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The Sustainability Reporting Standards Board (SRSB) is authorized by its *Terms of Reference* to develop and issue authoritative pronouncements. The term ‘authoritative pronouncements’ includes: Sustainability Reporting Standards (SRSs), related interpretations and guidance and FAQs. Authoritative pronouncements are to be developed and issued in the public interest and according to due process as defined in this protocol.

All references to ‘due process’ in this document refer exclusively to the requirements defined by this protocol.

In developing its authoritative pronouncements, the SRSB follows the due process and working procedures described below.

The development process of SRSs is divided in the following steps:

- Project Identification and Prioritization
- Project Commencement
- Development of Proposed SRSs
- Interaction with the GRI Board and Stakeholder Council
- Public Exposure
- Consideration of Respondents’ Comments on an Exposure Draft
- Approval of an SRS, and Consideration of the Need for Re-Exposure
- Release of a Final SRS

These steps are explained in more detail below. Furthermore, the Due Process Protocol includes clarifying remarks on:

- General Procedures of the Due Process
- Withdrawal of an SRS
- Matters of Due Process (Ref: Paras. 31 and 32)

Matters of due process are identified in Fundamental Principles I and II and in paragraphs 1–32 of this document. Final SRSs may be issued by the SRSB only after the Due Process Oversight Committee (DPOC) is satisfied that due process has been followed in their development in the public interest. In accordance with its *Terms of Reference*, the DPOC is bound to provide independent and timely advice.

Working procedures, shown in a separate section of this document, are steps applied by the SRSB to facilitate the operation of its due process but do not themselves form part of the due process. Working Procedures may be modified in practice to suit circumstances.
DUE PROCESS

Fundamental Principles

The work of the SRSB is to be undertaken solely for a purpose and in a manner that:

I. Complements the GRI’s Vision and Mission as approved by the Board of the GRI.

II. Promotes the Public Interest; defined here as:

*Those overarching interests of humanity, held in common, that include but exceed the partial interests of individuals or groups.*

In the context of sustainability reporting, the Public Interest includes a general interest in:

- making well-informed decisions – and therefore in having easy and timely access to relevant and reliable information on which such decisions might be based,
- sustaining healthy economic, environmental and social systems on which human flourishing ultimately depends,
- being neither overlooked nor marginalized – especially if relatively weak in comparison to others,
- the transparency, fairness and integrity of processes that affect the public domain.

General

1. SRSB meetings to discuss the development and to approve the issuance of SRSs are open to the public – either in person or via electronic means as determined by the SRSB. Additionally, up to three representatives of the GRI Board or Stakeholder Council may attend meetings of the SRSB as observers. Observers do not have a seat at the SRSB table and may not participate in the business of the SRSB. Matters of a general administrative nature or with privacy implications may be dealt with in closed sessions of the SRSB. (Ref: Para. A1)

2. Meeting agenda papers, including issues papers and draft SRSs prepared for the SRSB’s review and debate and minutes of the immediately preceding meeting of the SRSB, are to be published in English on the SRSB website in advance of each SRSB meeting. (Ref: Para. A2-A5)

3. Meetings are to be conducted in English, which is the official working language of the GRI.

Project Identification and Prioritization

4. The SRSB identifies potential new projects based on:

   a. a review of national and international developments,
   b. comments and suggestions received from the GRI Board of Directors (as advised by the GRI Stakeholder Council) and
c. from those who have an interest in the development of SRSs issued by the SRSB.

5. To facilitate this process, the SRSB periodically develops and approves a strategy and work program. In developing its strategy and work program, the SRSB shall have regard to s. 12 of this protocol. (Ref: Para. A6-A8).

Project Commencement

6. A proposal to start a new project is to be prepared by the Standards Department based on research and on appropriate consultation within the SRSB – and then present its project proposal to the SRSB for it to approve, amend or reject. The draft project proposal is to be circulated to the GRI Board and SC to identify matters of possible relevance to the project. The SRSB shall receive and consider the comments of the GRI Board (as advised by the Stakeholder Council); however it is the sole responsibility of the SRSB to determine and prioritize the project proposal having regard to the overriding importance of serving the public interest. The SRSB is to approve, amend or reject the Standard Department’s project proposal in a meeting open to the public. (Ref: Para. A9-A10)

Development of Proposed SRSs and formation of Project Working Groups

7. The SRSB may assign responsibility for the development of a project to a multi-stakeholder Project Working Group (PWG). Members of a PWG are to be instructed by the SRSB that they shall act in an individual capacity, exclusively in the public interest and according to due process as defined in this protocol. (Ref: Para. A11-A19)

8. Where a PWG is established, its membership shall reflect the balance of multi-stakeholder constituencies on which the membership of the SRSB is based – as defined in the SRSB Terms of Reference. As a minimum, each PWG shall have at least one person drawn from each of the constituencies on which the membership of the SRSB is based – as defined in the SRSB Terms of Reference. The work of a PWG will not be overthrown if, for some valid reason, the SRSB is unable to achieve the ideal multi-stakeholder composition.

9. The SRSB shall determine whether to hold a public forum or roundtable, or issue a consultation paper, in order to solicit views on a project under consideration. The SRSB shall also consider the appropriateness of conducting a field test of the application of its proposals for a new or revised SRS either prior to or after a draft SRS being issued for public exposure. The rationale for the SRSB’s decision in relation to these steps shall be discussed at a SRSB meeting and the decision shall be minuted and published. Comments received through a public forum or roundtable, or in response to the issue of a consultation paper, are to be considered in the same manner as comments received on an exposure draft. (Ref: Para. A20-A21)

10. A PWG should report to the SRSB and seek guidance whenever it requires further advice in order to advance the project or where its members cannot reach consensus. When a PWG is satisfied that it has a proposed draft SRS that is ready for exposure, it presents the draft to the SRSB. The SRSB shall review the draft and, if considered necessary, may ask the PWG to conduct further research and or further develop the draft prior to it being voted on, by the SRSB, for exposure. (Ref: Para. A22)
11. The SRSB shall vote on the approval of an exposure draft of the proposed SRS in accordance with the SRSB's Terms of Reference. When a member of the SRSB votes in favor of the release of an exposure draft, the member is confirming that he or she is satisfied that the draft would form an acceptable SRS in the event that no comments were to be received on exposure of a kind that would require the SRSB to amend the proposals. (Ref: Para. A23)

Interaction with the GRI Board and Stakeholder Council

12. The SRSB shall seek the views of the GRI Board (as advised by the Stakeholder Council) on the identification and prioritization of projects to be undertaken by the SRSB. The process for seeking these views shall be as agreed by the SRSB and GRI Board. In particular, the GRI Board (as advised by the Stakeholder Council) is invited to comment on the SRSB's strategy and work program, including project priorities and any changes therein, to help establish their appropriateness. Where the GRI Board (as advised by the Stakeholder Council) has recommended a project for consideration by the SRSB, the Chair of the SRSB informs the DPOC and the Chairman of the GRI Board of the decisions of the SRSB concerning the GRI Board’s recommendation.

13. The SRSB shall seek comment from the GRI Board (as advised by the Stakeholder Council) during the development and finalization of an SRS in relation to:
   • Proposals to start new projects;
   • Significant issues relating to the development of an SRS; and
   • Significant issues raised in comment letters on exposure drafts and the SRSB’s related response.
   The views of the GRI Board (as advised by the Stakeholder Council) are to be sought and considered, but are not binding on the SRSB.

14. The Chair of the SRSB is responsible for bringing to the SRSB's attention significant comments received from the GRI Board (as advised by the Stakeholder Council). The SRSB shall consider (but is not bound by) comments received from the GRI Board. As in all other matters, the SRSB shall decide each matter independently, in the public interest, according to due process.

Public Exposure

15. Approved draft SRSs are to be exposed for public comment. Exposure drafts are to be placed on the SRSB website where they can be accessed free of charge by the general public. Each exposure draft is to be accompanied by an explanatory memorandum that highlights the objective(s) of and the significant proposals contained within the draft SRS, as well as the SRSB's view on the main issues addressed in the development thereof. (Ref: Para. A24-A25)

16. The exposure period will ordinarily be no shorter than 60 days – and for as long as deemed appropriate by the SRSB. (Ref: Para. A26-A27)

17. Comments made by respondents to an exposure draft are a matter of public record and are posted on the SRSB website after the end of the exposure period. (Ref: Para. A28-A30)
Consideration of Respondents’ Comments on an Exposure Draft

18. To facilitate the deliberative process, the PWG is to provide the SRSB, as part of the SRSB’s public agenda papers, with an analysis that summarizes the significant issues raised by respondents, outlines their proposed disposition and, as appropriate, explains the reason(s) why significant changes recommended by a respondent(s) are, or are not, to be accepted. PWG’s will be responsible for identifying what, in their opinion, constitutes a ‘significant change’ to the content of an exposure draft. (Ref: Para. A31-A32)

19. Members of the SRSB are to familiarize themselves with the issues raised in comment letters on exposure drafts such that they are able to make well-informed decisions as they finalize an SRS. The SRSB is to deliberate on significant matters raised in the comment letters received, with significant decisions recorded in the minutes of the meeting of the SRSB. (Ref: Para. A33-A34)

20. At the meeting in which the SRSB deliberates on significant matters raised in the comment letters received, members of the SRSB are to be asked whether there are any issues raised by respondents, in addition to those issues summarized by the PWG, that they consider should be discussed by the SRSB. This does not preclude a member of the SRSB from raising a matter for discussion at a later time.

Approval of an SRS, and Consideration of the Need for Re-Exposure

21. When a PWG is satisfied that it has a proposed final SRS that is ready for approval, it is to present the revised content of the exposed SRS to the SRSB for approval. The SRSB shall review the draft and, if considered necessary, may ask the PWG further to develop the draft prior to it being voted on, by the SRSB. In determining whether or not it is considered necessary for a PWG to undertake further work, the SRSB shall have regard to the following factors:

- Whether or not the proposed final SRS gives effect to the fundamental principles defined in this document.
- The likelihood of the relevant PWG reaching a conclusion that is different to that originally reported to the SRSB.
- The cost/benefit of making a further referral to the relevant PWG.

22. The work of the SRSB will be undertaken principally with the support of the Standard Department. The Standard Department will report to and work under the direction of the SRSB and in accordance with the due process. The Head of the Standard Department shall attend the meetings of, but is not be a member of, the SRSB. The Head of the Standard Department is responsible for advising the SRSB on whether due process has been followed and with proper regard for the public interest, before a final SRS may be approved for issue. (Ref: Para. A35-A36)

23. The SRSB is to vote on the approval of the final revised content of an exposed SRS in accordance with its terms of reference. Approval of the final revised content of an exposed SRS is an approval for its issue as a final SRS, unless the SRSB subsequently votes in favor of re-exposure as described below. (Ref: Para. A37-A38)

24. After approving the final revised content of an exposed SRS, the SRSB shall vote on whether there has been substantial change to the exposed document such that a re-exposure is necessary. An affirmative vote in accordance with the SRSB's Terms of Reference for re-
exposure is necessary if an exposed document is to be re-exposed. The basis of the SRSB's decision with respect to re-exposure is to be recorded in the minutes of the SRSB meeting at which the related project is discussed. (Ref: Para. A39-A41)

25. When an exposed document is re-exposed, the explanatory memorandum accompanying the re-exposure draft shall include the reasoning for re-exposure and sufficient information to allow an understanding of the changes made as a result of the earlier exposure.

26. Where applicable, the SRSB shall set an effective date for the application of the final SRS. (Ref: Para. A42)

27. For each final SRS, the Standards Department shall issue a separate document explaining its basis for conclusions including its consideration of and response to comments received on an exposure draft. (Ref: Para. A43)

Withdrawal of an SRS

28. The SRSB shall vote on the withdrawal of an SRS, whether that withdrawal is due to the issue of a new or a revised SRS that incorporates or replaces the subject matter of an existing SRS or for any other reason, in accordance with the SRSB's Terms of Reference.

Release of a Final SRS

29. The Chair of the SRSB shall be responsible to the DPOC for reporting that due process has been followed in the development of the final SRS. The Chairs of any PWGs are responsible for advising the DPOC on whether, in their opinion, due process has been followed effectively in relation to each PWG's involvement in the development of the final SRS. (Ref: Para. A44)

30. Before release of a final SRS, the Chair of the SRSB shall obtain the conclusion of the DPOC as to whether due process has been followed. This process may involve the SRSB taking further appropriate steps should the DPOC express a concern or a negative conclusion about whether due process has been followed. (Ref: Para. A45)

Matters of Due Process

31. If a concern over adherence to due process is raised formally with the SRSB (other than an issue that is clearly frivolous or vexatious), whether by a third party or otherwise, the SRSB shall assess the concern and seek an appropriate resolution. The SRSB's decision on the matter is to be communicated to the party raising the concern. If the SRSB is unable to achieve a mutually satisfactory resolution of the concern, then the complainant may request that the concern be assessed by the DPOC directly. In any case, alleged breaches of due process and the resolution thereof are to be communicated by the SRSB to the DPOC. The results of investigations of alleged breaches of due process are to be reported by the Chair at a meeting of the SRSB that is open to the public. (Ref: Para. A46-A48)

32. The steps relating to contact between the SRSB and DPOC as specified in this Protocol are the minimum required in order to ensure adherence to Due Process. The SRSB and DPOC may agree additional steps – allowing for more regular reviews of due process in the development of any SRS or more generally to improve communication and coordination during the process. The details of any additional steps agreed by the SRSB and DPOC shall be published on the SRSB website prior to their being instituted.
WORKING PROCEDURES

General

SRSB Meetings (Ref: Para. 1)

A1. The SRSB meetings are to be recorded and archived on the SRSB website.

Meeting Agenda Papers (Ref: Para. 2)

A2. Meeting agenda papers are to be published on the SRSB website ordinarily no later than two weeks in advance of each SRSB meeting. Draft meeting minutes are to be published on the SRSB website ordinarily within three weeks after each SRSB meeting.

A3. The Appendix of this document lists the unique titles for common SRSB documents at various stages of due process.

A4. Agenda papers are to be retained on the SRSB website for at least three years from the date of the meeting. Final minutes are to be retained on the SRSB website indefinitely.

A5. Updated project summaries and meeting highlights are to be posted to the SRSB website after each meeting.

Project Identification and Prioritization (Ref: Para. 4)

A6. The SRSB’s strategy review shall involve a formal survey of those whom it deems to be key stakeholders in order to obtain views about issues that they believe should be addressed by the SRSB in the immediate future.

A7. The development of the SRSB’s strategy and work program shall include the issue of a consultation paper for public comment, placed on the SRSB website where it can be accessed free of charge by the general public, for ordinarily no less than 90 days. The SRSB shall consider the results of the public consultation in formulating, as necessary, a revised strategy and work program.

A8. The SRSB’s strategy reviews and consultations are not anticipated to be an annual process.

Project Commencement

Project Proposals (Ref: Para. 6)

A9. The SRSB may, for its convenience, appoint a Steering Committee from among its members to make an initial assessment of project proposals. Where the SRSB has a Steering Committee (or equivalent), a proposal to start a new project is to be first considered by the Steering Committee (or equivalent). As appropriate, the Steering Committee (or equivalent) is to recommend to the SRSB either that a project proposal be approved or that no new project be initiated at that time. A project proposal shall identify, where applicable, who has first proposed a project for development by the Standards Department and submission to the SRSB for its consideration.

A10. Project proposals shall identify the objectives of the proposed project and explain how achievement of those objectives would serve the public interest. SRSB members, the GRI Board and SC and others interested in the development of the proposed pronouncement are thereby provided with a benchmark against which the project can be measured.
Development of Proposed SRSs and formation of Project Working Groups

Multi-stakeholder Project Working Group (Ref: Para. 7)

A11. A project proposal shall include details of any proposed assignment of responsibility for the project to a PWG. The proposal shall identify, where appropriate, specific areas of expertise or geographical representation that may be needed on the PWG. A PWG can only be established with the approval of the SRSB.

A12. The principal criterion for selecting PWG members shall be identification of the best persons for the job. In making a selection of participants, criteria will include: relevant knowledge, relevant experience and availability to perform the role.

A13. A PWG is usually to be chaired by a member of the SRSB – and may include other members of the SRSB. The Head of the Standard Department, in consultation with the members of the SRSB, is to determine the composition of the PWG. PWGs may contain participants, such as external experts, who are not members of the SRSB but who have experience relevant to the subject matter. Subject to the availability of competent individuals, a PWG shall contain at least one representative from each of the constituencies that make up the GRI Stakeholder Council. The SRSB shall be the sole judge of what constitutes ‘competence’ for appointment to a PWG.

A14. Where a PWG is established, ideally a minimum of one third and up to one half of its members may be drawn from the membership of the GRI Stakeholder Council (SC) – with expressions of interest being sought from each member of the GRI Stakeholder Council whenever a PWG is to be established. An SC member may only serve on a PWG in their individual capacity – and not as a representative of the SC. In selecting members from the SC for a particular Project Working Group, due consideration shall be given to the particular competence and experience required for the topic addressed by the Project Working Group. The work of a PWG shall not be invalidated by its inability at any time to achieve the ideal number of SC members.

A15. Members of a PWG are to be identified in the project summaries contained on the SRSB website and in the relevant project agenda papers for a SRSB meeting.

A16. PWG meetings are not open to the public.

A17. A PWG is to identify issues, and propose recommendations, relevant to the development of the proposed SRS on which SRSB input is appropriate. These papers, which are ordinarily accompanied by a draft version of the proposed pronouncement, are to be developed based on research and consultation, which may include: conducting research; consulting with the SRSB or the GRI Board (as advised by the Stakeholder Council), practitioners, regulators, national standard setters and other interested parties.

A18. The papers submitted by the PWG to the SRSB shall include confirmation that no other significant matters were discussed and agreed by the PWG, in particular in regard to a decision to exclude a significant matter from the proposed draft pronouncement.

A19. The SRSB may carry out projects in cooperation, or conduct projects jointly, with a national standard setter(s) or other organizations with relevant expertise. In the case where a
project is to be conducted jointly\(^1\), a member of the SRSB is to chair, or co-chair, any joint
PWG that might be established. Where practicable, joint projects are to be conducted on a
multi-national basis whereby two or more national standard setters or national
organizations are involved in the joint project.

Public Forum or Roundtable, or Consultation Paper (Ref: Para. 9)
A20. In deciding upon the need to hold a public forum or roundtable or to issue a consultation
paper, the SRSB shall consider whether the subject of the SRS, the level of interest among
stakeholders, the likely or actual existence of a significant and controversial divergence of
views, the need for additional information in order to further the SRSB's deliberative
process, or some other reason indicates that wider or further consultation would be
appropriate.
A21. The outcome(s) of a public forum or roundtable, or the issue of a consultation paper, is to
be summarized and reported to the SRSB, as part of the SRSB's public agenda papers, for
purposes of the SRSB's deliberation on the subject under consideration.

Proposed Draft SRS (Ref: Para. 10)
A22. The SRSB has a responsibility to be sensitive to any issues that might have an adverse
impact on the GRI as a whole. In order to assist the SRSB to discharge this responsibility, a
PWG is to raise proactively with the SRSB any issue that may have implications for the GRI
as a whole. The SRSB shall seek comment on such matters from the GRI Board (as advised
by the Stakeholder Council).

Approval of Draft SRS (Ref: Para. 11)
A23. Where applicable, the SRSB is to set a proposed effective date for the application of the
pronouncement as part of the exposure draft.

Public Exposure
Exposure Drafts (Ref: Para. 15)
A24. Notice of the issuance of exposure drafts is to be widely distributed to: regulatory bodies
deemed by the SRSB to have a relevant interest; organizations that have registered or are
likely to have an interest in the pronouncements issued by the SRSB; GRI Organizational
Stakeholders; and relevant sections of the media. The SRSB is to consider and decide
whether there are any additional broad stakeholder groups to whose attention a proposed
pronouncement should be drawn.
A25. An explanatory memorandum may also direct respondents, including those representing
specific constituencies such as developing nations, small and medium-sized reporters or

\(^1\) Joint projects are subject to the due process of the SRSB. If exposed separately both globally and by
the national standard setter(s) with whom the project is being jointly developed, and where
applicable, SRSB may additionally have regard to comments received by the national standard
setter(s), where they may be relevant globally, and to the extent the process does not result in
unnecessary delay in the finalization of the pronouncement. The final pronouncement approved by
SRSB becomes a final SRS in the normal way. It may differ from the corresponding document(s), if any,
approved by the collaborating national standard setter(s).
the public sector, to aspects of the draft SRS on which specific comments are sought.

**Exposure Period** (Ref: Para. 16)

A26. Although the exposure period for a draft SRS will ordinarily be no shorter than 90 days, a shorter or longer exposure period may be set when considered appropriate. A longer exposure period may be set, for example, where complex or pervasive changes might affect translation or in order to make wider consultation possible. A shorter exposure period may be set, for example, where in the public interest there is a need to conclude deliberation on a matter more quickly, the exposure draft is relatively simple or short, or where the SRSB decides to re-expose all or only part of a draft SRS.

A27. Exposure drafts are to indicate that the SRSB cannot undertake to consider comments and suggestions received after the close of the exposure period.

**Comments Received** (Ref: Para. 17)

A28. An acknowledgement of receipt is to be sent to every respondent to an exposure draft.

A29. SRSB members, and PWG members, who are not members of the SRSB, are to be notified when comment letters have been made available on the SRSB website.

A30. The exposure draft and comment letters are to be made available for the reference purpose of SRSB members at the SRSB meeting in which the project is scheduled for discussion.

**Consideration of Respondents’ Comments on an Exposure Draft**

**Comments Received on Exposure** (Ref: Para. 18)

A31. The comments and suggestions received within the exposure period are to be read and considered by a PWG – if established by the SRSB.

A32. Project agenda papers are to contain a cumulative summary of the significant decisions made by the SRSB on matters relating to the project, including its position on the significant issues raised in comment letters.

**Deliberation of Significant Matters** (Ref: Para. 19)

A33. Neither the SRSB nor a PWG is to enter into debate with respondents on individual comment letters. The SRSB or a PWG may decide, however, to discuss a letter of comment with the respondent to seek clarification on a matter.

A34. If requested, the SRSB will explain to the GRI Board (as advised by the Stakeholder Council) its reason(s) for not having accepted their comments or proposals. The nature and outcome of such discussions are to be reported and recorded in the minutes of the SRSB meeting at which the related project is discussed.

**Approval of a Pronouncement and Consideration of the Need for Re-Exposure**

**Adherence to Due Process** (Ref: Para. 22)

A35. The Head of the Standard Department is to provide a written report in the agenda papers of the meeting outlining the basis for concluding whether due process has been followed with respect to actions up to the date of the meeting.

A36. The Chair of the SRSB is also to report to the SRSB on whether or not due process has been
followed during the meeting at which a final SRS is approved for issuance. The substance of this report is to be recorded in the minutes.

Approval (Ref: Para. 23)

A37. The results of voting, including dissenting votes and abstentions – and the reason(s) therefore, on the approval of the revised content of an exposure draft are to be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

A38. The agenda paper containing the draft proposed revised content of exposed SRS is to be updated for changes agreed by the SRSB during the course of the meeting and is to be posted to the SRSB website after the meeting at which the SRSB is to approve the final SRS. The updated agenda paper posted to the SRSB website is for information purposes only and is not the final pronouncement. The final pronouncement is that approved by the SRSB after the DPOC has confirmed that due process was followed in its development.

Re-Exposure (Ref: Para. 24)

A39. When an exposure draft has been subject to many changes, a summary comparative analysis is to be presented to the SRSB. This analysis is to show, to the extent practicable, the differences between the exposure draft and the proposed final SRS.

A40. The Head of the Standard Department, in consultation with the Chair of the SRSB and chair of any PWG, are to advise the SRSB on whether a draft SRS, or part thereof, needs to be re-exposed.

A41. Situations that constitute potential grounds for a decision to re-expose may include, for example: substantial change to a proposal arising from matters not aired in the exposure draft such that commentators have not had an opportunity to make their views known to the SRSB before it reaches a final conclusion; substantial change arising from matters not previously deliberated by the SRSB; or substantial change to the substance of a proposed SRS.

Effective Date (Ref: Para. 26)

A42. In setting the date for the application of an SRS, the SRSB shall consider the reasonable expected minimum period for effective implementation.

Basis for Conclusions (Ref: Para. 27)

A43. The document explaining the SRSB's basis for conclusions with respect to comments received on an exposure draft is to be circulated to the SRSB for comment and is to be issued after clearance by the Chair and Head of the Standards Department. The issue of the document is i) not to be subject to voting approval by the SRSB and therefore ii) does not constitute part of the final SRS and iii) is non-authoritative. It is to be retained for an indefinite period on the SRSB website.

Release of a Final Pronouncement

Adherence to Due Process (Ref: Para. 29)

A44. The Chair of the SRSB is to provide the DPOC with a written report outlining the basis for the conclusion on whether due process has been followed.
415 Final Pronouncement (Ref: Para. 30)
416 A45. Subject to having received confirmation from the DPOC that in its opinion due process has
417 been followed, the SRSB is to issue its authoritative pronouncement together with a
418 separate document explaining its basis for conclusions including its consideration of and
419 response to comments received on an exposure draft, is to be posted to the SRSB website.

420 Matters of Due Process
421 Responding to a concern (Ref: Para 31)
422 A46. Where the SRSB has a Steering Committee (or equivalent), the Steering Committee (or
423 equivalent) is to assess issues raised over due process and obtain relevant information
424 from all parties involved. The Steering Committee (or equivalent) is to bring the issue to
425 the attention of the SRSB with a recommendation on whether the alleged breach has merit
426 and, if so, an appropriate resolution.
427 A47. The SRSB is to report annually to the general public on the progress in regard to its defined
428 technical work program and its compliance with Due Process. Ultimately, the DPOC will
429 judge whether the development of pronouncements complied to GRI’s Due Process and
430 therefore the DPOC shall approve the SRSB’s annual report.
431 A48. The DPOC shall develop and publish a process by which it will receive and evaluate
432 grievances concerning the application of due process, under this protocol, in the
433 development of SRSs.

434 APPENDIX

435 List of Unique Titles for Common SRSB Documents at Various Stages of Due Process Project
436 Commencement
437 Proposal to start a new project:
438 • “[Title of Project]—[SRSB] Project Proposal”

439 Development of Proposed SRSs
440 Agenda papers prepared for the SRSB’s review and debate addressing issues in the course of the
441 development of a proposed SRS:
442 • “[Title of Project]—Issues and [SRSB] Working Group Proposals dated [MM/YY]”

443 Draft versions of a proposed pronouncement accompanying such agenda papers:
444 • “[Title of Project]—Draft Pronouncement dated [MM/YY]”
445 • “[Title of Project]—Draft Pronouncement dated [MM/YY] Showing Changes from Draft dated
446 [MM/YY]”

447 Consultation papers issued to solicit views on a matter under consideration:
448 • “[Title of Project]—[SRSB] Consultation Paper dated [MM/YY]”
Consideration of Respondents’ Comments on an Exposure Draft

Agenda papers addressing the significant issues by respondents on an exposure draft:

- “[Title of Project]—Summary of Significant Comments on Exposure and [SRSB] Working Group Recommendations dated [MM/YY]”

Agenda papers prepared for subsequent SRSB meetings that outline the PWG’s response to the SRSB’s consideration of significant comments on exposure:


Draft versions of a proposed pronouncement accompanying such agenda papers follow the format described above.

Agenda papers setting out the main differences between an exposure draft and the proposed final SRS, when the exposure draft has been subject to many changes:

- “[Title of Project]—Comparison of Exposure Draft and Draft Pronouncement dated [MM/YY]”

Approval of a Final Pronouncement

Document posted to the SRSB website after the meeting at which the SRSB approves the final SRS showing final changed agreed by the SRSB:

- “[Title of Project]—Final Draft Pronouncement dated [MM/DD/YY] Showing Changes from Draft dated [MM/DD/YY]: As Approved by [SRSB] for Submission to DPOC”

Release of a Final Pronouncement

Final pronouncement:

- “[Title of Pronouncement]”

Document explaining the SRSB’s basis for conclusions with respect to comments received on an exposure draft:

- “[Title of Pronouncement]—Significant Comments on [SRSB] Proposals and Basis for Conclusions Thereon