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Dear Stakeholder

This is the fourth year of the CRRA, introduced as the first global corporate responsibility reporting awards in August 2007. We’ve seen continued interest among companies wishing to participate and are encouraged by the wide range of sectors and countries represented; fortunately our online voters have ensured that the range of winners is also wide.

Reporting trends are following established patterns: every year there are more reports from more companies, with one in five published by a ‘first-time reporter’. We’d like to see more reports independently assured and we’d like to see an upswing in the successful integration of CR and financial reporting, but it doesn’t appear that we’ll see either anytime soon. For the moment then, we note the increase in quantity, and await the step-change in quality.

As we discovered last year, in the face of the global recession, global CR communication is holding its own. That is to say, the disclosure of CR information is continuing, as an essential element of corporate transparency and accountability. This communication could be more successful. Communication being a two-way process, the reports and statistics profiled on our site show one half of the process, but we don’t know the extent to which messages reached their intended audiences, let alone whether they achieved their intended purpose. Some form of feedback process would help here.

We continue to expand our site and services. We currently profile over 31,000 reports from over 7,500 companies and our website is used by 35,000 registered users. We’re dependent on you, as a stakeholder, letting us know what you find useful or less useful, and how you think we can best meet your CR needs. Whether with a short line or a considered letter, please contact me at paul@corporateregister.com with feedback and suggestions, and I’ll read your contribution and reply – thank you in advance.

I hope you find this report interesting reading.

Paul Scott
Managing Director

March 2011
The CR Reporting Awards – Global Winners & Reporting Trends

CorporateRegister.com is the authoritative global directory of corporate responsibility (CR) reports, with the landmark of 30,000 profiled reports reached in January 2011. We use ‘corporate responsibility reports’ as a term which includes a wide range of non-financial reports – see page 5. We collect reports from all sizes of company from around the world, with the provisos that they all be publicly available and in a Latin script. While we also collect reports in non-Latin scripts (Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Arabic, Greek, Turkish) these are not yet displayed on our site – one of several projects in progress.

These charts show snapshots from our statistics as of the first quarter of 2011. Our statistics are updated whenever we update the website, several times every week. Because we don’t restrict ourselves to a defined universe of companies, instead including any report which meets our definitions, we’re continually including new reports whether discovered by our researchers or sent to us by our site users. This means that our chart snapshots are just that – we still discover new reports from previous years. The trends remain remarkably constant, however.

Upgrading to a Professional or Academic Account (see page 32) gives access to a wide range of up-to-date statistics, including sets of detailed charts for the top twenty reporting countries.

**FIG 1: Global report output per year**

Reporting across all sizes of company has grown steadily since 1992 and appears unaffected by the global recession. This time last year we expected around 4,000 reports to be published during 2010, but in fact the figure is nearer 5,000. Taking the non-Latin reports into account, which we also intend to display, the total figure of all CR reports published in 2010 approaches 6,000.

**Reporting by region**

Europe has taken the lead in CR reporting over the past 20 years, and continues to produce half of all global CR reports. Europe took an early lead in CR reporting, and its dominance is partly the result of the volume of reports resulting from its early start, and partly the result of so many individual countries making their contribution (see Fig. 2 – fourteen of the top 20 reporting countries are European).

**FIG 2: Top 20 reporting countries**

Until 2009 the UK was the single most productive reporting country, but in both 2009 and 2010 the USA pushed it into second place. Japan is set to produce the most reports within the next couple of years, and already does so were reports available only in Japanese to be included in the statistics.

Most Asian reports are from Japan, but other countries in the region are joining the movement, notably China.

**FIG 3: Reporting output by year, by region**

Europe
Reports profiled on the CorporateRegister.com database fall into a wide range of defined report types. We check the content of each report, as we profile a report by its content and not by its title. For example, a report may have the title ‘Sustainability Report 2010’ but the content may be entirely environmental, so we would profile it as an environmental report. Fig 5 shows a consolidated picture with the many individual report types reduced to a few main groupings.

This chart illustrates how corporate non-financial reporting has developed from predominantly single-issue (mainly environmental) reports two decades ago, into the multi-issue reports we know today.

We differentiate between ‘CSR/Corporate Responsibility’ and ‘Sustainability’ reports. While both can cover multiple issues such as environment, society, community, ethics, supply chain, human rights etc, only ‘Sustainability’ reports include economic and socio-economic information.

‘Corporate Responsibility’ and ‘Sustainability’ are the two most important current report types, and each successive year shows a consolidation of this position.

Integrated reporting

Integrated reporting is the topic of the moment, with several organisations debating and planning a broad transition from CR reporting into combined financial and non-financial reporting.

Plans are for much headway to be made within ten years. Current trends would indicate that this is unlikely without mandatory legislation – current levels are around five percent of total global CR output, with little growth year on year, certainly not the surge needed to fulfil expectations. Only in two countries, Brazil and South Africa (with 15% and 18% of CR reports respectively) is integrated reporting making real headway.
Much of the debate centres on whether information needs to be ‘integrated’ or merely ‘connected’, whether a report should comprise a single document or several information sources, and how such a report should be assured.

Integrated reporting is such a hot topic we’ve included it as a CR Debate on page 30 and on our website.

**GRI reporting – the current situation**

The Global Reporting Initiative is still the sole global framework on which companies can base their CR reports. The framework, with too many indicators and application levels, is unwieldy, often confusing, and in need of an overhaul. The framework is arguably of most use where reporters use sector supplements, as the inclusion or non-inclusion of the issues most relevant (‘material’) to a specific sector then becomes evident. We suspect that few reports are developed on the basis of the GRI framework; instead, we hear many reporters use the framework as a first issues checklist, then develop their report, and then retrofit a GRI index to the resulting publication.

We track reports with a GRI contents index, and our database has the most authoritative record of this reporting category (not yet including reports which are only available in Japanese, Chinese, Arabic etc – see page 4). Year on year growth is slow but steady, and GRI reports now approach forty percent of all profiled CR reports.
The CR Reporting Awards 2011

IN THIS SECTION:
• Entrants and voting process
• The winners, and how they won

We're proud to present the fourth global, independent, annual awards for CR reporting, and we'd like to thank all this year's participants and voters for making it possible. Thank you!

The reasoning behind the Awards

It's important to identify and acknowledge achievement in corporate responsibility reporting. It shows companies where they're on track, gives others an idea of the standard they may be expected to meet (and where they may fall short), and gives a sense of cohesion in a wide-ranging and quickly-evolving area.

Our company is small, independent and focused on corporate responsibility. Founded in 1996, we're in this for the long term. We have 35,000 global stakeholders registered and using our website, all interested in CR reporting and representing one of the largest CR stakeholder audiences anywhere. We respect panels of appointed experts (we should do – we've been appointed to many such panels, national and international, ourselves!), but we consider harnessing the wisdom of crowds by inviting our online community to decide the results, to be the most convincing and independent voting format.

Following the third annual CRRA we took stock. Was this a winning formula? While we considered that the underlying structure of categories and voting procedures remained sound, we decided to introduce some new rules:

1) Companies winning the same category for two years in succession are not eligible to enter this category for a third year. This ensures that the CRRA remains open to any strong entrant and doesn't become an automatic repeat performance.

2) We are restricting the number of entries per category. Some categories are very popular and fill up quickly, such as 'Best Report', and for these we allow a slightly larger number of participants.

3) Companies for whom many invalid/bad votes are cast are not invited to participate the following year. This new rule, announced last year, resulted in five reporters being excluded from entry in the CRRA 2011.

Four years of analysing results and voting patterns, using the same framework of categories and criteria, convinces us that these are the 'right' results if we're looking for consensus on 'good' reporting.

How we organised the Awards

We have a structure of nine reporting categories, across two areas:

1. Types of Report
   - Best Report
   - Best First Time Report
   - Best SME Report
   - Best Integrated Report

2. Aspects of Reporting Transparency
   - Carbon Disclosure
   - Creativity in Communications
   - Relevance & Materiality
   - Openness & Honesty
   - Credibility Through Assurance

Taking September 2009 to September 2010 as the reporting period, we invited companies with reports profiled on our website to enter the CRRA. There's a small fee to enter each category which is put towards the CRRA programme, report and event. All companies entering at least two categories receive a free invitation to enter our annual event and Awards ceremony.

This year 90 companies entered the CRRA. The original CRRA’07 attracted 300 companies and this number was clearly overwhelming for the voters. Last year we reduced this to 130 companies and this year we feel the number is about right. Our aim must be to present the reports and encourage our voters to read them, rather than presenting such a bewildering range of reports that no voter could possibly be expected to look at them all.

Awards Timeline

Call for entries
11th October 2010

Entrants list closed
26th October 2010

Voting opened
28th October 2010

Voting closed
28th January 2011

Winners announced
24th March 2011
The CRRA Entrants

The reports entered this year have a regional breakdown comparable to the output of all reports published during the year.

**FIG 11: CRRA Entrants by region**

- Africa & Middle East
- Asia
- Australasia
- Europe
- North & Central America
- South America

The Results – online voting

Voting opened October 28 2010 and closed January 28 2011. All signed-up users of CorporateRegister.com could view all reports across all nine Awards categories, and use a single set of votes throughout the voting period. Voters could review their choices, change their minds and add further votes as often as they wished, until the deadline.

Over the three month voting period 7,336 votes were registered – a 10% decrease on the previous year. As we had registered year on year increases until now, this is a disappointment and we will examine how to get back on track next year.

Integrity of the voting process

In any voting process there are those who try to gain unfair advantage. There are also those who, unaware that they are contravening the rules, may attempt to influence the outcome unfairly. From the outset of the CRRA in 2007 we made it clear that the integrity of the voting process is of paramount importance to us, and that measures are in place to identify and discount irregular votes. We are satisfied that entire voting process has integrity, and that the category winners are indeed the ‘real’ winners.

Employees of reporting companies are not allowed to vote for their own reports.

Such votes are ‘invalid’. This rule is made clear throughout the voting process, and companies entering the CRRA are also made aware of it. If we did not have this rule in place then systematic voting could jeopardise the integrity of the results, as the largest companies with the most employees might encourage their employees to sign up and vote (or employees simply take it upon themselves to vote for their company). We identify all voters, check if they have any votes for their own company (via registration details and also IP checks) and discount these votes.

We also track other votes which may be ‘bad’ for one of a number of reasons: For example the voters may have signed up with fictitious details, or created blocks of repetitive votes for the same company. We term these ‘bad’ votes and discount them also.

This year we discounted a total of 1,554 ‘invalid’and ‘bad’ votes, or 21% of the total. This is an increase of 50% on last year’s discounted votes, which comprised 14% of the total. ‘Invalid’ votes from one country, Portugal, accounted for all of this increase.
Who placed ‘bad’ or ‘invalid’ votes?

As in previous years, we can see that the majority of these votes were from users signing up with us after the voting opened. Once again, our constituency of existing users was far more reliable.

The vast majority of invalid/bad votes in previous years were for a few companies in Portugal, which were excluded this year. This year’s invalid/bad votes were dominated by a single company, again from Portugal.

The remaining 6,981 valid votes formed the basis for our results. Here’s where the votes came from, both regionally and by stakeholder group:

FIG 14: CRRA'11 ‘Good’ votes by region

FIG 15: CRRA'11 ‘Good’ votes by stakeholder group
**Best Report** The winners

This is the category for the best overall CR report published in 2009-10.

What makes a good report? This is open to debate, which makes the results all the more revealing. We asked our users to consider five essential elements: Content, Communication, Credibility, Commitment & Comparability.

The entrants

This category received 35 entrants, all of which received valid votes by the end of the voting period.

The results

**Winner**

**Hewlett Packard**

Corporate Responsibility Report. For the year ended 31 March 2010

View online

Selected voters’ comments on the report:

“HP has progressed into a front runner on sustainability reporting. It brings a human face to reporting by personalising stories and using technology to best advantage to bring stories to life.”

CSR Consultant, UK

“While this is a very long report it is also thorough and transparent. It clearly connects sustainability to business strategy and provides good examples of how the company addresses key challenges.”

CSR Consultant, USA

“A highly focused, interactive report that makes innovative use of technology to improve the user experience.”

CSR Consultant, USA

Runner Up #1

**Coca-Cola Enterprises**

View online

Runner Up #2

**Bayer AG**

View online

4th **General Electric Company**

5th **Novo Nordisk A/S**

6th **Co-operative Group Limited**

7th **Royal Dutch Shell plc**

8th **Natura Cosméticos SA**

9th **Coop**

10th **Banco Espírito Santo SA**
**Best Report** How the winners won

### Distribution of scores

**FIG 16: All scoring entrants**

### Winning characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Winner</th>
<th>Runner Up #1</th>
<th>Runner Up #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Compact Index</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI Index</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Copy Format</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF Format</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTML Format</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scoring by stakeholder group, compared with average across all categories

**FIG 17a: This category**

- Academics: 9%
- Corporate CR Professionals: 32%
- CR Consultants: 13%
- Government, Authorities & Agencies: 1%
- Investors & Analysts: 3%
- Media / Journalists: 2%
- NGOs & Charities: 25%
- Support Services: 13%
- Students: 1%

**FIG 17b: Overall**

- Academics: 11%
- Corporate CR Professionals: 23%
- CR Consultants: 3%
- Government, Authorities & Agencies: 4%
- Investors & Analysts: 17%
- Media / Journalists: 1%
- NGOs & Charities: 1%
- Support Services: 3%
- Students: 10%
- Government, Authorities & Agencies: 3%

### Scoring by region for the top 3 reports

- **Hewlett-Packard Company (US)**
- **Coca-Cola Enterprises (US)**
- **Bayer AG (Germany)**
**Best First Time Report** The winners

The category was for companies who had produced their very first CR report.

**The entrants**
This category received 15 entrants, all of which received valid votes by the end of the voting period.

**The results**

**Winner**

**Virgin Group**
Corporate Responsibility Report. For the year ended 31 March 2010

View online

Selected voters' comments on the report:

“This is a wonderfully designed think piece that captures one's attention to the subject matter. Straying away from the norm 'report' makes this my first choice.”
Corporate CSR Professional, USA

“This report is a very good attempt for a first time reporter.”
Corporate CSR Professional, South Africa

---

**Runner Up #1**

**McGraw Hill Companies Inc**

View online

**Runner Up #2**

**Hyundai Engineering & Construction Co**

View online

4th SGS Société Général De Surveillance
5th Pacific Hydro Pty Limited
6th Oil & Natural Gas Corporation Limited
7th ArcelorMittal USA
8th Alaska Air Group Inc
9th ArcelorMittal India Ltd
10th The Hongkong and Shanghai Hotels Ltd
Best First Time Report: How the winners won

Distribution of scores

FIG 19: All scoring entrants

Winning characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Winner</th>
<th>Runner Up #1</th>
<th>Runner Up #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Compact Index</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI Index</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Copy Format</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF Format</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTML Format</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring by stakeholder group, compared with average across all categories

FIG 20a: This category

FIG 20b: Overall

FIG 21: Scoring by region for the top 3 reports

- Virgin Group Ltd (UK)
- McGraw Hill Companies Inc (US)
- Hyundai Engineering & Construction Co (South Korea)
Best SME Report  The winners

Our definition of SME (micro, small and medium-size enterprises) is fewer than 250 employees and annual turnover of less than €50m.

The entrants
This category received 7 entrants, all of which received valid votes by the end of the voting period.

The results

Winner
Pacific Hydro
Corporate Responsibility Report. For the year ended 31 March 2010

Winner:
Pacific Hydro
Corporate Responsibility Report. For the year ended 31 March 2010

Selected voters’ comments on the report:
“For an SME report I rank it as excellent.”
Corporate CSR Professional, South Africa

“This report demonstrates a good conceptual approach to understanding and managing impacts beyond the limits of the company’s front door.”
CSR Consultant, Israel

Runner Up #1
Arcelor Mittal India Ltd

Runner Up #2
Lipor

4th  GoLite LLC
5th  Net Balance Management Group Pty Ltd
6th  Hauska & Partner Group
7th  Shared Interest Society Limited

View online

View online
**Best SME Report** How the winners won

### Distribution of scores

**FIG 22:** All scoring entrants

![Bar chart showing distribution of scores for all scoring entrants.](chart)

### Winning characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Winner</th>
<th>Runner Up #1</th>
<th>Runner Up #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Compact Index</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI Index</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Copy Format</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF Format</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTML Format</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scoring by stakeholder group, compared with average across all categories

**FIG 23a:** This category

![Pie chart showing scoring by stakeholder group for this category.](chart)

- Academics: 9%
- Corporate CR Professionals: 12%
- CR Consultants: 31%
- Government, Authorities & Agencies: 17%
- Investors & Analysts: 5%
- Media / Journalists: 3%
- NGOs & Charities: 1%
- Support Services: 1%
- Students: 1%

**FIG 23b:** Overall

![Pie chart showing scoring by stakeholder group for the overall.](chart)

- Academics: 11%
- Corporate CR Professionals: 23%
- CR Consultants: 30%
- Government, Authorities & Agencies: 17%
- Investors & Analysts: 1%
- Media / Journalists: 4%
- NGOs & Charities: 1%
- Support Services: 1%
- Students: 1%

### FIG 24: Scoring by region for the top 3 reports

- **Pacific Hydro Pty Limited (Australia)**
  - Africa & Middle East: 10%
  - Asia: 15%
  - Australasia: 20%
  - Europe: 40%
  - North America: 20%
  - South America: 5%

- **ArcelorMittal India Ltd (India)**
  - Africa & Middle East: 10%
  - Asia: 20%
  - Australasia: 30%
  - Europe: 20%
  - North America: 5%
  - South America: 5%

- **Lipor (Portugal)**
  - Africa & Middle East: 10%
  - Asia: 10%
  - Australasia: 10%
  - Europe: 40%
  - North America: 10%
  - South America: 10%
Best Integrated Report  The winners

Most corporate responsibility reports are ‘stand-alone’ ie they are separate from the Annual Report & Accounts (AR&A). Increasingly, companies are combining non-financial aspects into their AR&As, and the best are integrating them fully, rather than including just a small section of non-financial information. The award is for the report that most successfully integrates the financial & non-financial aspects.

The entrants
This category received 11 entrants, all of which received valid votes by the end of the voting period.

The results

Winner
Natura Cosmeticos
Corporate Responsibility Report. For the year ended 31 March 2010
View online

Selected voters’ comments on the report:

“Nice presentation of materiality, goals and progress.”
CSR Consultant, USA

“Strong, credible presentation, and nicely laid out. There is a strong assurance statement.”
CSR Consultant, Hong Kong

Runner Up #1
SolarWorld AG
View online

Runner Up #2
AXA SA
View online

4th Vestas Wind Systems A/S
5th American Electric Power
6th Vancouver City Savings Credit Union
7th NH Hoteles SA
8th TNT NV
9th Indra Sistemas SA
10th Landcom
Best Integrated Report How the winners won

Distribution of scores

FIG 25: All scoring entrants

Winning characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Winner</th>
<th>Runner Up #1</th>
<th>Runner Up #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Compact Index</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI Index</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Copy Format</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF Format</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTML Format</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring by stakeholder group, compared with average across all categories

FIG 26a: This category

Academics: 10%
Corporate CR Professionals: 12%
CR Consultants: 22%
Government, Authorities & Agencies: 23%
Investors & Analysts: 28%
Media / Journalists: 20%
NGOs & Charities: 17%
Support Services: 4%
Students: 1%

FIG 26b: Overall

Academics: 11%
Corporate CR Professionals: 23%
CR Consultants: 10%
Government, Authorities & Agencies: 30%
Investors & Analysts: 10%
Media / Journalists: 3%
NGOs & Charities: 19%
Support Services: 17%
Students: 4%

FIG 27: Scoring by region for the top 3 reports

Natura Cosméticos SA (Brazil)
SolarWorld AG (Germany)
AXA SA (France)

0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%
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Best Carbon Disclosure  The winners

Which report gives the best disclosure of the company's carbon emissions, the implications for climate change, and the mitigation measures taken? We prompted voters to check for policy, quantified data and targets.

The entrants
This category received 16 entrants, all of which received valid votes by the end of the voting period.

The results

Winner
Vodafone Group plc
Corporate Responsibility Report. For the year ended 31 March 2010

Runner Up #1
General Electric Company

Runner Up #2
Banco Bradesco SA

4th  Bayer AG
5th  Coca-Cola Enterprises Inc
6th  Royal Dutch Shell plc
7th  ITC Limited
8th  Danisco A/S
9th  Alaska Air Group Inc
10th  Baxter International Inc

Selected voters' comments on the report:

“This is a very well structured report, with good coverage of a number of issues of global concern.”
CSR Consultant, South Africa

“Vodafone has a good, strategic approach to climate change and carbon disclosure, with a dual-target approach to reducing their emissions in both developed and emerging markets, and addressing carbon disclosure in their supply chain.”
CSR Consultant, UK
Best Carbon Disclosure How the winners won

Distribution of scores

FIG 28: All scoring entrants

Winning characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Winner</th>
<th>Runner Up #1</th>
<th>Runner Up #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Compact Index</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI Index</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Copy Format</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF Format</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTML Format</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring by stakeholder group, compared with average across all categories

FIG 29a: This category

FIG 29b: Overall

Scoring by region for the top 3 reports

Vodafone Group plc (UK)

General Electric Company (US)

Banco Bradesco SA (Brazil)
Creativity in Communications The winners

Which report is a real pleasure to read, because the authors have given thought to both the content and the reader? Do you find the report engaging and informative, or boring and unimaginative? This award is for the report which best succeeds in getting its message across, using creativity as a defining factor.

The entrants
This category received 29 entrants, all of which received valid votes by the end of the voting period.

The results

Winner
Virgin Group Ltd
Corporate Responsibility Report. For the year ended 31 March 2010
View online

Selected voters’ comments on the report:
“This report is highly innovative and describes the company’s sustainable initiatives in an easy to read manner.”
Communications Consultant, Brazil

“Very attractive, creative design, a quick good read that was both informative and enjoyable.”
Management Consultant, USA

Runner Up #1
The Coca-Cola Company
View online

Runner Up #2
Hewlett-Packard Company
View online

4th General Electric Company
5th Kraft Foods Inc
6th Banco Espirito Santo SA
7th British American Tobacco plc
8th Aveda Corporation
9th Grundfos A/S
10th ArcelorMittal
Creativity in Communications How the winners won

Distribution of scores

FIG 31: All scoring entrants

Winning characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Winner</th>
<th>Runner Up #1</th>
<th>Runner Up #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Compact Index</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI Index</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Copy Format</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF Format</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTML Format</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring by stakeholder group, compared with average across all categories

FIG 32a: This category

FIG 32b: Overall

Academics 28%
Corporate CR Professionals 25%
CR Consultants 17%
Government, Authorities & Agencies 6%
Investors & Analysts 5%
Media / Journalists 4%
NGOs & Charities 2%
Support Services 2%
Students 1%

Africa & Middle East 30%
Asia 10%
Australasia 4%
Europe 17%
North America 11%
South America 3%

Scoring by region for the top 3 reports

Virgin Group Ltd (UK)
The Coca-Cola Company (US)
Hewlett-Packard Company (US)
Relevance & Materiality The winners

How many times have we seen reports which are long on length but short on relevant content? Which don't tell us about the non-financial issues which impact company performance, but lay down a smokescreen of non-essential information? This award is for the report which cuts to the chase and tells us about the material issues (ie those specific to the company performance and sector, the risks and opportunities), clearly and succinctly. A short report which gives us the relevant information should win over a blockbuster of several hundred pages.

The entrants
This category received 30 entrants, all of which received valid votes by the end of the voting period.

The results

Winner
SABMiller
Corporate Responsibility Report. For the year ended 31 March 2010

View online

Selected voters’ comments on the report:
“The content of the report provides generous coverage of what SAB has been able to identify as their most material issues.”
CSR Consultant, South Africa

“This report is well-conceived, with a great strategic set-up.”
Management Consultant, USA

Runner Up #1
L’Oréal SA
View online

Runner Up #2
Novo Nordisk
View online

4th Bayer AG
5th Coca-Cola Enterprises Inc
6th General Electric Company
7th Banco Espirito Santo SA
8th British American Tobacco plc
9th HSBC Holdings plc
10th Royal Dutch Shell plc
Relevance & Materiality

How the winners won

Distribution of scores

FIG 34: All scoring entrants

Winning characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winner</th>
<th>Runner Up #1</th>
<th>Runner Up #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Compact Index</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI Index</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Copy Format</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF Format</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTML Format</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring by stakeholder group, compared with average across all categories

FIG 35a: This category

FIG 35b: Overall

Scoring by region for the top 3 reports

SABMiller plc (UK)

L’Oréal SA (France)

Novo Nordisk A/S (Denmark)
Openness & Honesty  The winners

It's sometimes difficult to tell the whole truth. It's easy to highlight the good news and ignore the bad. Whether performance is poor or excellent is less relevant for this award. This award is for the report which comes clean, tells both the good and the bad news, and which convinces us that this is a balanced picture.

The entrants
This category received 28 entrants, all of which received valid votes by the end of the voting period.

The results

Winner
Novo Nordisk
Corporate Responsibility Report. For the year ended 31 March 2010

View online

Selected voters' comments on the report:
“‘They have fully integrated their KPIs into their DNA as a company and the message is clearly communicated.’”
Government Agency, The Netherlands

“This report demonstrates a solid integration of financial and non-financial information, and has a good mix of quantitative and qualitative information with clear graphs.”
CSR Consultant, Canada

Runner Up #1
Co-operative Group

View online

Runner Up #2
Microsoft Corporation

View online

4th Vodafone Group plc
5th Coca-Cola Enterprises Inc
6th Hewlett-Packard Company
7th L’Oréal SA
8th Banco Espírito Santo SA
9th ArcelorMittal
10th Danisco A/S
Openness & Honesty

How the winners won

Distribution of scores

Winning characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Winner</th>
<th>Runner Up #1</th>
<th>Runner Up #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Compact Index</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI Index</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Copy Format</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF Format</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTML Format</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring by stakeholder group, compared with average across all categories

FIG 38a: This category

FIG 38b: Overall

FIG 39: Scoring by region for the top 3 reports

Novo Nordisk A/S (Denmark)

Co-operative Group Limited (UK)

Microsoft Corporation (US)
Credibility through Assurance

The winners

Many of the best reports include a section on external assurance – the company engages an independent third party to verify aspects of the report, and publishes its methodology, conclusions and recommendations. This award is for the assurance statement which adds the most credibility to the overall report.

The entrants

This category received 12 entrants, all of which received valid votes by the end of the voting period.

The results

Winner

Co-operative Group

Corporate Responsibility Report. For the year ended 31 March 2010

View online

Selected voters’ comments on the report:

“Good assurance statement covering all the related aspects has been given. Reading the assurance statement alone has provided lots of inputs on the company’s approach to sustainability and its monitoring mechanisms.”

CSR Consultant, Canada

“This report is comprehensive, transparent and focused on accuracy. It is a great representation of all the work Co-operative Group is involved with.”

Corporate CSR Professional, UK

Runner Up #1

General Electric Company

View online

Runner Up #2

Royal Dutch Shell plc

View online

4th Banco Espirito Santo SA
5th Caja Navarra
6th British American Tobacco plc
7th Banco Bradesco SA
8th City Developments Limited
9th Wipro Limited
10th State Street Corporation
Credibility through Assurance How the winners won

Distribution of scores

FIG 40: All scoring entrants

Winning characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Winner</th>
<th>Runner Up #1</th>
<th>Runner Up #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Compact Index</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI Index</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Copy Format</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF Format</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTML Format</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring by stakeholder group, compared with average across all categories

FIG 41a: This category

FIG 41b: Overall

Scoring by region for the top 3 reports

Co-operative Group Limited (UK)

General Electric Company (US)

Royal Dutch Shell plc (UK)
Dear Stakeholder

Reading through this year’s reports (yes, I looked at every one) it struck me how huge many of the PDF files were. Given the time some PDFs take to download, a large file size is a disincentive to read the report. At CorporateRegister.com we see thousands of reports using PDF format, some of hundreds of pages comprising less than 1mb of file size, while others of only a couple of dozen pages sometimes run into 50mb or more. For the record, we no longer profile any reports with a PDF file size above 50mb – several reports we have turned down have been above 100mb!

Of the 31,000 reports profiled on our site, 27,500 have an identifiable PDF file size. The average PDF file size across all these reports is 3.2mb. Any report significantly larger than this probably hasn’t been designed with the user in mind.

We also have problems with the many reports we see using Flash. Flash appears to be favoured by trendy design consultants but is frustrating for users. It doesn’t offer any user advantages, is often difficult to load and frequently causes computer crashes. So reporters, if your designer insists on using a Flash report format, please ensure a PDF version is also available.

This reminded me of the many years spent running the Electronic Media Commendation, part of the ACCA UK Awards for Sustainability Reporting and partnered between CorporateRegister.com and ACCA UK. This annual commendation looked at all the PDF and HTML reports submitted for the overall reporting awards, with a panel of experts judging them against a specific set of reporting criteria.

I looked back through the judges’ reports compiled between 2003 and 2008, and realised how poorly many current reports shape up against the recommendations we made. I’ve selected some of the observations and technical recommendations we made, I think they’re still useful:

**PDF format**

- Make files smaller to download by avoiding unnecessary high-resolution graphics, which are the main culprits behind unwieldy PDF files. Do you really need that background image behind your text, or that high-resolution report cover which takes two minutes to load?
- Vector graphics allow for smaller file sizes than raster images and should be used where possible
- Save your PDF with ‘Fast Web View’ so users can view the report while it downloads, rather than having to wait until downloading is complete

**HTML format**

This reporting format offers many advantages such as advanced navigation, the possibility of ‘personalising’ a report, interactivity and the inclusion of new media (eg podcasts and videos). The use of XBRL could further transform the nature of CR reporting.

However, we see many HTML reports which are messy, cluttered, overloaded with detail and generally hard to use. Some pointers for good HTML report design include:
ONLINE REPORTING

Navigation:

- Ensure the report is easy to find from the company home page, or from a clearly signed sustainability or CR section – not buried in the recesses of a sprawling website.

- Some online reports are the equivalent of 1,000 pages or more, so clear navigation is essential. For many reporters this is a blind spot, after all, they know their way around their report, so why should others become lost? Ensure there's a clear list of contents (the best reports have several options), a 'search' function, and a simple report structure which the user can grasp intuitively.

- Ensure there's a clear boundary between the report and the rest of the corporate site. All too often an online report ‘leaks’ across an invisible boundary into the main site, and finding the route back to the report can be confusing and irritating.

- Provide a clear path through an online report, rather than a jumble or a labyrinth. Help the user save time and avoid unnecessary exploration: headings in a contents list can expand as a mouse hovers over them, and hyperlinks can have a ‘rollover’ to explain where the link leads – it shouldn’t be necessary to click every button to see what it does!

Write for the web:

- When we use the web we generally want information quickly. This means our writing style needs to be more succinct than for a print version – shorter paragraphs and sentences, more use of bullet points, clear headings and the use of summaries wherever possible.

Accessibility

This is essential to best practice reporting. Reports should be easy to navigate and understand, but also accessible to people with disabilities. Approximately 15% of the UK population have a disability, and presumably this is a comparable indication for the percentage of global population. Of these, many have impairments affecting how they access electronic text.

One of the liberating advantages of the web is that electronic reports can be accessible to people with visual impairments in a way printed reports never can be. Some people use text-to-speech technology such as screen readers, while others cannot use a mouse and are reliant on keyboard access. Good report design ensures not only that these issues are taken into account, but make life easier for everyone else at the same time.

This issue is far too wide to do it justice here, but guidance is available:

- Web Accessibility Initiative’s ‘Web Content Accessibility Guidelines’ www.w3.org/WAI/intro/wcag.php
- RNIB Web Access Centre www.rnib.org.uk/professionals/webaccessibility/Pages/web_accessibility.aspx
- For those developing PDF reports, Adobe has useful accessibility guidelines www.adobe.com/accessibility

Please get in touch if you have information, views or examples on this topic. We'll be adding a new section on the website.

Paul Scott
Managing Director
CR debates

The question of what makes a good CR report is far from settled. Here at the CR Reporting Awards we utilise the combined wisdom and experience of our 35,000 users to determine the best in CR reporting over the past 12 months. But that doesn’t mean that all questions are answered.

In the interests of stimulating discussion we have asked a number of leading CR experts to weigh in on two hot CR topics. We present a short summary of each side’s arguments over the next two pages, but you can go online at www.corporateregister.com/blog to read their full pieces, and to weigh in yourself.

Topic A: In future, all good CR reporting will be integrated

For: Robert Eccles and George Serafeim


George Serafeim is an Assistant Professor of Business Administration at the Harvard Business School. His research has been published in prestigious academic journals such as the Review of Accounting Studies, Journal of Accounting Research, and Financial Analysts Journal.

Through integrated reporting companies develop a better internal understanding of the relationship between financial and nonfinancial performance.

Companies also receive the external benefit of a greater shared consensus amongst their shareholders and other stakeholders of the company’s objectives and performance targets.

The result of these internal and external benefits is a more sustainable company with a secure license to operate and lower reputational risk.

“Those companies who have already started towards integrated reporting will see their short-term costs translate into an investment that has a substantial return as the rest of their peers scramble to catch up with them.”

Against: Roger Cowe

Roger Cowe is a writer and consultant on corporate sustainability and an associate director at Context Group (www.econtext.co.uk).

The integration of sustainability into companies’ annual financial reporting to shareholders should not mean merely squeezing a section on sustainability in among all the other content.

Sustainability reporting addresses many audiences. Even well-integrated reporting cannot be a substitute for sustainability communications with other stakeholders.

It’s impossible to meet the needs of all audiences in a single document or format. An integrated report is good for investors but not for other audiences.

“Putting sustainability reporting and financial reporting together isn’t necessarily the Holy Grail it is increasingly cracked up to be.”
Topic B: XBRL will be vital for CR reporting

For: Liv Watson

Liv Watson is a Director and leads the Research and Development function at AccountAbility. She was one of the original developers of the XBRL standard, as well as a founder of the XBRL International consortium.

XBRL will allow publishers to describe data models, data concepts, and data references and records in such a way that they can be linked and quarried as if they were part of a single database.

XBRL will provide a common platform to help companies develop definitions of commonly used terms.

For XBRL to become a useful tool stakeholders will need to come together to classify financial and business reporting information into agreed upon XBRL taxonomies.

“XBRL will be vital for providing a common platform to help companies with developing definitions of commonly used terms critical to bring down the barriers of information silos.”

Against: Daniel Roberts

Daniel Roberts has been involved at all levels in the XBRL world since the beginning of 2003, including serving as Chairman of the XBRL US Steering Committee and is a voting member of the XBRL International Assurance Working Group.

Corporate responsibility reporting requires taking into account the true cost and impact of business, and that requires far more information than is currently reported.

The provision of information at the data-level is important (preferably in XBRL), but there are more important issues that must be addressed in CR reporting.

The elements I consider vital are mandatory reporting against a regulator-defined standard that integrates financial and non-financial measures and is audited. And finally, that is tagged, preferably in XBRL.

“Communication needs to clearly demonstrate how each company impacts the “commons”. XBRL by itself does none of this, it is a boundary standard for the exchange and provision of data-level information that can be “trusted”.”

We hope these pieces are the start of the discussion, rather than the end. The above summaries are only a snapshot of our contributors’ arguments. The full debate is taking place online, at www.corporateregister.com/blog
Professional accounts – reporting statistics

At the heart of our online resource is an interactive database of over 31,000 corporate non-financial reports. Over 35,000 registered users have free Personal Accounts, with which they can search the database to access reports. But most users don't know what they are missing. They can get the full picture by upgrading to a Professional or Academic Account.

We have put a huge amount of effort into upgrading and improving the statistics we make available to our Professional Account subscribers. As well as expanding the range of overall trends we track, we have also created two new sections, looking at six reporting indicators for each of the 20 most active CR reporting countries, as well as tracking the CR reporting performance of leading financial indices. We are constantly adding reports to our database, even for previous years, so our statistics are updated whenever we update our website – in fact, several times a week. So you can be sure you have access to the latest data available.

Overall statistics

We have expanded our range of overall statistics to cover more regional trends. You can look at the take-up of various external standards over time and by region, as well as in major industry sectors.

For example, you can observe the growth in CR reporting by region. This chart shows the early and continuing lead taken by Europe in this area.

We also track the sectors in which reporting companies are located, illustrating both which sectors have produced the most reports over time, as well as the sectors that have produced the most reports in the past year. As we continue to find new reports – even for past years – we update all our statistics, so this chart in particular is continually evolving as we find more and more reports.
**Country statistics**

FIG 46: *Country statistics page*

We have created a new category of statistics that are focused on exploring reporting trends at the level of individual countries. We report on six statistics for each of the top 20 reporting countries. These statistics are: the total number of reports produced in each country from 1992 to 2010; the number of reports produced each year for each country; the type of reports produced each year for each country; and the proportion of reports produced in each country using the AA1000AS, external verification, and the Global Reporting Initiative framework.

For example, you can use these charts to build a complete overview of reporting trends in each of the 20 countries covered. Using Italy, the 6th largest producer of CR reports as a case study, you can see the growth in CR reporting over time – in particular the rapid uptake of reporting between 2000 and 2006.

FIG 47: *Number of reports produced in Italy per year (1992-2010)*

You can also look at changing trends in the type of reports companies are producing. We categorise report type based on the content of the report. The number of environment reports produced in Italy each year has declined as companies have increasingly embraced more comprehensive sustainability and corporate social responsibility reports.

FIG 48: *Report output in Italy by type (2000 to 2010)*

In addition to these regional and country-level trends, we have also begun tracking the non-financial reporting performance of key financial indices.
Over 35,000 registered users have free Personal Accounts, with which they can search the database using parameters such as sector, year and country. Personal Accounts can be upgraded to Professional or Academic Accounts, and an upgraded Account can give a whole new perspective on accessing the reporting database.

For example:

Personal Accounts

Imagine a stakeholder wishing to research reporting in the Mining sector. With a Personal Account, this person can search for all reports in the ‘Mining’ sector, and can narrow down this long list of 1,400 reports by searching in combinations of year and country. They will be able to read all these reports individually, but getting an overview can be time consuming.

Professional Accounts

A stakeholder with an upgraded account might start by looking at the Statistics section, to see the significance of the Mining sector:

FIG 49: Reports by Sector 1992-2010 (Top 20 sectors)

Then using the ‘Search by Report’ feature, the stakeholder can search by individual ICB (Industry Classification Benchmark) sub-sectors (searching by ICB sub-sector is only available for upgraded accounts). There are five ICB Mining sub-sectors, so quick searches for each can be used to compile statistics, which a researcher can then illustrate as a chart:

FIG 50: Illustrative overview of reporting by Mining ICB sub-sector 1992-2010

Following this theme of searching for reports by ICB subsector, combinations of other search criteria may be included. For example, a ‘GRI’ search criteria (not included with free accounts) can be included to assess the proportion of GRI reports per sub-sector:

FIG 51: Illustrative overview of GRI reporting within Mining sub-sectors 1992-2010

Then using the ‘Search by Report’ feature, the stakeholder can search by individual ICB (Industry Classification Benchmark) sub-sectors (searching by ICB sub-sector is only available for upgraded accounts). There are five ICB Mining sub-sectors, so quick searches for each can be used to
Or, by selecting an additional ‘Year’ criterion, a researcher can compile an overview of GRI reporting over a number of years within any of the sub-sectors:

FIG 52: Illustrative overview of GRI reporting in the Gold Mining sub-sector (2001-2010)

Finally, there is enough searchable data on the website to compile quite sophisticated charts. So searching by different combinations of criteria could be used to compile the following chart, which would otherwise only be possible by reading and assessing each individual report:

FIG 55: Illustrative example of reporting by Mining sub-sector (2001-2010)

Our archive is unique, the world’s most comprehensive database of non-financial reporting. Upgrading the free Personal Account to Professional will give a far wider perspective on this archive – see above. But what if a stakeholder needs to search for specific terms or phrases within a report? With a free Personal Account this would mean long hours – even weeks and months – reading individual reports. Find our solution overleaf...
Professional accounts – the PDF Search Tool

Our on-line PDF Search Tool allows our Professional Account holders to search inside our thousands of reports. A researcher can search by keyword or phrase. So instead of laboriously downloading hundreds or thousands of files and reading or searching through them, you can now define a group of reports (by country, sector, year etc) or even the entire database at once, and look for specific text. The results show the search term in context, and it’s easy to drill down into the specific report.

Having our unique archive of 31,000 non-financial reports together with this powerful on-line tool gives professional users the means to carry out research in minutes which would otherwise take months!

Practical examples

Continuing our Mining sector theme, we searched all mining sector reports published over the last year for six ‘hot topics’: Biodiversity, EITI (Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative), Artisanal Mining, GHG Protocol, Kimberley Process and conflict diamonds. See Fig 56 for the statistical success of these quick searches, followed by some verbatim extracts from the results:

**FIG 56: Using the PDF Search Tool**

- **Total number of reports from ‘Mining’ sector 2009-2010**
- **Reports mentioning “Biodiversity”**
- **Reports mentioning “Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative”**
- **Reports mentioning “Artisanal Mining”**
- **Reports mentioning “GHG Protocol”**
- **Reports mentioning “Kimberley Process”**
- **Reports mentioning “Conflict Diamonds”**

**Hot Topic: Biodiversity**

A series of management plans tailored to meet the specific environmental challenges of our mine sites have been implemented to ensure that significant species and areas of biodiversity are appropriately managed.

**Hot topic: Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI)**

These initiatives include the OECD Guidelines on Multinational Enterprises; the Global Reporting Initiative; the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights; the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative; the IFC Performance Standards; and the Equator Principles.

**Hot topic: Artisanal Mining**

To ensure the safety of our operations and of these artisanal mining communities, artisanal miners are not permitted in working areas and are arrested in the event that they enter these areas. Approximately 9,500 arrests were made in 2009, an increase of 3,000 over the number arrested in 2008. A corresponding decrease in the number of severe or fatal accidents involving artisanal miners was however observed.

**Hot topic: GHG Protocol**

All sites with assistance of an external agency undertook an exercise to account and report on the GHG emission using the WRI and WBCSD’s GHG protocol.

**Hot topic: Kimberley Process**

In addition, there are separate assurance programs to ensure that the requirements are met for the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme and the World Diamond Council System of Warranties.

**Hot topic: Conflict diamonds**

All involved with the Kimberley Process continue to monitor and assess the effectiveness of the certification scheme and strive towards a world free of conflict diamonds.

Of course, the same procedure could be followed for any number of topics and sectors: the advantage of our PDF Search Tool is that using it is so easy and painless.

If your work or study involves looking at the content of non-financial reports, you really should make the upgrade!
Take a closer look

Get the most from CorporateRegister.com with a Professional Account

We have an upgrade to our free personal account: the Professional Account.

Benefits include:

• Extended access to the CorporateRegister.com reporting archive and additional search criteria
• Use of the PDF Search Tool. This powerful tool allows you to unlock the content of the archive
• Access to our newly expanded Statistics section
• A range of further benefits for groups of five users or more – contact us for details

Professional Accounts are on annual subscription, starting at just £500 for individuals and heavily discounted academic rates.

Contact info@corporateregister.com or +44 20 7014 3366 for more information
About CorporateRegister.com
Global CR resources

CorporateRegister.com was founded in 1998 as a website dedicated to providing global CR resources. At the start of 2011 over 35,000 registered users benefited from free access to over 31,000 CR reports, updates of the latest reports, upcoming events, reviews, related news items and a comprehensive directory of CR reporting service providers.

We offer an array of services to CR reporters and the organisations which assist in CR report development. We create awareness of new CR reports, facilitate online stakeholder dialogue and connect service providers with CR report developers.

We value our independence and impartiality, and exist as a link between CR reporters and CR stakeholders. Our mission is to continue to provide high quality CR related information to an informed global audience.

Paul Scott, Managing Director
info@corporateregister.com
www.corporateregister.com
+44 20 7014 3366
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