Standard Revision Survey

* Required

Welcome to the ResponsibleSteel standard revision consultation portal

Welcome to the ResponsibleSteel Standard Revision consultation portal. This is an opportunity for stakeholders to provide feedback on proposed revisions to the ResponsibleSteel International Production Standard, including proposals relating to greenhouse gas emissions, alignment with regulations, workers' rights, and claims. Feedback received through this consulta-tion will help shape the next draft of the Production Standard and inform the development of Version 3.0.

If you cannot use this portal for any reason, feel language is a barrier to participation or have any other questions please email us at standards@responsiblesteel.org in any language and we will do our best to accommodate your request.

如果由于任何原因您无法使用此门户，感觉语言是参与的障碍，或者有任何其他问题，请以任何语言通过电子邮件与我们联系，邮箱地址为 standards@responsiblesteel.org，我们将尽力满足您的请求。

Data Protection Notice

The specific purpose of the survey is to collect stakeholder input to proposed changes to the International Production Standard v2.1.1 (categorised as 'research' under UK GDPR). This survey is entirely optional and you may withdraw at any time. Any project reports and case studies using the information in this form may have the names and organisations of consulta-tion participants redacted, depending on the preference you state below.

Given the above would you like to continue?

1. Do you agree to the collection and use of your personal data as described above? *

- ◯ I would like to continue and am willing to be named in any public report
- ◯ I would like to continue but do not want to be named in any public report
- ◯ I do not want to continue (end survey)

Purpose and scope of consultation

ResponsibleSteel is reviewing and revising the ResponsibleSteel International Production Standard to ensure it continues to reflect evolving industry needs, advances in responsible steel production, and the expectations of stakeholders across the steel value chain.

More information on the Standard Revision can be found here.

The public consultation is open from 30 September to 23 November and provides an opportunity to review the pro-posed revisions, understand the rationale behind them, and share your feedback. Your input will help shape the next version of the Standard and ensure it remains credible, practical and effective in driving continuous improvement across the global steel industry.

You can download an export of this survey as a **PDF** and an **Excel file.**
The primary ways to participate are by completing the consultation survey and joining focused discussions with the ResponsibleSteel team if required. **You can register interest in a focused discussion here**. Either way, before providing feedback, we encourage you to review the consultation materials, explainer videos and FAQs available on the next page of this survey.

If you wish to provide feedback on more than one topic you will need to complete the survey multiple times. You will be able to choose which topic you respond to on the next page.

It is strongly recommended that you finalise your answers in a separate document and then come back to the survey only when you are ready to submit your responses.

This consultation covers a range of topics. More information on each topic can be found below.

0. An overview of the proposed revisions across all consultation topics, including the rationale for change and key consultation questions.

- Download PDF

1. **Proposed revisions to Principle 10** (Climate Change & Greenhouse Gas Emissions) aim to improve clarity, comparability and credibility in greenhouse gas accounting, disclosure and decarbonisation planning. The consultation covers climate trans-ition planning, emissions accounting methodologies, Decarbonisation Progress Levels and disclosure requirements.

- Watch explainer video
- Overview document (PDF)
- Workstream 1: Climate transition planning
- Workstream 2: GHG emissions accounting methodologies
- Workstream 3: Product emissions allocation for Decarbonisation Progress Level (DPL) classification

2. Proposed changes seeking to strengthen expectations around planning for workforce and community impacts associated with decarbonisation, decommissioning and **industrial conversions related to climate change.**

- Watch explainer video
- Overview document (PDF)

3. Proposed revisions aiming to clarify **annual leave** requirements while recognising different legal and operational contexts across ResponsibleSteel-certified sites.

- Watch explainer video
- Overview document (PDF)

4. Exploring how ResponsibleSteel can better support members navigating an increasingly complex landscape of **ESG regulations, reporting frameworks and due diligence requirements.**

- Watch explainer video
- ESG Mapping Tool (PDF)
- ESG Frameworks (PDF)

5. Proposed changes seeking to simplify and strengthen the rules **enabling claims** about ResponsibleSteel-certified sites and products, while supporting greater uptake of steel from certified sites.

- Watch explainer video
- Overview document (PDF)

2. What is your feedback about? *

Please select one only. If you would like to provide feedback on more than one topic please complete the survey multiple times.

- ◯ Climate Change and GHG Emissions
- ◯ Enabling Claims
- ◯ ESG Regulations, Reporting Frameworks and Due Diligence Requirements
- ◯ Industrial Conversions Related to Climate Change
- ◯ Annual Leave

Principle 10 (Climate Change & Greenhouse Gas Emissions)

Climate transition planning

- Watch explainer video
- Overview document (PDF)
- Workstream 1: Climate Transition Planning (available upon request)
- Workstream 2: GHG Accounting & Methodologies (available upon request)
- Workstream 3: Decarbonisation Progress Levels & Disclosure (available upon request)

3. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Overall, the proposed changes to P10 related to climate transition planning (as summarised in Table 1) are acceptable to me.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

4. Please explain your answer.

5. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Replacing the requirement to meet a sector-wide, temperature-aligned pathway with the requirement to have an explicit corporate commitment to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050 improves the clarity and auditability of the requirement.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

6. Please explain your answer.

7. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
A net-zero target year beyond 2050 can be justified by national circumstances, such as where relevant sites are located in developing-country contexts or in countries with an established national net-zero target beyond 2050.	○	○	○	○	○	○
Where an organisation operates sites across multiple countries, the justification should consider its overall geographic footprint and capacity to decarbonise.	○	○	○	○	○	○
Greater expectations should apply where the organisation is headquartered in, or predominantly operates in, developed countries.	○	○	○	○	○	○

8. Please explain your answers.

9. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Material upstream Scope 3 emissions should be included alongside Scope 1 and 2 for defining a net-zero emissions target at the corporate level.	○	○	○	○	○	○

10. Please explain your answer.

11. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
If material Scope 3 emissions are included in the net-zero emissions target, there are certain GHG Protocol categories that should be mandatory for inclusion.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

12. Please explain your answer, defining any mandatory GHG Protocol Scope 3 categories (1–15) you would set for the inclusion of Scope 3 emissions.

13. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
To determine whether near-term targets can credibly contribute to the long-term net-zero ambition, auditors would need evidence of both the strategy (a documented plan setting out the actions, investments and technologies expected to deliver the near-term targets and long-term ambition) and the feasibility of the targets (evidence that they are achievable based on the organisation's operations, planned investments and available technologies).	○	○	○	○	○	○
Successful near-term implementation of a corporate Climate Transition Plan (CTP) should be demonstrated by achievement of the published near-term emission reduction targets and/or demonstrated completion of defined actions and milestones set out in the CTP.	○	○	○	○	○	○

14. Please explain your answers.

15. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Site-level achievement of Decarbonisation Progress Level (DPL) 1 by 2030 should be the minimum requirement for demonstrating credible near-term progress. DPL1 ranges from ≤2.80 tCO_2e/t crude steel (cs) at 0% scrap to ≤0.50 tCO_2e/t csat 100% scrap, covering Scope 1, Scope 2 and material upstream Scope 3 emissions. Audits conducted after 31 December 2030 should demonstrate achievement of at least DPL1 using data for the 2030 calendar year. (Refer to the ResponsibleSteel DPL Guide for more information on DPL1).	○	○	○	○	○	○

16. Please explain your answer.

GHG emissions accounting methodologies

- Watch explainer video
- Overview document (PDF)
- Workstream 1: Climate Transition Planning (available upon request)
- Workstream 2: GHG Accounting & Methodologies (available upon request)
- Workstream 3: Decarbonisation Progress Levels & Disclosure (available upon request)

17. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Overall, the proposed changes to P10 related to GHG emission accounting methodologies (as summarised in Table 2) are acceptable to me.	○	○	○	○	○	○

18. Please explain your answer.

19. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Use of the ResponsibleSteel emissions accounting methodology should be mandatory for steelmaking sites to provide a comparable measure of crude steel GHG emissions intensity, in line with the SSP Transparency Criteria.	○	○	○	○	○	○

20. Please explain your answer.

21. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Alongside the declaration of crude steel GHG emissions intensity, steelmaking sites should be required to declare the percentage of scrap in their metallic inputs, in line with the SSP Transparency Criteria.	○	○	○	○	○	○

22. Please explain your answer.

23. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Sites upstream or downstream of steelmaking (e.g. ironmakers, downstream steel processors) should be required to disclose the emissions intensity of production instead of their annual emissions (which is what they are currently required to do).	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Sites upstream or downstream of steelmaking (e.g. ironmakers, downstream steel processors) should use a common ResponsibleSteel GHG emissions accounting methodology to calculate the emissions intensity of production which allows flexibility in the system boundary cut-off point to reflect different operational configurations (e.g. to capture iron production, crude steel production, or hot-rolled steel production).	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

24. Please explain your answers.

25. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
The conservative default embodied GHG factors (i.e. a 1.2 multiplier applied to the global average for most materials, or 1.6 for methane-intensive materials) should be replaced by a mandatory Primary Data Share (PDS) calculation and disclosure, as proposed in Annex D, and in line with the data quality indicator in the SSP Transparency Criteria.	○	○	○	○	○	○

26. Please explain your answer.

27. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
The SSP Transparency Criteria for GHG Emissions Reporting, including a mandatory requirement to disclose the 'mining to crude steel' emissions intensity in addition to the 'cradle to gate' GWP value in the EPD/PCF, should be incorporated into the requirements for product-level carbon footprint reporting.	○	○	○	○	○	○

28. Please explain your answer.

Product emissions allocation for Decarbonisation Progress Level (DPL) classification

- Watch explainer video
- Overview document (PDF)
- Workstream 1: Climate Transition Planning (available upon request)
- Workstream 2: GHG Accounting & Methodologies (available upon request)
- Workstream 3: Decarbonisation Progress Levels & Disclosure (available upon request)

29. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Overall, the proposed changes to P10 to enable DPL classification for products and production lines in addition to the site-wide average (as summarised in Table 3) is acceptable to me.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

30. Please explain your answer.

31. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
For sites to make DPL claims on products and/or production lines, the whole site should be covered by Core Site certification at a minimum.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
For sites to make DPL claims on products and/or production lines, the whole site should have met at a minimum DPL 1.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

32. Please explain your answers.

33. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
The allocation of renewable energy attributes to specific products or production lines, restricted to the relevant physical flow (i.e. control led mass balance), is acceptable to me. For example, 1000 MWh of renewable electricity attributes could be allocated to a single production line at a site, reducing its market-based Scope 2 emissions to near-zero.	○	○	○	○	○	○

34. Please explain your answer.

Enabling Claims

- Watch explainer video
- Overview document (PDF)

35. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Allowing products that have come from sites that have Core Site certification to be sold with marketing claims, even if they have not reached Progress Level 1 for Principle 3 (Responsible Sourcing of Input Materials) or Principle 10 (Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases) is acceptable.	○	○	○	○	○	○
These products should be called 'Certified Steel' rather than 'steel from a certified site' as part of a unified, simplified system.	○	○	○	○	○	○

36. Please explain your answers.

Enabling Claims

- Watch explainer video
- Overview document (PDF)

37. Which of the following should be required to be in place before a site may sell their products as ResponsibleSteel certified?

Select all that apply.

- [ ] That the product has only been handled by supply chain actors whose processes for the traceability of their products have been verified.
- [ ] That the individual products themselves can be traced back to the steel producer and its volume reconciled by an auditor, wherever it is in the value chain downstream from the steel producer.
- [ ] That an accurate declaration of the GHG emissions associated with those products is provided, based on a regionally or internationally-recognised product carbon footprint (PCF) methodology (in the form of a 3rd party verified PCF or Environmental Product Declaration).

38. Please explain your answer.

Enabling Claims

- Watch explainer video
- Overview document (PDF)

39. To what level of granularity should claims be allowed?

Select all that apply.

- [ ] Site-level: It is only if all of the products from a site are certified that any of the products can be claimed as certified.
- [ ] Production line: Some product lines from a site could be claimed as certified, even if other production lines from the same site are not certified.
- [ ] Product: Some products from a site could be claimed as certified, even if other products from the same site are not certified.

40. Please explain your answer.

Enabling Claims

- Watch explainer video
- Overview document (PDF)

41. To enable claims to be made related to products leaving the site, we need to ensure internal traceability. In your opinion, what is the preferred method?

Select one option.

- ◯ Include additional requirements for traceability into the Production Standard (e.g. P2).
- ◯ Require a separate traceability certification (but find ways to ensure the audits happen at the same time).

42. Please explain your answer.

43. If ResponsibleSteel were to require that only products that have been handled by supply chain actors whose processes for traceability have been verified could be certified, how should these requirements be implemented for steel producers?

Tick all options that are acceptable.

- ☐ By requiring the site to be certified against the same ResponsibleSteel Chain of Custody Standard (details to be confirmed) as the downstream supply chain actors handling certified products.
- ☐ As a principle of the ResponsibleSteel Production Standard that duplicates only those parts of the draft ResponsibleSteel Chain of Custody Standard (i.e. traceability) that are relevant to the steel producer.
- ☐ N/A: Steel producers should not have to do this at all.

44. Please explain your answer.

45. What are the most important things that a site would have to show in order to demonstrate that the risk of counterfeit certified and/or low-emissions steel being sold through their site is low?

Please explain your answer.

46. Please add any further comments on this topic.

Enabling Claims

- Watch explainer video
- Overview document (PDF)

47. The what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
References to what can be claimed about a site or product's achievement should be removed from the Production Standard and relocated to the Claims and Logo Use Guide.	○	○	○	○	○	○

48. Please explain your answer.

ESG Regulations, Reporting Frameworks and Due Diligence Requirements

- Watch explainer video
- ESG Mapping Tool (PDF)
- ESG Frameworks (PDF)

49. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
ResponsibleSteel helps my organisation demonstrate compliance with regulatory frameworks.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

50. Please explain your answer.

About the draft mapping tool

- Watch explainer video
- ESG Mapping Tool (PDF)
- ESG Frameworks (PDF)

51. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Draft mapping tool would help my organisation prepare for and demonstrate compliance with the selected ESG regulatory frameworks.	○	○	○	○	○	○

52. Please explain your answer, including any suggestions for what the tool would need to include to be most useful.

53. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
The individual ratings given in the draft mapping tool are appropriate.	○	○	○	○	○	○

54. Please explain your answer, identifying any ratings you think are wrong and why.

About further support with the evolving regulatory landscape

- Watch explainer video
- ESG Mapping Tool (PDF)
- ESG Frameworks (PDF)

55. The Production Standard is only one of the levers ResponsibleSteel could use to support members with the evolving regulatory landscape, and others may be better suited.

Please rank the following levers from 1 (most relevant) to 4 (least relevant).

- Further changes to the Production Standard
- More detailed guidance and resources (such as the draft mapping tool)
- Working groups to share lessons learned on how ResponsibleSteel is being used to demonstrate value towards regulatory compliance
- Pilots to implement ResponsibleSteel in practice and further demonstrate its value towards regulatory compliance

56. Please explain your answer, including any other options you would consider instead of those listed.

About potential changes to the Production Standard

- Watch explainer video
- ESG Mapping Tool (PDF)
- ESG Frameworks (PDF)

57. One way to show where the Production Standard can support members with regulatory frameworks is to add a reference in each Principle Introduction to the specific ESG frameworks that the Principle's requirements could help address.

    To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
ESG regulations should be referenced in the Principle Introduction, given the risk that these references may become outdated as legislation changes.	○	○	○	○	○	○

58. Please explain your answer.

59. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
There are terms and definitions used by Responsible Steel that should be aligned with those used in specific regulatory frameworks.	○	○	○	○	○	○

60. Please explain your answer, specifying which terms or definitions and which frameworks.

61. Are there requirements in the ResponsibleSteel Production Standard that you would revise to match a compliance obligation you have?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

62. Please explain your answer, specifying which requirements and why.

Industrial Conversions Related to Climate Change

Clarification that technical changes due to climate change are included in Criterion 4.1

- Overview document (PDF)
- Watch explainer video

63. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Overall, the proposed requirements will be effective at ensuring that the site takes action to minimise short- and long-term social, economic and environmental implications of climate change transitions.	○	○	○	○	○	○

64. Please explain your answer.

65. Criterion 4.1 is clarified to specify how the site shall conform, i.e. that when decommissioning, closure or a conversion is announced, the site assesses transition risks, impacts and opportunities and consults workers and their representatives (including trade unions), affected communities and local authorities. It is also specified that mitigation plans must include identified impacts and proportionate measures to address adverse social and economic effects on workers and communities. It includes, for example, measures for worker retention and reskilling. It is expected that these changes will minimise short- and long-term social, economic and environmental implications of climate change transitions, and increase the consistency of the outcomes seen across audits.

    To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
The clarifications are acceptable to me.	○	○	○	○	○	○

66. Please explain your answer.

67. Some Requirements (4.1.1 and 4.1.1.2) refer to action in "good faith", which we have defined as "A site engages in good faith when it treats consultation as a real opportunity to influence the outcome rather than a formality to be completed. This means engaging early enough that the decision is not already settled; recognising workers and their representatives as legitimate counterparts; providing information that is adequate, accessible and timely enough to allow meaningful participation; being represented by people with authority to respond; making genuine and constructive efforts to reach mutual understanding; avoiding unjustified delay, coercion, intimidation or misrepresentation; and honouring the commitments it enters into."

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
It is useful to have the term "good faith" added.	○	○	○	○	○	○
The definition of "good faith" as it is written is acceptable.	○	○	○	○	○	○

68. Please explain your answers.

Human rights due diligence

- Watch explainer video
- Overview document (PDF)

69. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
I see value in adding mandatory guidance about having to conduct a human rights risk assessment when a conversion is going to kick-off and using the output of this effort to inform the conversion plans.	○	○	○	○	○	○

70. Please explain your answer.

71. The guidance for 7.1 (Human rights due diligence) lists a range of methodologies for impact and risk assessment.
Would you add or remove any methodologies from this list?

Please explain your answer.

72. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
The guidance provided on the process for conducting impact and risk assessment clear and adequate.	○	○	○	○	○	○

73. Please explain your answer stating what you would change to improve the guidance.

Clarity and measurability of changes related to technical changes due to climate change

- Watch explainer video
- Overview document (PDF)

74. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Overall, the proposed requirements are clear and easy to understand.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

75. Please tell us what could be done to make them clearer and/or easier to understand.

76. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
The proposed requirements are measurable/verifiable/ auditable.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

77. Please explain your answer.

Overall views on changes related to technical conversions due to climate change

- Watch explainer video
- Overview document (PDF)

78. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
I can see the proposed requirements leading to some unintended outcomes.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

79. Please explain your answer.

80. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
These changes are worth it, even if they mean audits take longer and cost more.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

81. Please explain your answer.

82. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
The proposed requirements are acceptable to me.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

83. Please explain your answer, only raising new points you haven't already told us about above.

Annual Leave

Setting an appropriate amount of annual leave and defining what should count as annual leave

- Watch explainer video
- Overview document (PDF)

84. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Public holidays should be included (rather than excluded) when calculating the number of days of paid leave a worker has taken during a year of service.	○	○	○	○	○	○

85. Please explain your answer.

86. If public holidays were included when calculating the number of days of paid leave a worker has taken, what should the minimum number of total paid days leave be set at? I.e. we want to know if in this case you think a minimum of 15 days would remain appropriate (if interpreting a working week as five days).

Please explain your answer.

87. If public holidays were included when calculating the number of days of paid leave a worker has taken, we would consider setting a minimum number of non-public holidays that count towards the total number of days of paid leave.
What should the minimum number of non-public holidays counting to that total be set as?

Optionality of making policies public

- Watch explainer video
- Overview document (PDF)

88. Currently sites are required to make public their policies regarding fatigue management, voluntary overtime, breaks, and paid annual leave.

    To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
This requirement should only apply when the site operates in a jurisdiction where the contents of the policy are not already required by applicable local law and where the site has already demonstrated compliance with that law.	○	○	○	○	○	○

89. Please explain your answer.

Defining how sites engage with governments

- Watch explainer video
- Overview document (PDF)

90. To what extent do you agree with the definition and inclusion of this requirement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
6.9.1.4.1.1 in Option C introduces the concept of engaging with governments to improve local labour laws.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

91. Please explain your answer.

Comparing the effectiveness of the different options

- Watch explainer video
- Overview document (PDF)

92. To what extent do you agree with the intent of this requirement?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
The intent of Requirement 6.9.1.4 is to: (1) ensure sufficient rest and recovery periods for workers, (2) safeguard their health, safety and well-being, and (3) enable them to meet their family responsibilities.	○	○	○	○	○	○

93. Please explain your answer.

94. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
A minimum of 25 working days of paid annual leave after the worker reaches one year of service, where the paid annual leave includes a minimum of ten days that are not comprised of public holidays would meet the intent of Requirement 6.9.1.4.	○	○	○	○	○	○
Allowing any other practical approach defined by the site as part of its public policy and justified as meeting the intent of Requirement 6.9.1.4, alongside requiring the "presence of a collective bargaining agreement (or equivalent, following the process outlined in 6.4.3) that provides alternative supportive mechanisms that meet the intent of Requirement 6.9.1.4, would ensure that the intent of Requirement 6.9.1.4 is met in practice.	○	○	○	○	○	○

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
Allowing any other practical approach defined by the site as part of its public policy and justified as meeting the intent of Requirement 6.9.1.4, alongside persistent engagement with governments within whose jurisdictions the site operates to strengthen labour laws and regulations related to the intent of Requirement 6.9.14, would ensure that the intent of Requirement 6.9.1.4 is met in practice.	○	○	○	○	○	○
These three options would lead to similar outcomes for workers across certified sites.	○	○	○	○	○	○

95. Please explain your answers.

96. You may propose some combination of Options A, B and C. Do you have anything you would like to propose?

Please explain your answer.

97. Are there any other options we should consider that you think are equivalent to Option C?

Please explain your answer.

98. Please rank the options in terms of preference.

- No change to 6.9.1.d, we leave the requirement as it is currently.
- Allowing public holidays to count towards annual leave, but raising the total number of days of annual leave required to 25. Making the policy public is made conditional based on whether requirements go beyond local labour law. Clarification that it is not enough to have these policies, but that they shall also be implemented. Clarification of the definition of a working week.
- Implements the changes in Option B and allows sites to demonstrate and justify to their Certification Body (CB) that their company policies, whatever they are, "ensure sufficient rest and recovery periods for workers, to safeguard their health, safety and wellbeing, and to enable them to meet their family responsibilities." This option is the one recommended by the ResponsibleSteel Technical Advisory Groups.
- Some combination of Options A, B and C as per stakeholder advice.
- Some other option I describe below.

99. Please explain your answer.

Comparing other aspects of the different options

Our recommended Option C includes all the proposed revisions and so these questions will focus only on Option C.

- Watch explainer video
- Overview document (PDF)

100. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
The requirements proposed for Option C are clear and easy to understand.	○	○	○	○	○	○
The requirements proposed for Option C are measureable/verifiable/auditable.	○	○	○	○	○	○

101. Please explain your answer telling us what could be done to improve them in this regard.

102. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
I can see the requirements proposed for Option C leading to some unintended outcomes.	○	○	○	○	○	○
Option C is worth it, even if it means audits take longer and cost more.	○	○	○	○	○	○
The requirements proposed in Option C are acceptable to me.	○	○	○	○	○	○

103. Please explain your answers.

Your details

104. Full name

105. Email address

106. Which country are you based in?

107. What organisation do you represent, if any?

Name one only.

108. Please state which stakeholder category best describes your job:

- Academia
- Assurance / Certification Bodies
- Consultancy and/or Think Tanks
- End Users / Brands / OEMs
- Governance and/or Management
- Technology Providers
- Mining and Raw Material Production
- Non-Governmental Organisation / Civil Society Organisation
- Standard-Setting, Conformity Assessment, and/or Accreditation
- Steel Primary Processing (Ironmaking and Steelmaking)
- Steel Product Traders
- Steel Secondary Processing & Manufacturing
- Trade Associations
- Trade Unions
- Other

To help us improve this portal, please complete the following questions.

109. How did you first hear about this portal?

- ◯ Personal contact from an ResponsibleSteel staff
- ◯ member ResponsibleSteel main website
- ◯ ResponsibleSteel email signature banner
- ◯ Social media (e.g. LinkedIn; Twitter)
- ◯ ResponsibleSteel email newsletter
- ◯ Industry media
- ◯ Event attended by ResponsibleSteel
- ◯ From a friend or colleague
- ◯ Other

110. Please indicate your agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
I found this survey simple and easy to participate in.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Participating in this consultation was worth my time.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
This survey was exactly what I needed to provide my feedback on this topic.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
I would recommend participating in ResponsibleSteel consultations to my colleagues.	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

111. Please explain your answers, providing suggestions on how we might improve this portal. This will help us improve over time.

112. Would you like to stay informed about future ResponsibleSteel consultations or events?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Microsoft. The data you submit will be sent to the form owner.

Microsoft Forms