

*******PRE-PUBLICATION RELEASE*******

Global Reporting Initiative™

2002 SUSTAINABILITY REPORTING GUIDELINES

This Pre-Publication Release is made available to reporters and report users prior to formal release of the final 2002 GRI *Guidelines* on 31 August 2002 at the World Summit in Johannesburg, South Africa. The formal release will not change in substance, but is subject to final editorial modifications.

THE GRI BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Last	First	Organisation
Adams	Roger	Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA)
Aloisi de Lardere	Jacqueline	United Nations Environment Programme, Division of Technology, Industry, and Economics
Feldmann	Fabio	Former Secretary of Environment, State of São Paulo
Goto	Toshihiko	Environmental Auditing Research Group (EARG)
Henderson	Judy	Immediate past Chair, Australian Ethical Investment Ltd
Hölz	Hanns Michael	Deutsche Bank Group
Irani	Jamshed J.	Tata Sons Limited
Massie	Robert Kinloch	Coalition for Environmentally Responsible Economies (CERES)
Moody-Stuart	Mark	Retired Chair, Royal Dutch/Shell
Normark	Anita	International Federation of Building and Wood Workers (IFBWW)
Pityana	Nyameko Barney	University of South Africa, Former Chair, Human Rights Commission
Shailor	Barbara	American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO)
Stigson	Björn	World Business Council for Sustainable Development
White	Allen	Acting Chief Executive, Global Reporting Initiative
Wong	Peter	Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu, Hong Kong; Board Member, International Federation of Accountants

PREFACE

The Board of Directors of the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) is pleased to release the *2002 Sustainability Reporting Guidelines*. This event marks a major milestone in the evolution of GRI both as an institution and as a reporting framework. From an institutional perspective, it marks the beginning of the first cycle of release, testing, review, and revision under GRI's new governance structure. From a reporting perspective, the *2002 Guidelines* represent the culmination of two years of revisions work involving hundreds of individuals, as well as a significant advancement in rigour and quality relative to the *June 2000 Guidelines*. The GRI Board recognises that this remains 'work in progress'. GRI is a living process that operates in the spirit of "learning by doing". We are convinced that the lessons gained from using the *Guidelines* are the best compass for guiding ongoing improvement.

Background on the GRI *Guidelines*

The GRI was launched in 1997 as a joint initiative of the U.S. non-governmental organisation CERES and United Nations Environment Programme with the goal of enhancing the quality, rigour, and utility of sustainability reporting. The initiative has enjoyed the active support and engagement of representatives from business, non-profit advocacy groups, accounting bodies, investor organisations, trade unions, and many more. Together, these different constituencies have worked to build a consensus around a set of reporting guidelines with the aim of achieving worldwide acceptance.

The first set of GRI *Sustainability Reporting Guidelines* appeared as an Exposure Draft in 1999. Following testing and public comment, the GRI released the *June 2000 Sustainability Reporting Guidelines*. A revision process began immediately and continued over the next two years, culminating in the work of the last six months. The process has benefited from extensive public comment from stakeholders worldwide. Every comment was carefully considered and a deliberate choice was made on which to incorporate. We recognise that not all suggestions were integrated into the new *Guidelines* but we strongly encourage continued engagement from all parties during the next cycle of revisions.

GRI recognises that developing a globally accepted reporting framework is a long-term endeavour. In comparison, financial reporting is well over half a century old and still evolving amidst increasing public attention and scrutiny. The *2002 Guidelines* represent the GRI Board's view of a consensus on a reporting framework at this point in time that is a blend of a diverse range of perspectives.

There are numerous ways to use the *2002 Guidelines*. An organisation may choose to simply use them for informal reference or to apply the *Guidelines* in an incremental fashion. Alternatively, an organisation may decide to report based on the more demanding level of "in accordance." This level of reporting relies on transparency to balance the need for flexibility in reporting with the goal of enhancing comparability across reporters. GRI welcomes all reporting organisations—whether beginners or advanced—as users of the *Guidelines*.

The release of the *2002 Guidelines* marks the beginning of a new cycle of revisions. The GRI Board of Directors is developing a clear and detailed due process for the further refinement of the *2002 Guidelines* with the aim of releasing an updated version in 2004. During the next two years, this process will offer ample opportunity for consultation on all aspects of the *Guidelines*. We invite all parties to join us—through testing, through working groups, through interactions with GRI's governance structure—in the on-going process of building

the core guidelines, sector supplements, and technical protocols of the GRI framework into the next step forward in the evolution of sustainability reporting.

Signed,

Dr. Judy Henderson
Chair
GRI Board of Directors

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	6
PART A: USING THE GRI <i>GUIDELINES</i>	11
WHAT ARE THE GRI <i>GUIDELINES</i> ?	12
WHAT IS A GRI “SUSTAINABILITY REPORT”?	13
RELATIONSHIP TO STAKEHOLDER DIALOGUE	13
WHO SHOULD USE THE <i>GUIDELINES</i> ?	13
PART B: REPORTING PRINCIPLES	23
TRANSPARENCY	26
INCLUSIVITY	27
AUDITABILITY	28
SUSTAINABILITY CONTEXT	28
COMPLETENESS	29
RELEVANCE	30
NEUTRALITY	31
COMPARABILITY	31
ACCURACY	32
CLARITY	32
TIMELINESS	33
PART C: REPORT CONTENT	34
GENERAL NOTES	35
OVERVIEW OF PART C	36
GRI REPORT CONTENT	40
1. VISION AND STRATEGY	40
2. PROFILE	41
3. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS	43
4. GRI CONTENT INDEX	46
5. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	46
A. <i>Economic Performance Indicators</i>	48
B. <i>Environmental Performance Indicators</i>	51
C. <i>Social Performance Indicators</i>	54
PART D: ANNEXES	59
GLOSSARY	60
ANNEX 1: OVERVIEW OF THE GLOBAL REPORTING INITIATIVE ¹	64
ANNEX 2: LINKAGES BETWEEN SUSTAINABILITY AND FINANCIAL REPORTING	67
ANNEX 3: GUIDANCE ON INCREMENTAL APPLICATION OF THE <i>GUIDELINES</i>	71
ANNEX 4: CREDIBILITY AND ASSURANCE	74
ANNEX 5: GRI INDICATORS	78
ANNEX 6: GRI CONTENT INDEX	83
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	85

INTRODUCTION

The Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) is a long-term, multi-stakeholder, international process whose mission is to develop and disseminate globally applicable *Sustainability Reporting Guidelines* (“*Guidelines*”). These *Guidelines* are for voluntary use by organisations¹ for reporting on the economic, environmental, and social dimensions of their activities, products, and services.² The aim of the *Guidelines* is to assist reporting organisations and their stakeholders in articulating and understanding the overall contributions of the reporting organisations toward sustainable development.

Since the publication of the first *Sustainability Reporting Guidelines* in June 2000, the trends that catalysed the formation of GRI have continued unabated and, in most cases, have intensified. The issues—globalisation and corporate governance, accountability, and citizenship—have now moved to the mainstream of policy and management debates in many organisations. The turbulent first years of the 21st century underscore the reason for GRI’s rapid expansion: higher standards of accountability and increasing dependence on wide-ranging external networks will form a significant part of the fabric of organisational practice in the years to come.

Support for creating a new, generally accepted disclosure framework for sustainability reporting continues to grow among civil society, business, government, and labour. GRI’s rapid evolution in just a few years from a bold vision to a new permanent global institution reflects the imperative and the value that various constituencies assign to such a disclosure framework. The GRI process, rooted in inclusiveness, transparency, neutrality, and continual enhancement, has enabled GRI to give concrete expression to accountability. (See Annex 1 for an overview of the Global Reporting Initiative.)

Trends

What, specifically, are the key trends during the last two years that have fuelled GRI’s swift progress? Among the most influential are:

Expanding globalisation: Expansion of global capital markets and information technology continue to bring unprecedented opportunities for the creation of new wealth. At the same time, there is deep scepticism among many that such wealth will do anything to decrease social inequities. While governmental and non-governmental entities are major players in the globalisation process, it is corporate activity that remains its driving force. The result: all parties—including corporations—are seeking new forms of accountability that credibly describe the consequences of business activities wherever, whenever, and however they occur.

Search for new forms of global governance: Globalisation challenges the capacity of existing international and national institutions to govern corporate activity. One dramatic indication of this concern has been the incipient interest in the drafting of a binding international convention on corporate accountability. The borderless global economy requires equally borderless governance structures to help direct private sector activity toward

¹ This includes corporate, governmental, and non-governmental organisations. All are included within GRI’s mission. In its first phase, GRI has emphasised corporations with the expectation that governmental and non-governmental organisations will follow in due course.

² GRI uses the term “sustainability reporting” synonymously with citizenship reporting, social reporting, triple-bottom line reporting and other terms that encompass the economic, environmental, and social aspects of an organisation’s performance.

outcomes that are socially and environmentally, as well as economically, beneficial. New models of international governance, affecting such areas as greenhouse gas emissions, forestry and fishing practices, ozone depletion, labour practices, and financial accounting standards exemplify a new generation of initiatives that align governance and associated information demands in an increasingly complex and interconnected world. A key theme in all of these emerging governance models is the demand for transparency of and access to information.

Reform of corporate governance: Pressures on corporations to establish and maintain high standards of internal governance are accelerating. As society witnesses the growing influence of corporations in driving economic, environmental, and social change, investors and other stakeholders expect the highest standards of ethics, transparency, sensitivity, and responsiveness from corporate executives and managers. Governance systems are increasingly expected to extend beyond their traditional focus on investors to address new concerns and stakeholder groups. The independence of board members, executive participation in external partnerships, compensation and incentive schemes, and integrity of auditors are under increasing scrutiny. Effective corporate governance depends on access to relevant, high-quality information that enables performance tracking and invites new forms of stakeholder engagement. The proliferation of corporate governance initiatives—the Cadbury Commission and the Turnbull Report in the UK, the King Report in South Africa, Brazil’s innovative New Stock Exchange, OECD’s Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and Corporate Governance Principles, and the World Bank’s Corporate Governance Forum—attest to rising expectations for high standards of corporate behaviour.

Global role of emerging economies: The same globalisation, accountability, and governance trends evident in industrial nations are taking root in emerging economies. Nations such as Brazil, India, and South Africa are engaging in the globalisation process and growing trade opportunities in foreign markets. The technology innovation and capital flows that powered globalisation in the last decade now permeate these emerging nations, positioning them as regional and global players on the economic stage of the 21st century. At the same time, tightly linked global supply chains are spreading common management practices and increasing accountability pressures in all segments of the value chain. Corporate accountability has expanded from its early association with multi-national (or trans-national) corporations into a broad-based movement that is affecting private sector entities of all sizes around the world.

Rising visibility of and expectations for organisations: The spread of the Internet and communications technologies is speeding the global transfer of information and amplifying the speed and force of feedback mechanisms. Consumers, supported by growing media coverage of sustainability issues, have ready access to information about the actions of individual organisations at an unprecedented level of detail. Companies, in particular, are facing more clearly articulated expectations from customers and consumers regarding their contributions to sustainable development, as well as growing demands for specific changes in operating practices. Several recent high-profile events have exemplified the risks to reputation and brand image associated with poor sustainability management.

Measurement of progress toward sustainable development: As sustainable development has become widely adopted as a foundation of public policy and organisational strategy, many organisations have turned their attention to the challenge of translating the concept into practice. The need to better assess an organisation’s status and align future goals with a

complex range of external factors and partners has increased the urgency of defining broadly accepted sustainability performance indicators.

Governments' interest in sustainability reporting: When the GRI was conceived in 1997, governmental interest in integrated economic, environmental, and social reporting was scant. Today, voluntary, statutory, and regulatory initiatives abound. In Australia, the United States, Taiwan, Japan, and European Union countries such as France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Denmark, incentives and requirements to enlarge the scope of conventional corporate financial reporting to include non-financial information are rapidly unfolding. Some actions are motivated by national environmental and social policy goals, others by investor pressures to obtain a clearer picture of corporate performance via the securities regulatory process. All indications point to continuing expansion of governmental reporting initiatives to new countries and regions over the next few years.

Financial markets' interest in sustainability reporting: The financial industry slowly but steadily is embracing sustainability reporting as part of its analytical toolkit. Spurred by growing demand for social and ethical funds among institutional and small investors, new “socially responsible” indices are appearing each year. At the same time, the exploration of the relationship between corporate sustainability activities and shareholder value is advancing. Linkages between sustainability performance and key value drivers such as brand image, reputation, and future asset valuation are awakening the mainstream of the financial markets to new tools for understanding and predicting value in capital markets.

Emergence of next-generation accounting: The 20th century saw worldwide progress in harmonising financial reporting. Indeed, the rich tradition of financial reporting, continually evolving to capture and communicate the financial condition of the enterprise, has inspired GRI's evolution. Yet today, many observers—including accountants themselves—recognise that characterising the “bricks and mortar” economy of the past will not suffice as a basis for characterising today's information economy. Valuing intangible assets—human capital, environmental capital, alliances, and partnerships—must complement the valuation of conventional tangible assets—factories, equipment, and inventory. Under the rubric of “business reporting”, “intangible assets analysis”, and “value reporting”, a number of accounting groups have launched programmes to explore how accounting standards should be updated to embrace such value drivers. New concepts of risk, opportunity, and uncertainty are likely to emerge (see Annex 2).

Benefits of Reporting

All these trends are familiar to business managers seeking to sharpen their competitiveness in a globalising world. For the two thousand or more companies worldwide that have already reported, the business justification for voluntary economic, environmental, and social reporting is fact, not hypothesis. While no reporting organisation may ever see the full range of potential benefits, observers point to the following common views in the business community:

- Effective management in a global economy, where information (reliable or unreliable) travels at Internet speed, requires a proactive approach. Measuring and reporting both past and anticipated performance is a critical management tool in today's high-speed, interconnected, “24-hour news” world.
- Today's strategic and operational complexities require a continual dialogue with investors, customers, advocates, suppliers, and employees. Reporting is a key

ingredient to building, sustaining, and continually refining stakeholder engagement. Reports can help communicate an organisation's economic, environmental, and social opportunities and challenges in a way far superior to simply responding to stakeholder information requests.

- Companies increasingly emphasise the importance of relationships with external parties, ranging from consumers to investors to community groups, as key to their business success. Transparency and open dialogue about performance, priorities, and future sustainability plans helps to strengthen these partnerships and to build trust.
- Sustainability reporting is a vehicle for linking typically discrete and insular functions of the corporation—finance, marketing, research and development—in a more strategic manner. Sound reporting opens internal conversations where they would not otherwise occur.
- The process of developing a sustainability report provides a warning of trouble spots—and unanticipated opportunities—in supply chains, in communities, among regulators, and in reputation and brand management. Reporting helps management evaluate potentially damaging developments before they develop into unmanaged and unwelcome surprises.
- Sustainability reporting helps sharpen management's ability to assess the organisation's contribution to natural, human, and social capital. This assessment enlarges the perspective provided by conventional financial accounts to create a more complete picture of the company's long-term prospects. Reporting helps highlight the societal and ecological contributions of the corporation and the "sustainability value proposition" inherent in its products and services. Such measurement is central to maintaining and strengthening the "licence to operate".
- Sustainability reporting may reduce volatility and uncertainty in share price for publicly traded enterprises, as well as reduce the cost of capital. Fuller and more regular information disclosure, including much of what analysts seek from managers on an ad hoc basis, can add stability to a company's financial condition by avoiding major swings in investor behaviour caused by untimely or unexpected disclosure.

These trends, separately and synergistically during 2000-2002, have reinforced interest in GRI and its core mission.

Confluence of Need and Opportunity

Yet much work remains. Inconsistent reporting approaches developed by business, government, and civil society continue to appear. At the same time, many other organisations wonder how best to engage in reporting. As diverse groups seek information, the continuing flow of unconnected information queries gives rise to confusion, redundancy, and frustration. As was the case in June 2000, these 2002 *Guidelines* represent another step toward resolving the challenge of responding to surging information demands emanating from competing reporting frameworks. By drawing thousands of partners and hundreds of organisations into a voluntary, multi-stakeholder process, GRI continues to work toward harmonisation of disclosure, thereby maximising the value of reporting for both reporting organisations and users alike.

This confluence of need and opportunity underpins GRI's rapid development. There are, of course, many challenges ahead. GRI recognises that the goal of reporting on economic, environmental, and social performance at the organisational level—let alone a fully

integrated sustainability assessment—is at the earliest stages of a journey that will continue for many years.

But for GRI, the fundamentals that inspired its creation remain unchanged. The long-term objective of developing “generally accepted sustainability accounting principles” requires both a concrete product incorporating the world’s best thinking and a legitimate, dynamic process through which continuous learning can occur. With a new permanent institution to implement its mission, the GRI is positioned to deliver increasingly improved guidelines, technical protocols, and industry supplements. All will evolve on a platform of technical excellence, multi-stakeholder process, and transparency embodied in GRI as a new global institution.

PART A:
USING THE GRI *GUIDELINES*

What Are the GRI *Guidelines*?

The GRI *Guidelines* are a framework for reporting on an organisation's economic, environmental, and social performance. The *Guidelines*:

- outline reporting principles and specific content to guide the preparation of organisation-level sustainability reports;
- assist organisations in presenting a balanced and reasonable picture of their economic, environmental, and social performance;
- promote comparability of sustainability reports, while taking into account the practical considerations related to disclosing information across a diverse range of organisations with extensive and geographically dispersed operations;
- support benchmarking and assessment of sustainability performance with respect to codes, performance standards, and voluntary initiatives; and
- serve as a key tool in the overall process of stakeholder engagement.

This is a technical document, aimed at practitioners, that presents the GRI *Guidelines* and their application. For a more general introduction to the *Guidelines*, please see our companion document: *Introduction to the 2002 Guidelines*.

The *Guidelines* are not:

- a code or set of principles of conduct;
- a performance standard (e.g., emissions target for a specific pollutant); or
- a management system.

The *Guidelines* do not:

- provide instruction for designing an organisation's internal data management and reporting systems; or
- offer instruction on methodologies for preparing reports, or on performance monitoring and verification practices.

The *Guidelines* document is structured in five parts:

Introduction	Overview of the trends driving sustainability reporting, the interest in GRI, and the benefits of reporting.
Part A: Using the <i>Guidelines</i>	General guidance on use of the <i>Guidelines</i> .
Part B: Reporting Principles	Principles and practices that promote rigorous reporting and underlie the application of the <i>Guidelines</i> .
Part C: Report Content	Guidance on the content and compilation of a report.
Part D: Annexes	Additional guidance and resources for using the <i>Guidelines</i> .

What Is a GRI “Sustainability Report”?

The GRI *Guidelines* organise “sustainability reporting” in terms of economic, environmental, and social performance (also known as the “triple bottom line”). This structure has been chosen because it reflects what is currently the most widely accepted approach to discussing sustainability. GRI recognises that, like any simplification of a complex challenge, this definition has its limitations. Achieving sustainability requires balancing the complex relationships between current economic, environmental, and social needs in a manner that does not compromise future needs. Defining sustainability in terms of three separate elements (economic, environmental, and social) can sometimes lead to thinking about each element in isolation and a failure to consider the issue in an integrated manner. Nonetheless, the triple bottom line is a starting point that is comprehensible to many, and has achieved a degree of consensus as a reasonable entry point into a complex issue. Looking ahead, GRI is committed to continually improving the structure and content of the *Guidelines* in line with the evolving consensus on how to best measure performance against the goal of sustainability.

Relationship to Stakeholder Dialogue

The primary goal of reporting is to contribute to an ongoing stakeholder dialogue. Reports alone provide little value if they fail to inform stakeholders or support a dialogue that influences the decisions and behaviour of both the reporting organisation and its stakeholders. However, GRI clearly recognises that the engagement process neither begins nor ends with the publication of a sustainability report.

Within the broader context of stakeholder engagement, GRI’s mission is to elevate the quality of reporting to a higher level of comparability, consistency, and utility. The purpose of these *Guidelines*, and the GRI framework as a whole, is to capture an emerging consensus on reporting practices. This provides a point of reference against which reporting organisations and report users can approach the challenge of developing effective and useful reporting practices.

Who Should Use the *Guidelines*?

Use of the GRI *Guidelines* is voluntary. They are intended to be applicable to organisations of all sizes and types operating in any location. The core guidelines embodied in this document are not specific to any industry sector. This 2002 release has been developed primarily with the needs of business organisations in mind, but the *Guidelines* can be applied by other types of organisations such as government agencies and not-for-profit organisations.

The *Guidelines* are intended to complement other initiatives to manage economic, environmental, and social performance and related information disclosure. The *Guidelines* and GRI reports are not a substitute for legally mandated reporting or disclosure requirements, nor do they override any local or national legislation. Reporting organisations should note in their reports instances where government regulations, conventions, or treaties restrict disclosure of certain information identified in the *Guidelines*.

Reporting by Smaller Organisations

Reporting may present a special challenge for smaller organisations—whether for-profit or not-for-profit, private or public. Such organisations may choose to adopt a phased or incremental approach to implementing the *Guidelines*. GRI welcomes efforts to develop tools to help smaller organisations begin using the *Guidelines* in an incremental fashion. Such tools will gradually increase the availability of economic, environmental, and social performance information, and, should eventually allow the organisation to issue a report in accordance with the GRI *Guidelines*.

The GRI Family of Documents

The GRI family of documents includes the following:

- the Sustainability Reporting Guidelines (the “Guidelines”);
- sector supplements;
- issue supplements; and
- technical protocols.

Brief descriptions are as follows:

The Guidelines

This document is the foundation upon which all other GRI documents are based. The *Guidelines* represent the reporting content that has been identified as most broadly relevant to both reporting organisations and report users. The document should be considered the “core” of the GRI family of documents. Other supplements, focused on sectors and issues, are intended to add to, but not replace, the *Guidelines*. In other words, reporting organisations using a supplement are also expected to use the *Guidelines*.

Sector Supplements

GRI recognises the limits of a one-size-fits-all approach and the importance of capturing the unique set of sustainability issues faced by different industry sectors (e.g., mining, automotive, banking). To address this need, GRI is developing sector supplements through a multi-stakeholder process for use with the core *Guidelines*. These supplements are at an early stage of development, but will grow in number and rigour over time. The first examples will begin appearing in 2002 as separate documents.

As of June 2002, GRI had completed drafting sector supplements for tour operators and for financial services (social performance indicators only) and had begun drafting supplements for the mining, automotive, and telecommunications sectors.

Issue Supplements

GRI expects to develop issue-specific supplements on topics such as “diversity” and “productivity” to provide reporting organisations with additional models for organising the information in the *Guidelines* and sector supplements.


Technical Protocols

To assist users in applying the *Guidelines*, GRI is developing its first technical protocols on indicator measurement. Each protocol addresses a specific set of indicators (e.g., energy, child labour). Over time, most of the indicators in the GRI *Guidelines* will be supported by a specific technical protocol. The GRI protocols may also extend to cover issues such as reporting boundaries or other questions pertaining to reporting principles and structure.

Preparing a Report Using the GRI Family of Documents

An organisation preparing a GRI report should start with the *Guidelines*. If a sector supplement applicable to the reporting organisation is available, the reporting guidance and indicators contained in that supplement should be used in addition to the indicators and information contained in the *Guidelines*. In the absence of a sector supplement, reporting organisations are encouraged to go beyond the information contained in the *Guidelines* and to include whatever information is specific to their sector and essential to ensuring a balanced and reasonable representation of their sustainability performance. When reporting on specific indicators in either this document or a supplement, reporting organisations should apply GRI technical protocols whenever available.

Figure A1.



For more information on any of the GRI family of documents, visit www.globalreporting.org.

Relationship of the *Guidelines* to Other Sustainability Management Tools

Over the last decade, there has been a proliferation of tools to help organisations, especially businesses, manage their economic, environmental, and social performance. These tools have appeared in a number of forms, ranging from codes to management systems to standardised methodologies and more. All of them seek to guide organisational behaviour.

GRI, in contrast, is an external reporting framework that enables organisations to communicate: 1) actions taken to improve economic, environmental, and social performance; 2) the outcomes of such actions; and 3) future strategies for improvement. The *Guidelines* do not govern an organisation's behaviour. Rather they help an organisation describe the outcome of adopting and applying codes, policies, standards, and management systems.

GRI complements other tools and practices used by organisations to manage their sustainability performance, including:

- charters or codes of conduct (general principles to guide an organisation's behaviour);
- organisational policies (internal guidance or rules on how an organisation addresses an issue);
- standards (prescribed methodologies, processes, or performance targets);
- third-party voluntary initiatives; and
- management systems (both certifiable and non-certifiable systems covering areas such as environmental and social performance or quality control).

The GRI *Guidelines* have been enriched by incorporating concepts and practices from a wide range of business, governmental, labour, and NGO initiatives. These have included initiatives that address issues at the facility, sector, organisational, national, and global levels. In developing the *Guidelines*, GRI has attempted to provide a reporting tool that complements other initiatives while remaining faithful to its overarching mission and reporting principles.

Reporting Expectations and Design

The specific issues listed below are addressed in the following pages:

- core versus additional indicators;
- flexibility in using the *Guidelines*;
- customising a report within the GRI framework;
- selecting additional content through engaging stakeholders;
- structuring GRI reports;
- frequency and medium of reporting;
- financial reports; and
- credibility of GRI reports.

Core Versus Additional Indicators

The 2002 *Guidelines* contain two categories of performance indicators: core and additional. Both types of indicators have emerged from the GRI consultative process as valuable measures of the economic, environmental, and social performance of organisations. These *Guidelines* distinguish between the two types of indicators as follows:

Core indicators are:

- relevant to most reporting organisations; and
- of interest to most stakeholders.

Thus, designation as “core” signifies general relevance to both reporters and report users. In designating an indicator as “core”, however, GRI has exercised some discretion in strictly applying the above definition. For core some indicators, relevance may be limited to many, but not most, potential reporters. In the same vein, an indicator may be of keen interest to many, but not most, stakeholders. Over time, GRI expects that development of sector supplements will lead to the shifting of a number of core indicators to such supplements.

Additional indicators are defined as those that have one or more of the following characteristics:

- represent a leading practice in economic, environmental, or social measurement, though currently used by few reporting organisations;
- provide information of significant potential interest to stakeholders who are particularly important to the reporting entity; and
- are deemed worthy of further testing for possible consideration as future core indicators.

Reporting organisations are encouraged to use the additional indicators in Section 5 of Part C to advance the organisation's and GRI's knowledge of new measurement approaches. Such feedback will provide a basis for assessing the readiness of additional indicators for future use as core indicators, for use in sector supplements, or for removal from the GRI indicator list.

Flexibility in Using the Guidelines

GRI encourages the use of the GRI Guidelines by all organisations, regardless of their experience in preparing sustainability reports. The *Guidelines* are structured so that all organisations, from beginners to sophisticated reporters, can readily find a comfortable place along a continuum of options.

Recognising these varying levels of experience, GRI intentionally provides ample flexibility in how organisations use the *Guidelines*. The options range from adherence to a set of conditions for preparing a report "in accordance" with the *Guidelines* to an incremental approach, which begins with partial adherence to the reporting principles and/or report content in the *Guidelines* and gradually moves to fuller adoption. This range of options is detailed below.

Reporting "in Accordance" with the Guidelines

Some organisations may opt to prepare their reports "in accordance" with the *Guidelines* (see Box 1).

Box 1: "In Accordance"

Organisations that wish to identify their report as prepared "in accordance" with the 2002 GRI *Guidelines* must meet five conditions:

1. Include a GRI Content Index as specified in Part C.
2. Report on the numbered elements in Sections 1 to 3 of Part C.
3. Respond to each core indicator in Section 5 of Part C by either (a) reporting on the indicator or (b) explaining the reason for the omission of each indicator.
4. Ensure that the report is consistent with the principles in Part B of the Guidelines.
5. Include the following statement signed by the board or CEO: "This report has been prepared in accordance with the 2002 GRI Guidelines. It represents a balanced and reasonable presentation of our organisation's economic, environmental, and social performance."

The decision to report, "in accordance" with the *Guidelines* is an option, not a requirement. It is designed for reporters whose goals and capabilities are ready for a high level of reporting

and who seek to distinguish themselves as leaders in the field. The growing number of organisations with strong reporting practices demonstrates the ability of numerous organisations to adopt the “in accordance” option.

The conditions for reporting “in accordance” with the *GRI Guidelines* seek to balance two critical objectives:

- comparability; and
- flexibility.

Comparability has been integral to GRI’s mission from the outset, and is closely tied to its goal of building a reporting framework parallel to financial reporting. The “in accordance” conditions help incrementally advance GRI’s commitment to achieving maximum comparability across reports by creating a common reference point for all reporters that choose to use this option.

While GRI seeks to enhance comparability between reports, it is also committed to supporting flexibility in reporting. Legitimate differences exist between individual companies and between industry sectors. The GRI framework must have sufficient flexibility to allow reports to reflect differences between individual organisations and across sectors.

The “in accordance” conditions rely on transparency to balance the dual needs of comparability and flexibility. Reporting organisations are asked to clearly indicate how they have used the *Guidelines* and, in particular, the core indicators. The evaluation of these decisions is then left to report users.

Reporting organisations that choose to report “in accordance” must note the reasons for the omissions of any core indicators in their reports, preferably in or near the GRI Content Index. GRI recognises that various factors may explain the omission of a core indicator. These include, for example: protection of proprietary information; lack of data systems to generate the required information; and conclusive determination that a specific indicator is not relevant to an organisation’s operations. In providing these explanations, reporting organisations are encouraged to indicate their future reporting plans, if any, relative to each excluded core indicator. Indicators omitted for the same reason may be clustered and linked to the relevant explanation.

GRI emphasises that the exclusion of some indicators still allows organisations to report “in accordance” with the *Guidelines* as long as explanations appear. GRI does not certify claims of “in accordance” nor does it validate explanations of omitted information. However, reporting organisations that elect an “in accordance” approach should anticipate that users will compare their reports against the five conditions associated with the “in accordance” status.

Incremental Application of the Guidelines


Given the still youthful state of comprehensive economic, environmental, and social reporting, GRI recognises that many organisations are still building their reporting capacity. These organisations are invited to choose an incremental approach consistent with their current capacity (see Annex 3). Such organisations may choose not to cover all of the content of the *GRI Guidelines* in their initial efforts, but rather to base their reports on the GRI framework and gradually expand coverage over time in a stepwise fashion.

For example, a first-time reporter may use a portion of the performance indicators (Part C) without having to provide an indicator-by-indicator explanation of omissions. Over time, expanding use of the reporting principles and/or indicators will move the organisation toward more comprehensive coverage of economic, environmental, and social performance. Organisations that choose an incremental approach may reference GRI in their report. Such a

reference should include a brief description of how GRI informed development of the report. However, incremental reporters should not use the term “in accordance” nor include the prescribed board or CEO statement (see Box 1) unless all conditions for the “in accordance” option are met.

In sum, as an initiative keenly aware of the wide spectrum of reporter experience and capabilities, GRI enables reporters to select an approach that is suitable to their individual organisations. With time and practice, organisations at any point along this spectrum can move gradually toward comprehensive reporting built on both the principles and content of the GRI framework. Similarly, GRI will continue to benefit from the experiences of reporting organisations and report users in further improving the *Guidelines*.

Figure A2.



Customising a Report Within the GRI Framework

The *Guidelines* set out the basic information for inclusion in a report. However, it is understood and expected that reporting organisations will need to take further steps to design their report content to reflect the unique nature of their organisation and the context in which it operates. These steps may involve:

- defining reporting boundaries;
- inserting additional content (usually based on stakeholder consultation) such as indicators, textual discussions, etc.; and/or
- adopting a tailored structure or format.

Boundaries

In the early years of reporting, most organisations measured and reported on impacts based on the traditional boundary criteria used in financial reporting, that is, legal ownership and

direct control. In recent years, companies have begun to experiment with expanding their reporting boundaries to better reflect the unique “footprint” of their organisation and its activities. The completeness principle in Part B offers brief commentary on boundaries, and GRI is working to develop additional guidance and technical protocols on this issue. Until such guidance is available, the GRI framework emphasises the importance of extensive interaction with stakeholders to determine appropriate reporting boundaries. Equally important, organisations should maintain a high degree of transparency within reports regarding what specific reporting boundaries have been chosen.

Content

GRI encourages organisations to go beyond the information requested in Part C of the *Guidelines*, as needed, to present a balanced and reasonable picture of their overall economic, environmental, and social performance. In applying the *Guidelines*, each reporting organisation will make different decisions regarding the use of the additional performance indicators in Section 5 of Part C based on its individual circumstances. Reporting organisations should also include other content, particularly integrated performance indicators, identified through stakeholder consultation (see below). This information and these indicators may relate to sector- or geography-specific issues that face the organisation. GRI is developing supplements to address some of these needs.

Structure

See below for GRI guidance on structuring reports.

Selecting Additional Content Through Engaging Stakeholders

Compared with financial reporting, which is targeted primarily at one key stakeholder—the shareholder (and to a lesser extent lenders, suppliers, and business partners)—sustainability reporting has a large and diverse audience. Stakeholder engagement plays an important role in helping to ensure that a report achieves its primary purpose: providing information that meets the needs of the organisation’s stakeholders. GRI reporters are expected to use these *Guidelines* (Part C, Sections 1 to 3 and core indicators from Section 5) in addition to sector supplements (if available) as the basis for their report. The reporting elements and indicators in the *Guidelines* have been developed through an extensive multi-stakeholder, consultative process. However, the inclusion of information (including performance indicators) identified through consultation with an organisation’s particular stakeholders is an important additional step in furthering the utility of its sustainability report; it is also one of the fundamental principles underlying GRI reporting (see Part B on “inclusivity”).

Reporting organisations are encouraged to engage in direct and frequent consultation with their key stakeholders to identify additional indicators of interest to their stakeholders beyond those in the GRI framework. Since consultation often involves a range of parallel discussions with different stakeholders, it is important to document the interactions that result in the organisation’s selection of indicators and to explain these in the report. While GRI emphasises the importance of stakeholder feedback in drafting reports, it does not attempt to offer specific guidance on how to conduct stakeholder engagement.

Structuring GRI Reports

Part C of these *Guidelines* (“Report Content”) is organised to form a logical framework. Reporting organisations are encouraged to use the same organisation for their report. GRI believes that completeness and comparability in economic, environmental, and social reporting are best served when all reporting organisations adhere to a common structure; however, it recognises that some reporting organisations will want to choose a different format and structure based on what they perceive as most effective for their situation. In evaluating alternative approaches to organising their reports, organisations should carefully weigh the need to capture legitimate organisational and sectoral differences against the

benefits of standardised structures. Common structures and formats support consistency and comparability. This provides benefits to both reporting organisations and report users by enhancing the clarity of communication and the ease of use of the documents over an extended period of time. In situations where reporting organisations use alternative structures, the Content Index outlined in Part C becomes even more essential as a tool to help users find and compare the content of reports.

The choice among different media for reporting (e.g., paper, electronic) may also influence decisions on the structure of reports. For example, some organisations might choose to produce a summary paper report and to make a fully detailed report available on the Internet. Where Internet-based reports using the *Guidelines* are made up of linked pages, a means to view the report ordered according to GRI sections should be provided, in addition to any other structure.

Frequency and Medium of Reporting

A wide variety of media is now available to prepare and distribute reports, ranging from traditional printing to various multi-media technologies including the Internet and CD-ROMs. This gives organisations substantial creativity and freedom in determining the frequency of preparing reports and the mode of distribution. In general, GRI recommends that reporting on economic, environmental, and social performance be timed to coincide, and possibly integrated, with other external reporting, such as annual financial reports and quarterly earnings statements. Such timing will reinforce the linkages between financial performance and economic, environmental, and social performance as a whole (see Annex 2).

In the future, information disclosure is likely to involve a mix of annual, quarterly, and even “real-time data” distributed through a range of different media, each chosen based on the timing and nature of the reported information. Internet-based reporting will facilitate frequent updating of some aspects of GRI reports. However, continuous reporting should not replace periodic consolidated reports, vetted through an internal procedure and providing a “snapshot” of the organisation at a given point in time. “Snapshots” are important for supporting comparisons between organisations and between reports. It is also recommended that such periodic reports be available in their complete form from the reporting organisation’s website (e.g., as a downloadable file).

Decisions regarding frequency and medium of reporting should also take into account the expected use and feedback related to a report. Reporting is part of a broader dialogue between the reporting organisation and its stakeholders that should result in new actions by both parties. The frequency and medium of reporting can potentially either enhance or detract from the progress of the dialogue.

Financial Reports

Most organisations publish separate financial and sustainability reports; however, a few corporations have begun to experiment with publishing a single annual report including financial, economic, environmental, and social information. GRI believes that both financial reporting and sustainability reporting serve important functions and can enrich each other (see Annex 2). GRI encourages the coordination of both reporting processes and expects that financial performance measurement will increasingly benefit from the measurement of economic, environmental, and social performance over time.

Credibility of GRI Reports

Stakeholders expect to be able to trust an organisation’s sustainability report. To benefit from the process of sustainability reporting, reporting organisations themselves also want to take steps to enhance the credibility of their reports. This contributes to building stakeholder trust

and to continual improvement in the quality of reporting systems and processes within the organisation.

The perceptions and expectations of users about the credibility of an organisation's sustainability report are influenced by a range of factors. It is important for each reporting organisation to ascertain and evaluate the relative importance of each of these factors (see Annex 4 for examples of such factors). The GRI recommends that consultation with stakeholders is the best way to ascertain their perceptions and expectations about matters of credibility.

In response to stakeholder expectations, reporting organisations have adopted a variety of strategies for enhancing the credibility and quality of sustainability reports. Strategies include stakeholder consultation panels, strengthened internal data collection and information systems, issue-specific audits by appropriate experts, internal audits of data collection and reporting systems, use of the GRI *Guidelines* as the basis for report preparation (and saying so), reviews and commentaries by independent external experts, and use of independent assurance¹ processes for sustainability reports. In deciding strategy and developing and implementing policies and practices to enhance report credibility and quality, organisations are encouraged to adopt a progressive approach, each stage of which adds to the credibility and quality of their reporting.

In order to address stakeholders' concerns about the credibility of reports on economic, environmental, and social performance, the GRI recommends that reports include a statement of:

- the reporting organisation's policies and internal practices to enhance the credibility and quality of its sustainability report; and
- the reporting organisation's policy and current practice with regard to providing independent assurance about the full report.

GRI recognises that providing independent assurance about sustainability reports is, like reporting itself, at an early stage of development. For example, there is no consensus yet on performance indicators for social performance or related assurance approaches. GRI encourages the independent assurance of sustainability reports and the development of standards and guidelines for the assurance process to be followed by assurance providers.

Annex 4 offers further practical guidance to reporting organisations on assurance provision and related processes that enhance report quality and credibility.

¹ The following is a proposed working description of independent assurance: "The provision of independent assurance is a structured and comprehensive process of collecting and evaluating evidence on a subject matter (the sustainability report) that is the responsibility of another party (management of the reporting organisation), against suitable criteria. As a result of the process, assurance providers express a conclusion that provides the intended users/stakeholders with a stated level of assurance about whether the subject matter (the sustainability report) conforms in all material respects with the identified criteria. The assurance process is performed by independent, competent experts who maintain an attitude of "professional scepticism".

**PART B:
REPORTING PRINCIPLES**

Introduction

This section of the *Guidelines* identifies reporting principles essential to producing a balanced and reasonable report on an organisation's economic, environmental, and social performance. The June 2000 *Guidelines* presented a first version of these principles. These were informed by the financial accounting tradition and adapted for reporting on economic, environmental, and social performance with reference to further research related to environmental accounting. Now, with the benefit of time and learning through application of the June 2000 *Guidelines*, GRI presents a revised set of principles that combine and extend many of the concepts that appeared under the headings of "underlying principles" and "qualitative characteristics" of GRI reports in the June 2000 *Guidelines*.

Those familiar with financial reporting will recognise overlaps between GRI's reporting principles and those used in financial reporting. However, while financial reporting is a key benchmark for developing principles for reporting on economic, environmental, and social performance, significant differences do exist between the two practices. The principles in this section of the *Guidelines* attempt to take these differences into account. They are rooted in GRI's experience over the last four years, incorporating knowledge from both science and practice. They represent a blend of the financial tradition with emerging concepts in the field of reporting on economic, environmental, and social performance.

The GRI views these principles as integral to its reporting framework, equal in weight to the elements in Part C of the Guidelines. Organisations using the *Guidelines* to prepare reports are expected to apply these principles in their report preparation. Collectively, the principles define a compact between the reporting organisation and report user, ensuring that both parties share a common understanding of the underpinnings of a GRI report. They provide an important reference point to help a user interpret and assess the reporting organisation's decisions regarding the content of its report. The principles are designed with the long term in mind. They strive to create an enduring foundation upon which performance measurement will continue to evolve based on new knowledge and continuing practice.

The principles in this section are framed in terms of the goals toward which a report should strive, and some reporting organisations may not be able to apply them to their fullest extent in the short term. However, organisations should be able to identify continued improvement in how rigorously they apply the principles to their reporting process, in much the same way as they pursue improvement in the various aspects of economic, environmental, and social performance.

Reports do not need to contain a detailed checklist showing that all principles have been adopted, but they should offer some discussion of how the reporting principles have been applied. This should include both successes and challenges. If a reporting organisation does not seek to apply these principles, they are asked to indicate where such departures exist and why. Discussion of the application (or non-application) of principles could appear in the profile section of the report or in a separate section that addresses some of the technical aspects involved in drafting the report.

The 11 principles outlined in the following section will help ensure that reports:

- present a balanced and reasonable account of economic, environmental, and social performance, and the resulting contribution of the organisation to sustainable development;
- facilitate comparison over time;
- facilitate comparisons across organisations; and
- credibly address issues of concern to stakeholders.

Organisation of the Principles

The principles in Part B are organised in a logical order (see Figure B1) and can be grouped in four clusters. Those that:

- form the framework for the report (transparency, inclusivity, and auditability);
- inform decisions about what to report (sustainability context, completeness, and relevance);
- relate to ensuring quality and reliability (comparability, accuracy, and neutrality); and
- inform decisions about access to the report (clarity and timeliness).

The principles of transparency and inclusivity represent the starting point for the reporting process and are woven into the fabric of all the other principles. All decisions about reporting (e.g., how, when, what) take these two principles and associated practices into consideration.


The principles of sustainability context, completeness, and relevance play the key role in determining what to report. Reports should help place the organisation's performance in the broader context of sustainability challenges, risks, and opportunities. The information contained within the report must meet the test of completeness in terms of the reporting boundaries (i.e., entities included), scope (i.e., aspects or issues reported), and time frame. Lastly, reported information should be relevant to the decision-making needs of stakeholders.

The quality and reliability of the report content are guided by the principles of neutrality, comparability, and accuracy. Reports should be comparable over time and across organisations. Information should be sufficiently accurate and reliable to enable its use for decision-making purposes. Equally important, the report should present its content in a balanced and unbiased manner.

The principles of clarity and timeliness govern the access and availability of reports. Put simply, stakeholders should receive easily understood information in a time frame that allows them to use it effectively.

Lastly, the principle of auditability relates to several other principles such as comparability, accuracy, neutrality, and completeness. Specifically, this principle refers to the ability to demonstrate that the processes and information in the report meet appropriate standards for quality, reliability, and other similar expectations.

Figure B1.



Transparency

Full disclosure of the processes, procedures, and assumptions in report preparation are essential to its credibility.

Transparency is an overarching principle and is the centrepiece of accountability. It requires that, regardless of the format and content of reports, users are fully informed of the processes, procedures, and assumptions embodied in the reported information. For example, a report must include information on the stakeholder engagement processes used in its preparation, data collection methods and related internal auditing, and scientific assumptions underlying the presentation of information. This transparency in reporting is an exercise in accountability—the clear and open explanation of one’s actions to those who have a right or reason to inquire.

Transparency is central to any type of reporting or disclosure. In the case of financial reporting, governments and other organisations over many decades have created, and continue to enhance, disclosure rules affecting financial reports to increase the transparency of the reporting process. These generally accepted accounting principles and evolving international accounting standards seek to ensure that investors are given a clear picture of the organisation’s financial condition, one that includes all material information and the basis upon which this depiction is developed.

GRI seeks to move reporting on economic, environmental, and social performance in a similar direction by creating a generally accepted framework for economic, environmental, and social performance disclosure. As this framework continues to evolve rapidly, general practices will evolve in parallel, based on best practice, best science, and best appraisal of user needs. In this dynamic environment, it is essential that reporting organisations be transparent regarding the processes, procedures, and assumptions that underlie their reports so that users may both believe and interpret reported information. In this sense, transparency transcends any one principle, but affects all.

Inclusivity

The reporting organisation should systematically engage its stakeholders to help focus and continually enhance the quality of its reports.

The inclusivity principle is rooted in the premise that stakeholder views are integral to meaningful reporting and must be incorporated during the process of designing a report. Reporting organisations should seek to engage stakeholders who are both directly and indirectly impacted. Aspects of reporting enriched by stakeholder consultation include (but are not limited to) the choice of indicators, the definition of the organisation’s reporting boundaries, the format of the report, and the approaches taken to reinforce the credibility of the reported information. Characteristics relevant to designing stakeholder consultation processes include the nature and diversity of products and services, the nature of the reporting organisation’s operation/activities, and the geographic range of operations. Stakeholder engagement, like reporting itself, is a dynamic process. Executed properly, it is likely to result in continuous learning within and outside the organisation, and to strengthen trust between the reporting organisation and report users. Trust, in turn, fortifies report credibility, itself a key goal of GRI’s reporting framework.

The principle of inclusivity also considers the diverse needs of stakeholders who use sustainability reports. The range of users of a sustainability report is broader than that of financial reports. Inclusivity is essential to ensuring that the reporting process and content reflect the needs of these diverse users. Each user group has specific information expectations—at times overlapping with those of other groups, at times distinct. Failure to identify and consult with stakeholders is likely to result in reports that are less relevant to users' needs and thereby less credible to external parties. In contrast, systematic stakeholder engagement enhances receptivity and usefulness across user groups. This engagement may also include soliciting views regarding the utility and credibility of sustainability reports issued by the reporting organisation.

GRI recognises that many reporting organisations have a wide range of potential stakeholders. Any systematic approach to inclusivity will require an organisation to define an approach for grouping and prioritising stakeholders for purposes of engagement. In the spirit of the inclusivity and transparency principles, it is important for reporting organisations to clearly and openly explain their approach to defining whom to engage with and how best to engage.

Auditability

Reported data and information should be recorded, compiled, analysed, and disclosed in a way that would enable internal auditors or external assurance providers to attest to its reliability.

The auditability principle refers to the extent to which information management systems and communication practices lend themselves to being examined for accuracy by both internal and external parties. Reports using the *Guidelines* contain data that is both qualitative and quantitative in nature. In designing data collection and information systems, reporting organisations therefore should anticipate that internal auditing and external assurance processes may be used in the future.

In preparing reports, organisations should continually ask the question: Is the response to an information query presented in such a way that an internal or external party in the future could examine its accuracy, completeness, consistency, and reliability? Unverifiable statements or data that affect the broad messages contained in a report using the *Guidelines* may compromise its credibility. In addition to accuracy and reliability, the completeness of information may also affect the ability of an auditor to render an assessment.

Sustainability Context

The reporting organisation should seek to place its performance in the larger context of ecological, social, or other limits or constraints, where such context adds significant meaning to the reported information.

Many aspects of sustainability reporting draw significant meaning from the larger context of how performance at the organisational level affects economic, environmental, and social capital formation and depletion at a local, regional, or global level. In such cases, simply reporting on the trend in individual performance (or the efficiency of the organisation) leaves open the question of an organisation's contribution to the total amount of these different types of capital. For some users, placing performance information in the broader biophysical, social, and economic context lies at the heart of sustainability reporting and is one of the key differentiators between this type of reporting and financial reporting. Moreover, while the ability of an organisation to "sustain" itself is obviously important to a range of stakeholders, it is unlikely that any individual organisation will remain in existence indefinitely. This

principle emphasises the sustainability of the broader natural and human environment within which organisations operate.

Where relevant and useful, reporting organisations should consider their individual performance in the contexts of economic, environmental, and social sustainability. This will involve discussing the performance of the organisation in the context of the limits and demands placed on economic, environmental, or social resources at a macro-level. This concept is most clearly articulated in the environmental area in terms of global limits on resource use and pollution levels, but may also be relevant to social and economic issues.

The understanding of how best to link organisational performance with macro-level concerns will continue to evolve. GRI recommends that individual reporting organisations explore ways to incorporate these issues directly into their sustainability reports in order to advance both reporting organisations' and users' understanding of these linkages.

Completeness

All information material to users for assessing the reporting organisation's economic, environmental, and social performance should appear in the report in a manner consistent with the declared boundaries, scope, and time period.

This principle refers to accounting for and disclosing, in sufficient detail, all information of significant concern to stakeholders within the declared boundaries (i.e., operational, scope, and temporal) of the report. Defining whether such information meets the test of significance to stakeholders should be based on both stakeholder consultation as well as broad-based societal concerns that may not have surfaced through the stakeholder consultation process. Such broad-based concerns may derive, for example, from national policy and international conventions.

The completeness principle is three-dimensional:

Operational boundary dimension: Reported information should be complete in relation to the operational boundaries of the reporting organisation, in other words, the range of entities for which the reporting organisation gathers data. These boundaries should be selected with consideration of the economic, environmental, and social impacts of the organisation. Such boundaries may be defined based on financial control, legal ownership, business relationships, and other considerations. The boundaries may vary according to the nature of the reported information. In some cases, the most appropriate boundaries for meeting the expectations outlined by other reporting principles may extend beyond traditional financial reporting boundaries.

Scope dimension: Scope is distinct from boundaries in that an organisation could choose extended reporting boundaries (e.g., report data on all the organisations that form the supply chain), but only include a very narrow scope (e.g., only report on human rights performance). In the context of GRI, "scope" refers to aspects such as energy use, health and safety, and other areas for which the Guidelines include indicators and queries. Despite the fact that the reporting boundary may be complete, the scope (e.g., human rights aspects only) may not be complete. The process for determining a complete scope may include, for example, the results of lifecycle analysis of products or services and assessment of the full range of direct and indirect social or ecological impacts of the reporting organisation. Some of these same tools may also influence decisions about the other dimensions of completeness discussed here. The report should disclose all relevant information within the context of the scope (i.e., aspects) covered.

Temporal dimension: Reported information should be complete with reference to the time period declared by the reporting organisation. As far as possible, reportable activities, events, and impacts should be presented for the reporting period in which they occur. This may involve reporting on activities that produce minimal short-term impact, but will have a cumulative effect that may become material, unavoidable, or irreversible in the longer term. Such activities might include, for example, the release of certain bio-accumulative or persistent pollutants. Disclosure of the nature and likelihood of such impacts, even if they may only materialise in the future, comports with the goal of providing a balanced and reasonable representation of the organisation's current economic, environmental, and social performance. In making estimates of future impacts (both positive and negative), the reporting organisation should be careful to make well-reasoned estimates that reflect the best understanding of the likely size, nature, and scope of impacts. Although speculative in nature, such estimates can provide useful and relevant information for decision-making as long as the limitations of the estimates are clearly acknowledged.

Defining Boundaries

Defining boundary conditions for reporting on economic, environmental, and social performance is a complex challenge. Complicating factors include the diverse nature of the information and the intricate relationships between the organisation and the larger economic, environmental, and social systems within which it operates. Boundary research is a high priority in GRI's work programme. Discussion papers, exposure drafts and testable protocols will appear during 2002-2003, leading to more systematic and precise treatment of this critical area in the near future.

Information within the organisation often flows from management systems that operate on a regular, short-term cycle, typically one year. However, a single reporting cycle often is too brief to capture many important economic, environmental, and social impacts. This type of performance, by nature, focuses on the long-term, with forward-looking trends at least as important as lagging, or historical, ones. Thus, reporting organisations should strive to gradually align information systems to account for these forward-looking trends in addition to historical trends.

Relevance

Relevance is the degree of importance assigned to a particular aspect, indicator, or piece of information, and represents the threshold at which information becomes significant enough to be reported.

Relevance in sustainability reporting is driven by the significance attached to a piece of information to inform the user's decision-making processes. Stakeholders use information on economic, environmental, and social performance in a variety of ways, some of which may differ substantially from that of the reporting organisation. The significance of information can be judged from a number of perspectives; however, in any reporting system, the key perspective is that of the information user. The primary purpose of reporting (as opposed to other types of outreach and communication) is to respond to user information needs in a neutral and balanced manner. Reporting must therefore place a strong emphasis on serving users' specific needs.

In considering relevance, it is important to remain sensitive to differences in how users and reporting organisations apply information. Through stakeholder consultation, a reporting organisation can better understand stakeholders' information needs and how best to respond to them. Ideally, reports should contain information that is useful and relevant to both the

reporting organisation and the report users. However, in some cases, information may be relevant to the report user, but may not be of the same value to the reporting organisation.

It is important to differentiate between situations where reporting expectations differ and those where information is irrelevant.

Neutrality

Reports should avoid bias in selection and presentation of information and should strive to provide a balanced account of the reporting organisation's performance.

The neutrality principle refers to the fair and factual presentation of the organisation's economic, environmental, and social performance. Embodied in the principle of neutrality is the notion that the core objective behind a reporting organisation's selection and communication of information is to produce an unbiased depiction of its performance. This means presenting an account that includes both favourable and unfavourable results, free from intentional tilt or under- or overstatement of the organisation's performance. The report should focus on neutral sharing of the facts for the users to interpret. Environmental reporting, the precursor to sustainability reporting, has demonstrated this type of gradual evolution from anecdotal and selective disclosure toward a more neutral, factual presentation of data. While reporting practices still vary significantly among reporting organisations, many have recognised that achieving and maintaining credibility among users hinges on the commitment of the reporting organisation to a neutral and fair depiction.

Under the neutrality principle, the *overall* report content must present an unbiased picture of the reporting organisation's performance, avoiding selections, omissions, or presentation formats that are intended to influence a decision or judgement by the user. Where the reporting organisation wishes to present its perspective on an aspect of performance, it should be clear to the reader that such information is separate and distinct from GRI's reporting elements. In the same way that annual financial reports typically contain interpretive material in the front end and financial statements in the back, so too should GRI reports strive for a clear distinction between the reporting organisation's interpretation of information and factual presentation.

Comparability

The reporting organisation should maintain consistency in the boundary and scope of its reports, disclose any changes, and re-state previously reported information.

This principle refers to ensuring that reports on economic, environmental, and social performance support comparison against the organisation's earlier performance as well as against the performance of other organisations. This allows internal and external parties to benchmark performance and assess progress as part of supporting rating activities, investment decisions, advocacy programmes and other activities. Comparability and associated demands for consistency are a prerequisite to informed decision-making by users.

When changes in boundary, scope, and content of reporting occur (including in the design and use of indicators), reporting organisations should, to the maximum extent practicable, re-state current accounts to ensure that time series information and cross-organisational comparisons are both reliable and meaningful. Where such re-statements are not provided, the reporting organisation should disclose such circumstances, explain the reasons, and discuss implications for interpreting current accounts.

Accuracy

The accuracy principle refers to achieving the degree of exactness and low margin of error in reported information necessary for users to make decisions with a high degree of confidence.

Economic, environmental, and social indicators can be expressed in many different ways, ranging from qualitative responses to detailed quantitative measurements. The characteristics that determine accuracy vary according to the nature of the information. For example, the accuracy of qualitative information is largely determined by the degree of clarity, detail, and balance in presentation. The accuracy of quantitative information, on the other hand, may depend on the specific sampling methods used to gather hundreds of data points from multiple operating units. The specific threshold of accuracy that is necessary will depend in part on the intended use of the information. Certain decisions will require higher levels of accuracy in reported information than others.

Application of the accuracy principle requires an appreciation of:

- the intentions and decision-making needs of the users; and
- the different conditions under which information is gathered.

As with other principles, it is important to be transparent in how this principle is applied. Explaining the approaches, methods, and techniques that the reporting organisation uses to achieve satisfactory levels of accuracy will help improve the credibility of the report and the acceptance of the reported information.

Clarity

The reporting organisation should remain cognizant of the diverse needs and backgrounds of its stakeholder groups and should make information available in a manner that is responsive to the maximum number of users while still maintaining a suitable level of detail.

The clarity principle considers the extent to which information is understandable and usable by diverse user groups. In financial reporting, there is an unspoken assumption concerning the general level of background knowledge and experience of the assumed “primary” user group, namely, investors. No such “primary” user group exists for GRI at this juncture. In fact, it may never exist owing to the diversity of user groups that are consumers of economic, environmental, and social performance information. In using the *GRI Guidelines*, it is reasonable to assume that all users have a working knowledge of at least a portion of the economic, environmental, and social issues faced by the reporting organisation. However, not all user groups will bring the same level of experience—or even the same language—to the report. Thus, reporting organisations, through assessing stakeholder capabilities, should design reports that respond to the maximum number of users without sacrificing important details of interest to a subset of user groups. Technical and scientific terms should be explained within the report, and clear, suitable graphics should be used where appropriate. Providing information that is not understandable to stakeholders does not contribute to successful engagement. Clarity is therefore an essential characteristic of any reporting effort.

Timeliness

Reports should provide information on a regular schedule that meets user needs and comports with the nature of the information itself.

The usefulness of information on economic, environmental, and social performance is closely tied to its timely availability to user groups. Timeliness ensures maximum uptake and utility of the information, enabling users to effectively integrate it into their decision-making. As with financial disclosures, reporting on economic, environmental, and social performance is most valuable when users can expect a predictable schedule of disclosures. Special updates can be issued if and when unexpected developments of material interest to users occur.

Reporting organisations should structure disclosures to accord with the nature of information. Certain environmental information, for example, may be most useful on a quarterly, monthly or continuous (“real time”) basis, while other environmental information is most suitable for an annual report. Similarly, reporting on economic performance may parallel financial reporting: annual disclosures can summarise economic performance during the prior 12 months, while quarterly updates can be issued in parallel with quarterly earnings reports to investors. With the menu of new communications technologies available to reporting organisations, adjusting the timing of disclosures to reflect the varying nature of an organisation’s impacts is now more feasible than ever before. However, the degree to which any technology approach can be applied depends on stakeholders having access to the necessary technology.

Although a regular flow of information is desirable for meeting certain needs, reporting organisations should commit to a single point in time to provide a consolidated accounting of their economic, environmental, and social performance. This is necessary to meet the fundamental objective of comparability across organisations. As an example, a yearly consolidated report released on a predictable schedule, accompanied by interim updates using electronic media, represents a standard structure that is consistent with the principle of timeliness.

The Verification Working Group

In response to user requests, GRI in 1999 formed a working group to explore issues and options for strengthening the credibility of sustainability reports through various assurance mechanisms. The results of these consultations are reflected in the statements in Part A (Credibility of GRI Reports) and in Annex 4 on assurance processes. The working group has also prepared an advisory assurance strategy paper (available on www.globalreporting.org) for consideration by the GRI Board of Directors. In 2002, the Board will consider options for how GRI might continue to play a constructive role in advancing the assurance of sustainability reports.

**PART C:
REPORT CONTENT**

General Notes

1. **Boundaries:** Organisations using the *Guidelines* may have complex internal structures, multiple subsidiaries, joint ventures, and/or foreign operations. Particular care should be taken to match the scope of the report with the “economic, environmental, and social footprint” of the organisation (i.e., the full extent of its economic, environmental, and social impacts). Any differences should be explained.
2. **Use of technical protocols:** In reporting on indicators contained within the *Guidelines*, reporters should use GRI technical protocols whenever available. Drafting of protocols for a limited number of GRI indicators began in 2002, and drafts in progress can be found on the GRI website (www.globalreporting.org). GRI recognises the need for continued development of protocols, and the current set represents the first of many that will follow in coming years. If, for any reason, a reporting organisation does not use an existing GRI protocol, it should clearly describe the measurement rules and methodologies used for data compilation. For situations where a formal GRI protocol is not yet available, reporting organisations should use their professional judgement, drawing on international standards and conventions wherever possible.
3. **Metrics:** Reported data should be presented using generally accepted international metrics (e.g., kilograms, tonnes, litres), calculated using standard conversion factors. When other metrics are used, reports should provide conversion information to enable international users to make prompt conversions.
4. **Time frames and targets:** Wherever possible, reports should present information for all performance indicators in a manner that enables users to understand current and future trends. At a minimum, reporting organisations should present data for the current reporting period (e.g., one year) and at least two previous periods, as well as future targets where they have been established. This information provides essential context for understanding the significance of a given piece of information. Comparisons with industry averages, where available, can also provide useful context.
5. **Absolute/normalised data:** As a general principle, reporting organisations should present indicator data in absolute terms and use ratios or normalised data as complementary information. Providing normalised data only may mask absolute figures, which will be the information of primary interest to some stakeholders. However, if absolute data are provided, users will be able compile their own normalised analysis using information from Section 2 of Part C (profile). Nevertheless, GRI does recognise the utility of data presented as ratios. Ratio data may be useful in partnership with absolute data for communicating performance trends or articulating performance across two or more linked dimensions of sustainability. When ratios are included, organisations are asked to make use of normalising factor(s) from within the report, and from Section 2 of Part C (profile), if appropriate. See Annex 5 for more information on ratios.
6. **Data consolidation and disaggregation:** Reporting organisations will need to determine the appropriate level of consolidation (aggregation) of indicator data. For example, indicators could be presented in terms of the performance of the organisation worldwide or broken down by subsidiaries, countries of operation, or even individual facilities. This decision requires balancing the reporting burden against the potential additional value of data reported on a disaggregated (e.g, country or site) basis. Consolidation of information can result in loss of a significant

amount of value to users, and also risks masking particularly strong or poor performance in specific areas of operation. In general, reporting organisations should disaggregate information to an appropriate and useful level as determined through consultation with stakeholders. The appropriate level of consolidation/disaggregation will vary by indicator.

7. *Graphics*: The use of graphics can enhance the quality of a report. However, care should be taken to ensure that graphics do not inadvertently lead readers to incorrect interpretations of data and results. Care is needed in the selection of axes, scales, and data (including conversion of raw data to ratios and indices for graphic purposes) and the use of colour and different types of graphs and charts. Graphics should be a supplement to—not a substitute for—text and narrative disclosure of information. In general, raw data should accompany graphical presentations, either alongside or in appendices. Graphs should always clearly indicate the source of their data.
8. *Executive summary*: GRI encourages the inclusion of an executive summary. In keeping with the reporting principles in Part B, the summary should draw only on material from within the report and be materially consistent with the content of the report.

Overview of Part C

Part C of the *Guidelines* specifies the content of a GRI report. The report content is organised in what GRI considers a logical order, and reporting organisations are encouraged to follow this structure in writing their reports. See General Notes and Part A for further guidance on report structure. Questions regarding other issues related to application of the *Guidelines* are also addressed in Part A. Please note that Part C is best read in conjunction with Part B.

Part C of the *Guidelines* is divided into five sections:

1. *Vision and Strategy* – description of the reporting organisation’s strategy with regard to sustainability, composed of text discussion and a statement from the CEO.
2. *Profile* – overview of the reporting organisation’s structure and operations and of the scope of the report.
3. *Governance Structure and Management Systems* – description of organisational structure, policies, and management systems, including stakeholder engagement efforts.
4. *GRI Content Index* – a table supplied by the reporting organisation identifying where the information listed in Part C of the *Guidelines* is located within the organisation’s report.
5. *Performance Indicators* – measures of the impact or effect of the reporting organisation divided into integrated, economic, environmental, and social performance indicators.

The above only covers basic report content as defined by GRI. As noted in Part A, reporting organisations might also have additional sector-specific or organisation-specific information to include in their reports. Organisations that wish to identify their report as “in accordance” with the *Guidelines* should see the associated reporting expectations below.

“In Accordance”

Organisations that wish to identify their report as prepared “in accordance” with the 2002 GRI *Guidelines* must meet five conditions:

1. Include a GRI Content Index as specified in Part C.
2. Report on the numbered elements in Sections 1 to 3 of Part C.
3. Respond to each core indicator in Section 5 of Part C by either (a) reporting on the indicator or (b) explaining the reason for the omission of any indicator.
4. Ensure that the report is consistent with the principles in Part B of the *Guidelines*.
5. Include the following statement signed by the board or CEO: “This report has been prepared in accordance with the 2002 GRI Guidelines. It represents a balanced and reasonable presentation of our organisation’s economic, environmental, and social performance.”

GRI does not verify these claims, but reporting organisations should expect that users will compare those reports that identify themselves as “in accordance” with the GRI *Guidelines* against the above points. See Part A for further details.

Major Changes Since June 2000

Since the release of the June 2000 edition of the *Guidelines*, GRI has made a number of major changes to the content of a GRI report:

- Following a year-long consultative exercise, the performance indicators have been substantially revised. The most significant changes are found in the economic and social sections. Aspects and indicators have been reorganised, and new indicators appear. For details on the consultative process, please visit the Global Reporting Initiative website (www.globalreporting.org) to view the Final Report of the Measurement Working Group.
- The requirement for an Executive Summary section has been removed; however, GRI still encourages reporting organisations to include a summary.
- The Vision and Strategy section has been revised to include the CEO statement.
- The 2002 *Guidelines* have new content on governance to describe the place of economic, environmental, and social issues in top-level decision-making processes.
- Reporting organisations using the GRI *Guidelines* are now expected to include a Content Index within their report, identifying the location of GRI performance indicators and other information.
- The distinction between “generally applicable” and “organisation-specific” environmental indicators has evolved into the classifications of “core” and “additional”. All indicators are now classified as “core” or “additional”. Core indicators are those relevant to most reporting organisations and of interest to most stakeholders. Additional indicators are viewed as those that have one or more of the following attributes: 1) represent leading practice in economic, environmental, or social measurement aspects, though currently used by few reporting organisations; 2) provide information of significant potential interest to stakeholders who are

particularly important to the reporting entity; and 3) are deemed worthy of further testing for possible consideration as future core indicators.

- GRI indicators have been revised to better align with major international agreements, including conventions on the environment, labour, and human rights.
- The sections on Performance Indicators are now presented in alphabetical order: economic, environmental, social.

Indicators in the GRI Framework

GRI structures performance indicators according to a hierarchy of category, aspect, and indicator. The definitions used by GRI within this hierarchy are derived from international standards, but adapted to the GRI framework. Indicators are grouped in terms of the three dimensions of the conventional definition of sustainability—economic, environmental, and social. Annex 5 contains further information on GRI's approach to indicators.

In the 2002 *Guidelines*, the hierarchy is structured as follows:

	Category	Aspect
ECONOMIC	Direct economic impacts	Customers Suppliers Employees Providers of capital Public sector
	Environmental	Materials Energy Water Biodiversity Emissions, effluents, and waste Suppliers Products and services Compliance Transport Overall
SOCIAL	Labour practices and decent work	Employment Labour/management relations Health and safety Training and education Diversity and opportunity
	Human rights	Strategy and management Non-discrimination Freedom of association and collective bargaining Child labour Forced and compulsory labour Disciplinary practices Security practices Indigenous rights
	Society	Community Bribery and corruption Political contributions Competition and pricing
	Product responsibility	Customer health and safety Products and services Advertising Respect for privacy

An introduction to each set of indicators in Section 5 of Part C briefly describes the reasoning that led to the specific organisation of aspects and indicators in the 2002 *Guidelines*.

Note that within the context of GRI, performance indicators can be either quantitative or qualitative. While quantitative or numerical measures offer many advantages, they may prove unreliable, incomplete, or ambiguous for measuring performance on certain issues. GRI considers qualitative indicators, those indicators requiring textual response, to be complementary and essential to presenting a complete picture of an organisation's economic, environmental, and social performance.

Qualitative measures may be most appropriate when dealing with highly complex economic or social systems in which it is not possible to identify quantitative measures that capture the role of the reporting organisation in contributing positively or negatively to economic, environmental, or social conditions. Qualitative approaches may also be most appropriate for measurements of impacts to which the organisation is one of many contributors. In such situations, the organisation may be able to describe its impact, but perhaps not measure its impact in a quantitative manner. Wherever possible, qualitative performance indicators have been worded to encourage a response that can be expressed along a scale as opposed to a general descriptive statement (see Annex 5).

GRI Report Content

The following five sections contain the reporting elements and performance indicators for the 2002 GRI *Guidelines*. Reporting elements are numbered (e.g., 1.1, 2.10) and performance indicators are contained in tables in Section 5. The elements and indicators are listed in **bold type**. Some are supported by additional guidance or explanation in standard type.

1. Vision and Strategy

This section encompasses a statement of the reporting organisation's sustainability vision and strategy, as well as a statement from the CEO.

1.1. **Statement of the organisation's vision and strategy regarding its contribution to sustainable development**

Present overall vision of the reporting organisation for its future, particularly with regard to managing the challenges associated with economic, environmental, and social performance. This should answer, at a minimum, the following questions:

- What are the main issues for the organisation related to the major themes of sustainable development?
- How are stakeholders included in identifying these issues?
- For each issue, which stakeholders are most affected by the organisation?
- How are these issues reflected in the organisation's values and integrated into its business strategies?
- What are the organisation's objectives and actions on these issues?

Reporting organisations should use maximum flexibility and creativity in preparing this section. The discussion should be informed by the reporting organisation's major direct and indirect economic, environmental, and social issues and impacts (both positive and negative). Reporting organisations are encouraged to draw directly from indicators and information presented elsewhere in the report. They should include in their discussion any major opportunities, challenges, or obstacles to moving toward improved economic, environmental, and social performance. International organisations are also encouraged to explicitly discuss how their economic, environmental, and social concerns relate to and are impacted by their strategies for emerging markets.

1.2. **Statement from the CEO (or equivalent senior manager) describing key elements of the report**

A statement from the reporting organisation's CEO (or equivalent senior manager if other title is used), sets the tone of the report and establishes credibility with internal and external users. The GRI does not specify the content of the CEO statement; however, it believes such statements are most valuable when they explicitly refer to the

organisation's commitment to sustainability and to key elements of the report. Recommended elements of a CEO statement include the following:

- highlights of report content and commitment to targets;
- description of the commitment to economic, environmental, and social goals by the organisation's leadership;
- statement of successes and failures;
- performance against benchmarks such as the previous year's performance and targets and industry sector norms;
- the organisation's approach to stakeholder engagement; and
- major challenges for the organisation and its business sector in integrating responsibilities for financial performance with those for economic, environmental, and social performance, including the implications for future business strategy.

The CEO statement may be combined with the statement of vision and strategy.

2. Profile

This section provides an overview of the reporting organisation and describes the scope of the report. Thus, it provides readers with a context for understanding and evaluating information in the rest of the report. The section also includes organisational contact information.

Organisational Profile

Reporting organisations should provide the information listed below. In addition, they are encouraged to include any additional information that is needed for a full picture of the organisation's operations, products, and services.

2.1. Name of reporting organisation.

2.2. Major products and/or services, including brands if appropriate.

The reporting organisation should also indicate the nature of its role in providing these products and services, and the degree to which the organisation relies on outsourcing.

2.3. Operational structure of the organisation.

2.4. Description of major divisions, operating companies, subsidiaries, and joint ventures.

2.5. Countries in which the organisation's operations are located.

2.6. Nature of ownership; legal form.

2.7. Nature of markets served.

2.8. Scale of the reporting organisation:

- number of employees;
- products produced/services offered (quantity or volume);
- net sales; and
- total capitalisation broken down in terms of debt and equity.

In addition to the above, reporting organisations are encouraged to provide additional information, such as:

- value added;
- total assets; and
- breakdowns of any or all of the following:
 - sales/revenues by countries/regions that make up 5 percent or more of total revenues;
 - major products and/or identified services;
 - costs by country/region; and
 - employees by country/region.

In preparing the profile information, organisations should consider the need to provide information beyond that on direct employees and financial data. For example, some organisations with few direct employees will have many indirect employees. This could include the employees of subcontractors, franchisees, joint ventures, and companies entirely dependent on or answerable to the reporting organisation. The extent of these relationships may interest stakeholders as much or more than information on direct employees. The reporting organisation should consider adding such information to its profile where relevant.

Reporting organisations should choose the set of measures best suited to the nature of their operations and stakeholders' needs. Measures should include those that can be used specifically to create ratios using the absolute figures provided in other sections of the report (See Annex 5 for information on ratios). All information should cover that portion of the organisation that is covered by the report.

2.9. List of stakeholders, key attributes of each, and relationship to the reporting organisation.

Stakeholders typically include the following groups (examples of attributes are shown in parentheses):

- community (locations, nature of interest);
- customers (retail, wholesale, businesses, governments);
- shareholders and providers of capital (stock exchange listings);
- suppliers (products/services provided, local/national/international operations);
- trade unions (relation to workforce and reporting organisation);
- workforce, direct and indirect (size, diversity, relationship to the reporting organisation); and
- other stakeholders (business partners, local authorities, NGOs).

Report Scope

2.10. Contact person(s) for the report, including e-mail and web addresses.

2.11. Reporting period (e.g., fiscal/calendar year) for information provided.

2.12. Date of most recent previous report (if any).

2.13. Boundaries of report (countries/regions, products/services, divisions/facilities/joint ventures/subsidiaries) and any specific limitations on the scope.

If reporting boundaries do not match the full range of economic, environmental, and social impacts of the organisation, state the strategy and projected timeline for providing complete coverage.

2.14. Significant changes in size, structure, ownership, or products/services that have occurred since the previous report.

2.15. Basis for reporting on joint ventures, partially owned subsidiaries, leased facilities, outsourced operations, and other situations that can significantly affect comparability from period to period and/or between reporting organisations.

2.16. Explanation of the nature and effect of any re-statements of information provided in earlier reports, and the reasons for such re-statement (e.g., mergers/acquisitions, change of base years/periods, nature of business, measurement methods).

Report Profile

2.17. Decisions not to apply GRI principles or protocols in the preparation of the report.

2.18. Criteria/definitions used in any accounting for economic, environmental, and social costs and benefits.

2.19. Significant changes from previous years in the measurement methods applied to key economic, environmental, and social information.

2.20. Policies and internal practices to enhance and provide assurance about the accuracy, completeness, and reliability that can be placed on the sustainability report.

This includes internal management systems, processes, and audits that management relies on to ensure that reported data are reliable and complete with regard to the scope of the report.

2.21. Policy and current practice with regard to providing independent assurance for the full report.

2.22. Means by which report users can obtain additional information and reports about economic, environmental, and social aspects of the organisation's activities, including facility-specific information (if available).

3. Governance Structure and Management Systems

This section provides an overview of the governance structure, overarching policies, and management systems in place to implement the reporting organisation's vision for sustainable development and manage its performance. In contrast, Section 5 (performance indicators) addresses the results and breadth of the organisation's activities. Discussion of stakeholder engagement forms a key part of any description of governance structures and management systems.

Some of the information listed in this section may overlap with information in other publications from the organisation. GRI is sensitive to the need to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort. However, for the sake of ensuring full and complete contextual information for users of sustainability reports, it is important to cover the items listed below in combination with other information on the organisation's economic, environmental, and social performance. Organisations may wish to cross-reference between different documents, but this should not be done at the expense of excluding necessary information in a sustainability report.

Structure and Governance**3.1. Governance structure of the organisation, including major committees under the board of directors that are responsible for setting strategy and for oversight of the organisation.**

Describe the scope of responsibility of any major committees and indicate any direct responsibility for economic, social, and environmental performance.

3.2. Percentage of the board of directors that are independent, non-executive directors.

State how the board determines “independence”.

3.3. Process for determining the expertise board members need to guide the strategic direction of the organisation, including with regard to environmental and social risks and opportunities.**3.4. Board-level processes for overseeing the organisation’s identification and management of economic, environmental, and social risks and opportunities.****3.5. Linkage between executive compensation and achievement of the organisation’s financial and non-financial goals (e.g., environmental performance, labour practices).****3.6. Organisational structure and key individuals responsible for oversight, implementation, and audit of economic, environmental, social, and related policies.**

Include identification of the highest level of management below the board level directly responsible for setting and implementing environmental and social policies, as well as general organisational structure below the board level.

3.7. Mission and values statements, internally developed codes of conduct or principles, and policies relevant to economic, environmental, and social performance and the status of implementation.

Describe the status of implementation in terms of degree to which the code is applied across the organisation in different regions and departments/units. “Policies” refers to those that apply to the organisation as a whole, but may not necessarily provide substantial detail on the specific aspects listed under the performance indicators in Part C, Section 4 of the *Guidelines*.

3.8. Mechanisms for shareholders to provide recommendations or direction to the board of directors.

Include reference to any policies or processes regarding the use of shareholder resolutions or other mechanisms for enabling minority shareholders to express opinions to management.

Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder engagement activities should reflect the organisation’s stakeholders as identified in the profile section.

3.9. Basis for identification and selection of major stakeholders.

This includes the processes for defining an organisation’s stakeholders and for determining which groups to engage.

3.10. Approaches to stakeholder consultation reported in terms of frequency of consultations by type and by stakeholder group.

This could include surveys, focus groups, community panels, corporate advisory panels, written communication, management/union structures, and other vehicles.

3.11. Type of information generated by stakeholder consultations.

Include a list of key issues and concerns raised by stakeholders and identify any indicators specifically developed as a result of stakeholder consultation.

3.12. Use of information resulting from stakeholder engagements.

For example, this could include selecting performance benchmarks or influencing specific decisions on policy or operations.

Overarching Policies and Management Systems

GRI has included policy indicators in both Section 3 (governance structure and management systems) and Section 5 (performance indicators), using the general principle of grouping information items closest to the most relevant aspect. The broader, overarching policies are most directly related to the governance structure and management systems section of the report. The existence of the most detailed level of policy (e.g., policies on child labour) may be captured in the performance indicator section of the report. Where the reporting organisation perceives an overlap in the GRI framework, it should choose the most appropriate location in report for the information.

3.13. Explanation of whether and how the precautionary approach or principle is addressed by the organisation.

This could include an example that illustrates the organisation's approach to risk management in the operational planning or the development and introduction of new products. For reference, see glossary for the text of Article 15 of the Rio Principles.

3.14. Externally developed, voluntary economic, environmental, and social charters, sets of principles, or other initiatives to which the organisation subscribes or which it endorses.

Include date of adoption and countries/operations where applied.

3.15. Principal memberships in industry and business associations, as well as national/international advocacy organisations.

3.16. Policies and/or systems for managing upstream and downstream impacts, including:

- supply chain management as it pertains to outsourcing and supplier environmental and social performance; and
- product and service stewardship initiatives.

Stewardship initiatives include efforts to improve product design to minimize negative impacts associated with manufacturing, use, and final disposal.

3.17. Reporting organisation's approach to managing indirect economic, environmental, and social impacts resulting from its activities.

See below (under "A. Economic Performance Indicators") for a discussion of indirect economic impacts.

3.18. Major decisions during the reporting period regarding the location of, or changes in, operations.

Explain major decisions such as facility or plant openings, closings, expansions, and contractions.

3.19. Programmes and procedures pertaining to economic, environmental, and social performance.

Include discussion of:

- priority and target setting;
- major programmes to improve performance;
- internal communication and training;
- performance monitoring;
- internal and external auditing; and
- senior management review.

3.20. Status of certification pertaining to economic, environmental, and social management systems.

Include adherence to environmental management standards, labour, or social accountability management systems, or other management systems for which formal certification is available.

4. GRI Content Index

4.1. Provide a table identifying location of each element of the GRI Report Content (section and indicator) in the report (and vice versa).

The purpose of this section is to enable report users to quickly assess the degree to which the reporting organisation has included the information and indicators contained in the *GRI Guidelines*. Specifically, the reporter should identify the location of the following GRI elements:

- Vision and Strategy: responses to questions identified in 1.1 and 1.2 (statement from the CEO).
- Profile: 2.1 to 2.22.
- Governance Structure and Management Systems: 3.1 to 3.20.
- Performance Indicators: all core performance indicators and identification of the location of explanations for any omissions.
- Any of the additional indicators from Section 5 of Part C that the reporter chooses to include in the report.

5. Performance Indicators

This section lists the core and additional performance indicators for GRI reports. Reporting organisations that wish to report “in accordance” with the *Guidelines* should read Part A for further details.

The performance indicators are grouped under three sections covering the economic, environmental, and social dimensions of sustainability. This grouping is based on the conventional model of sustainable development and is intended to aid users of the *Guidelines*. However, limiting performance indicators to these three categories may not fully capture the economic, environmental, and social performance of an organisation for a number of reasons. For example:

- changes in one aspect of economic, environmental, or social performance often results in changes to other aspects of sustainability;
- sustainability strategies often use one area of sustainability as a reference point when defining goals for another area; and
- achieving sustainable development requires coordinated movement across a set of performance measurements, rather than random improvement within the full range of measurements.

Therefore, in addition to the economic, environmental, and social dimensions, a fourth dimension of information is necessary: integrated performance.

The following pages describe the core and additional indicators related to economic, environmental, and social performance. Integrated indicators are also considered in this section, but the *Guidelines* leave selection of the most appropriate integrated indicators to the reporting organisation, based on input from its stakeholders.

Integrated Indicators

Given the unique relationship of each organisation to the economic, environmental, and social systems within which it operates, GRI has not identified a standardised set of integrated performance indicators. However, GRI encourages reporting organisations to consult with stakeholders and develop an appropriate shortlist of integrated performance indicators to include in their reports.

Integrated measures are generally of two types:

1. Systemic indicators; and
2. Cross-cutting indicators.

Systemic indicators relate the activity of an organisation to the larger economic, environmental, and social systems of which it is a part. Systemic indicators can relate two different kinds of information. For example, an organisation could describe its performance relative to an overall system or a benchmark, such as a percentage of the workplace accident rates found in the sector. Similarly, an organisation could present its net job creation rate as a proportion of the total number of jobs created in a region.

Absolute systemic indicators describe an organisation's performance in relation to the limit or capacity of the system of which it is a part. An example would be the amount of air pollutants of a given type released as a proportion of the total amount allowable in a region as defined by a relevant authority.

In general, systemic indicators provide an understanding of the degree to which the organisation's performance may influence the performance of a larger system. These types of measures are most useful for organisations that operate within a relatively narrowly defined geographic area.

Cross-cutting indicators directly relate two or more dimensions of economic, environmental, and social performance as a ratio. Eco-efficiency measures such as the amount of emissions per unit of output or per monetary unit of turnover are the best known examples (further guidance on ratio indicators can be found in Annex 5). Many organisations have proposed standardised sets of environmental efficiency indicators that measure various types of resource use or pollution emissions against an economic or productivity measure. Cross-cutting indicators effectively demonstrate the size of the positive or negative impact for each incremental change in another value.

In developing and reporting cross-cutting indicators, care should be taken to:

- draw, where possible, on information already reported under these Guidelines;
- ensure that the indicators use ratios derived from normalised measures and, when possible, from internationally accepted metrics; and
- supplement, not replace, non-ratio indicators.

A. Economic Performance Indicators

The economic dimension of sustainability concerns an organisation's impacts on the economic circumstances of its stakeholders and on economic systems at the local, national and global levels. Economic impacts can be divided into:

- direct impacts; and
- indirect impacts.

These impacts can be positive or negative. Broadly speaking, economic performance encompasses all aspects of the organisation's economic interactions, including the traditional measures used in financial accounting. However, economic indicators as articulated by GRI have a scope and purpose that extends beyond that of traditional financial indicators.

Financial indicators focus primarily on the profitability of an organisation for the purpose of informing its management and shareholders. By contrast, economic indicators in the sustainability reporting context focus more on the manner in which an organisation affects the stakeholders with whom it has direct and indirect economic interactions. Therefore, the focus of economic performance measurement is on how the economic status of the stakeholder changes as a consequence of the organisation's activities, rather than on changes in the economic status of the organisation. In some cases, existing financial indicators can directly inform these assessments. However, in other cases, different measures may be necessary, including the re-casting of traditional financial information to emphasise the impact on the stakeholder. In this context, shareholders are also considered a stakeholder group.

While financial performance indicators are highly developed, indicators of organisation-level economic performance as described in the previous paragraph are still evolving. The indicators in this section are the result of a consultation process that began after the release of the June 2000 *Guidelines* and represent a new approach to reporting on economic impacts. This framework will continue to evolve in future versions of the *GRI Guidelines* as understanding matures.

Direct Impacts

The economic indicators on direct impacts are designed to:

- measure the financial flows between the organisation and its key economic stakeholders; and
- indicate how the organisation affects the economic circumstances of those stakeholders.

The aspects for this section are organised around stakeholder groups. Each aspect includes a monetary flow indicator, which provides an indication of the scale of the relationship between reporting organisation and stakeholder. Most monetary flow indicators are paired with one or more other indicators that provide insight into the nature of the performance and impact on the stakeholder's economic capacity.

For example, under suppliers, the monetary flow indicator associated with "cost of all goods, materials, and services purchased" provides information on the scale of flows between the reporting

organisation and its suppliers. The performance indicator describes one facet of the economic relationship between the suppliers and the reporting organisation.

Indirect impacts

The total economic impact of an organisation includes indirect impacts stemming from externalities or from impacts on communities. Externalities are those costs or benefits arising from a transaction that are not fully reflected in the price or monetary amount of the transaction. A community can be considered as anything from a neighbourhood, to a country, or even a community of interest such as a minority group within a society. Although often complex, indirect impacts are measurable. However, given the diversity of situations facing reporting organisations, GRI has not determined a single, generic set of such indicators. Thus, each organisation will have to select performance indicators based on its own analysis of the issues. Information on the reporting organisation’s overall approach to identifying and managing indirect impacts is covered under item 3.17 in the Governance and Management Systems section.

Examples of externalities might include:

- innovation measured through patents and partnerships;
- economic effects (positive or negative) of changes in location or operations; or
- the contribution of a sector to GDP or national competitiveness.

Examples of community impacts might include:

- community dependency on the organisation’s activities;
- ability of the organisation to attract further investment into an area; or
- the location of suppliers.

Further discussion of indirect economic impacts is available through discussion papers prepared by the economics subgroup of the Measurement Working Group. These can be found on the GRI website.

Economic Performance Indicators

Core Indicators	Additional Indicators
Direct Economic Impacts	
Customers	
<p>Monetary flow indicator:</p> <p>EC1. Net sales (as listed in the profile section under 2.8).</p> <p>EC2. Geographic breakdown of markets. For each product or product range, disclose national market share by country where this is 25% or more. Disclose market share and sales for each country where national sales represent 5% or more of GDP.</p>	

Core Indicators	Additional Indicators
Suppliers	
<p>Monetary distribution indicator: EC3. Cost of all goods, materials, and services purchased.</p>	<p>EC11. Supplier breakdown by organisation and country. List all suppliers from which purchases in the reporting period represent 10% or more of total purchases in that period. Also identify all countries where total purchasing represents 5% or more of GDP.</p>
<p>EC4. Percent of contracts that were paid in accordance with agreed terms, excluding agreed penalty arrangements. Terms may include conditions such as scheduling of payments, form of payment, or other conditions. This indicator is the percent of contracts that were paid according to terms, regardless of the details of the terms.</p>	
Employees	
<p>Monetary flow indicator: EC5. Total payroll and benefits expense (including wages, pension, other benefits, and redundancy payments) broken down by country or region. This remuneration should refer to current payments and not include future commitments. (Note: Indicator LA8 on training also offers information on one aspect of the organisation's investment in human capital.)</p>	
Providers of Capital	
<p>Monetary flow indicator: EC6. Distributions to providers of capital broken down by interest on debt and borrowings, and dividends on all classes of shares, with any arrears of preferred dividends to be disclosed. This includes all forms of debt and borrowings, not only long-term debt.</p>	
<p>EC7. Increase/decrease in retained earnings at end of period. Note: the information contained in the profile section (2.1-2.8) enables the calculation of several measures, including ROACE (Return On Average Capital Employed).</p>	
Public Sector	
<p>Monetary flow indicators: EC8. Total sum of taxes of all types paid broken down by country.</p>	<p>EC12. Total spent on non-core business infrastructure development. This is infrastructure built outside the main business activities of the reporting entity such as a factory building, a school, or hospital for employees and their families.</p>
<p>EC9. Subsidies received broken down by country or region. This refers to grants, tax relief, and other types of financial benefits that do not represent a transaction of goods and services. Explain definitions used for types of groups.</p>	
<p>E10. Donations to community, civil society, and other groups broken down in terms of cash and in-kind donations per type of group.</p>	

Core Indicators	Additional Indicators
Indirect Economic Impacts	
	EC13. Describe the organisation's indirect economic impacts. Identify major externalities associated with the reporting organisation's products and services.

B. Environmental Performance Indicators

The environmental dimension of sustainability concerns an organisation's impacts on living and non-living natural systems, including ecosystems, land, air and water. The environmental dimension of sustainability has achieved the highest level of consensus among the three dimensions of sustainability reporting.

It is particularly important to provide environmental performance information in terms of both absolute figures and normalised measures (e.g., resource use per unit of output). Both measures reflect important, but distinct, aspects of sustainability. Absolute figures provide a sense of scale or magnitude of the use or impact, which allows the user to consider performance in the context of larger systems. Normalised figures illustrate the organisation's efficiency and support comparison between organisations of different sizes. In general, stakeholders should be able to calculate normalised figures using data from the report profile (e.g., net sales) and absolute figures reported in the environmental performance section. However, GRI asks the reporting organisation to provide both normalised and absolute figures.

In reporting on environmental indicators, reporting organisations are also encouraged to keep in mind the principle of sustainability context. With respect to the environmental measures in the report, organisations are encouraged to relate their individual performance to the broader ecological systems within which they operate. For example, organisations could seek to report their pollution output in terms of the ability of the environment (local, regional, or global) to absorb the pollutants.

Environmental Performance Indicators

Core Indicators	Additional Indicators
Materials	
EN1. Total materials use other than water by type. Report in tonnes, kilograms, or volume). Provide definitions used for types of materials.	
EN2. Percentage of materials used that are wastes (processed or unprocessed) from sources external to the reporting organisation. Refers to both post-consumer recycled material and waste from industrial sources. Report in tonnes, kilograms, or volume.	
Energy¹	
EN3. Direct energy use segmented by primary source. Report on all energy sources used by the reporting organisation for its own operations as well as for the production and delivery of energy products (e.g., electricity or heat) to other organisations. Report in joules.	EN17. Initiatives to use renewable energy sources and increase energy efficiency.
	EN18. Energy consumption footprint (i.e., annualised lifetime energy requirements) of major products. Report in joules.
EN4. Indirect energy use. Report on all energy used to produce and deliver energy products purchased by the reporting organisation (e.g., electricity or heat). Report in joules.	EN19. Other indirect (upstream/downstream) energy use and implications, such as organisational travel, product lifecycle management, and use of energy-intensive materials.

¹ Note: Draft protocols are currently under development for these indicators. Please see www.globalreporting.org for further details.

Core Indicators	Additional Indicators
Water ¹	
EN5. Total water use.	EN20. Identify water sources and related ecosystems/habitats significantly affected by the organisation's use of water. Include Ramsar-listed wetlands and the overall contribution to resulting environmental trends.
	EN21. Annual withdrawals of ground and surface water as a percent of annual renewable quantity of water available from the sources. Breakdown by region.
	EN22. Total recycling and reuse of water. Includes wastewater and other used water (e.g., cooling water).
Biodiversity	
EN6. Location and size of land owned, leased, or managed in biodiversity-rich habitats. Further guidance on biodiversity rich habitats may found at www.globalreporting.org (forthcoming).	EN23. Total amount of land owned, leased, or managed for production activities or extractive use by the organisation.
	EN24. Amount of impermeable surface as a percentage of land purchased or leased.
EN7. Description of the major impacts on biodiversity associated with the organisation's activities and/or products and services in terrestrial, freshwater, and marine environments.	EN25. Impacts of organisation's activities and operations on protected and sensitive areas (e.g., IUCN protected area categories 1-4, world heritage sites, and biosphere reserves).
	EN26. Changes to natural habitats resulting from the reporting organisation's activities and operations and percentage of habitat protected or restored. Identify type of habitat affected and its status.
	EN27. Objectives, programmes, and targets for protecting and restoring native ecosystems and species in degraded areas.
	EN28. Number of IUCN Red List species with habitats in areas affected by the reporting organisation's operations.
	EN29. List business units currently operating or planning operations in or around protected or sensitive areas.
Emissions, Effluents, and Waste	
EN8. Greenhouse gas emissions (CO ₂ , CH ₄ , N ₂ O, HFCs, PFCs, SF ₆). Report separate subtotals for each gas in tonnes and in tonnes of CO ₂ equivalent for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • direct emissions from sources owned or controlled by the reporting entity • indirect emissions from imported electricity heat or steam See WRI-WBCSD Greenhouse Gas Protocol.	EN30. Other relevant indirect greenhouse gas emissions (CO ₂ , CH ₄ , N ₂ O, HFCs, PFCs, SF ₆). Refers to emissions that are a consequence of the activities of the reporting entity, but occur from sources owned or controlled by another entity (report in tonnes of gas and tonnes of CO ₂ equivalent). See WRI-WBCSD Greenhouse Gas Protocol.
EN9. Use and emissions of ozone-depleting substances. Report each figure separately in accordance with Montreal Protocol Annexes A, B, C, and E in tonnes of CFC-11 equivalents (ozone-depleting potential).	EN31. Identify all production, transport, import, or export of any waste deemed "hazardous" under the terms of the Basel Convention Annex I, II, III, and VIII.

Core Indicators	Additional Indicators
<p>EN10. NO_x, SO_x, and other significant air emissions by type. Include emissions of substances regulated under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • local laws and regulations • Stockholm POPs Convention (Annex A, B, and C) – persistent organic pollutants • Rotterdam Convention on Prior Informed Consent (PIC) • Helsinki, Sofia, and Geneva Protocols to the Convention on Long-Range Trans-boundary Air Pollution 	<p>EN32. Identify water sources and related ecosystems/habitats significantly affected by the organisation's discharges of water and runoff. Include Ramsar-listed wetlands and the overall contribution to resulting environmental trends. See GRI Water Protocol.</p>
<p>EN11. Total amount of waste by type and destination. "Destination" refers to the method by which waste is treated, including composting, reuse, recycling, recovery, incineration, or landfilling. Explain type of classification method and estimation method.</p>	
<p>EN12. Significant discharges to water by type. See GRI Water Protocol (forthcoming).</p>	
<p>EN13. Significant spills of chemicals, oils, and fuels in terms of total number and total volume. Significance is defined in terms of both the size of the spill and impact on the surrounding environment.</p>	
Suppliers	
	<p>EN33. Performance of suppliers relative to environmental components of programmes and procedures described in response to Management Systems and Governance section of the <i>Guidelines</i> (Section 3.21).</p>
Products and Services	
<p>EN14. Significant environmental impacts of principal products and services. Describe and quantify (where relevant).</p>	
<p>EN15. Percentage of the weight of products sold that is reclaimable at the end of the products' useful life and percentage that is actually reclaimed. "Reclaimable" refers to either the recycling or reuse of the product materials or components.</p>	
Compliance	
<p>EN16. Incidents of and fines for non-compliance with all applicable international declarations/conventions/treaties, and national, subnational, regional, and local regulations associated with environmental issues. Explain in terms of countries of operation.</p>	
Transport	
	<p>EN34. Describe significant environmental impacts of transportation used by reporting organisation for logistical purposes.</p>
Overall	
	<p>EN35. Total environmental expenditures by type. Explain definitions used for types of expenditures.</p>

C. Social Performance Indicators

The social dimension of sustainability concerns an organisation's impacts on the social systems within which it operates. Social performance can be gauged through an analysis of the organisation's impacts on stakeholders at the local, national, and global levels.

Social performance measurement enjoys less of a consensus than environmental performance measurement. Through its consultative process, GRI has selected indicators by identifying key performance aspects surrounding labour practices, human rights, and broader issues affecting consumers, community, and other stakeholders in society. The specific aspects for labour practices and human rights performance are based mainly on internationally recognised standards such as the Conventions of the International Labour Organisation and international instruments such as the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In particular, the labour practices and human rights indicators have drawn heavily on the ILO's Tripartite Declaration Concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy, and the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, which were deemed most relevant to the responsibilities of business during the GRI consultative process.

The aspects of labour practices that relate to human rights have been incorporated into the latter category. This decision was made to avoid treating "labour rights" as something different from, or less important than, "human rights". The decision reflects the strong sentiment that an organisation's contribution in the area of labour practices should not be simply to protect and respect basic rights; it should also be to enhance the quality of the working environment and value of the relationship to the worker. While the aspects under labour practices and human rights are closely related (e.g., collective bargaining and industrial relations), there remains a fundamental difference in the purpose of the indicators, and they have therefore been kept separate. The aspects and indicators under human rights help assess how a reporting organisation helps maintain and respect the basic rights of a human being. The aspects and indicators under labour practices measure ways in which an organisation's contributions go beyond these baseline expectations.

Several of the social performance indicators differ considerably in nature from other economic and environmental performance indicators in the *Guidelines*. Many of the social issues that are the subject of performance measurement are not easily quantifiable, so a number of social indicators are qualitative measures of the organisation's systems and operations, including policies, procedures, and management practices. These indicators relate not to general, overarching policies (as listed in Section 3 of Part C of the *Guidelines*) but to specific, narrowly defined social aspects such as forced or compulsory labour, or freedom of association. Future protocols will help further articulate the specific details associated with these indicators of practice and policy.

While GRI has sought to capture issues of key concern to most stakeholders, the *Guidelines* do not, at present, address the questions of all potential stakeholders. Given the diversity of social situations and issues that confront them, organisations should use stakeholder consultation to ensure that the social impacts on which they report are as complete as possible. Three areas that will require further attention in the future are employee remuneration, working time, and broadening the coverage of community. It is currently felt that these issues are best addressed on a sector-specific basis in GRI's future sector supplements. However, consideration will be given to incorporating appropriate indicators into the *Guidelines* in future revision cycles.

The social performance indicators that appear in this document represent a significant step forward from the previous version of the *Guidelines* in identifying core issues that are applicable to most organisations. However, GRI social indicators will be continually enhanced over time as the field of performance measurement progresses and GRI receives further feedback on the *Guidelines*.

Social Performance Indicators: Labour Practices and Decent Work

Core Indicators	Additional Indicators
Employment	
LA1. Breakdown of workforce, where possible, by region/country, status (employee/non-employee), employment type (full time/part time), and by employment contract (indefinite or permanent/fixed term or temporary). Also identify workforce retained in conjunction with other employers (temporary agency workers or workers in co-employment relationships), segmented by region/country.	LA12. Employee benefits beyond those legally mandated (e.g., contributions to health care, disability, maternity, education, and retirement).
LA2. Net employment creation and average turnover segmented by region/country.	
Labour/Management Relations	
LA3. Percentage of employees represented by independent trade union organisations or other bona fide employee representatives broken down geographically OR percentage of employees covered by collective bargaining agreements broken down by region/country.	LA13. Provision for formal worker representation in decision making or management, including corporate governance.
LA4. Policy and procedures involving information, consultation, and negotiation with employees over changes in the reporting organisation's operations (e.g., restructuring).	
Health and Safety	
LA5. Practices on recording and notification of occupational accidents and diseases, and how they relate to the ILO Code of Practice on Recording and Notification of Occupational Accidents and Diseases.	LA14. Evidence of substantial compliance with the ILO Guidelines for Occupational Health Management Systems.
LA6. Description of formal joint health and safety committees comprising management and worker representatives and proportion of workforce covered by any such committees.	
LA7. Standard injury, lost day, and absentee rates and number of work-related fatalities (including subcontracted workers).	
LA8. Description of policies or programmes (for the workplace and beyond) on HIV/AIDS.	
Training and Education	
LA9. Average hours of training per year per employee by category of employee (e.g., senior management, middle management, professional, technical, administrative, production, and maintenance).	LA16. Description of programmes to support the continued employability of employees and to manage career endings.
	LA17. Specific policies and programmes for skills management or for lifelong learning.
Diversity and Opportunity	
LA10. Description of equal opportunity policies or programmes, as well as monitoring systems to ensure compliance and results of monitoring. Equal opportunity policies may address workplace harassment and affirmative action relative to historical patterns of discrimination.	

Core Indicators	Additional Indicators
<p>LA11. Composition of senior management and corporate governance bodies (including the board of directors), including female/male ratio and other indicators of diversity as culturally appropriate.</p>	

Social Performance Indicators: Human Rights

Core Indicators	Additional Indicators
Strategy and Management	
<p>HR1. Description of policies, guidelines, corporate structure, and procedures to deal with all aspects of human rights relevant to the reporter’s operations, including monitoring mechanisms and results. State how policies relate to existing international standards such as the Universal Declaration and the Fundamental Human Rights Conventions of the ILO. See glossary.</p>	<p>HR8. Employees training on the reporter’s policies and practices concerning all aspects of human rights relevant to the reporter’s operations. Include type of training, number of employees trained, and average training duration.</p>
<p>HR2. Evidence of consideration of human rights impacts as part of investment and procurement decisions, including selection of suppliers/contractors.</p>	
<p>HR3. Description of policies and procedures to evaluate and address human rights performance within the reporting organisation’s supply chain and contractors, including monitoring systems and results of monitoring. “Human rights performance” refers to the aspects of human rights identified as reporting aspects in the GRI performance indicators.</p>	
Non-discrimination	
<p>HR4. Description of global policy and procedures/programmes preventing all forms of discrimination in the reporter’s operations, including monitoring systems and results of monitoring.</p>	
Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining	
<p>HR5. Description of freedom of association policy and extent to which this policy is universally applied independent of local laws, as well as description of procedures/programmes to address this issue.</p>	
Child Labour²	
<p>HR6. Description of policy excluding child labour as defined by the ILO Convention 138 and extent to which this policy is visibly stated and applied, as well as description of procedures/programmes to address this issue, including monitoring systems and results of monitoring.</p>	

² Note: Draft protocol is currently under development for these indicators. Please see www.globalreporting.org for further details.

Core Indicators	Additional Indicators
Forced and Compulsory Labour	
HR7. Description of policy to prevent forced and compulsory labour and extent to which this policy is visibly stated and applied as well as description of procedures/programmes to address this issue, including monitoring systems and results of monitoring. See ILO Convention No. 29, Article 2.	
Disciplinary Practices	
	HR9. Description of appeal practices, including, but not limited to, human rights issues (representation and appeals process).
	HR10. Description of non-retaliation policy and effective, confidential employee grievance system (including, but not limited to, its impact on human rights).
Security Practices	
	HR11. Human rights training for security personnel. Include type of training, number of persons trained, and average training duration.
Indigenous Rights	
	HR12. Description of policies, guidelines, and procedures to address the needs of indigenous people. This includes indigenous people in the workforce and in communities where the organisation currently operates or intends to operate.
	HR13. Description of jointly managed community grievance mechanisms/authority.
	HR14. Share of operating revenues from the area of operations that are redistributed to local communities.

Social Performance Indicators: Society

Core Indicators	Additional Indicators
Community	
SO1. Description of policies to manage impacts on communities in areas affected by the reporting organisation's activities, as well as description of procedures/programmes to address this issue, including monitoring systems and results of monitoring. Include explanation of procedures for identifying and engaging in dialogue with community stakeholders.	SO4. Awards received relevant to the reporting organisation's social, ethical, and environmental performance.
Bribery and Corruption	
SO2. Description of the reporting organisation's policy, procedures/management systems, and compliance mechanisms for organisations and employees addressing bribery and corruption. Include a description of how the organisation meets the requirements of the OECD Convention on Combating Bribery.	
Political Contributions	
SO3. Description of reporting organisation's policy, procedures/management systems, and compliance mechanisms for managing political lobbying and contributions.	SO5. Amount of money paid by the reporter to political parties and institutions whose prime function is to fund political parties or their candidates.

Competition and Pricing	
	SO6. Court decisions regarding cases pertaining to anti-trust and monopoly regulations.
	SO7. Description of reporting organisation's policy, procedures/management systems, and compliance mechanisms for preventing anti-competitive behaviour.

Social Performance Indicators: Product Responsibility

Core Indicators	Additional Indicators
Customer Health and Safety	
<p>PR1. Description of policy for preserving customer health and safety during use of reporting organisation's products and services, and extent to which this policy is visibly stated and applied, as well as description of procedures/programmes to address this issue, including monitoring systems and results of monitoring. Explain rationale for any use of multiple standards in marketing and sales of products.</p>	<p>PR4. Number and type of instances of non-compliance with regulations concerning customer health and safety, including the penalties and fines assessed for these breaches.</p>
	<p>PR5. Number of complaints upheld by regulatory or similar official bodies to oversee or regulate the health and safety of the reporting organisation's products and services.</p>
	<p>PR6. Voluntary code compliance, product labels or awards with respect to social and/or environmental responsibility that the reporter is qualified to use or has received. Include explanation of the process and criteria involved.</p>
Products and Services	
<p>PR2. Description of reporting organisation's policy, procedures/management systems, and compliance mechanisms related to product information and labelling.</p>	<p>PR7. Number and type of instances of non-compliance with regulations concerning product information and labelling, including any penalties or fines assessed for these breaches.</p>
	<p>PR8. Description of reporting organisation's policy, procedures/management systems, and compliance mechanisms related to customer satisfaction, including results of surveys measuring customer satisfaction. Identify geographic areas covered by policy.</p>
Advertising	
	<p>PR9. Description of reporting organisation's policies, procedures/management systems, and compliance mechanisms for adherence to standards and voluntary codes related to advertising. Identify geographic areas covered by policy.</p>
	<p>PR10. Number and types of breaches of advertising and marketing regulations.</p>
Respect for Privacy	
<p>PR3. Description of reporting organisation's policy, procedures/management systems, and compliance mechanisms for consumer privacy. Identify geographic areas covered by policy.</p>	<p>PR11. Number of substantiated complaints regarding breaches of consumer privacy.</p>

**PART D:
ANNEXES**

Glossary

The following are GRI's definitions of key terms used in this document.

Additional indicators: An indicator used at the discretion of the reporter to enrich a report.

Basel Convention: The Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal was drafted and adopted in 1989, and entered into force in 1992. The Convention works to reduce the movement of hazardous wastes, to ensure that wastes are disposed of as close as possible to where they were produced and to minimise the generation of hazardous wastes in terms of quantity and level of hazardousness.

(<http://www.unep.ch/basel/index.html>)

Cadbury Commission: A committee chaired by Sir Adrian Cadbury, based in the UK, which focused on the control and reporting functions of boards and on the role of auditors. At the heart of the Committee's recommendations, released in 1992, is a Code of Best Practice designed to achieve the necessary high standards of corporate behaviour. The London Stock Exchange required all listed companies registered in the UK to state whether they were complying with the Code and to give reasons for any areas of non-compliance. In 1998, this LSE requirement was expanded to include the Cadbury, Greenbury, and Hampel reports in what is now known as the Combined Code.

Cadbury Commission, *Report of the Committee on the Financial Aspects of Corporate Governance* (December 1992).

CITES: The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora is an international agreement between governments. Its aim is to ensure that international trade in species of wild animals and plants does not threaten their survival. Today, it accords varying degrees of protection to more than 30,000 species of animals and plants, whether they are traded as live specimens, fur coats, or dried herbs. It was put into force in 1975 and has 150 voluntary parties.

(www.cites.org)

CFC-11 Equivalent: Chlorofluorocarbons – known to disintegrate the Ozone layer, a greenhouse gas.

Convention on Long-Range Trans-boundary Air Pollution: The Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution was drafted after scientists confirmed that air pollutants could travel several thousand kilometres before deposition. This implied that cooperation at the international level was necessary to solve problems such as acidification. The Convention was the first legally binding instrument at the international level to deal with problems of air pollution on a broad regional basis. It was signed in 1979 and entered into force in 1983. It has greatly contributed to the development of international environmental law and created the essential framework for controlling and reducing the damage to human health and the environment caused by transboundary air pollution. It is a successful example of what can be achieved through intergovernmental cooperation.

Since its entry into force the Convention has been extended by eight protocols including the Helsinki, Sofia, and Geneva Protocols.

Core indicator: An indicator required to publish a report “in accordance” with the GRI *Guidelines* as described in Part A and Part B of the *Guidelines*.

Decent Work: Productive work in which rights (specifically those contained in the ILO's Declaration of Fundamental Rights at Work) are protected, which generates an adequate income, with adequate social protection. It also means sufficient work, in the sense that all should have full access to income-earning opportunities.

Based on Report of the Director General: Decent Work, 87th Session, June 1999.

Eco-efficiency: The delivery of competitively priced goods and services that satisfy human needs and bring quality of life, while progressively reducing ecological impacts and resource-use intensity throughout the lifecycle to a level at least in line with the earth's estimated carrying capacity. In short, creating more value with less impact. (www.wbcsd.org)

Ecological footprint: The size and impact of the “footprints” on the earth's ecosystems made by companies, communities, or individuals reflect a number of interlinked factors, including human population numbers, consumption patterns, and technologies used.

Fundamental Human Rights Conventions of the ILO: International Labour Standards Covered in the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (adopted by the International Labour Conference at its 86th session, Geneva 1998):

Convention Nr. 87: Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise, 1948

Convention Nr. 98: Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining, 1949

Convention Nr. 29: Forced Labour, 1930

Convention Nr. 105: Abolition of Forced Labour, 1957

Convention Nr. 100: Equal Remuneration, 1951

Convention Nr. 111: Discrimination (Employment and Occupation), 1958

Convention Nr. 138: Minimum Age, 1973

Convention Nr 182: Worst Forms of Child Labour

Greenhouse gas emissions: Gaseous pollutants released into the atmosphere through human actions that amplify the greenhouse effect. The greenhouse effect is widely accepted as the cause of global climate change. Gases include CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, HFCs, PFCs, SF₆, and other CO₂ equivalents.

Indicator: A measure of performance, either qualitative or quantitative, that appears in Part C of the *Guidelines*.

Indicator aspects: The general types of information that are related to a specific category (e.g., energy use, child labour, customers). A given category may have several aspects.

Indicator categories: The broad areas, or groupings, of economic, environmental, or social issues of concern to stakeholders (e.g., human rights, direct economic impacts).

International Labour Organisation: The International Labour Organisation is the UN specialized agency that seeks the promotion of social justice and internationally recognized human and labour rights. It was founded in 1919 and is the only surviving major creation of the Treaty of Versailles, which brought the League of Nations into being. It became the first specialized agency of the UN in 1946.

IUCN protected area categories: The World Conservation Union (IUCN) defines a protected area as:

"an area of land and/or sea especially dedicated to the protection and maintenance of biological diversity, and of natural and associated cultural resources, and managed through legal or other effective means."

IUCN categorises protected areas by management objective and has identified six distinct categories of protected areas.

(<http://wcpa.iucn.org/wcpainfo/protectedareas.html>)

IUCN Red List: The IUCN Red List is the world's most comprehensive inventory of the global conservation status of plants and animals. It uses a set of criteria to evaluate the extinction risk of thousands of species and subspecies. These criteria are relevant to all species and all regions of the world.

(www.redlist.org)

The King Report: The King Committee on Corporate Governance in South Africa was formed in 1992 (under the auspices of the Institute of Directors in Southern Africa and chaired by Mervyn King) to promote the highest standards of corporate governance in South Africa. Corporate Governance in South Africa was institutionalised by the publication of the King Report on Corporate Governance in 1994, and more recently by the release of an updated version ("King 2") in 2002. The King Report is recognised internationally as the most comprehensive publication on the subject, embracing the inclusive or stakeholder approach to corporate governance. The King Report features a Code of Corporate Practices and Conduct, which the Johannesburg Stock Exchange stipulates all listed companies must follow.

(www.iodsa.co.za)

Kyoto Protocol: In December 1997, more than 160 nations met in Kyoto, Japan, to negotiate binding limitations on greenhouse gases for the developed nations, pursuant to the objectives of the Framework Convention on Climate Change of 1992. The outcome of the meeting was the Kyoto Protocol, in which the developed nations agreed to limit their greenhouse gas emissions relative to the levels emitted in 1990.

(<http://unfccc.int/>)

Lifecycle Analysis (also Lifecycle Inventory, Cradle to Grave, Material Flow Analysis): A detailed examination of the full lifecycle of a product, process, system, or function. Taking as an example the case of a manufactured product, an LCA involves making detailed measurements during the manufacture of the product, from the mining of the raw materials used in its production and distribution, through to its use, possible reuse or recycling, and eventual disposal.

Montreal Protocol: The Montreal Protocol on Substances That Deplete the Ozone Layer is a landmark international agreement designed to protect the stratospheric ozone layer. The treaty was originally signed in 1987 and substantially amended in 1990 and 1992. The Montreal Protocol stipulates that the production and consumption of compounds that deplete ozone in the stratosphere (chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), halons, carbon tetrachloride, and methyl chloroform) were to be phased out by 2000 (2005 for methyl chloroform).

(<http://www.unep.org/ozone/montreal.shtml>)

NOx: Nitrous oxides.

Precautionary approach/principle: This principle emerged from Article 15 of the Rio Principles, which states:

“In order to protect the environment, the precautionary approach shall be widely applied by States according to their capabilities. Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation.”

(www.unep.org/unep/rio.htm)

Products and services: Physical and non-physical products and services including loans, investments, and other financial instruments.

Reporting element: Refers to the numbered information (e.g., 2.1, 3.13) queries listed in Part C that are part of a GRI report.

Reporting organisation: The organisation preparing the report specified in the profile section of a GRI report (Section 2).

Report user: Any stakeholder of the reporting organisation who uses the report, including both external and internal stakeholders.

Social and ethical funds: Investment funds that use social or other non-financial criteria in selecting investments.

SOx: Sulphur oxides.

Stockholm POPs Convention: The Stockholm Convention is a global treaty to protect human health and the environment from persistent organic pollutants (POPs). POPs are chemicals that remain intact in the environment for long periods, become widely distributed geographically, accumulate in the fatty tissue of living organisms and are toxic to humans and wildlife. POPs circulate globally and can cause damage wherever they travel. In implementing the Convention, governments will take measures to eliminate or reduce the release of POPs into the environment.

(<http://www.chem.unep.ch/sc/>)

Turnbull Report: A report published by the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England & Wales on the implementation of the internal control requirements of the Combined Code on Corporate Governance.

(<http://www.icaew.co.uk/internalcontrol>)

Annex 1: Overview of the Global Reporting Initiative¹

History

The GRI was convened in 1997 by the Coalition for Environmentally Responsible Economies (CERES) in partnership with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). It was established to elevate sustainability reporting practices to a level equivalent to those of financial reporting, while achieving comparability, credibility, rigour, timeliness, and verifiability of reported information. GRI has undertaken this work with the active participation of corporations, environmental and social NGOs, accountancy organisations, trade unions, investors, and other stakeholders worldwide.

The GRI released an exposure draft *Sustainability Reporting Guidelines* in 1999. After an exhaustive period of drafting, pilot testing, and further consultation, GRI released the first version of its *Sustainability Reporting Guidelines* in June 2000. The 2002 version of the *Guidelines* marks the continuation of a cycle of testing, review, consultation, and revision of both the *Guidelines* and the supporting documents. Future revision cycles will remain rooted in the principles the GRI has embodied since its inception: inclusiveness, balance, transparency, and technical excellence.

Organisational Profile

In late 2002, the permanent GRI Secretariat will be headquartered in Amsterdam. GRI will be affiliated with the United Nations as a UNEP Collaborating Centre. The Secretariat will be responsible for implementing the organisational work programme approved by the Board of Directors in consultation with the Stakeholder Council and the Technical Advisory Council. In developing its guidance on sustainability reporting, the GRI will continue to rely heavily on the input of multi-stakeholder, ad hoc working groups. Since 1999, several hundred organisations have participated in working groups that have guided GRI's work on performance indicators, assurance practices, and revising the *Guidelines*. Through these working groups, the Secretariat strives to incorporate a diversity of perspectives and experience that is balanced in terms of constituencies and geographic representation. The products of the working groups—and GRI as a whole—are subject to pilot testing processes to assess the efficacy of the reporting framework.

Recent Milestones

The period 2000-2002 marked a number of milestones in the development of GRI. Some of these are listed below.

Governance

GRI is making rapid progress toward establishing the institutional framework to support its work in the future.

- The permanent GRI was officially inaugurated in early April 2002 at the United Nations in New York City. Social and environmental NGOs, corporations, labour, government, and UN representatives publicly endorsed the GRI's mission at the ceremony.
- Following an open nomination process that netted more than 100 nominations, a distinguished nominating committee selected a 14-person Board of Directors to guide the GRI's future development. The Board has representation from every continent and numerous stakeholder groups including business, NGOs, labour, accounting, investment, and government.

¹ More detailed information on GRI's history and governance structure is available at www.globalreporting.org.

- The GRI has taken initial steps to establish a Stakeholder Council. The Council will be the formal policy forum within GRI, where stakeholders will be equal partners in charting the future course of the organisation. More than 100 nominations for Council members were received. From these, an initial 36 have been chosen, and these stakeholders will be responsible for electing the remaining members of the Council. The Stakeholder Council also has a direct role in selecting the Board of Directors.
- In late 2002, the GRI will establish a Technical Advisory Council to guide the Board of Directors and the Secretariat on technical matters relating to reporting on economic, environmental, and social performance.
- At a basic level of engagement, the GRI has registered more than 1,700 individual stakeholders from 72 countries in 2001-2002.

Guidelines Development

The GRI reporting framework has undergone significant evolution since the release of the first version of the *Guidelines* in 2000. Building on the experience of applying the *Guidelines* over the last two years, GRI has revised the *Guidelines* and initiated work on developing further supplements and protocols to add to the rigour and robustness of the reporting framework.

- In support of the revisions process, GRI undertook a Structured Feedback Process that gathered input on the Guidelines from 31 companies.
- Recognising the intense debate around assurance of reports, GRI established a Verification Working Group as a forum for discussing how verification should be addressed in the GRI framework and, more broadly, in the continuing evolution of reporting on economic, environmental, and social performance worldwide.
- In 2001, GRI established the Measurement Working Group to develop recommendations on performance indicators for inclusion in the 2002 Guidelines. The group comprised 130 experts from over 25 countries, and worked for close to a year to prepare its recommendations.
- The Revisions Working Group—a group of 12 individuals representing a broad range of constituencies and geographic areas—worked for six months to propose revisions to the Guidelines. As part of their review of the Guidelines, the Revisions Working Group was also responsible for integrating the recommendations of the Measurement Working Group into the 2002 Guidelines.
- GRI is developing sector supplements that will identify and address sector-specific issues that are not reflected in the core Guidelines for inclusion in sustainability reports. GRI is developing supplements for the automotive, financial services, mining, telecommunications, and tour operator sectors. A second wave of sector initiatives will be launched in mid-2002. In addition, GRI has begun developing its first technical protocols to support specific indicators. With release of these first protocols covering energy, water, and child labour indicators, a process will continue in which new protocols will emerge at a steady rate in the coming years. All will be subject to testing, comment, and revision through a multi-stakeholder consultative process.
- GRI also plans to produce Issue Papers that will guide reporting organisations that wish to organise their reports along thematic lines (e.g., productivity, diversity, development). These will seek to encourage integrated approaches that cross and blend multiple dimensions of economic, environmental, and social reporting into a holistic reporting design.

Outreach

Global outreach continues to be a major focus for GRI. In 2001-2002, several thousand stakeholders were engaged in dialogue and information briefings in Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Germany, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, South Africa, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States, and dozens of conferences worldwide. The result has been an increased uptake of the *Guidelines*. Through ongoing consultation with multilateral organisations, the *Guidelines* are being recommended to companies as an essential tool in ensuring transparency and demonstrating commitment to social responsibility. The United Nations Global Compact, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, the European Council of Ministers, the European Community, and World Economic Forum, among others, have referenced the *Guidelines* in communications to their constituencies. More than 120 companies from 18 countries have used the *Guidelines* in shaping their sustainability reports.

The Future

The year 2002 marks a turning point in the development of the GRI, with the establishment of a new institutional structure and the development of the new *Guidelines* and accompanying pilot supplements and technical protocols. Looking ahead, GRI remains committed to its mission of elevating the quality of reporting on economic, environmental, and social performance to a higher level of consistency, comparability, and rigour. It is committed to continuing global leadership as a new, permanent institution that will make a major contribution to accountability and transparency in the 21st century.

Annex 2: Linkages Between Sustainability and Financial Reporting

Introduction

Sustainability reporting has the potential to provide critical information for business analysis that is normally absent from financial reports. This information complements financial reports with forward-looking information that can enhance the report users' understanding of such key value drivers as human capital formation in the firm, corporate governance, management of environmental risks and liabilities, and the capacity to innovate. In some circumstances, sustainability performance information already can provide insights to support business analysis, and may have relevance within the framework of traditional financial reports. Fully articulating the relationship between financial and sustainability performance will require more time and research to link the performance indicators used for these areas. By consistently measuring sustainability performance over time, companies can strengthen both their internal business practices and their external communications. This annex briefly discusses how each of these advantages is occurring and how, over time, they can be further strengthened through the development of more rigorous methods for translating sustainability information into the language of financial analysis.

Sustainability Information and Internal Business Analysis

Two key components of internal business analysis are: 1) understanding the external environment in which the company conducts its business; and 2) assessing the elements that underpin the company's competitive advantage. Sustainability information is relevant to both.

External Environment

Analysis of the external environment focuses on issues such as product, labour, and capital markets and regulatory structures. These issues, in turn, relate in part to the risks and opportunities associated with management of the economic, environmental, and social aspects of the business. Overlaps and synergies exist between the conventional indicators used for analysis of the external environment and those used for measuring economic, environmental, and social performance. For example, social indicators related to the composition and status of the workforce may be used to highlight opportunities for expanding the firm's intellectual capital. Similarly, comparing anticipated changes in corporate governance standards in major stock exchanges against the current governance practices of the firm offers valuable information to investors on future changes in executive compensation, the composition of boards, and confidence in current audit committee practices. Sustainability reports that include this kind of information offer an invaluable complement to conventional financial statements.

Competitive Advantage

Competitive advantage is built through cost leadership and product/service differentiation and, increasingly, through the formation and retention of intellectual capital. Sustainability performance indicators can serve as a vehicle to help companies understand and measure the degree to which their economic, environmental, and social performance contributes to competitive advantage.

Cost Leadership

Increased process efficiency is an example of a proven sustainability strategy for decreasing costs and improving profitability, and thereby gaining cost leadership. Opportunities to cut costs or create revenues through increased yield and the sale of waste streams (e.g., scrap metals, agricultural by-products) exist throughout the value chain of a business (e.g., product design, manufacturing processes, use, and disposal) and can offer significant benefits, particularly in sectors with low

margins. A substantial body of literature documents cost savings and added revenues generated through waste minimisation programmes. Environmental performance indicators related to resource use and waste generation can support assessment of the cost savings and revenues realised by a company through increased process efficiency.

Costs and Risks

Cost analysis can be greatly enhanced by a holistic approach to assessing risks and uncertainties. In some industry sectors, key risks and uncertainties have strong links to environmental and social concerns. The growing number of companies that have suffered business setbacks due to mishandling of key environmental and social issues over the last decade has placed sustainability management on the corporate governance agenda. Codes of conduct, governance principles, and disclosure rules are moving companies to higher standards of non-financial reporting, including expanded coverage in their financial statements. Economic, environmental, and social indicators are appearing with increasing frequency, providing insights into the vision and effectiveness of management in anticipating new risks and opportunities in the marketplace. For example:

- Knowledge of direct and indirect energy use and types of fuels consumed by the company can reveal the company's exposure to the risks of future carbon emission agreements and requirements.
- Performance indicators on energy efficiency initiatives and the use of renewable energy can help demonstrate the degree to which the company is insulated from volatile and cyclical non-renewable energy markets.
- Indicators on the volume, trends, and nature of pollution releases will allow management to assess whether individual facilities are at risk from pending environmental regulations or whether they are likely to become the target of regulatory authorities.
- Attention to social indicators describing the diversity of a company's workforce may allow managers to identify discriminatory practices that could have led to costly litigation.
- Performance indicators related to worker health and safety support assessment of the risk of costly accidents or workers' compensation demands.

Product Differentiation

Sustainability initiatives and strategies also provide opportunities for product differentiation—a key component of competitive advantage. Many leading companies are repositioning their products as services as part of their attempt to reduce their environmental or social impacts. In the process, they have helped differentiate their product in a manner that has enhanced their competitive position. For example, companies have shifted to offering services such as the leasing, rather than sale, of carpets or computers. Efforts to address greenhouse gas emissions have catalysed the development of new clean energy technologies such as fuel cells, electric vehicles, and increasingly powerful and efficient wind turbines. Companies face varying opportunities in these new technologies, and disclosure of information on sustainability initiatives and strategies can help clarify the degree to which a company is poised to take advantage of these new opportunities.

The environmental and social performance of companies can also have significant effect on intangible assets such as brand image and consumer goodwill, which are recognised as key to company reputation and trust. These issues are especially sensitive for companies selling directly to consumers in highly competitive markets. The diamond industry, responding to public pressure regarding human rights abuses associated with mines in certain countries, has taken to laser certification of where the diamond was mined. Information on product stewardship initiatives and efforts to enhance the positive environmental and social lifecycle impacts of products can point to areas of possible competitive advantage. Similarly, in certain sectors such as apparel, measures of the quality and performance of a company's environmental and social performance management systems

are highly salient to assessing the future ability of the company to preserve brand value and reputation.

Intellectual Capital Formation

Other intangible assets such as intellectual capital, the ability to innovate, investment in research and development, and networks and alliances are integral to analysing a company's financial prospects. These assets are influenced by an organisation's commitment to training, skills and knowledge development, workforce relations, and employee turnover—the foci of social performance indicators in sustainability reporting. Innovative partnerships with stakeholders around environmental or social aspects of products or markets can lead to product differentiation and brand enhancement. Indeed, some view strong stakeholder relationships as an intangible asset in its own right. The full range of intangible assets is increasingly attracting the interest of business analysts and accountants seeking to understand and predict the value of companies.

Analysing Risks Across a Portfolio of Holdings

Just as information on sustainability performance can help inform analysis of individual companies, it can also be of value in assessing risk across a series of companies. For example, a portfolio manager seeking to build a strong portfolio of energy and heavy industrial holdings wants to understand the risks involved and how the stocks in the portfolio will move together. By gathering information on the level of exposure to different fuel types and the companies' greenhouse gas emissions, the manager can assess the degree of risk associated with potential future carbon offset legislation given the degree of portfolio exposure to carbon-intensive businesses.

Sustainability Indicators and Financial Reporting and Communications

In addition to providing insights to support internal financial analysis, information on sustainability performance also has a place in mainstream financial reports. Some leading companies have already begun to experiment with merging their sustainability and financial reports into a single annual report. Even with separate documents, however, there exists substantial opportunity and value in cross-over and cross-referencing. Certain standard reporting categories and measures in financial reports, for example, can and should incorporate aspects of sustainability performance. To illustrate, the reduction of waste streams leading to lower costs should appear in the form of decreased expenses in the financial report, while revenue from productive use of waste streams should be included as income. Liabilities such as vulnerability to changes in environmental regulation or international labour conventions can be captured in the liabilities section of the balance sheet.

On a more general level, economic, environmental, and social trends can appear in the sections of financial reports that relate to the discussion and analysis of future risks and opportunities. Several financial reporting regulations worldwide (e.g., the Management Discussion and Analysis [MD&A] portion of the US Securities and Exchange Commission's guidelines) require companies to disclose known future uncertainties and trends that may materially affect financial performance. In the case of certain industry sectors or companies, discussion of sustainability performance in the MD&A would be merited where environmental or social concerns may affect a company's ability to expand operations or where mishandling these issues could lead to significant damage to corporate reputation and brand value. New codes of corporate governance have increasingly begun to highlight the need for discussion of board-level attention to risks associated with sustainability concerns.

Despite the growing overlaps between sustainability and financial reporting, the greatest challenge in bridging financial and sustainability reporting lies in translating economic, environmental, and social performance indicators into measures of financial value. Many sustainability indicators are qualitative and do not lend themselves easily to financial valuation. The outcome of sustainability strategies and corresponding capital outlays are so uncertain that benefits are difficult to forecast. As a rule, financial analysts are interested in information that is:

- material to the business (representing a measurable change in income or revenue in a business segment);
- provided in financial measures; and
- forward looking (can provide insight into trends in business performance).

Performance indicators used in sustainability reporting often do not directly meet all of these criteria. Rather, they require additional manipulation or contextualisation to become directly useful in financial analysis. New methodologies are required to link performance in the economic, environmental, and social dimensions to financial performance. Like other business analysis tools, the underlying assumptions and measures will have to be industry-specific to provide meaningful and comparable performance benchmarks.

One critical reason for linking sustainability performance indicators with conventional financial reporting is to provide data in denominations and terms that are consistent with financial reporting. Sustainability information should be provided in the same units of analysis—business units, segments, and geographic coverage—as a company’s financial reports. The information can be made even more useful when placed in the context of sector-specific benchmarks.

Conclusion

While sustainability information is typically treated separately, ample opportunity exists to translate it into a form that speaks to the needs of financial analysts. As the business case for sustainable practices becomes increasingly clear, sustainability reporting offers real value to those whose business is to assess the current financial health of companies and anticipate future performance. At present, the content of sustainability reports tends to appear in forms and units that are not readily convertible into financial terms. But rapid advances in areas such as environmental management accounting, valuation of intangible assets, and value reporting promise to make sustainability information useful to the financial community. With mounting pressures to strengthen corporate accountability in all its dimensions, the cross-over and convergence of sustainability and financial reporting is looking increasingly likely. Full integration in the form of single reports that depict performance along all dimensions—conventional financial, economic, environmental, social—is already practised by a handful of leading companies. The combination of better analytical methods and rising stakeholder demands for a richer form of disclosure is likely to continue this movement toward a new generation of one-stop performance reporting.

Annex 3: Guidance on Incremental Application of the *Guidelines*

Introduction

GRI encourages organisations to prepare reports in accordance with the GRI *Guidelines*. However, some organisations, particularly first-time reporters and small and medium-sized organisations, may take a gradual approach to reporting, covering some elements at first and moving steadily toward a report that is in accordance with the *Guidelines* (see Part A). This annex provides examples of how such organisations may begin reporting incrementally as the first step on the road toward the gradual enhancement and enlargement of their sustainability report. GRI hopes that this information will encourage all organisations, regardless of their reporting experience, to begin working toward reporting in accordance with the *Guidelines*.

Balancing Principle with Practice

The 2002 *Guidelines* reflect a broad consensus as to the content that should be addressed when reporting on the economic, environmental, and social performance of an organisation. This content embodies the views, experience, and expertise of a diverse range of reporters and report users committed to harmonising and improving the quality and content of reports on economic, environmental, and social performance. Still young by accounting standards, this consensus is a work in progress, and indicators will continue to evolve with continuous experimentation and learning.

Organisations that use the *Guidelines* face the challenging task of achieving a high standard of quality while also expanding the scope of their reporting. While pursuing these goals, they must build the resources and expertise required to accomplish the task.

In working toward both reporting excellence and increasing the number of reporting organisations, GRI accepts that a phased approach may be necessary for some organisations depending on their resources, experience, and internal management systems. At the same time, GRI expects and seeks evidence that any organisations making reference to the *Guidelines* are serious in their commitment to developing a report covering economic, environmental, and social performance in future reporting cycles. Full coverage and disclosure of information are essential to presenting a balanced and reasonable picture of an organisation's economic, environmental, and social performance. Such accuracy is necessary if stakeholders are to make informed decisions.

Implementing an Incremental Approach

Organisations choosing to adopt an incremental approach may find the four simple models presented below useful in structuring their strategy toward full adoption of the *Guidelines*. These models may offer a useful starting point for designing a reporting strategy, identifying shortcomings and setting goals. Over time, such a process will result in full adoption of the GRI framework and the opportunity for an organisation to report "in accordance" with the *Guidelines* (see Part A). Organisations may opt for any one or a combination of models based on their capabilities, stakeholder needs, and overall strategy.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT

Sustainability Reporting		
Economic	Environmental	Social

- Typical of an organisation that is experienced in producing environmental reports.
- Systems in place to gather data on environmental impacts, but little or no experience reporting other dimensions.
- Currently little attention to economic and social dimensions of performance.
- Systems and processes need to be developed in order to gather input through stakeholder engagement.

THE FRAGMENTED REPORT

Sustainability Reporting		
Economic	Environmental	Social

- Reporting entity has some systems for gathering data on economic, environmental, and social performance.
- Little or no integration across the three elements.
- Lacks full performance data under each heading.
- Provides the most data on environmental performance and the least on economic.

THE LIMITED THREE-DIMENSIONAL REPORT

Sustainability Reporting		
Economic	Environmental	Social

- Typical of an organisation that has just begun to report and has embraced one or a few sustainability integration themes.
- Limited but approximately equal amount of economic, environmental, and social information.
- Some evidence of integration across dimensions.

FULL ADOPTION

Sustainability Reporting		
Economic	Environmental	Social

- Full data gathering according to the GRI section on performance, with integration, analysis of interactions, and causal links among economic, environmental, and social dimensions.

GRI Content Index and Marking Text

When linking an incremental report to the *Guidelines*, the GRI Content Index specified in Part C is the most important tool for the reporter and the report user. This Index directs users quickly and conveniently to the location of GRI information in a report and clearly communicates the scope of the incremental effort. The reporter may also wish to provide a more detailed index to use as a vehicle for communicating information to users regarding its choice of content and plans for future coverage. Annex 6 has further information and suggestions regarding the format of a GRI Content Index.

In addition to providing a GRI Content Index, reporters may also want to highlight GRI information in the text of their report. Examples of highlighting techniques could include:

- Using coloured or bold text.
- Icons placed in the margin of the page next to the GRI information.
- Colour bars on the corners or edges of pages where GRI information can be found.

Conclusion

The GRI encourages all organisations—regardless of size, sector, location, or sophistication—to begin using the *Sustainability Reporting Guidelines*. An incremental approach is a welcome and integral part of both the organisation's and GRI's learning process. This mutual learning is an essential ingredient in the continuous improvement of the *Guidelines*, which is central to the GRI's future success.

Annex 4: Credibility and Assurance

This annex contains guidance for organisations considering the use of assurance processes as a means to enhance the credibility and quality of their sustainability reports. The use of assurance processes should be considered in terms of the value they may bring to reporting organisations, especially where stakeholder expectations have been determined and support for such processes has been identified. Stakeholder expectations about reports and their credibility are influenced by a variety of factors, including:

- the process the organisation uses to recognise the interests of stakeholders affected by its activities, consult with them, take their interests into account when compiling its report, and to select, collect, and verify the information that forms the basis of the report;
- the approach used by the organisation to identify all significant sustainability impacts;
- the users' understanding of the content and information provided and judgements about the organisation's commitment to and progress toward sustainability;
- the report's ability to convey a complete and clear description of the sustainability issues, risks, and opportunities facing the organisation;
- the users' perception(s) of the willingness of the organisation to report honestly;
- the inclusion in the report of a management statement or declaration that the report is presented in accordance with the GRI *Guidelines*;
- the inclusion in the report (or absence) of an independent assurance statement about the reliance that can be placed on the report; and
- the users' familiarity with financial reporting and related assurance requirements, standards, and practices.

GRI recommends that consultation with stakeholders is the best way to ascertain their perceptions and expectations about matters of credibility.

1. Internal information systems and processes

Many organisations have internal systems in place to record, monitor, and improve the accuracy, completeness, and reliability of financial, operational, health, safety, and environmental management information. Management information may also include data on community involvement but may not include information, for example, on systematic monitoring of unintended community impacts, support for or violations of human rights, or other social issues.

Information about and information systems regarding these aspects of performance are not necessarily subject to internal assurance processes. Stakeholders do not normally have access to information about the internal systems and processes that management relies on to produce performance information, whether for internal or external use. Stakeholders may therefore look for assurances that the information reported is reliable and complete.

GRI encourages the independent assurance of sustainability reports—one approach that a reporting organisation may select to enhance the credibility of its sustainability report. Where independent assurance is part of an organisation's sustainability reporting, the independent assurance provider will typically examine and report upon the effectiveness of internal systems and processes to provide relevant and reliable data for measuring the organisation's sustainability performance. This assurance process helps support the reliability and completeness of information in the report.

2. Assurance Process Considerations

In considering and entering into assurance-providing arrangements, reporting organisations are encouraged to clarify the following matters with assurance providers to ensure maximum benefit is gained from the assurance process.

Subject Matter

Whether:

- the subject matter of the sustainability report is clearly and adequately defined;
- all categories of stakeholders have been recognised and any significant stakeholders have been excluded;
- the organisation has ascertained the expectations of its stakeholders regarding sustainability issues and performance, reporting requirements, and methods of improving credibility, including independent assurance; and
- the scope of the information covered by assurance processes is defined (any omissions of significant information covered by such processes are to be explained).

Assurance Criteria and Evidence

Whether:

- appropriate criteria, such as recognised performance indicator protocols or reporting guidelines (e.g., *GRI Sustainability Reporting Guidelines*), are available to enable the evaluation of evidence, including whether the *GRI Guidelines* have been followed;
- adequate evidence is available to support the reported information, including corroborative statements and/or other evidence from external stakeholders, if necessary; and
- there is evidence that fundamental reporting principles such as those in Part B of the *GRI Guidelines* have been considered and applied in preparing the report.

Controls

Whether:

- management control systems are fully supported by organisational policy and resources and operate consistently across the organisation and over time.

Usefulness of Reported Information

Whether:

- stakeholders have been consulted about the usefulness and credibility of the report content and the usefulness (including credibility) of assurance provided by an external assurance provider.

3. Selection of Independent Assurance Providers

Organisations preparing reports are advised to consider the following issues and attributes in selecting their assurance provider:

- the assurance provider's degree of independence and freedom from bias, influence, and conflicts of interest;
- the assurance provider's ability to balance consideration of the interests of different stakeholders;
- the assurance provider has not been involved in the design, development, or implementation of the organisation's sustainability monitoring and reporting systems or assisted in compiling the sustainability report;
- that sufficient time is allocated to the assurance provider to enable the assurance process to be carried out effectively, using due professional care; and
- the assurance provider is collectively or individually competent to meet the objectives of the assurance assignment, as demonstrated through an appropriate level of experience and professional judgement.

4. Directors' (Governing Bodies') Responsibilities Regarding Independent Assurance

The effectiveness of the independent assurance process is strengthened when the directors (or governing body):

- recognise explicitly that they are responsible for the content of the sustainability report;
- recognise explicitly that the assurance provider alone is responsible for the content of the independent assurance report and will agree, at the beginning of the engagement, to publish the assurance report in full;
- ensure that adequate resources are made available for the independent assurance provider's work and that the assurance provider will have access to all individuals, groups, sites, records, and information that they consider necessary to carrying out the assurance engagement.

5. Independent Assurance Providers' Reports

The assurance provider's report is published along with the sustainability report to which it relates. However, it is clearly identified as separate from the sustainability report text, and is addressed to the organisation's board of directors (or governing body) or, if so agreed, to its stakeholders.

Although GRI does not develop or prescribe practice standards for the provision of independent assurance, it offers the following guidance on what might be included in an independent assurance report. At a minimum, the report would present:

- a reference to the directors' or management statement that the information in the sustainability report and its presentation is the responsibility of the directors or governing body and management of the organisation;
- a statement that the content of the assurance provider's report and the opinion(s) it gives is the sole responsibility of the assurance provider;
- a statement affirming the assurance provider's independence and freedom from bias and conflicts of interest;
- a statement of the scope and objective of the assurance engagement. This statement will make clear not only the levels of assurance intended, but also which parts of the sustainability report, if any, are not covered by the assurance provider's work;
- the criteria (e.g., GRI Guidelines) that the assurance provider used in assessing the evidence and reaching conclusions relative to the objective of the engagement;
- the professional standards for providing assurance that have been applied in carrying out the assurance engagement;
- a brief description, or outline, of how the assurance provider obtained qualitative and quantitative evidence to provide the basis for the conclusions or opinion rendered. This will include the extent to which different categories of stakeholders participated in the planning and execution of the assurance process and indicate any constraints to this process;
- a clear statement of the assurance provider's conclusion or opinion regarding the accuracy, completeness, reliability, and balance of the sustainability report, relative to the scope and objective of the assurance engagement. The statement will be more useful to users if it includes constructive reporting on any reservations the assurance provider has on these matters; and
- the identity and location of the assurance provider and the date of the assurance provider's report.

Organisations should continuously assess the results of the assurance process, where possible in consultation with their stakeholders, to satisfy themselves as to its value and to identify potential improvements in the process that would add to its effectiveness in enhancing the credibility of sustainability reports.

Annex 5: GRI Indicators

Over the past decade, there has been a focus on researching and codifying approaches to economic, environmental, and social performance measurement at the organisational level. While there has been significant convergence recently, each approach has maintained minor variations to address its specific purpose. The GRI framework for the performance indicators that appear in Section 5 of Part C is built on the foundation of previous work in the field of environmental and social performance measurement. However, like most systems, it is adapted to the specific needs of sustainability reporting, which this annex seeks to outline.

Purpose of GRI Indicators

The function of GRI performance indicators is to provide information about the economic, environmental, and social impacts of the reporting organisation in a manner that enhances comparability between reports and reporting organisations. In the case of GRI, the indicators are designed to inform both the reporting organisation and any stakeholders seeking to assess the organisation's performance. To achieve these goals, performance must not only be defined in terms of internal management targets and intentions, but also must reflect the broader external context within which the reporting organisation operates. The latter lies at the core of reporting on economic, environmental, and social performance. In the end, it speaks to how an organisation contributes to sustainable development by virtue of its economic, environmental, and social interactions with its diverse stakeholders.

GRI Indicator Framework

The performance indicators in Part C are organised according to the following hierarchy:

- | | |
|------------|---|
| Category: | The broad areas, or groupings, of economic, environmental, or social issues of concern to stakeholders (e.g., human rights, direct economic impacts). |
| Aspect: | The general subsets of indicators that are related to a specific category. A given category may have several aspects, which may be defined in terms of issues, impacts, or affected stakeholder groups. |
| Indicator: | The specific measurements of an individual aspect that can be used to track and demonstrate performance. These are often, but not always, quantitative. A given aspect (water) may have several indicators (e.g., total water use, rate of water recycling, discharges to water bodies). The balance between quantitative and qualitative indicators will vary by aspect depending on a range of factors. Indicators have been aligned to the maximum degree possible with existing international conventions and agreements. |

This hierarchy is informed by the system used by ISO 14000. Aspects are framed to reflect the issues, impacts, and stakeholder groups that link to the economic, environmental, and social concerns of report users. It may change over time as the field of performance measurement continues to evolve.

The level of stakeholder interest in a given aspect or indicator is the key determinant of its significance, or relevance, to a sustainability report. A pillar of the GRI framework is that aspects and indicators derive from an extensive, multi-stakeholder consultative process. By virtue of the level of interest expressed by stakeholders through these processes, these aspects and indicators represent a broad-based consensus of the significant issues and indicators regarding economic, environmental, and social performance.

Indicator Classifications

The GRI does not seek to divide performance indicators into types based on the content or nature of the indicator (e.g., policy, input/output, impact), but rather generally organises according to the relevance of the issue to stakeholders. GRI performance indicators are classified along the following lines:

- Core indicators, in general, are: 1) those relevant to most reporters; and 2) of interest to most stakeholders.
- Additional indicators are viewed as one or more of the following: 1) leading practice in economic, environmental, or social measurement, though currently used by few reporters; 2) providing information of significant potential interest to stakeholders who are particularly important to the reporting entity; and 3) deemed worthy of further testing for possible consideration as a future core indicator.

The content or nature of the specific indicators associated with an aspect will depend on the information needs and purposes of the concerned stakeholders. In some cases, this will result in an emphasis on policy or management, while in others the focus may be on conditions within the organisation's operations (e.g., labour conditions), or on external conditions (e.g., changes in carbon emissions).

Qualitative vs. Quantitative Indicators

GRI recognises the value of both qualitative and quantitative information, and views both as complementary and necessary to presenting a balanced and reasonable picture of an organisation's economic, environmental, and social performance. Where possible, GRI employs quantitative indicators. However, certain topics, particularly in the field of social performance measurement, do not readily lend themselves to quantification. For example:

- A number may not provide a clear sign of a positive or negative impact. For example, environmental expenditures are relevant as a cost measure, but could suggest either improvement or deterioration in environmental performance.
- Numerical values may lose significant information through the process of consolidation. For example, measures of regulatory violations or union representation may lose much of their meaning when aggregated across countries with significantly different legal structures.
- The nature of certain issues may make quantitative measurements impossible. For example, a quantitative measure of bribery would be unlikely to reveal systematic efforts to eliminate bribery. Reporting organisations that do not engage in bribery will report zero, and those organisations that regularly employ bribery will not report systematic engagement in an illegal activity.

In situations where quantitative measures are not effective, GRI relies on qualitative measures of the reporting organisation's activities. Section 3, for example, on governance structure and management systems, includes queries of a more open-ended nature regarding overarching policies and programmes; however, GRI frames qualitative indicators to encourage responses that are scalable rather than requesting open-ended descriptive statements.

Reporting Indicators: Absolute Figures and Ratios

Reporting organisations should present raw performance data in terms of absolute figures, and for a given period of operation (most often a year). These absolute figures might be expressed in a currency or in physical units (such as tonnes, cubic metres, or gigajoules). Absolute figures provide information on the size of an impact, value, or achievement.

Relative figures are ratios between two absolute figures of the same or different kind. Ratios allow comparisons of similar products or processes. They also help relate the performance and achievements of one firm, business unit, or organisation to those of another. Ratio indicators provide information on the efficiency of an activity, on the intensity of an impact, or on the quality of a value or achievement.

Need for Reporting Absolute Figures

Absolute figures provide information about the magnitude of the reporting organisation's contribution to an overall effect. They are essential to any assessment of carrying capacity, ceiling, or limits—a core principle of sustainability. For example, the total amount of phosphorus (in tonnes) released to a river by a particular operation enables users to consider these releases relative to the river's carrying capacity (the total amount the river could carry without showing a certain effect, such as eutrophication). Absolute environmental figures are essential as a linkage to the carrying capacity of an ecosystem or any natural or physical compartment, such as a watershed or rainforest. The same is true for economic and social information (e.g., relating an organisation's total revenues or turnover to a state or national total). Making reference to these broader systems linkages is encouraged, and will help users to interpret absolute data. Even without a specific local context, absolute figures can also be useful for stakeholders trying to understand the relative magnitude of two organisations for purposes of prioritising efforts. For instance, a stakeholder seeking to identify the 10 largest emitters of a given pollutant would require absolute figures and would not find normalised data or ratios useful.

In sum, absolute figures on economic, environmental, and social issues enable data users to:

- consistently track data;
- sum various releases into a total impact; and
- form additional ratios other than those already reported.

Need for Reporting Ratios

Ratios relate two absolute figures to each other and thereby provide context to both. For example, the fuel efficiency of a car can be expressed in the number of kilometres a user can drive per litre of gasoline consumed. This expresses the functional benefit of the car relative to the fuel required to achieve that benefit. Alternatively, to shift the focus to the impact of a particular activity's resource consumption, a reporter may choose a ratio of the litres of gasoline the car consumes per 100 kilometres. These indicators represent one type of integrated indicator as referenced in Section 5 of Part C.

Ratio indicators serve to:

- relate two aspects to each other;
- make relationships visible and interpretable; and
- enable comparison of different scales of operation relative to a specific activity (e.g., kilograms of product per litre of water used).

Ratios help illuminate linkages across the economic, environmental, and social dimensions of sustainable development. For example, eco-efficiency expresses the relation between the value of a product or service and its environmental influence, where value can be expressed in monetary or functional terms. While eco-efficiency relates economic and environmental aspects, it might also be useful to create a similar linkage between the economic and social aspects of organisational performance.

Ratios also can be particularly useful for comparing two organisations of different scales. Absolute figures give a sense of magnitude, but they do not tell the full story. The magnitude of an organisation's impact will not always correlate with its size. The statement that Organisation A uses 10 times the energy of Organisation B may be factually correct. However, Organisation A could also be 10 times as energy-efficient. In some situations, the absolute figure will be the most relevant piece of information, but in other situations, the efficiency will be a more relevant measure of economic, environmental, and social performance. Normalised data, which relate an absolute figure (e.g., accidents) to a common factor (e.g., hours worked), enable a report user to compare the relative efficiency of two organisations in managing an aspect of economic, environmental, and social performance, regardless of differences in size.

Organisations should form ratios with their performance data that make sense for their business and support their decision-making. They should select ratios for external reporting that allow better communication of their performance to their stakeholders, and will help inform stakeholders' decisions. Reporters should carefully consider what ratio indicators best capture the benefits and impacts of their business.

Types of Ratio Indicators and Their Application

There are three general types of ratio indicators: productivity/efficiency ratios, intensity ratios, and percentages. Each type of ratio indicator serves different purposes and communicates different information.

Productivity/Efficiency Ratios

Productivity/efficiency ratios relate value to impacts. Increasing ratios reflect improvements in the amount of value received per unit of impact.

Normally, businesses track financial performance with efficiency ratios. Increases in key financial indicators (e.g., sales and profit increases) reflect positive financial performance. In the same way, resource and environmental issues can be expressed in efficiency terms, by using, for example, the World Business Council for Sustainable Development's eco-efficiency indicators, which link product/service value and environmental influence.

Examples of productivity/efficiency ratios include:

- labour productivity (e.g., turnover per employee);
- resource productivity (e.g., sales per unit of energy consumption, GDP per unit of material input);
- process eco-efficiency (e.g., production volume per unit of waste, net sales per unit of greenhouse gas emissions in tonnes of CO₂ equivalent);
- functional eco-efficiency of products or services (e.g., water efficiency of a washing machine, fuel efficiency of a car); and
- financial efficiency ratios (e.g., profit per share).

Intensity Ratios

Intensity ratios express an impact per unit of activity or unit of value. A declining intensity ratio reflects performance improvement. Historically, many organisations tracked environmental performance with intensity ratios.

Examples of intensity ratios include:

- emission intensity (e.g., tonnes of SO₂ emissions per unit of electricity generated);
- waste intensity (e.g., amount of waste per production volume); and
- resource intensity (e.g., energy consumption per function, material input per service).

Percentages

Organisations regularly use ratios expressed in percentage terms. A percentage indicator is a ratio between two like issues, with the same physical unit in the numerator and denominator.

Examples of percentages that can be meaningful for use in performance reports include:

- input/output ratios (e.g., process yields);
- losses (e.g., electricity transmission loss, non-product output per materials input);
- recycling percentages (e.g., fraction of waste recycled per total waste);
- fractions (e.g., percentage of renewable energy, fraction of recycled materials, percentage of hazardous waste);
- quotas (e.g., percentage of women in upper management); and
- financial performance ratios (e.g., return on equity, return on operating assets).

Organisations are encouraged to use ratios or other integrated measures where it helps better communicate their overall economic, environmental, and social performance.

Annex 6: GRI Content Index

The goals of the GRI Content Index are twofold:

- to allow the user to quickly and conveniently identify the location of a specific piece of reported information listed in the *Guidelines*; and
- to allow the user to clearly understand the degree to which the reporting organisation has covered the content in the *GRI Guidelines*.

GRI is not prescribing a specific format for the Index in the 2002 *Guidelines*. It encourages reporters to create a format that effectively serves the above purposes. In general, tables should be prominently identified. They should:

- be easy to read;
- be concise;
- clearly identify the location of information;
- list all of the GRI reporting elements; and
- enable the user to quickly identify which elements have been included in the report and where to find the information.

Reporting organisations are also encouraged to use the Content Index itself, or space near the Index, to provide explanations and future plans for omitted core indicators.

The following is an example of how a table might appear. In this example, the table includes the corresponding number for each reporting element in Part C of the *Guidelines*. The reporting organisation would place the number of the page(s) containing the information next to the appropriate reporting element. For any core indicators not included in the report, the reporting organisation would enter the letters “EX” followed by the page number where the explanation for the decision to exclude the indicator would be found. Alternatively, the reporting organisation may wish to put a short explanation of the reason for exclusion in the Content Index itself.

Sample Content Index

CORE AND ADDITIONAL BY CATEGORY

Vision and Strategy	
1.1	pg
1.2	pg

Profile	
2.1	pg
2.2	pg
2.3	pg
2.4	pg
2.5	pg
2.6	pg
2.7	pg
2.8	pg
2.9	pg
2.10	pg
2.11	pg
2.12	pg
2.12	pg
2.14	pg
2.15	pg
2.16	pg
2.17	pg
2.18	pg
2.19	pg

Management Systems	
3.1	pg
3.2	pg
3.3	pg
3.4	pg
3.5	pg
3.6	pg
3.7	pg
3.8	pg
3.9	pg
3.1	pg
3.11	pg
3.12	pg
3.13	pg
3.14	pg
3.15	pg
3.16	pg
3.17	pg
3.18	pg
3.19	pg
3.2	pg
3.21	pg
3.22	pg

Economic					
Core		Additional		Other	
Customers					
EC1	pg				
EC2	pg				
Suppliers					
EC3	pg	EC11	pg		
EC4	pg				
Employees					
EC5	pg				
Providers of Capital					
EC6	pg				
EC7	pg				
Public Sector					
EC8	pg	EC12	pg		
EC9	pg				
EC10	pg				
Indirect Economic Impacts					
		EC13	pg		

Environmental					
Core		Additional		Other	
Materials					
EN1	pg				
EN2	pg				
Energy					
EN3	pg	EN17	pg		
EN4	pg	EN18	pg		
		EN19	pg		
Water					
EN5	pg	EN20	pg		
		EN21	pg		
		EN22	pg		
Biodiversity					
EN6	pg	EN23	pg		
EN7	pg	EN24	pg		
		EN25	pg		
		EN26	pg		
		EN27	pg		
		EN28	pg		
		EN29	pg		
Emissions, Effluents and Waste					
EN8	pg	EN30	pg		
EN9	pg	EN31	pg		
EN10	pg	EN32	pg		
EN11	pg				
EN12	pg				
EN13	pg				
Suppliers					
		EN33	pg		
Products and Services					
EN14	pg				
EN15	pg				
Compliance					
EN16	pg				
Transport					
		EN34	pg		
Overall					
		EN35	pg		

Social					
Core		Additional		Other	
Employment					
LA1	pg	LA12	pg		
LA2	pg				
Labour/Management Relations					
LA3	pg	LA13	pg		
LA4	pg				
Health and Safety					
LA5	pg	LA14	pg		
LA6	pg	LA15	pg		
LA7	pg				
LA8	pg				
Training and Education					
LA9	pg	LA16	pg		
		LA17	pg		
Diversity and Opportunity					
LA10	pg				
LA11	pg				
Strategy and Management					
HR1	pg	HR8	pg		
HR2	pg				
HR3	pg				
Non-discrimination					
HR4	pg				
Freedom of Assoc. & Collective Bargaining					
HR5	pg				
Child Labour					
HR6	pg				
Forced and Compulsory Labour					
HR7	pg				
Disciplinary Practices					
		HR9	pg		
		HR10	pg		
Security Practices					
		HR11	pg		
Indigenous Rights					
		HR12	pg		
		HR13	pg		
		HR14	pg		
Community					
SO1	pg	SO4	pg		
Bribery and Corruption					
SO2	pg				
Political Contributions					
SO3	pg	SO5	pg		
Competition and Pricing					
		SO6	pg		
		SO7	pg		
Customer Health and Safety					
PR1	pg	PR4	pg		
		PR5	pg		
		PR6	pg		
Products and Services					
PR2	pg	PR7	pg		
		PR8	pg		
Advertising					
		PR9	pg		
		PR10	pg		
Respect for Privacy					
PR3	pg	PR11	pg		

*Indicate the page where data on each indicator is reported

**Where an indicator is not reported, and an explanation is included, indicate this by placing 'EX' before the page number where the explanation can be found.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

GRI would like to thank all of the individuals listed in the following pages, as well as the hundreds of others who have contributed time, energy, and ideas to the development of the GRI framework. However, while the input from the individuals and groups that follow contributed to the development of these *Guidelines*, the final draft is a result of a multi-staged process, and not all individuals will necessarily endorse all the details in the final draft.

Steering Committee

Last	First	Organisation
Adams	Roger	Association of Chartered Certified Accountants
Agarwal	Anil	Centre for Science and Environment
Aloisi de Lardere	Jacqueline	United Nations Environment Programme, Division of Technology, Industry, and Economics
Bateman	Mark	Investor Responsibility Research Center
Bennet	Nancy	United Nations Environment Programme
Correa	Maria Emelia	CECODES (Columbian Business Council for Sustainable Development)
Elkington	John	SustainAbility
Enell	Magnus	ITT Flyght AB
Goto	Toshihiko	Environmental Auditing Research Center
Henriques	Adrian	New Economics Foundation
Knecht	Franz	Connexis
Kreis	Erin	General Motors
Kuszewski	Judy	SustainAbility
Lehni	Markus	World Business Council for Sustainable Development
Massie	Robert Kinloch	Coalition for Environmentally Responsible Economies
Mullins	Judith	General Motors
O'Brien	Amy Muska	Council for Economic Priorities
Ranganathan	Janet	World Resources Institute
Sanchez	Tauni	World Business Council for Sustainable Development
Sorensen	Preben	Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu
Terry	Virginia	SustainAbility
Tsunoda	Kimie	Green Reporting Forum
Willis	Alan	Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants
Zadek	Simon	AccountAbility

Revisions Working Group

Last	First	Organisation
Bateman	Mark	Investor Responsibility Research Center (IRRC)
Govender	Vanida	Eskom
Haldar	Aditi	Development Alternatives
Henriques	Adrian	Independent Adviser
Kreis	Erin	General Motors Corporation
Lee	Mark	Business for Social Responsibility
Oswald	Ron	International Union of Food, Agricultural, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers' Associations
Pongsapich	Amara	Social Research Institute, Chulalongkorn University
Ranganathan	Janet	World Resources Institute
Taillant	Daniel	Centro de Derechos Humanos y Medio Ambiente (CEDHA)
Thurm	Ralph	Siemens
Willis	Alan	Independent Chartered Accountant

Measurement Working Group

MWG Co-Chairs

Last	First	Organisation
Bhushan	Chandra	Centre for Science and Environment
Knoepfel	Ivo	SAM Group
Tuppen	Christopher	British Telecom

MWG Members

Last	First	Organisation
** Double asterisk denotes membership in the Core MWG Group		
Adams **	Roger	ACCA
Ahmed	Noman	The Federation of Pakistan Chambers of Commerce & Industry (FPCCI)
Anielski	Mark	Pembina Institute for Appropriate Development
Aziz Mat	Dato' A.	SIRIM
Bader	Pascal	Ministerium für Umwelt und Verkehr Baden-Württemberg Referat 21 - Grundsatzfragen der Umweltpolitik
Bakirya	Judith	STRONGO
Barber	Janet	Formerly with WWF
Bennet **	Nancy	United Nations Environment Programme
Bisang **	Otti	Credit Suisse
Brengle	Andrew	Kinder Lyderberg Domini & Co.
Brownell	Gail	Agilent Technologies
Burri	Patrik	Credit Suisse
Cabrera **	Editha	San Miguel Brewing
Cameron	Catherine	[Independent]
Cash	Raheem M.	Logistics Management Institute
Castillo	Olivia	Asia Pacific Roundtable for Cleaner Production
Chavagneux	Christian	l'Économie Politique
Cherp	Aleg	Department of Environmental Sciences and Policy Central European University
Close	Ann	Environment Australia
Cote-Freeman	Susan	Transparency International
Coulsen	Arnoud	Lafarge
Cozette	Martial	Centre Français d'Information sur les Entreprises
Cramer	Aron	Business For Social Responsibility
Crubézy	Priscilla	Caisse des dépôts et consignations
da Silva	Claudia Velosa	VfU - Verein für Umweltmanagement in Banken, Sparkassen und Versicherungen e.V.
Desotelle	Vic	InKNOWvate
Druckrey	Frauke	VCI
Dudok van Heel	Oliver	Amnesty International UK Business Group
Dupre	Stanislas	Utopies
Edme	Robin	Terra Nova Conseil
Farrow	Paul	IFC Consulting of Canada
Fatoux	Francois	Observatoire sur la Responsabilite Societale des Entreprises
Feldman	Ira	Greentrack Strategies
Fredericks	Rob	Ford Motor Company
Gaudineau	Patrice	SNCF
Glazebrook	Brian	Ecobalance/PricewaterhouseCoopers
Gminder	Carl	Project Sustainability Balanced Scorecard Institut für Wirtschaft und Ökologie , Universität St. Gallen
Gordon	Richard	Manaaki Whenua - Landcare Research
Gressel	Noam	M.A.A.L.A.- Business for Social Responsibility in Israel
Grueninger	Beat	B&SD Business and Social Development GmbH

Last	First	Organisation
Hagen	Katherine	HRI (Hagen Resources International)
Haldar	Aditi	Development Alternatives, India
Hameed	Abdul	Universiti Teknologi MARA
Hardi	Peter	International Institute for Sustainable Development
Harris	Andy	Waste Recycling Group Plc
Henriques	Adrian	[Independent]
Hine	Stephen	Ethical Investment Research Service
Hodge	Jennifer	Syracuse University
Hollands	Martin	Fauna & Flora International
Hopkins	Michael	Middlesex University Business School
Hounscome	Rob	CSIR
Howes	Rupert	Forum for the Future
Ikeda de Oliveira	Fabiana	B&SD Ltda.
Ite	Uwem E.	Department of Geography, Lancaster University
Jacob	Vincent	French Ministry of the Environment
Jang	Jee In	College of Business Administration, Chung-Ang University
Justice **	Dwight	International Confederation of Free Trade Unions
Kistner	Estelle	O2 France
Klaffke **	Kathrin	Imug
Kreis	Erin	General Motors Corporation
Krimphoff	Jochen	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP
Kühnl	Carmen	Siemens AG
Kurasaka **	Hidefumi	Representing Ministry of Environment
Lampriere	Luc	John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University
Larrinaga-González	Carlos	Universidad de Burgos
Le Roy	Michael K.	Department of Politics and International Relations, Wheaton College
Lee **	Mark	Business For Social Responsibility
Lehni **	Markus	Deloitte Touche
Litvack	Karina	Friends Ivory and Sime
Loiselet	Eric	Terra Nova Conseil
Luly	Keri	Amethyst Group, Inc.
Madiera **	Jose	European Commission
Makara	Mapula	Sasol
McInerny	Tom	SAI
Melchiorson	Anne	PricewaterhouseCoopers
Mitchell	Caroline	BP
Moneva	José	Universidad de Zaragoza
Montgomery	Robert	Inter-American Development Bank
Müller	Kaspar	Ellipson AG
Murphy	Sara	Forum for the Future
Neto	Valdemar de Oliveira	Instituto Ethos
Nielsen	Ron	Alcan, Inc.
Niskala	Mikael	KPMG Sustainability Services
Noesen	Scott	Dow Chemical
Pastuszek	Harry	IFC Consulting
Pierce	Mike	Institute of Social and Ethical AccountAbility
Pongsapich **	Amara	Social Research Institute
Poulsen	Birgit	FDB Co-op Denmark
Raar	Grace Jean	Deakin University
Ralph	Walt	General Motors Corporation
Randers **	Jørgen	Representing WWF

Last	First	Organisation
Ranganathan	Janet	World Resources Institute
Rauberger	Rainer	Henkel
Reibstein	Rick	US EPA
Render	Jo	First Peoples Worldwide/First Nations Development Institute
Ringwood	Kristina	WMC (Australian mining company)
Rinkevicius	Leonardas	Institute of Policy and Public Administration Faculty of Social Sciences, Kaunas University of Technology
Rosenbaum **	Ruth	CREA
Ross	Sheila	University of Liverpool
Rossodivita	Aurora	Eurelectric
Rovere	Darin	Centre for Innovation in Corporate Responsibility
Russell **	David	Dow Chemical
Sanchez **	Tauni	World Business Council for Sustainable Development
Sandborg	Verie	Baxter
Scheidt **	Lutz-Guenther	Sony
Schiesser	Philippe	ECOEFF/Eco-Conception Conseils
Seifert	Eberhard	Wuppertal Institut für Klima, Umwelt und Energie
Shah	Faiz	RBI-Responsible Business Initiative
Sillence	Gordon	Instituto Português de Ecologia
Simmons	Brad	Ford Motor Co.
Snyder	Corey	Procter & Gamble
Somers	Lieven	Impulse Centre for Corporate Sustainability, Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School
Spetter	Mark	Resense Duurzaam
Stappen	Ralf Klemens	Francis of Assisi Academy for the Protection of Earth
Steele	Amanda	Prime Minister's Community Business Partnership
Swaminathan	Bhanu	Fertiliser Association of India
Swanson	Darren	Harvard University
Taillant	Daniel	Centro de Derechos Humanos y Medio Ambiente (CEDHA)
Théry	Nicolas	CFDT
Thomas	Allison	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP
Thorpe	Vic	Just Solutions
Thouvenot	Thierry	WWF-France
Thurm **	Ralph	Siemens
Totten	Michael	Conservation International
Tsogas	George	Luton Business School, Luton University
Tsunoda	Kimie	Green Reporting Forum
Versteegen	Stephan	BECO Environmental Management & Consultancy
Wackernagel **	Mathis	Redefining Progress
Wade	Mark	Shell International
Wagner	Marcus	Centre for Sustainability Management, University of Lüneburg
Weissbrodt	David	University of Minnesota Law School
Wells **	Christopher	UNIBANCO
Wennberg	Ulrika	Global Responsibility
White	Heather	Verite
Zadek	Simon	Institute of Social and Ethical AccountAbility
Zollner	Anne	International Labor Affairs Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor

Participants in the Structured Feedback Process

Company	Industry	Country
Agilent	Information technology	USA
BASF	Chemicals	Germany
Baxter International	Medical supplies	USA
Bayer AG	Life sciences/chemicals	Germany
British American Tobacco	Tobacco products	UK
CWS Powder Coatings	Chemicals	Germany
ESAB	Welding supplies	Sweden
Ford Motor Company	Automobiles	USA
Gaz de France	Energy utility	France
General Motors	Automobiles	USA
Halliburton	Energy services	USA
Ito Yokado	Retail	Japan
Jebsen and Jessen	Industrial products/services	Singapore
Kirin Brewery	Food and beverage	Japan
Natura	Personal care	Brazil
Nike	Apparel	USA
Panasonic (Matsushita Electric)	Electronics	Japan
Procter & Gamble	Consumer products	USA
Renault	Automobiles	France
Rio Tinto	Mining	UK
Shell	Oil and gas	UK
Siam Kraft	Paper products	Thailand
SKF Group	Metal products	Sweden
Suncor Energy	Oil and gas	Canada
Sydkraft Group	Energy services	Sweden
Texaco	Oil and gas	USA
TotalFinaElf	Oil and gas	France
TransAlta	Energy utility	Canada
TXU Europe	Energy utility	UK
Vivendi Environnement	Communications	France
WSP Group	Construction consulting	UK