

Stakeholder Engagement Planning Kit

The mapping and planning templates behind meaningful engagement, built to the standard the UNGPs and Article 13 of the CSDDD actually require.

From *Navigating Human Rights Due Diligence: A Compliance-to-Engagement Implementation Guide* · Thomas Gaultier · thomasgaultier.com/resources/hrdd

Meaningful engagement is a defined standard, not a good intention: two-way, good faith, ongoing dialogue with affected stakeholders, in accessible formats, responsive to the circumstances of the people engaged. One-way communication, tokenistic consultation and public relations do not satisfy it.

These two templates keep the distinction visible. The mapping template separates rightsholders, whose rights are at stake, from stakeholders more broadly, and forces a priority that follows severity and vulnerability rather than volume of noise. The plan template then commits each group to a method, a frequency, a named owner and an output, which is what turns a policy commitment into something an assessor can check.

— Stakeholder and rightsholder mapping

Stakeholder Group	Type	Impact Severity	Vulnerability Level	Engagement Priority	Preferred Engagement Method
Workers (own operations)	Rightsholder	[High / Med / Low]	[High / Med / Low]	[1 / 2 / 3]	Surveys, focus groups, union dialogue
Supply chain workers	Rightsholder	[High / Med / Low]	[High / Med / Low]	[1 / 2 / 3]	Grievance mechanisms, worker voice tools
Local communities	Rightsholder	[High / Med / Low]	[High / Med / Low]	[1 / 2 / 3]	Community meetings, advisory panels
Indigenous Peoples	Rightsholder	[High / Med / Low]	[High / Med / Low]	[1 / 2 / 3]	FPIC process, culturally appropriate dialogue
Civil society / NGOs	Stakeholder	[High / Med / Low]	[High / Med / Low]	[1 / 2 / 3]	Regular consultation, joint initiatives
Trade unions	Stakeholder / Rightsholder	[High / Med / Low]	[High / Med / Low]	[1 / 2 / 3]	Social dialogue, collective bargaining

Migrant workers	Rightsholder	[High / Med / Low]	[High / Med / Low]	[1 / 2 / 3]	Translated materials, trusted intermediaries
-----------------	--------------	--------------------	--------------------	-------------	--

PRACTITIONER TIP

Priority follows severity, not volume

Severity is scale, scope and irremediability. The groups that score highest are frequently the ones least able to reach you: workers deep in the supply chain, communities without formal representation, people whose first language is not the one your grievance channel operates in. If your engagement priority tracks who contacts you most, the mapping has failed.

— Engagement plan

Stakeholder Group	Engagement Objective	Method	Frequency	Responsible Party	Expected Output
[e.g., Supply chain workers]	[e.g., Understand working conditions]	[e.g., Confidential interviews]	[e.g., Annually]	[e.g., Sustainability team]	[e.g., Fieldwork report with findings]
[e.g., Local communities]	[e.g., Assess project impacts]	[e.g., Community meetings]	[e.g., Quarterly]	[e.g., Community liaison officer]	[e.g., Meeting minutes, action items]
[Stakeholder group: e.g., suppliers' workers, union representatives, indigenous communities, vulnerable groups]	[Objective: what the engagement must learn, verify, or resolve]	[Method: in-person, digital, survey, or trusted intermediary]	[Frequency: regular cadence plus triggering events]	[Owner: named function with budget authority]	[Output: the document or decision the engagement must produce]

Consultation informs people. Engagement changes decisions.

Free to download and to use in your work. Please keep the attribution. These instruments are navigation aids and working templates, not legal advice: the provisions they cite must be read in full and applied with qualified counsel.