other (what's missing)	prioritisation of different principles to different types of initiatives. Are there specific instructions for different types of users? Actions to take them on board?	Noted for development of guidance materials. Also, to clarify, the intent is that specific requirements remain identified in the Codes. And that future revisions of the ISEAL Codes of Good Practice more clearly link to the revised Credibility Principles so as to support adoption of the Codes and so that ISEAL Code compliance can be more clearly interpreted/understood at this more strategic level.

621	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Other (general)	The principles are a useful reference to support stakeholder discussion. They were too tightly defined previously and generally the revision is going in a good direction.	Noted with thanks
622	Standards and standards-like	Overall	Technical (general)	Re sustainability impacts, measurable progress & improvement – feedback focused primarily on the role of remediation: Does appreciate the more positive framing, and the focus on improvement is clearer. It does seem that the principles are repositioned, but perhaps we've overshot this somewhat: we could give more weight to eliminating bad practices. Perhaps remediation needs to move from measurable progress to impacts. This would more clearly situation remediation at the heart of system design. Remediation is no longer sufficient but will remain a necessary condition for success. Remediation and prevention is also the clearest argument for using an independent system.	See amended Sustainability impacts.