

## **GUIDANCE ON**

# **Requirements for Accreditation of Standards Development Organisations**

17 July 2019

### **Standards Development and Accreditation Committee (SDAC)**

Standards Development and Accreditation Committee

Standards Australia

GPO Box 476

Sydney NSW 2001

[www.standards.org.au/standards-development/accreditation](http://www.standards.org.au/standards-development/accreditation)

## INTRODUCTION

In August 2014 a new set of requirements for accrediting Standards Development Organisations (SDOs) was introduced — *Requirements for Accreditation of Standards Development Organisations October 2014*. This replaced the previous *Requirements for Accreditation of Standards Development Organisations (April 2013)* and *Criteria for Designation as an Australian Standard (April 2013)* although many of the provisions of these documents were retained.

The new *Requirements for Accreditation of Standards Development Organisations* is divided into three sections covering: 1) the organisation; 2) general standards management processes; and 3) specific processes that a document has to go through to be labelled an Australian Standard®. This model follows that used by both the American National standards Institute (ANSI)<sup>1</sup> and the Standards Council of Canada (SCC)<sup>2</sup> both of whom also accredit SDOs.

This guide provides some background and explanation of the requirements needed to be complied with by SDOs. Its objective is to assist existing accredited SDOs, and organisations seeking accreditation, to understand and better comply with the stated requirements. It also aims to help improve the standards development process, both to assist the organisation and to maintain the high status and acceptability Australian Standard® brand standards have achieved.

There are 10 principles (listed in the Introduction) that drive the accreditation requirements, and SDOs should use these principles to guide their operations.

The introductory section ‘Application of the Requirements’ provides some basic information related to the process of accreditation. Users should also be aware that a ‘NOTE:’ associated with a requirement is for information only and SDOs do not have to comply with any notes.

This guide also suggests some possible evidence that can be used to demonstrate to auditors that the organisation is compliant. This evidence is not exhaustive, nor compulsory, and the organisation may provide additional or alternative evidence. The auditor may also request additional material. There is further information on auditing under the section Additional Guidance Material at the end of the requirements section.

Some nonessential material from the *Requirements for Accreditation of Standards Development Organisations* document has been omitted from this guide. The definitions have also been moved to the end.

---

<sup>1</sup> *ANSI Essential Requirements: Due process requirements for American National Standards* January 2014 Available at: [www.ansi.org/essentialrequirements](http://www.ansi.org/essentialrequirements)

<sup>2</sup> *SCC CAN-P-1:2012 Canadian Standards Development Program Requirements for the accreditation of Standards Development Organizations and for the Approval of National Standards of Canada* November 2012 Available at: <http://www.scc.ca/en/about-scc/publications/criteria-and-procedures/standards-and-standards-development-organization-accreditation>

## REQUIREMENTS

### SECTION 1 THE ORGANISATION

**COMMENT:** This section deals with the organisation itself, its standing within industry, society and/or government; its resources; and its relationship with its stakeholders. Few, if any, special procedures or documents are required, evidence that requirements are being met should come from normal operating documents. It is essentially asking ‘Are you the type of organisation who should be writing standards.’

#### 1 ORGANISATION

Requirement	Guidance
<p>1.1 The SDO shall be a representative organisation with the objective of furthering the interests or status of its members or constituents.</p> <p>NOTE : Examples of representative organisations include industry associations, professional bodies, consumer organisations. They usually have a membership of allied interests (organisations and/or individuals) and provide a range of stakeholder interactions.</p>	<p>The note describes the type of organisation who would be expected to be an SDO. It reflects general practice in other countries that have accreditation schemes. Commercial, for profit, or shareholder based companies would not normally be considered suitable SDOs. Government agencies are acceptable particularly if they have a specific industry sector focus.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Charter; membership; board composition.</li> <li>• Mission, vision statements.</li> <li>• Examples of activities such as training courses, submissions to government, direct support to members.</li> </ul>
<p>1.2 The SDO shall have credibility and repute within its business sector, profession and/or industry.</p>	<p>There may be a situation where an organisation purports to represent a particular sector but in practice does not have the support of the majority of stakeholders in that sector. This could occur where a sector is somewhat disorganised and a small minority are seeking to speak on behalf of the whole sector. Similarly, there may be two or more organisations claiming to represent the sector. While minority representation does not preclude accreditation, SDAC needs to take care to avoid unnecessary duplication, disputes or user uncertainty within a sector. Also, SDAC needs to be sure the organisation is not claiming to represent a sector when in fact it has no (or very few) links at all. SDAC may test claims here by directly contacting government or other industry organisations.</p>

	<p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government or international recognition; academic or commercial recognition.</li> <li>• Membership; board composition broadly representing the sector.</li> <li>• Peer support, particularly from other organisations that may operate in the same sector.</li> <li>• Feedback from individuals, or others in the sector, relating to the activities of the organisation in that sector.</li> <li>• Acting as spokesman for the industry, e.g. news releases; consultation with government; membership of committees, panels or task forces.</li> </ul>
<p>1.3 The SDO shall have a knowledge of the interests and the issues impacting its business sector, profession and/or industry.</p>	<p>The organisation does not have to be a repository of detailed and accurate knowledge about the sector they are operating. However, they do need to be aware of issues and trends. This is not to assist in providing technical input to a standard but rather to ensure stakeholder communication and involvement in the standards development process meets the principles of balance and transparency. Good knowledge of the sector also assists in the evaluation of new project proposals to ensure they provide a net benefit.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of interests and issues impacting the sector such as: depth of current information on a web site; submissions to government or other bodies, memberships of committees or task forces.</li> <li>• Professional competence such as research papers, industry guides, training courses, awards received.</li> <li>• Competence, professional qualifications or experience of staff within the organisation particularly those involved in the standard activities.</li> </ul>
<p>1.4 The SDO shall achieve effective engagement with all key stakeholders in its business sector, profession and/or industry.</p>	<p>Again this to help ensure its stakeholder communication and interactions are sufficient to meet the principles of openness and transparency. Also, communications need to be with a wide group not just a select few.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication strategy; appropriate resource allocation against the strategy.</li> <li>• Examples of previous communications; coverage and response.</li> <li>• Web site - currency and updating.</li> <li>• Facebook / twitter accounts</li> </ul>

<p>1.5 If the SDO undertakes certification, accreditation or similar activities, the SDO shall maintain a clear separation of the policy-making and governance functions of such activities from those of standards development.</p> <p>NOTE: Compliance with this requirement can be demonstrated by reference to policy, organizational structure and procedural documents.</p>	<p>The intent of this clause is to avoid the situation where standards development is used simply as a tool to further the certification business of a company. A standard should be developed on the basis of net benefit to the industry. Certification may (and sometimes does) come later but it is not the driver. Also, certification to any standard should be able to be carried out by any JAS-ANZ accredited certification body, not just the organisation developing the standard. This separation is used in other countries that have SDO accreditation schemes.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organisational structure; separation of standard writers from certifiers.</li> <li>• Policy statements, such as Board charters, showing the separation.</li> <li>• Documented procedures.</li> <li>• Management separation.</li> <li>• Governance structures and minutes of governance meetings.</li> <li>• Other organisations certifying to the same standard.</li> </ul>
<p>1.6 The SDO shall be a registered legal entity.</p>	<p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Certificate of business registration</li> <li>• Listing under “ABN Lookup” - <a href="http://abr.business.gov.au/">http://abr.business.gov.au/</a></li> <li>• Tax status</li> </ul>

## 2 RESOURCES

Requirement	Guidance
<p>2.1 The SDO shall have a structure and resources to support and maintain its Standards development operations. Resources shall include adequate ongoing funding, facilities and staff.</p>	<p>In addition to any program for developing new standards, being an SDO involves an obligation for ongoing maintenance of published standards. To do this requires some level of financial security or stability. Similarly, it is not really desirable to get some way down the track of developing a new standard only to have all activity cease due to a lack of resources. This is disappointing to stakeholders and may also have an adverse affect on the industry that was relying on the standard. While no one can say with certainty they are going to be financially secure in the future, SDAC is seeking a reasonable assurance of the organisation’s stability.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Audited accounts.</li> <li>• Standardisation activities included in budget; forward estimates, three year budget forecasts.</li> <li>• Stable and continuing sources of funds.</li> <li>• Long term grants or assistance (e.g. government funding for standards projects).</li> <li>• Existing staff, or capacity to add staff (employees or contractors), sufficient to cover standards activities.</li> <li>• Infrastructure availability including; managed IT systems, offices / workstations; access to meeting rooms.</li> </ul>
<p>2.2 There shall be a commitment to, and information on, the future program for the development and maintenance of standards.</p>	<p>Fairly self evident, an SDO requires commitment to their standards activities (otherwise why would they be in it!). This requirement really relates to long term strategic commitments rather than detailed project plans. These latter are covered under 21. Public availability of commitment and long term workprograms also helps build communication with stakeholders.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Company objectives in strategic plans.</li> <li>• Statements of commitment: in policy documents; marketing or promotional material; on the website; or in press releases.</li> <li>• Work program publicly available e.g. on website, on request from an outside party.</li> </ul>
<p>2.3 The SDO shall have sufficient and competent staff to manage and support its Standards activities.</p>	<p>Here ‘standards activities’ refers to not only managing the development of a standard (see 2.4) but to all the ancillary activities relating to the standards management functions (see Section 2). It will depend on the organisation and the number of standards being developed as to what are deemed to be sufficient resources to meet the requirements of this document. However, SDAC would be seeking an indication the organisation had adequately addressed the staffing issue. ‘Staff’ can include full or part employees or contractors hired for specific activities (e.g. managing the development of a standard). ‘Competent’ is a somewhat subjective term and SDAC is not seeking to dictate any specific rules. Organisations need to satisfy themselves that their staff are capable of fulfilling the roles and responsibilities assigned them. In the case of managers of standards development projects there is no requirement for formal qualifications in the subject field of the standard being developed. What is probably more appropriate is good communication and written skills and previous project management experience.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staffing levels commensurate with number of standards being developed.</li> <li>• Job or position descriptions containing qualifications and experience deemed appropriate by</li> </ul>

	<p>the SDO for the role.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roles and responsibilities statements.</li> </ul> <p>Note that Clauses 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 are usually audited together.</p>
<p><b>2.4</b> For each standard being developed, the SDO shall appoint a person who is responsible for managing the development project. This person shall be provided with the necessary authority and resources to enable the project to be completed within a reasonable timeframe.</p> <p>NOTES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The person may have other duties in the organisation, or could be handling a number of standards projects.</li> <li>2. Reasonable timeframe would generally mean a time acceptable to the Standards Reference Body.</li> </ol>	<p>Since development of a standard is required to be completed within an acceptable timeframe, one of the leading indicators of success is sufficient staff resources commensurate with the size and complexity of the project. It could also be expected that there was some degree of continuity in the development management role. There is also the requirement to complete a project in a reasonable timeframe (see also 20).</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organisation chart.</li> <li>• Duty statements; roles and responsibilities statements.</li> <li>• Staff memo(s) outlining role and/or operations.</li> <li>• Budget.</li> <li>• No stalled or inactive projects; delays not due to resourcing.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.5</b> The Project Management role shall be clearly separated from any technical representation the SDO may have on the Standards Reference Body.</p> <p>NOTE : This is best achieved by having the Project Manager a separate person to the SDO’s technical representative.</p>	<p>It is not essential, or even necessary, for the SDO to have a technical representative on any Standards Reference Body (SRB). The SDO’s primary role is as facilitator of the process. Similarly, the Project Manager’s role is different from that of a technical member of the SRB. The latter needs to be a technical expert focussed on the subject matter. The former is focussed on process and ensuring the SRB is adequately serviced.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SRB composition.</li> <li>• Duty statements or job description should clearly indicate the responsibilities.</li> <li>• Organisation charts showing separation.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.6</b> The SDO shall notify the SDAC of any significant changes that could materially affect the organisation’s capacity to be an accredited SDO.</p> <p>NOTE : This could include change of CEO, loss of Quality Management System (ISO 9001) certification, changes to financial status such as amalgamation or split-up of the organisation, changes to the governance</p>	<p>Previously there had been a requirement to notify SDAC of any changes to processes. This was considered too onerous and not necessary. Any changes could be picked up at the next audit and if they didn’t meet the requirements then a non-conformance could be issued. SDAC is concerned, however, about the long term viability of the organisation as an SDO, and hence the continuity and maintenance of their standards. If there were changes that could affect the viability of the SDO then SDAC would be likely to enter into a discussion regarding the fate of any standards or projects (see Cl. 14).</p>

structure.	Possible evidence of compliance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Auditors will be looking to see if there has been any significant changes to the SDO and whether these have been notified to SDAC (e.g. e-mail, press release).</li> </ul>
------------	--

### 3 ACCREDITATION

Requirement	Guidance
3.1 In order to achieve and maintain accreditation the SDO shall— <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) comply with the requirements in this document;</li> <li>b) comply with any additional policies or procedures as required by SDAC from time to time;</li> <li>c) facilitate auditing by to determine ongoing compliance;</li> <li>d) submit to the SDAC’s determination where there is a conflict in the scope of areas of accreditation; and</li> <li>e) pay all relevant fees to the SA to achieve and maintain accreditation.</li> </ol>	Self explanatory. Any additional policies or procedures will be notified directly by SDAC and will also be available at <a href="https://www.standards.org.au/standards-development/accreditation">https://www.standards.org.au/standards-development/accreditation</a> . Auditors will advise SDAC of any concerns about the audit process. Similarly, SDOs have been asked to provide SDAC of their evaluation, and any concerns they may have, of the auditor and audit process.

## SECTION 2 OPERATIONS

**COMMENT:** This section deals with the activities that support the standards development process as well as the support and maintenance of published standards. They can be called standards Administrative Procedures. SDAC is not concerned with other procedures or activities (e.g. HR, finance) within an organisation.

### 4 INTERNATIONAL ALIGNMENT

Requirement	Guidance
<p>4.1 Staff responsible for managing the standards development process shall be familiar with the World Trade Organization (WTO) Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (commonly referred to as the TBT Agreement) and particularly Annex 3.</p> <p>NOTES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Compliance with the TBT is particularly important for those standards that are likely to be called up in Government regulations.</li> <li>2. It is not necessary for an SDO to officially accept Annex 3 of the WTO TBT Agreement, the Code of Good Practice for the Preparation, Adoption and Application of Standards. Compliance with the Requirements for Accreditation of SDOs will ensure that the SDO complies with the terms of the TBT Agreement. Also, Standards Australia (as the accrediting body for SDOs within Australia) has formally advised its acceptance of the Code.</li> </ol>	<p>Australia is a signatory to the WTO GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) which includes the TBT agreement (<a href="http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/tbt_e/tbt_e.htm">http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/tbt_e/tbt_e.htm</a> ) This imposes an obligation on standards bodies to comply, as far as practical, with the provisions of the TBT. Basically, this agreement tries to ensure that regulations, standards, testing and certification procedures do not create unnecessary obstacles to international trade. Standards should not permit more favourable treatment of products of national origin when compared to like products originating in any other country. The TBT agreement (<a href="http://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/17-tbt.pdf">http://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/17-tbt.pdf</a> ) imposes certain requirements on standards bodies (Annex 3) e.g. public comment for 60 days. Note that this agreement has not been updated for some time so some aspects, e.g. ISONET, are not current but it is more the principles that count. The Secretary of SDAC can provide more information. It should also be noted that the TBT has influenced many of the accreditation provisions in this document.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Copies of TBT available.</li> <li>• Staff are aware of the main provisions, particularly of Annex 3.</li> </ul> <p>Note that Clauses 4.1 and 4.2 are usually audited together.</p>

<p>4.2 The provisions of the TBT agreement shall be communicated to Standards Reference Bodies. Where appropriate, the development processes and content shall be adjusted accordingly to meet the requirements of the TBT.</p> <p>NOTE : Such changes could include the notification of new projects that may be intended for use in regulations; adoption of an international standard rather than developing an Australian document; a minimum public comment period of 60 days; or avoiding barriers to imported products.</p>	<p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents or presentations given to committees.</li> <li>• Minutes of meetings.</li> <li>• Standards development procedures reflecting provisions of Annex 3.</li> <li>• Inclusion in any training material or advice to new SRB members.</li> </ul>
<p>4.3 Where an International Standard is being adopted as an AS, the requirements of ISO/IEC Guide 21.1 <i>Regional or national adoption of International Standards and other International Deliverables — Part 1: Adoption of International Standards</i> shall be complied with.</p> <p>NOTE : If unsure of the requirements for adopting international standards the SDO should contact Standards Australia’s International Development Manager.</p>	<p>Part of the TBT agreement is an obligation on SDOs to, as far as practicable, adopt International Standards (ISO or IEC) rather than develop local standards on the same subject. So far there has been no instance of an SDO adopting an IS, but for the future the SDO needs to be aware of the rules for adoption. If an SDO is considering adopting an IS then they will need to contact the Standards Australia’s International Development Manager since there are copyright issues.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Copy of Guide 21.1 available.</li> <li>• Staff aware of the main provisions.</li> </ul>

## 5 IMPARTIAL FACILITATION

Requirement	Guidance
<p>5.1 The SDO shall maintain impartiality and neutrality throughout the Standards development process including safeguarding the objectivity and impartiality of the individuals or groups responsible for Standards</p>	<p>The meaning of this clause relates to the accredited organisation and its internal structure as well as the members of SRBs. The SDO should not, for example, favour one group (e.g. manufacturers) over another, override the appointment of representative members on an SRB, ignore or overturn decisions made by the SRB, shortcut or otherwise interfere with the public comment process, or unilaterally change the coverage of the document away from the approved</p>

<p>development.</p> <p>NOTE : The requirement for impartiality and neutrality does not preclude the organisation from having an interest in the subject matter of the Standard, or from being represented on a Standards Reference Body. However, the organisation will need to comply with the intent of Clause 17.5.</p>	<p>scope. It is recognised however, that this cannot be a hard and inflexible rule and there may be good reasons for SDO initiated changes. In this case they should be discussed with the SRB and the SRB should agree. The SDO should also encourage its staff to adopt an objective and impartial role in its dealings with SRBs and representative organisations.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public statements, policies, and staff communications on impartiality and neutrality.</li> <li>• Policies that define situations where the decision of, or about, a standards reference body may be changed or over-ruled and the process to be followed in such cases.</li> <li>• No evidence of senior management requiring changes outside the above rules.</li> <li>• Records of changes in compliance with the rules.</li> <li>• Balance on SRB to comply with Cl. 17; no indication of ‘committee stacking’.</li> </ul> <p>Note that Clauses 5.1 and 5.2 are usually audited together.</p>
<p>5.2 Senior Management of the SDO shall not influence, or direct, the Standards Reference Body on the technical content of the final document.</p>	<p>While the previous clause covers the formation and operation of the SRB, this clause relates more to interference by the SDO in the technical content of a document, and particularly doing so in the face of SRB opposition. For example an SDO cannot directly insist on certain material being included in the document, the project being closed down unless content is included, or approval of the document is subject to a change in the text. While the provisions of Clause 5.1 may need to be varied in special circumstances, the content of the document should never be altered by the SDO. The SDO’s input to the technical content can only be through their representative(s) on the SRB, and this representative(s) carries no extra weight than others on the committee.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public statements, policies, and staff communications on not varying SRB agreed text.</li> <li>• Written procedures covering the technical approval by the committee and subsequent process / publishing approval.</li> <li>• No evidence of senior management requiring changes.</li> </ul>

## 6 PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES

Requirement	Guidance
<p>6.1 The organisation shall have appropriately documented procedures to support its Standards management and development processes.</p>	<p>There have been volumes written on how to document procedures! In the end however, the organisation needs to be mindful that documentation is done to a) ensure consistency in carrying out that procedure (e.g. over time and/or by different staff); b) to identify inputs, outputs and records; and c) to provide evidence (e.g. to an auditor) that processes are under control. Documentation need not be complex, voluminous, or even written. Flow charts, diagrams and drawings can be effective procedures. Procedures can be hard copy, .pdf, web based or posters. SDOs will need to satisfy themselves that their procedures are adequate to meet the above objectives.</p> <p>Note that this Clause need not be directly audited since the requirements for documented procedures are directly specified in other clauses. The SDO may demonstrate additional procedures that assist in their standards management activities.</p>
<p>6.2 The Standards development procedures shall include, but not necessarily be limited to—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the evaluation of new work items;</li> <li>b) establishing a balanced Standards Reference Body;</li> <li>c) public review, including reviews of stakeholder feedback;</li> <li>d) achieving and demonstrating consensus; and</li> <li>e) final process/publishing approval.</li> </ul> <p>NOTE : The required content these procedures are to address is given in Section 3.</p>	<p>The presence of these procedures can be checked. The content should comply with the relevant requirements in Section 3.</p>

<p><b>6.3 The Standards management and development processes and any associated procedures shall be regularly reviewed and, if appropriate, updated to ensure continuing effectiveness.</b></p>	<p>The review could be a formal process conducted periodically by a Board of the SDO, or a check by a senior manager. There is also the potential for updates to occur as a result of standards management staff suggesting improvements (the continuous improvement process). The key point is that the procedures are dynamic and are not just developed once and then ‘left on the shelf’.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A documented procedure for review .</li> <li>• Records of review , e.g. minutes of Board meetings, diary notes of meetings between managers and staff, instructions to staff to update the procedure or follow updated procedures.</li> <li>• Changes and updates to documented procedures; history of changes to documents.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.4 Procedures shall incorporate suitable privacy protection measures, including maintaining confidentiality of SRB deliberations.</b></p> <p>NOTE : SRB confidentiality usually means ensuring SRB members as well as the SDO and its staff are aware of the need not to disseminate SRB discussions or decisions to outside bodies (including the press) without the agreement of the SRB and the SDO. SRB members may discuss SRB deliberations with their representative organisations but these organisations also need to be made aware (by the SRB member) of the need to retain SRB confidentiality.</p>	<p>Each SDO will need to get legal advice on how their processes comply with the new Privacy Act. SA cannot offer advice but there is a Fact Sheet put out by the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner that is a guide to what action organisations need to take.</p> <p><a href="http://www.oaic.gov.au/privacy/privacy-resources/privacy-fact-sheets/other/privacy-fact-sheet-17-australian-privacy-principles">http://www.oaic.gov.au/privacy/privacy-resources/privacy-fact-sheets/other/privacy-fact-sheet-17-australian-privacy-principles</a></p> <p>The note explains the concept of SRB confidentiality. One further step SDO’s may care to take is not to list the names of the members of the SRB preparing the standard in the standard. It may be preferable to just list the organisations represented on the SRB. This reduces the risk of personal abuse of individuals.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Awareness of the privacy provisions; directions to staff; changes to procedures or records.</li> <li>• Directions to staff re SRB confidentiality.</li> <li>• Advice to SRB members and/or their organisations regarding SRB confidentiality.</li> <li>• Confidentiality requirements in staff contracts; also in agreements with contractors and volunteers.</li> </ul> <p>See also 7.5.</p> <p>There is a potential situation where an SDO may be required by law to release confidential information to a third party (e.g. as part of court proceedings).The SDO should obtain legal advice, but as a start those whose information is going to be released (e.g. SRB members) should, unless regulated by law, be notified in advance of the information being provided.</p>

<p>6.5 The documented Standards development procedures shall be freely available to any interested party.</p>	<p>This provision assists with the principles of transparency and openness. The documented procedures could be listed on a web site or forwarded when requested. Even if the documents are not on the web site it would be desirable if there was a notice advising that the procedures were available on request. Note that they do not need to be the full working procedures but simply a summary of the rules for standards development or even a comprehensive flow chart.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Website listing; public advice they are available</li> <li>• Instances of the procedures being supplied.</li> <li>• Summary procedures suitable for release.</li> </ul>
<p>6.6 The SDO shall record any significant changes in the organisation’s Standards development processes and make these available for audit.</p>	<p>The background to this has already been discussed under Cl. 2.6.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revised or new procedures made available for audit.</li> </ul> <p>Note that Clauses 6.3 and 6.6 are usually audited together.</p>

## 7 RECORDS

Requirement	Guidance
<p>7.1 The organisation shall keep and maintain adequate records of its standards development and management activities in order to demonstrate compliance with this SDO requirements document.</p>	<p>The main objective here is to maintain records that demonstrate compliance with this document. The SDO, in conjunction with the auditor, should determine the level of records required. Note that records do not have to be paper and most these days are electronic (e.g. e-mail, .pdf, rows in a spread sheet, records in a database).</p> <p>However, compliance is not the only objective for record keeping. The SDO may use records as an input into process improvement or procedural reviews. Records also help manage risk. For example, if a published standard is ever challenged records will be able to demonstrate that the standard went through the accredited process and that the principles of transparency and consensus had been correctly applied.</p> <p>Note that this Clause need not be directly audited since the specific requirements for records are directly specified in other clauses. The SDO may demonstrate additional records that assist in their standards management activities or in reducing risk associated with standards development.</p>

<p><b>7.2</b> There shall be a records management policy that specifies the records to be kept, by whom and for how long.</p> <p>NOTE : Records may be physical or electronic.</p>	<p>A variant to this may be that each documented procedure lists the records to be generated, where they are kept, for how long and how they can be accessed. This is particularly useful where the procedure involves electronic working (e.g. workflow in a database, the database storing the necessary information as fields or records). Much of this information may also be listed in help screens or user instructions for a software system. The key here is that people know (or can easily find out) where the records are and how to access them.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Records policy.</li> <li>• Examples of other forms of records and their accessibility.</li> </ul> <p>SDOs should be aware of any legal requirements for record retention (e.g. financial records) and include these in the policy.</p> <p>The SDO may also want to consider the secure disposal of sensitive records.</p> <p>Note that Clauses 7.1 and 7.2 are usually audited together.</p>
<p><b>7.3</b> The Standards development records for each published standard shall include, but not necessarily be limited to—</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) net benefit and project approval;</li> <li>b) Standards Reference Body (SRB) or work group composition (interest groups);</li> <li>c) public comment document ;</li> <li>d) comments and their disposition;</li> <li>e) document approved by the SRB;</li> <li>f) SRB approval, including compliance with consensus procedures; and</li> <li>g) final process/publication approval.</li> </ol>	<p>It is left up to the SDO to determine the exact form of the record (e.g. paper, spreadsheet, Word document).</p>

<p>7.4 The standards development records shall be retained for at least ten years from the date of publication of a Standard or two review cycles whichever is the greater.</p>	<p>The reasons for retention is in case there is a legal challenge to the document and particularly the development process.</p>
<p>7.5 The SDO shall have a policy on making the records relating to a standards development project available to industry, government and the community where requested. This policy shall take into account the principles of openness and transparency but recognise the needs of privacy and SRB confidentiality.</p>	<p>It is up to the SDO to determine the availability to different groups of the records relating to a standard’s development. Availability may depend on obligations to key stakeholders; on a philosophy of complete openness; or a concern that all committee deliberations are confidential. If records are to be made available it would be advisable to tell the SRB of the SDO’s policy and make sure any records do not inadvertently provide sensitive or personal information. The auditor will check there is a policy, and if records have been made available and whether they have complied with privacy issues. See also 6.4 and particularly any legal advice regarding privacy.</p>

## 8 MAINTAIN STANDARDS

Requirement	Guidance
<p>8.1 Standards within the scope of accreditation shall be regularly reviewed to ensure that they are up-to-date and current. This review period shall not be greater than seven years.</p> <p>NOTE : Options from the review could include revising, reconfirming or withdrawing the standard.</p>	<p>One of the obligations of being an SDO is to ensure their standards are technologically up-to-date and reflect current views on safety, quality and environmental impact. It is not necessary to have a fixed review period for all standards. Those that are in a rapidly changing technological field may be reviewed in a much shorter period than seven years.</p> <p>Reviewing a standard should involve the SRB (since they are the technical experts) and the SDO may decide that a formal ballot is required (or a simple majority). If the standard is to be revised then a project proposal should be developed (although it can draw heavily on any original proposal) and the project goes through the normal procedures. A reconfirmation involves the SRB confirming the standard meets the objectives for currency mentioned above. In this case no project is required, but the SDO should make sure the standard is marked as a reconfirmation and the year of reconfirmation (to show the user that the standard, which may have been published some time ago, is still current). Reconfirmation is optional and an SDO may chose not to use this process. Where the SRB decides the standard is to be withdrawn it is advisable to notify publicly that it is proposed to withdraw the standard on a certain date. The SDO may want directly notify key stakeholders.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedure(s) covering the standards review process including how long after publication is the</li> </ul>

	<p>standard to be reviewed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Available alternatives following review ; criteria for choosing the alternative.</li> <li>• Examples of a review and outcomes.</li> <li>• No current standards older than 7 years that have not been reviewed</li> </ul>
--	---

## 9 INQUIRIES AND DISPUTES

Requirement	Guidance
<p>9.1 The SDO shall have a formal process to accept and respond to public enquires regarding the technical content of a published standard.</p> <p>NOTE : This may include interpretations and rulings on the meaning or applicability of the standard.</p>	<p>This is different to complaints about the content of the standard or its development process. These queries are more in the nature of: background to the standard or the SDO; where standards can be purchased; clarification of the content; or application of the provisions. The process is analogous to customer service systems in other organisations. Where the question is simple an SDO staffer can normally respond. Where it is a technically complex question then it is usual to refer the matter to the appropriate technical expert on the SRB. The SDO could also publish, as a guidance document, various interpretations or rulings the SRB has made about a standard.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process for handling enquiries including staff allocated to the process.</li> <li>• Has it been used; any enquires been referred to the SRB.</li> <li>• Records of enquiries received and their resolution.</li> </ul>
<p>9.2 The SDO shall have a procedure for hearing complaints and handling appeals arising out of the Standards development process.</p> <p>NOTE : Complaints may be either of a substantive (technical) or procedural nature. Appeals are procedural in nature, and are launched as a result of decisions which the appellant considers to be procedurally in error. Procedural appeals can include whether a technical issue was afforded due process.</p>	<p>As the note explains this is different to the more general enquiries mentioned in 9.1. Where there are technical complaints (e.g. a matter was not covered in the standard) then it is usual to involve the SRB and often referral to the scope of the standard or original proposal can help. Such complaints can be used as input into a revision or new project. In some cases it may be necessary to issue an amendment to the standard to cover an inadvertent error or oversight.</p> <p>Procedural appeals (.e.g. balance on the SRB, a comment was ignored) is normally handled by the SDO. It is here that records are important. The SDO should be able to demonstrate that the standard went through the accredited process any all relevant input was taken into account.</p> <p>Where the complainant is not satisfied with the SDO’s response the matter needs to be referred to the SDAC who will undertake an independent investigation.</p>

	<p>Note that Clauses 9.2 and 9.3 are usually audited together.</p>
<p>9.3 The complaints and appeals procedure shall—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) be fair and unbiased;</li> <li>b) not impose an undue burden on any party;</li> <li>c) provide for the timely hearing of complaints, and</li> <li>d) ensure each complaint is fully addressed.</li> </ul> <p>Records of each complaint or appeal, and the outcome, shall be kept.</p>	<p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures (e.g. process maps, flow charts, forms, software) for handling complaints.</li> <li>• Staff responsible for dealing with the matter are independent of the nature of complaint or appeal.</li> <li>• Ease of making a complaint.</li> <li>• Recording of all complaints.</li> <li>• Action to be taken to address complaints.</li> <li>• Open or unresolved complaints.</li> <li>• Successful resolution of complaints.</li> <li>• Frequency of types of complaints (i.e. procedural or technical)</li> </ul> <p>Where it is difficult to ensure staff independence (i.e. lack of bias) then the SDO may have to set up an impartial committee. There is also the option of referring the matter to the SDAC.</p>
<p>9.4 The procedure for hearing complaints and appeals shall be reviewed regularly and, if appropriate, updated to ensure effectiveness.</p>	<p>Complaints are usually used to assist in continuous improvement and can often highlight areas of weakness. Review can be done either by a governance committee or a senior manager, who desirably would be independent of the staff involved in the complaint processing.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Records of reviews.</li> <li>• Any improvements as a result of complaints or reviews.</li> </ul>

## 10 IP AND COPYRIGHT

Requirement	Guidance
<p>10.1 The SDO shall ensure that it owns all intellectual property rights in, or is duly licensed to incorporate any third party material into, the Standard(s) developed by it.</p>	<p>This refers to material such as: text; drawings; photos; or computer code. Normally text and associated figures and tables remain the property of the SDO and are generated as part of the SRB drafting process. SDOs need to ensure that SRB members are aware of this and agree to the copyright of any material they generate being transferred to the SDO. This can often be done by getting SRB members to agree in writing to this requirement when they first join an SRB. However, there may be occasions where pre-existing material is directly inserted into the standard. In this case the copyright belongs to the originator of this material and the SDO will need to obtain a licence to use it. This agreement may be as simple as an e-mail agreeing to its use.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreements by SRB members to transfer their IP to the SDO.</li> <li>• Licences to use third party material.</li> </ul>
<p>10.2 The SDO shall have a patent policy that restricts the inclusion of patented items in a standard unless the use of a patented item is justifiable for technical reasons and the rights holder agrees to negotiate licenses with interested applicants, wherever located, on reasonable terms and conditions.</p>	<p>It is highly desirable not to specify patented items as a requirement in a standard. To do so may inhibit use of the standard and/or provide the owner of a patent an unfair advantage. However, there may be exceptional circumstances where inclusion of a patented item is essential. The SDO needs to ensure these are identified and that an undertaking is provided that a licence for use of the patented item will be made available on a non-discriminatory and reasonable basis. The patent policy that covers this needs to be agreed to by SRB members.</p> <p>The ISO and SA patent policies are given in the Additional Guidance section at the end of this document. These could assist the SDO in developing their policy.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documented policy.</li> <li>• SRB members aware of the policy.</li> </ul>

<p>10.3 Where an SDO is assuming responsibility for standards developed by another organisation (including an SDO), the SDO shall ensure all existing rights and obligations related to these Standards have been negotiated and agreed with the organisation.</p> <p>NOTE : At audit, negotiations need not have been completed; however there should be evidence of a bona fide intention on the part of organisation and the SDO to reach such an agreement.</p>	<p>This applies to the very rare occurrence when one SDO takes over from another that is no longer accredited. It essentially refers to transfer of copyright from one SDO to another and a transfer of any licensing agreements that had been entered into with third parties.</p>
---	---

## 11 TRADEMARK LICENCE

Requirement	Guidance
<p>11.1 The SDO shall enter into a licensing agreement with Standards Australia regarding the use of the ‘Australian Standard®’ trademark, logo and any associated graphics.</p>	<p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Licensing agreement (either complete or being negotiated).</li> </ul>
<p>11.2 The SDO shall comply with the <a href="#">Style Manual for Accredited SDOs (SDAC-004)</a> including any requirements relating to the use of the word mark, logo and text required to be included in published standards.</p>	<p>The style manual was developed as a result of Standards Australia’s requirements regarding the use of the logo as well as to ensure a degree of consistency across all Australian Standards irrespective of the SDO. The consistency helps users and also helps maintain the authoritativeness of document bearing the Australian Standard® brand.</p> <p>The auditor will check compliance of all published standards after the start date of these new requirements, particularly the use of the trademarks (Logo and Word mark) and the required preliminary text.</p>

## 12 INTERNATIONAL PARTICIPATION

Requirement	Guidance
<p>12.1 The SDO shall recognise, through a policy or similar statement, that Standards Australia is the Australian member of the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) and the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC). Participation in the standardisation activities of these two bodies shall be through SA.</p> <p>NOTES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SDOs need to be aware of this policy even if they are not participating. Further information can be found in SA’s Standardisation Guide 015 – <i>Australian Involvement in International Standardisation</i>.</li> <li>2. Participation by the SDO in other international standardisation activities, such as the ITU or Codex, is the responsibility of the SDO.</li> </ol>	<p>Could also be included in SRB member guidance.</p>
<p>12.2 Where an SDO wants to, or is, participating in IEC or ISO activities they shall comply with the appropriate SDAC procedures and any necessary directions from Standards Australia’s International Development Manager.</p> <p>NOTE : Such procedures include but are not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Membership of ISO or IEC technical committees.</li> <li>2. Participating in the technical work of ISO or IEC committees including the use of mirror committees.</li> <li>3. Commenting on and voting on ISO or IEC</li> </ol>	<p>At this stage, participation is through Standards Australia’s International Development Manager. Appropriate procedures will be developed as the level of international participation increases.</p>

documents.	
4. Attending international meetings, including applications for funding.	

### 13 CO-OPERATION AND LIAISON

Requirement	Guidance
13.1 Where appropriate, or as requested, the SDO shall cooperate with other SDOs, including Standards Australia, regarding activities of mutual interest and with the intent of enhancing communication and co-ordination of Standards development activities across industry and government.	A general requirement. While there has been little joint activity to date, there is the potential for this to happen in the future. It also allows SDOs to suggest joint activities that could benefit all SDOs. Attendance at, and participation in, SDO forums complies with this requirement.

### 14 TERMINATION

Requirement	Guidance
14.1 The SDO shall have a procedure(s) covering the eventuality of the SDO either becoming insolvent and winding up, or deciding to no longer retain its accreditation.	This is a new requirement and as the Note says: 'The intent of these clauses is to make the SDO think about the steps to be taken should they decide to give up accreditation or otherwise cease operations. It is part of a responsible approach to managing standardisation activities. In practise, apart from notifying stakeholders and the SRB(s) the most likely scenario will be a series of discussions with SA and any other relevant SDO.'  Note that Clauses 14.1 and 14.2 are usually audited together.
14.2 This procedure(s) shall relate to the standards development and management activities of the SDO (not financial or legal) and should include: a) Initial and ongoing advice to SDAC.	The SDO may include other steps to be taken when winding up is imminent. One option is to hand over work in progress to another accredited SDO.  Possible evidence of compliance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Procedure adequately addresses the issues of notifying stakeholders and the SDAC, and</li></ul>

<p>b) Notification of stakeholders and particularly members of the Standards Reference Body(s).</p> <p>c) Transfer of the ownership and licensing of the copyright in published standards.</p> <p>d) Handover to SA of relevant information and records where an SDO’s accreditation ceases, subject to compliance with relevant privacy requirements.</p> <p>NOTE : Published standards may either be withdrawn, transferred to another accredited SDO, or transferred to SA.</p>	<p>disposition of IP including published standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Adequate awareness of steps to be taken amongst relevant staff.</li></ul>
--	---

## SECTION 3 STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

**COMMENT:** This section deals with the requirements each published standard has to meet in order to be labelled an Australian Standard®.

### 15 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

Requirement	Guidance
<p>15.1 A Standard shall be within the SDO’s scope of accreditation.</p>	<p>Self evident. SDOs should check proposals for new standards to ensure they comply before approving the project.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scopes of published standards clearly written and fall within SDO scope of accreditation.</li> </ul>
<p>15.2 A Standard shall not duplicate an existing Australian Standard. Where such duplication occurs, justification or explanation shall be included in the standard.</p> <p>NOTES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There may be alternative solutions or methods of assessment in different standards that meet the same performance outcome.</li> <li>2. This explanation should help users choose the most appropriate standard.</li> </ol>	<p>Unlikely this will occur since each SDO has its own exclusive scope. However, there is the potential to duplicate standards written by Standards Australia, so a check for existing standards should be undertaken – this can be done by searching our website using the ‘Search site or look for a standard’ function at <a href="http://www.standards.org.au">www.standards.org.au</a>, using key words relating to the subject. The secretary also checks activity in Standards Australia before approving an SDO’s scope.</p> <p>The note does indicate where some duplication could be permissible but before undertaking such a project the SDO should contact the Secretary of SDAC.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any recorded searches of databases of Standards.</li> <li>• Scopes of published standards clearly written and do not duplicate other standards.</li> </ul> <p>The auditor may also conduct a search of standards databases to check there is no duplication.</p> <p>Note that Clauses 15.1, 15.2 and 15.4 are usually audited together.</p>

<p>15.3 Standards developed for conformance assessment purposes (i.e. the basis of a certification scheme) shall comply with the principles in ISO/IEC 17007, <i>Conformity assessment - Guidance for drafting normative documents suitable for use for conformity assessment</i>.</p>	<p>This is an important requirement for standards being used in certification schemes. Principle 1 is one of the main requirements, although the whole document provides useful guidance on how to write a standard. The reason for following this ISO standard is both to ensure neutrality in certification services (i.e. no one conformance assessment (CA) body receives an unfair advantage) and to increase the rigorousness and quality of standards written for conformance assessment. Poorly worded and structured standards are difficult to use, lead to ambiguities in interpretation, and can lead to litigation.</p> <p>The SDO will need to obtain a copy of the standard and be aware of the requirements. Where a standard is being developed for certification (or with the potential for certification) the SRB, and particularly those drafting the document, need to be familiar with its requirements and recommendations.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Availability of 17007.</li> <li>• Staff knowledge of its general requirements and where it is to be used/applied.</li> <li>• SRB provided with information/copy where drafting a CA standard.</li> <li>• Published standards (after the start date of these new requirements) to comply.</li> </ul>
<p>15.4 All reasonable efforts shall be made to avoid the creation of conflicting requirements between Standards on the same or similar subjects.</p>	<p>Similar to 15.2. There is the potential for an SDO to inadvertently create conflicts between their often highly focussed standards and standards that are more generic. For example requirements for a rail bridge could be at variance with a more generic standard covering bridges in general that had been developed in response to requests from road transport groups. Difficult to audit since it would require specialist knowledge and familiarity with a range of standards. However, where a complaint is received, either by the SDO or SA, then it will need investigation. Similarly the SDO may be asked by the auditor to provide details where there appears to be an overlap between two standards.</p>
<p>15.5 A copy of the final published standard shall be supplied to Standards Australia.</p> <p>NOTE : For internal use by SA and SDO committees.</p>	<p>This would normally be an electronic version.</p>

<p><b>15.6</b> The decisions of the SRB developing a Standard shall not be changed or over-ruled by the SDO unless there are special circumstances. The circumstances where such occurrences may apply shall be documented.</p> <p>NOTE : Such special circumstances most often occur where there is irreconcilable conflict in the SRB, where there are serious concerns from a regulator, where there are sustained significant concerns from a key user stakeholder, or where the accredited standards development process has not been followed.</p>	<p>This requirement, which relates to each individual standard, refers to decisions made by the SRB on process (e.g. to send for public comment, to go to ballot, to proceed with the project, to proceed with final publication). The note explains the type of circumstances that could apply and the SDO will need to identify their own special circumstances taking into account their key stakeholders. Note that over-ruling a decision does not apply to changing the technical content of a standard, i.e. Clause 5.2 still applies.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy relating to when a decision can be over-ruled.</li> <li>• Process to be followed.</li> <li>• Records for a standard showing no instance of interference.</li> </ul> <p>Note that Clauses 15.6 and 15.7 are usually audited together.</p>
<p><b>15.7</b> Where the SDO is proposing to overrule or change the decisions of the SRB, this shall be done in conjunction with the SRB. Communication between the SDO and the SRB concerning the changes shall be documented.</p> <p>NOTE : E-mail is suitable.</p>	<p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Circumstances relating to the particular instance.</li> <li>• Records of any communication.</li> </ul>

## 16 STANDARDS REFERENCE BODY—OPENNESS

Requirement	Guidance
<p><b>16.1</b> The development, and technical content, of each standard shall be the responsibility of a Standards Reference Body (SRB).</p> <p>NOTE : This SRB may be established at the beginning of a project, or may already exist and just take on the development of another standard in a series.</p>	<p>Self evident, standards are not the responsibility of one or two individuals. The requirements for the SRB are given in the following clauses.</p>

<p>16.2 Participation in an SRB shall be open to all stakeholders who are directly and materially affected by the proposed standard.</p>	<p>Each SDO will need to identify those stakeholders that are relevant to the individual SRB and/or standard to be developed. In many cases these stakeholders will not be directly involved with the SDO itself since the SDO's representative base may be limited. This requirement does not mean an SRB has to be open to anyone who may have a 'vague interest' in the project. Where a group asks to be involved and the SDO has doubts, the SDO could ask that group to justify why they should be involved.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List of organisations that could be approached to participate.</li> <li>• Classification of organisations by interest group.</li> <li>• Composition of individual SRBs complies.</li> </ul>
<p>16.3 The SDO shall invite significant interests to participate in a Standards development project and become a member of the appropriate SRB.</p>	<p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Records of invitations to participate in an SRB.</li> <li>• Alternatives where an organisation declines.</li> <li>• Interest group coverage.</li> </ul>
<p>16.4 No relevant interest group with a bona fide desire to participate shall be excluded from the SRB.</p>	<p>In many cases it is a question of getting organisations to participate rather than turning them away! Cl. 16.2 also covers this point, and the need for participants to be directly and materially affected still applies.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests to participate and outcomes.</li> </ul>
<p>16.5 There shall be no undue financial barriers to participation.</p>	<p>In some standards organisations there is a 'pay to participate' regime. Where this payment is set high there is a barrier to those interests who may have difficulty meeting the fee (e.g. consumer groups, sole traders, environmentalists). It is highly desirable that no meeting fees be charged.</p> <p>Similarly, SDO's need to avoid unintended financial barriers to participation. This could involve holding meetings in exotic and expensive locations. Travel and accommodation costs can be real barriers for some groups.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No or small meeting fees.</li> <li>• Meetings easily accessible.</li> </ul>

<p><b>16.6 Membership of the SRB shall not be conditional upon membership in any organisation, nor unreasonably restricted on the basis of technical qualifications or other such requirements.</b></p>	<p>SRB members usually represent a special interest organisation and are often members of that organisation (or their employer is a member). It is this way that the views of the special interest organisation is transmitted to the SRB (and vice versa). This Clause, however, requires that it is not compulsory for an SRB member to be part of any organisation. This includes professional and technical associations (e.g. Engineers Australia). Similarly, an SDO cannot stipulate that SRB members must have a particular degree or trade qualification. The objective of SRB membership is to get the best person for the job and the one who will best present the interests of the group they are representing.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of SRB members (i.e. no obvious bias).</li> <li>• Policy statements to this effect.</li> <li>• Records of approaches made to organisations/individuals.</li> </ul>
<p><b>16.7 Where a major sector does not accept the invitation to participate, the SDO shall determine the reason(s) why. The SDO should take steps to address the sector’s concerns to encourage participation.</b></p> <p>NOTE : Concerns could include: lack of interest in the subject; lack of resources; or lack of confidence in the structural or procedural aspects of the process.</p>	<p>The objective in developing a balanced and representative SRB is to obtain the widest possible input into the resulting standard. If a group does not participate there is the danger that the resulting standard will not be complete and will not cover issues relevant to that group. This reduces the value of the standard to the community and could also lead to the standard being ignored. The note indicates what may be some reasons for non-participation. Note that Cl. 16.8 is a special case of this more general policy.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refusals to participate</li> <li>• SDO’s inquiries.</li> <li>• Action taken to meet concerns.</li> </ul>

<p><b>16.8</b> Where consumer or public interest representation would provide the needed balance of interests, the SDO shall identify and make efforts to secure support for equal access and effective participation of such interests.</p> <p>NOTE : This does not require the SDO to provide financial support from their operating budgets.</p>	<p>Since both public interest and consumer groups are often not well funded they may have difficulty attending meetings of the SRB (e.g. due to travel costs). Some groups may also feel inadequate amongst ‘high powered technical experts’. There are also disabled groups (e.g. blind, deaf, and wheelchair users) who may have difficulty participating for physical reasons.</p> <p>While the SDO is not required to provide financial support for these groups they could make representations to organisations who could provide funding support for disadvantaged members. Similarly, where participation is limited due to physical factors the SDO could take action such as changing the meeting room location to allow disabled access, ensuring hearing loops are present, facilitating the use of guide dogs and so on.</p> <p>Note that the auditor could ask why consumers or public interest groups are not on an SRB when it would seem appropriate for them to be there.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Records of problems with participation.</li> <li>• Representations made.</li> <li>• Actions taken to facilitate participation.</li> </ul>
---	--

## 17 STANDARDS REFERENCE BODY—BALANCE

Requirement	Guidance
<p><b>17.1</b> The SRB shall comprise a balanced representation from all major interest categories relevant to the Standard.</p> <p>NOTE : Relevant participants would be those materially and directly affected by the published Standard.</p>	<p>Balance in SRBs preparing standards is one of the fundamental principles of standardisation<sup>3</sup>. As mentioned previously, incomplete representation can severely restrict the coverage of a standard and adversely affect its use and benefit to the community.</p> <p>The requirement is more in the nature of a general policy statement and the next two clauses provide details on what is the required constitution of SRBs.</p> <p>Note that Clauses 17.1, 17.2 and 17.3 are usually audited together.</p>

<sup>3</sup> ISO/IEC Guide 59:1994 Code of good practice for standardization.

<p><b>17.2 The interest categories shall be at least producer, user, and general interest. On an SRB, each interest category may cover a number of organisations or interest groups.</b></p> <p>NOTES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. See definitions for description of these groups.</li> <li>2. Further interest categories that may be used include the following: a) Consumer; b) Directly affected public; c) Distributor and retailer; d) Industrial/commercial; e) Insurance; f) Labour; g) Manufacturer; h) Professional society; i) Regulatory agency; j) Conformity assessment interests (e.g. testing laboratories, certification bodies); k) Industry association.</li> </ol>	<p>Note that the SDO, if on the SRB, would need to be part of one of the three categories, not a special category called SDO. If desired, and to better identify the groups that need to be on the SRB some of the categories mentioned in the Note can be used.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Records of SRB constitution, with categories identified.</li> <li>• Categories are realistically allocated to members.</li> </ul>
<p><b>17.3 No one interest (category or organisation) shall have a disproportionate representation on the SRB.</b></p> <p>NOTE : This would generally mean no one interest category would have more than 50% representation on the SRB, and preferably 1/3 for each of the three categories. Similarly, no one organisation may have more than 50% of the representatives on the SRB</p>	<p>It is difficult to provide quantitative requirements for SRB makeup since each standard can vary. SDOs will need to satisfy themselves that the make up of the SRB meets the intention of this clause. It is also suggested the SDO's technical representation to be limited (1 or 2). Organisation could mean the organisation (or group) the member is representing or the organisation the member is employed by.</p> <p>Note that the auditor could ask the SDO to justify the makeup of the committee if it seems there is bias to one category or organisation.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Records of SRB constitution, with representatives by category and organisations identified.</li> </ul>
<p><b>17.4 The defined interest categories and their representation on the SRB shall be publically available on the organisation's website.</b></p> <p>NOTE : When making this information public care should be taken to ensure individuals are not inadvertently identified (privacy). When describing the representation of a stakeholder interest group, this is generally limited to the organisations the members of the SRB represent.</p>	<p>The Note warns about the necessity to ensure privacy and not revealing members names unless the members have agreed in writing for this to occur. When the makeup of an SRB is made publicly available (e.g. on a website, in the published standard) categories do not have to be included. The use of categories is generally to assist the SDO in achieving a balanced committee.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Records of SRB constitution, with categories identified.</li> <li>• Any request and their responses.</li> </ul>

<p>17.5 Where an SDO is a participant in an SRB the SDO’s contribution shall be impartial, free from bias and avoid a conflict of interest between its role as a facilitator of the Standards Development process and as a participant in the process.</p> <p>NOTE : Participant includes both a technical member or the SRB secretariat.</p>	<p>This carries on from the more general policy in Cl. 5.1 and 5.2. In essence, the SDO representative cannot intimidate or otherwise try and force SRB members to adopt the SDO's views. The SDO voice should be one amongst equals. Validity of technical argument should be the only tool used.</p> <p>Note the auditor might ask the SDO to provide details of committee decisions if a query has been raised with SA or SDAC over undue influence being exerted by the SDO.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minutes of meetings showing decisions.</li> </ul>
<p>17.6 Any changes to the constitution of the SRB shall be recorded, including the rationale for the change. Any change shall maintain a balanced representation.</p>	<p>The purpose of this requirement is to ensure SRB makeup is not changed by stealth (to favour one group or organisation) after initial setup. The changes will be monitored at audit.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comparison of current make up and makeup when SRB originally formed.</li> <li>• Records of any changes and justifications.</li> </ul>

## 18 PROJECT PROPOSAL

Requirement	Guidance
<p>18.1 For each new or revised standard a Project Proposal shall be developed. This proposal shall cover—</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the scope and objective of the proposed standard;</li> <li>the need for the proposed Standard;</li> <li>a broad base of support for the development of the proposed Standard;</li> <li>the Net Benefit of the standard including:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the benefits of the proposed standard in</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>This clause specifies what is required in a proposal to develop a new (or revise an existing) standard. Its objective is to ensure there is a need for a standard, i.e. it avoids unnecessary standards that may ‘seem like a good idea’ without considering the consequences. It also prevents ‘gold plated’ standards and helps with the concept of ‘fit for purpose’. An added advantage is it helps the SDO balance their workload by ensuring the standards it develops are of benefit to the community and have widespread support.</p> <p>There is separate guidance material on how to develop a net benefit case at: <a href="http://www.standards.org.au/standards-development/accreditation">www.standards.org.au/standards-development/accreditation</a>.</p> <p>It is up to the SDO to develop their own format for the project proposal and how it is received and processed. However, in the interests of transparency the SDO may consider access for the public or stakeholders to submit a proposal together with guidance on information to be provided. (This could be on the SDO’s website.) Another option is to circulate to key stakeholders a call for proposals.</p>

<p>terms of one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Support for innovation, trade and economic benefit.</li> <li>II. Advancement of the health, safety and wellbeing of the community.</li> <li>III. Protection of the natural environment.</li> <li>IV. International competitiveness.</li> </ul> <p>ii) potential or actual impacts of implementing the Standard.</p> <p>NOTES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This may be the responsibility of the SDO or an external proposer.</li> <li>2. The net benefit may apply to a single standard or a series of standards dealing with the same topic.</li> <li>3. Guidance is available on what should be included in the Net Benefit statement.</li> <li>4. The standard may be a new standard or a revision of an existing standard(s).</li> <li>5. The SDO may decide whether or not to require a net benefit case for an amendment to an existing standard.</li> <li>6. As a result of SRB deliberations the Scope may vary over the development process although this should be avoided if possible.</li> </ol> <p>Where a group of closely related standards are being considered, the Project Proposal may cover the group.</p>	<p>Support should come from a broad range of stakeholders. On their own, statements from SDO staff or board members are not sufficient. If possible, support should also be sought from organisations that are not affiliated with the SDO.</p> <p>Where a proposal does not meet the requirements, the SDO will need to work with the proposer to modify the proposal.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project proposal for each standard.</li> <li>• Proposal contains the information specified (see also Cl. 18.2 and 18.3).</li> <li>• There is adequate support.</li> <li>• The net benefit provides sufficient information for an informed decision.</li> </ul> <p>Note that Clauses 18.1, 18.2 and 18.3 are usually audited together.</p>
<p>18.2 The project proposal shall address whether there are any International Standards on the same subject and the reasons why such International</p>	<p>Australia’s obligations under the WTO TBT (see Cl. 4.1) require standards bodies to adopt International Standards wherever possible (there are exemptions for health, safety, environment and interoperability). Alternatively, rather than adopting a complete international</p>

<p>Standards were not being adopted or used as the basis for the proposed standard.</p>	<p>standard (IS) it may be possible to modify an IS and include Australian variations.</p> <p>Proposers should have looked at the ISO and/or IEC catalogues:</p> <p><a href="http://www.iso.org/iso/home/store/catalogue_ics.htm">http://www.iso.org/iso/home/store/catalogue_ics.htm</a></p> <p><a href="http://webstore.iec.ch/?ref=menu">http://webstore.iec.ch/?ref=menu</a></p> <p>Where there is the potential for an IS to be adopted Standards Australia's International Development Manager should be contacted since there are copyright issues. A copy of the standard may be able to be made available to the SDO/SRB for review to determine whether it is suitable.</p> <p>The auditor, when reviewing project proposals, may access the IS catalogues to check whether there are similar standards that have not been referred to.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal contains reference to IS's.</li> <li>• Records or other evidence of searches of international standards catalogues.</li> </ul>
<p>18.3 The proposal shall indicate, if appropriate, the nature of any likely conformity assessment activities (such as testing, inspection, and certification) that may be undertaken once the Standard is published, and the likely bodies that will undertake such activities.</p> <p>NOTE : See also 15.3</p>	<p>This follows from Clause 15.3 and is included in the proposal to alert the SRB that the standard will need to comply with ISO/IEC 17007. By identifying possible CABs there is the opportunity for the SDO to avoid bias in the SRB (i.e. the SRB is not overloaded with representatives from the CAB that will write the standard in a way to benefit the CAB) and that neutrality in conformance assessment is preserved.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal contains reference to conformance assessment.</li> </ul>

## 19 APPROVAL OF PROJECTS

Requirement	Guidance
<p>19.1 The SDO shall approve (or otherwise) any proposed new project. Prior to approving any new project, the SDO shall review each project proposal to ensure—</p>	<p>Before approving the proposed project, the SDO will need to satisfy themselves that the stated requirements have been met. If there is some doubt the SDO should negotiate with the proposer to clarify/amend aspects of the proposal.</p> <p>The auditor may request the SDO to justify their decision if there is some doubt about the</p>

<p>a) the Standard is consistent with the national interest and demonstrates a net public benefit;</p> <p>b) reasonable attempts have been made to achieve harmonization with existing national Standards; and</p> <p>c) there has been adequate consideration of possible International Standards.</p>	<p>proposal complying.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved project proposal.</li> <li>• Reasons for the decision.</li> <li>• Net benefit case.</li> </ul>
---	---

## 20 DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Requirement	Guidance
<p>20.1 Following project approval, the SDO shall prepare a development plan that includes—</p> <p>a) the document being developed;</p> <p>b) the SRB responsible for the project;</p> <p>c) the person in the SDO responsible for the project;</p> <p>d) the type of project i.e. new Standard, revision of an existing standard(s), or an amendment to an existing standard;</p> <p>e) the anticipated timeframe for completion of the proposed Standard including key milestone dates such as commencement, public comment and ballot; and</p> <p>f) any key factors that may impinge on completion of the project.</p>	<p>This is basically a tool for helping transparency around a project. It would be useful if this information was available on the SDO’s website. It is also information that can be provided to SDAC for their records or for response to queries from stakeholders or other organisations.</p> <p>The plan also helps the SDO manage their processes.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development plan meeting the requirements.</li> <li>• Public availability.</li> <li>• Responses to requests.</li> </ul> <p>Note that Clauses 20.1, and 20.2 are usually audited together.</p>

<p>NOTES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The development plan can form the basis for public information about the project.</li> <li>2. The timeframe may not be able to be finalised until after the first meeting of the SRB since participant’s commitments may not be known.</li> <li>3. The timeframe should take into account the nature and complexity of the Standard, the needs of the specific user groups such as industry, government and the community, and the resources available.</li> </ol>	
<p>20.2 The development plan shall be monitored and, if appropriate, updated at regular intervals throughout the development of the standard.</p>	<p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reviews of development plan.</li> <li>• Results of any reviews.</li> </ul>

## 21 TRANSPARENCY

Requirement	Guidance
<p>21.1 For each new project the SDO shall publicly make available details of the Standard being developed. This information shall be readily accessible and shall include the work to be undertaken and the formation of any new Standards Reference Bodies. There shall be a process for receiving and, if appropriate, acting on, input from those with an interest in either the content of the proposed standard or in the constitution of the SRB.</p>	<p>Transparency in the development of standards is one of the fundamental principles of standardisation<sup>4</sup>. Transparency in relation to new project proposals has already been mentioned (Cl. 18). The SDO can choose the method for publically displaying the project details that best suits their clients’ and/or stakeholders’ needs. However, care should be taken to ensure ‘public’ display does not become a closed shop amongst an elite few stakeholders. The general public should be able to easily access the information as well.</p> <p>There is a requirement for SDOs to receive feedback about a proposed project and about an SRB. Basically this provides an opportunity for someone to determine what the standard covers (the scope could be a useful inclusion in available information), and “why doesn’t it cover...” It also allows someone to check whether their interests are being represented on the committee (either an interest category or representative organisation).</p> <p>Where appropriate input is received it needs to be referred to the appropriate body to deal with it,</p>

<sup>4</sup> ISO/IEC Guide 59:1994 Code of good practice for standardization.

<p>NOTES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The development plan could be the basis for this notification.</li> <li>2. Publicity could include on a web site, through a new sletter, and/or a special notification to key stakeholders.</li> </ol>	<p>e.g. the SDO for SRB issues or the SRB for technical issues.</p> <p>The SDO will determine the most appropriate method for receiving feedback (e.g. webform, e-mail, phone) and for acting on it. It would seem appropriate that the enquiry process (Cl. 9.1) also handle these issues.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures relating to the public notification of new projects.</li> <li>• Form and location of publicly available information.</li> <li>• Currency of publicly available information.</li> <li>• Process for receiving feedback.</li> <li>• Feedback received and any action taken.</li> </ul>
<p>21.2 A draft of the Standard shall be made available for public comment. This draft shall be as complete as possible and its release is to have the objective of gaining feedback from potential users of the standard on the appropriateness, or otherwise, of the requirements. Release of the draft shall be agreed to by the SRB. Availability of the draft shall be advised in suitable media. A reasonable period shall be allowed for the receipt of feedback.</p> <p>NOTES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Suitable media could include a web site, through a new sletter, and/or a special notification to key stakeholders and potential users. There is no requirement for a paid advertisement although this could be used if appropriate.</li> <li>2. 60 days is an acceptable minimum and complies with WTO requirements.</li> </ol>	<p>The Clause and Notes provide a good description of what is required.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures relating to the public comment draft.</li> <li>• SRB agreement to release document (e.g. minutes).</li> <li>• Form and location of publicly available draft.</li> <li>• Is the draft readily accessible by interested parties, i.e. not restricted to a limited audience.</li> <li>• Special notifications of draft becoming available.</li> <li>• Process for receiving comment; ease of use by the public and non-technical (IT) individuals.</li> <li>• Examples of comment received.</li> </ul>
<p>21.3 The SRB shall receive, review, consider and record the disposition of all public comment.</p> <p>NOTES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The SDO can decide which is the most appropriate</li> </ol>	<p>The key here is the requirement for the SRB to consider each comment individually. Comment should not be ignored because, for example, it comes from someone who is considered not to know what they are talking about, it comes from an organisation who is a competitor to one of the SRB members, or because it is from a group the SRB doesn't like. It may even be appropriate for the SDO to list comments anonymously before they are considered by the SRB.</p>

<p>method(s) of receiving comment, e.g. on-line form, via email, Word document.</p> <p>2. There is no requirement to respond to individual public comments, including the result of the SRB’s deliberations, although the SDO may choose to do so.</p>	<p>While it is the responsibility of each SRB to determine the appropriate action for each comment, the general approach could be to: reject the comment because it is not within the scope of the standard; accept the comment as valid and modify the standard; or not accept the comment for technical reasons. In the latter case the technical reasons why the comment was not accepted could be recorded. Note that irrespective of the approach, each decision needs to be recorded.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples of public comment listings.</li> <li>• Process used by the SRB to consider comment.</li> <li>• Records of consideration of comments.</li> </ul>
--	---

## 22 CONTENT APPROVAL AND CONSENSUS

Requirement	Guidance
<p>22.1 Procedures for standards development, as well as the technical content of the standard, shall be based on consensus.</p>	<p>This is, in essence, a policy statement. The consensus requirements for the technical content are given in the next two clauses. However, when reviewing other procedures and records the auditor will be looking for indications of where consensus has not been appropriately considered e.g. where decisions can be made on behalf of the SRB without their involvement.</p>
<p>22.2 The final technical content of the document shall be the result of a consensus agreement between members of the SRB. Evidence of consensus shall be a formal vote, with all members of the SRB being given the opportunity to vote.</p>	<p>The Clause provides a good description of what is required. The SDO is free to decide the most appropriate method of receiving the vote (e.g. web form, email, word document) and the length of the voting period. For the latter 1 – 2 weeks is appropriate. The SDO may need to ‘chase up’ members who have not submitted a vote.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Voting procedure.</li> <li>• Record of the vote.</li> </ul> <p>Note that Clauses 22.2 and 22.3 are usually audited together.</p>

<p>22.3 If there is not a unanimous vote, and if the SRB has made all reasonable efforts but is still unable to resolve one or more negative votes, consensus shall be deemed to have been achieved if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) a minimum 67% of those eligible to vote have voted affirmatively; and</li> <li>b) a minimum 80% of votes received are affirmative; and</li> <li>c) no major interest involved with the subject of the Standard has collectively maintained a negative vote.</li> </ul> <p>NOTE : See Appendix A for an explanation of the voting rules.</p>	<p>These rules are not straightforward, so Appendix A provides further explanation.</p> <p>This clause assumes that where there is not a unanimous vote there must be negative votes. However, there is the situation where not all members vote (i.e. it is not unanimous) but there are no negative votes. In this case it would be reasonable for SDOs to use point a) as the measure of consensus, i.e. 67% of members vote affirmatively, the balance of the members either not voting or abstaining. If the voting is less than 67% then the SDO will need to get those members who have not voted to submit a vote. If, despite the SDO's efforts, the 67% level is not reached, the SDO should not really claim consensus.</p> <p>'Resolution of negative votes' simply refers to the SRB determining what it would take for members voting negatively to change their vote to affirmative. Discussions could involve providing further technical evidence supporting a stance; modifying the standard to meet the member's concerns; or resolving not to proceed with publishing the standard.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Record of the vote.</li> <li>• Correct application of the voting rules.</li> <li>• Actions taken to resolve any negative votes.</li> </ul>
---	---

## 23 PROCESS APPROVAL

Requirement	Guidance
<p>23.1 Once the SRB has achieved consensus and the technical content of the standard is finalised, Senior Management within the SDO shall finally approve the standard for publication. In giving this approval the SDO Management shall satisfy itself that the standard has been through, and complied with, the accredited processes specified in Section 3 of this document. (Clauses 15 to 22; see also Clause 5.2)</p> <p>NOTES:</p>	<p>The Clause and Notes provide a good description of what is required.</p> <p>Possible evidence of compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedure for process approval.</li> <li>• Documents considered as part of the approval process.</li> <li>• Records of approval.</li> </ul>

<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Senior Management could be a governance committee of the SDO, a committee with the responsibility for oversight of standards activities, or a senior manager with delegated responsibility for ensuring process has been complied with.</li><li>2. Evidence that Senior Management may require before giving final process approval could include: the approved project proposal (is the scope of the document as was originally approved, was there a net benefit case), composition of the SRB (adequate balance and representation), details of the public comment process (were the public given sufficient opportunity to comment), and the final ballot results (was consensus reached, were there any negative votes and how were they resolved).</li></ol>	
---	--

## ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE MATERIAL

### Patent Policy (Refers to requirement 10.2)

<p><b>ISO/IEC Directives, Part 1, Consolidated ISO Supplement, 2013</b></p>	<p><b>2.14.1</b> If, in exceptional situations, technical reasons justify such a step, there is no objection in principle to preparing an International Standard in terms which include the use of items covered by patent rights – defined as patents, utility models and other statutory rights based on inventions, including any published applications for any of the foregoing – even if the terms of the standard are such that there are no alternative means of compliance. The rules given below and in the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2, 2011, Annex F shall be applied.</p> <p><b>2.14.2</b> If technical reasons justify the preparation of a document in terms which include the use of items covered by patent rights, the following procedures shall be complied with:</p> <p>a) The originator of a proposal for a document shall draw the attention of the committee to any patent rights of which the originator is aware and considers to cover any item of the proposal. Any party involved in the preparation of a document shall draw the attention of the committee to any patent rights of which it becomes aware during any stage in the development of the document.</p> <p>b) If the proposal is accepted on technical grounds, the originator shall ask any holder of such identified patent rights for a statement that the holder would be willing to negotiate worldwide licences under his rights with applicants throughout the world on reasonable and non-discriminatory terms and conditions. Such negotiations are left to the parties concerned and are performed outside ISO and/or IEC. A record of the right holder’s statement shall be placed in the registry of the ISO Central Secretariat or IEC Central Office as appropriate, and shall be referred to in the introduction to the relevant document [see ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2, 2011, F.3]. If the right holder does not provide such a statement, the committee concerned shall not proceed with inclusion of an item covered by a patent right in the document without authorization from ISO Council or IEC Council Board as appropriate.</p> <p>c) A document shall not be published until the statements of the holders of all identified patent rights have been received, unless the council board concerned gives authorization.</p> <p><b>2.14.3</b> Should it be revealed after publication of a document that licences under patent rights, which appear to cover items included in the document, cannot be obtained under reasonable and non-discriminatory terms and conditions, the document shall be referred back to the relevant committee for further consideration.</p>
<p><b>ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2, 2011</b></p> <p><b>Annex F</b></p> <p><b>Patent rights</b></p> <p>(In part)</p>	<p><b>F.3</b> A published document for which patent rights have been identified during the preparation thereof, shall include the following notice in the introduction where the text in italics is optional:</p> <p>“The International Organization for Standardization (ISO) [and/or] International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) draws attention to the fact that it is claimed that compliance with this document may involve the use of a patent concerning (...subject matter...) given in (...subclause...).</p> <p>ISO [and/or] IEC take[s] no position concerning the evidence, validity and scope of this patent right.</p> <p>The holder of this patent right has assured the ISO [and/or] IEC that he/she is willing to negotiate licences either free of charge or under reasonable and non-discriminatory terms and conditions with applicants throughout the world. In this respect, the statement of the holder of this patent right is registered with ISO [and/or] IEC. Information may be obtained from:</p> <p>... name of holder of patent right ...</p>

	<p>... address ...</p> <p>Attention is drawn to the possibility that some of the elements of this document may be the subject of patent rights other than those identified above. ISO [and/or] IEC shall not be held responsible for identifying any or all such patent rights.</p> <p>ISO (<a href="http://www.iso.org/patents">www.iso.org/patents</a>) and IEC (<a href="http://patents.iec.ch">http://patents.iec.ch</a>) maintain on-line databases of patents relevant to their standards. Users are encouraged to consult the databases for the most up to date information concerning patents.”</p>
<p><b>Standards Australia Standardisation Guide 3</b></p>	<p><b>3.7 Patents</b></p> <p>A Standard does not confer a monopoly on one section of industry to the detriment of another that can provide an equally satisfactory article. Nonetheless, on exceptional occasions, technical reasons may justify inclusion in the Standard of items or services covered by patent rights. There is no objection in principle to this, provided that certain rules are adhered to.</p> <p>The rules governing patented items in Standards are those adopted by ISO and IEC. The most important rule is that, before use of material known to be the subject of a patent is made a requirement of a Standard, it is to be ensured by means of a formal statement that the owner of the patent has agreed to make licences available to all who apply on reasonable and non-discriminatory terms.</p>

### Audits and auditing (Refers to Requirement 3.1)

<p><b>Accreditation audit</b></p>	<p>Objective: <i>“Is the organisation suitable and prepared”</i></p> <p>Is the organisation appropriately structured and resourced.</p> <p>What is its status in the sector / community .</p> <p>Do the standardisation activities have the support of its stakeholders.</p> <p>Are the necessary policies and procedures in place.</p> <p>Are staff (and other participants) aware of the policies, procedures, and their roles and responsibilities.</p>
<p><b>Surveillance audit</b></p>	<p>Objective: <i>“Are the documents being properly prepared and managed”</i></p> <p>To ensure any documents produced, or being produced, comply with the SDO’s accredited procedures and the appropriate requirements.</p> <p>To check whether required activities in addition to document development are being carried out.</p> <p>Check and approve any changes to procedures.</p> <p>Where there may be concerns, check whether the organisation retains its status and support and has adequate resources.</p> <p>Close out any previous observations / non-conformances.</p>
<p><b>Re-accreditation audit</b></p>	<p>Objective: <i>“Is the organisation and its processes still on track”</i></p> <p>Check whether the organisation retains its status and support; has adequate resources; and there have been no significant changes (e.g. governance).</p>

	<p>Check whether required activities in addition to document development are being carried out.</p> <p>Ensure staff and other participants such as SRB members continue to be aware of their roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>Check and approve any changes to procedures.</p> <p>Monitor document development.</p> <p>Close out any previous observations / non conformances</p>
<b>The audit</b>	<p>A surveillance audit should only take about a day, re-accreditation about 2 days; but this will depend on the SDO's activity.</p> <p>There will be a brief meeting to explain the audit, introduce the auditor and staff, and set out the audit schedule.</p> <p>Compliance is demonstrated by records, so ensure records are up to date and accessible.</p> <p>Records DO NOT have to be paper, most these days are electronic (e.g. e-mail, pdf, rows in a spread sheet, records in a database).</p> <p>Do not preselect examples (e.g. of a standard being developed). The auditor will select their own samples during the audit.</p> <p>Audit team members will act impartially and maintain confidentiality.</p>
<b>Post audit</b>	<p>At the conclusion of the audit there should be an exit meeting where issues can be discussed. Use this to ensure both the SDO and the auditor are absolutely clear on any findings/issues.</p> <p>At the meeting the auditor should also hand out an evaluation sheet. This should be completed and returned direct to the SDAC secretary.</p> <p>A draft report will be made available to the SDO by the auditor. The SDO will then have the opportunity to comment on any findings and clear up any misunderstandings before the final report is submitted to SDAC.</p>

## DEFINITIONS

### **Consensus—**

general agreement, characterized by the absence of sustained opposition to substantial issues by any important part of the concerned interests and by a process that involves seeking to take into account the views of all parties concerned and to reconcile any conflicting arguments.

NOTE : Consensus need not imply unanimity.

[ISO/IEC Guide 2]

### **Consensus agreement—**

when all of the major interests involved with the subject of the Standard have collectively accepted the content of the document and have voted affirmatively. This normally implies a unanimous affirmative vote, but occasionally it may be achieved where there are one or more outstanding negative votes.

### **Consumer—**

individual member of the general public, or consumer organizations, purchasing or using property, products or services for private purposes.

### **General interest—**

those with a demonstrated interest and relevant expertise that are not associated with the production, distribution, direct use, or regulation of the product(s), material(s) or service(s).

NOTE : May include technical or professional associations and trade unions.

### **Net benefit—**

the value or benefit of a standard to the Australian community that exceeds the costs likely to be imposed on suppliers, users and other parties in the community as a result of its development and implementation.

### **Procedure—**

specified way to carry out an activity or a process (ISO 9000:2006)  
[Alternatively: a series of actions conducted in a certain order or manner].

NOTES:

3. Procedures can be documented or not.

4. Where documented procedures are required this is specified.
5. Documented procedures can be electronic or physical documents.

### **Procedures, Standards Management—**

procedures for standards related activities within the organisation other than for the process of developing a standard. Used to be called ‘Administrative procedures’ and can include such processes as standards review and complaint handling.

### **Procedures, Standards Development—**

description of the standards development process from initial project proposal to the final publication, including establishment or review of SRBs.

### **Process—**

a series of actions or steps taken in order to achieve a particular end.

[Alternatively: a set of interrelated or interacting activities which transforms inputs into outputs - ISO 9000:2006]

NOTE : Inputs to a process are generally outputs of other processes.

### **Producer—**

those who are predominantly involved in production (i.e. manufacture), promotion, retailing, importing or distribution of the subject product(s), material(s) or service(s). Often termed a **Supplier**.

NOTE : A supplier can also be a contractor in contractual situations.

### **Project—**

a planned piece of work that has a specific purpose.

[Alternatively: unique process consisting of a set of coordinated and controlled activities with start and finish dates, undertaken to achieve an objective conforming to specific requirements, including the constraints of time, costs and resources. ISO 9000:2006]

### **Project manager—**

the person responsible for managing a standard’s development project (Clause 2.4).

**Regulator—**

any federal, state, municipal or other government instrumentality responsible for regulating the acceptability, sale or use of the subject products, materials or services and those bodies that enforce these rules and regulations.

**Standards Reference Body—**

the group (committee) of technical experts having the responsibility for the technical content of the standard they are developing.

**Technical content—**

the requirements, specifications, and/or recommendations, and associated tables and figures, that comprise the body of the standard. The technical content is developed within the scope of the standard.

**User—**

those who predominantly represent end users of the subject product(s), material(s), or service(s) and who are not involved in any way in production and/or distribution of the subject product(s), material(s) or service(s).

NOTE : Users can include consumers; general interest users; industrial users where the product(s), material(s), or service(s) is an input to a production process; and labour users where the product(s), material(s), or service(s) may be used in the workplace.

## APPENDIX A EXPLANATION OF THE VOTING RULES

### Informative

#### A.1 Background

These voting rules have been used by Standards Australia for over 20 years. They were originally brought in to replace a rule that required no outstanding negative votes before a standard could be published. This rule had led to situations where a standard that had received nearly complete support by the SRB was prevented from being published by a single self interested SRB member that continually voted no.

The objective of the rules was to allow a standard to proceed where there may have been one or a few outstanding negative votes, but where there was strong support from the remainder of the SRB. To avoid disadvantaging a particular sector the additional safeguard of not publishing the standard if a major interest involved with the subject of the Standard collectively maintained a negative vote was introduced.

These voting rules are quite restrictive but do ensure there is a high level of agreement within a SRB before the standard can be published. When looking at the votes the first check is the number of votes cast since a minimum 2/3 of the SRB must have voted. Where less than 2/3 of the SRB vote, it is not possible to claim consensus irrespective of the number of positive or negative votes. If 2/3 of the SRB have voted, and all these votes are affirmative then consensus can be claimed. If there are one or more negative votes in this batch then further votes will have to be submitted by the remaining 1/3 of members until such times as 80% of votes submitted are affirmative. Provided there is no significant interest group continuing to vote no, consensus can then be claimed.

The table below gives some examples of how these rules work for a hypothetical SRB of 20 members.

Members Voting	Voting YES	Voting NO	Consensus	
20	17	3	<b>Yes</b>	>67% of SRB vote yes >80% votes received are yes
20	15	5	<b>No</b>	>67% of SRB vote yes <80% votes received are yes
20	13	7	<b>No</b>	<67% of SRB vote yes <80% votes received are yes
18	15	3	<b>Yes</b>	>67% of SRB vote yes >80% votes received are yes
18	14	4	<b>No</b>	>67% of SRB vote yes <80% votes received are yes

16	13	3	<b>No</b>	<67% of SRB vote yes >80% votes received are yes
16	14	1	<b>Yes</b>	>67% of SRB vote yes >80% votes received are yes
14	12	2	<b>No</b>	<67% of SRB vote yes <80% votes received are yes
14	14	0	<b>Yes</b>	>67% of SRB vote yes >80% votes received are yes
10	9	1	<b>No</b>	<67% of SRB vote yes >80% votes received are yes

## DOCUMENT HISTORY

Version	Date	Change Details
1	1 October 2014	New Document
2	15 December 2015	Incorporate Version 2 (15 December 2015) of the Requirements for Accreditation.  Replacement of ‘ABSDO’ with SDAC or SA as appropriate.  Delete reference to Secretary ABSDO or replace with appropriate SA officer.
2.1	17 July 2019	Delete or replace references to SAI Global and related matters as appropriate. Amend Sections 4 & 17.4 to align with changes made to SDAC-001 on 29 January 2018.