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Survey Methodology
Please see page 26 for a complete overview of the qualitative and quantitative data collection for this report. This study was based on data collection from the 2007 Edelman Trust Barometer, the 2007 Net Impact Membership Survey and in-depth one-on-one interviews.

This brochure is printed on recycled paper that contains 100% post-consumer recycled (PCR) fiber. This recycled paper is made from fiber sourced from well-managed forests and other controlled wood sources and is independently certified by SmartWood, a program of the Rainforest Alliance, to the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) standards.

40.08 trees preserved for the future
115.72 lbs. water-borne waste not created
17,201 gallons wastewater flow saved
1,884 lbs. solid waste not generated
3,709 lbs. net greenhouse gases prevented
1,427 lbs. air emissions not generated
4,584 cubic feet natural gas unused
Equivalent to not driving 2,087 miles in an average car
Edelman and its research partners—Boston College Center for Corporate Citizenship, Net Impact and the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD)—have taken stock of the market to assess current CR communications trends.

Our research team has approached the subject as broadly as possible. Rather than confining our survey to CR reporting, we have investigated the full range of CR communications. The goal is for this wider purview to shed new light on best practices, as well as on the effectiveness of newer, even experimental CR communications efforts.

About This Report

Specifically, our research helps uncover the key dynamics behind CR communications, such as:

- What are the principles of effective engagement with external stakeholders like non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and socially responsible investment (SRI) funds?
- How are basic CR communications vehicles—principally the CR report—evolving?
- How are companies approaching the demand for more transparency?
- Who are the most important CR communications audiences?
Power and responsibility—the two go hand in hand. Or do they?

The majority of global opinion leaders believe that “global business plays a role that no other institution can in addressing major social and environmental challenge,” according to the Edelman 2007 Trust Barometer, an annual global study of credibility and trust. Yet less than half of those opinion leaders actually trust that companies will “do what’s right.” Clearly a strong disconnect exists between the power stakeholders bestow on companies and their belief that those responsibilities will be upheld.

Companies are hearing that skepticism in their stakeholders’ voices and responding with actions that build a link between power and responsibility. Not only are
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Defining “CR/Sustainability” Communications

Corporate responsibility (CR) and sustainability communications first entered the business realm in the early 1990s when a handful of companies issued CR reports. Over the next decade, a period of experimentation in CR reporting and communications ensued—from debate over what’s most relevant, to competition between companies sensing pressure to issue their own reports.

The field remains wide open for debate as corporate responsibility and sustainability is notorious for meaning many things to many people. If practitioners still can’t seem to agree on what to call this discipline—variously described as “corporate social responsibility” (CSR), “corporate responsibility” (CR), “sustainable development,” “corporate citizenship,”—one might also encounter confusion when it comes to talking about it. So we made certain to define our terms up front for respondents. Furthermore, we set out to be as broad and inclusive as possible in questioning respondents about CR and Sustainability communications, crafting our survey as objectively as possible.

Throughout this report we use the term “CR” to represent both “corporate responsibility” and “sustainability.” In our survey and in this report, “CR communications” collectively refers to corporate responsibility and sustainability reports and their collateral materials; SRI survey responses; press releases; web sites; e-mail communications; stakeholder meetings; executive speeches or presentations; and internal communications.
People Take Action Against Companies They Do No Trust
Have you ever done this in relation to a company you do not trust?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refused to buy their products or use their services</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticized them to people you know</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to invest in them</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigated more about their activities</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to work for them</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported legislation controlling or limiting their activities</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignored their attempts to communicate with you</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared your opinion and experiences on the Web</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written a letter or e-mail complaining to the media, a politician or an official third-party</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively demonstrated or protested against them</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Industry research has reinforced the business case for CR, particularly the role it plays in shaping corporate reputation. A company’s social and environmental impacts, as well as its treatment of employees across the supply chain, feed directly into stakeholder perceptions. It’s a matter of trust. And over the past few years it’s become increasingly clear that trust is critical to market performance and shareholder value.
Key Findings
The following market trends and insights emerged from our research as the key priorities and driving factors within Corporate Responsibility.

1 | **CR must be a corporate priority emanating from the top**
If the CEO and top management take an active interest in CR, provide resources and insist on accountability, a company’s CR efforts and communications will be significantly more effective and credible. For a company’s CR mandate to have teeth and be integrated with company values, senior management must demonstrably support and encourage CR efforts. Only then does social and environmental accountability become internalized to the point where CR communications and reporting is taken seriously as an essential component of the company’s benchmarking and goal-setting—and not viewed as an empty communications exercise.

2 | **Stakeholders often find communicating with companies to be difficult**
Companies now grasp the business case for effective stakeholder engagement and are working hard to improve communication lines—whether it’s through direct stakeholder contact, new web-based CR reporting, or other channels that allow for greater responsiveness to stakeholder issues and recommendations. Yet stakeholders of every stripe—NGOs, SRI fund managers, journalists, internal audiences—have criticized CR communications and engagement.

3 | **Stakeholders expect companies to lead—not just manage risk—on key issues**
Society’s lack of confidence in governments and public institutions to adequately address key global issues such as climate change, human rights, and poverty alleviation has resulted in increased expectations for the business sector to take the initiative. No longer are stakeholders content with reactive corporate responses to the world’s problems. Rather, they view corporate actions such as offsetting CO₂ (carbon dioxide) emissions or providing access to medicine in the developing world as litmus tests for trust in the private sector. With considerable media coverage of environmental and social issues, companies have an opportunity to align their brands with positive values and earn credit for their improved records.

4 | **Employees and socially responsible investors have emerged as key CR communications audiences**
Business leaders are recognizing the valuable relationship between employees and CR performance. With that in mind, leading companies are increasingly engaging in dialogue with their employees and subsequently making positive changes on issues like diversity, labor relations, and human rights. This surge of discourse with employees is matched by a similarly vigorous courting of SRIs. The corporate world has woken up to the growing ability of socially responsible initiatives to mitigate risk and create new opportunities—which directly affect their stock prices. SRI ratings matter to the extent that they influence the big institutional shareholders as well as potential business partners.

5 | **Companies often neglect an important CR communications audience: prospective employees**
While corporations are actively and successfully engaging employees on CR issues, they are not adequately courting prospective employees to the same degree. Companies do not consistently integrate CR messaging in their recruiting because they underestimate the importance a prospective employee places on a company’s CR programs. Prospective employees seek to make informed career choices and having access to a potential employer’s CR performance data is essential to the decision-making process.

6 | **Transparency is a key indicator of a socially responsible company**
Although philanthropy spawned many CR programs, today philanthropic activities and donations are the baseline that stakeholders expect all companies to meet. What stakeholders care most about is how honest and open are companies being and how are they treating their employees.
Though many companies are still struggling to manage their footprints, systems for capturing data and managing positive change have markedly advanced. Along the way, stakeholder engagement has become so central to the CR process that communications is in a sense becoming its principal driver.

Communications departments are the eyes and ears of companies whose very existence depends on the favor of their key constituencies. Their understanding of environmental and social risk and opportunity can be a major asset in engaging stakeholders and finding common ground.

And it’s no surprise that corporations’ communicators are leading the charge. Many already have experience collecting CR data, conveying CR messages across an organization, and executing stakeholder engagement. Their new challenge: Helping the business units fully grasp the value of CR to their bottom line and conveying the importance of balanced reporting.

At many companies the CR bureau is fairly nascent, founded in the last two to six years. At others, such as Timberland, it has existed for 20 years. For the former group of companies, CR was previously housed in various departments from corporate philanthropy or legal, to employee health and safety (EHS) or human resources.

For those companies where a dedicated CR division was part of environmental affairs, it often was distinct from any proactive social mission. In a few cases, the genesis of CR belongs to corporate branding initiatives that linked it to the communications department.

“The CSR department emerged from serendipity and chaos.”

Corporate Communicator
CR has created new dialogues within the company – between the corporate communicators and the brands, for example. As these key groups have opened up their lines of communication, new ideas and products have sprung forth.

**Best Practice**

**Timberland: Conscious Footprint**

In 2006 footwear apparel company Timberland not only introduced environmentally friendlier packaging for its footwear products, it added a “nutrition label” with details on the product’s environmental footprint. The “Our Footprint” label appears on the side of each footwear box so consumers “know exactly what went into making the shoes you put on your feet.” Resembling the “nutrition facts” label found on food and beverage products, the Timberland label gives consumers an easy-to-digest way to learn more about the company’s environmental efforts.

**Gap Clothing: Sustainable Design**

By blending organic cotton, hemp, and silk into some of its products, Gap is taking sustainability beyond the C-suite and putting it on its consumers’ backs. Examples include a Banana Republic skirt, made of a hemp/silk blend and select men’s T-shirts and tanks made with 100% organic cotton.

As CR goes mainstream, one of two things happen: either CR departments (usually two or three people) serve in a coordination/communication capacity, or CR encompasses various activities into one large division. For instance, in the case of one major retailer, CR now encompasses global compliance, affairs, and partnerships, and a social community-investment team.

For many companies we interviewed, especially those with a decentralized operating structure, we found that small CR departments had become hubs for information and resources. These hubs became vital to the gathering, organizing, and disseminating of social and environmental information. Their companies’ corporate and operating units fully understood the importance of CR, and the department managers knew their responsibilities spanned data collection, goal setting, and progress updates.

There is no doubt communications departments are instrumental in moving the needle on CR goals. They are uniquely positioned to measure stakeholder issues and set parameters for effective engagement.
At some companies, CR goals and objectives are set by a cross-functional executive committee or “business leadership team” that reports directly to the CEO and Board of Directors. Such a committee, which may include an HR, EHS, and legal representatives, approves major CR goals and holds certain company managers accountable.

**Key Finding 1 | CR must be a corporate priority emanating from the top**

Executive-level or “C-suite” involvement is vital to CR success. According to one NGO executive, it “sets the tone of seriousness of purpose.” It can make all the difference in terms of motivating and empowering employees to own the charge of a rigorous social- and environmental-performance agenda and to seeing that progress is made. With C-suite buy-in—particularly the CEO’s endorsement—CR programs can inject a sense of purpose in company culture.

**How involved is too much?**

Some respondents noted that it is “not the CEO’s job to do the work of Corporate Responsibility.” NGOs for the most part granted that CEO commitment is vital to maintaining that “for initiatives to work you must have complete buy-in from the C-suite.” But in terms of doing the work of CR, they say that it’s more important to have a dialogue with the core CR spokesperson or team leader on a given issue.

While it is extremely helpful for the CEO to serve as a clear standard-bearer for CR, there is debate about how much visibility is warranted and which communications vehicles suit CEOs championing the CR cause. CEO support sets a crucial tone of commitment to employees and stakeholders when it comes to CR.

But it is imperative to have other CR champions infused throughout the company’s departments and practices. Stakeholders report that dealing with the person who’s most knowledgeable about a given CR issue is key—and the CEO isn’t always that person.

In fact, although many CEOs are the only corporate voice in their CR reports—companies see it as crucial to spotlighting senior management’s commitment to CR progress—other CEOs are sharing the first word with other CR leaders throughout the company.

“Green leaders are emerging throughout companies, not just in the environmental departments.” Joel Makower, co-founder and executive editor, GreenBiz.com
IKEA

Reporting directly to the CEO

At IKEA Group, the $19.8 billion Euro Swedish home furnishings retailer, corporate responsibility is managed from the social and environmental affairs department. Thomas Bergmark, the department manager, has a team of nine people and reports directly to the president and CEO. “At a very early stage, the board and the CEO recognized how important these issues are to a business like IKEA,” Bergmark says. “It’s a great value having the role report to the CEO because there is no question in the organization as to whether this is important or not. It’s a very clear signal from the board and from the CEO.”

Bergmark has been in the position since it was created six years ago by merging the environmental function with the social function, though he has been with IKEA for 20 years in various positions.

His main role and responsibility is to ensure IKEA delivers on its environmental and social strategy, which is presented for scrutiny by the public and other stakeholders in the IKEA Social and Environmental Report. Bergmark’s social and environmental affairs department works with the PR and communications department to distribute the report. His team (and its network throughout the company) provides the facts, figures, and stories, while the communications team takes care of tone of voice and layout.

Bergmark also coordinates and drives CR issues internally, works with external networks including leading NGOs such as the WWF, and represents IKEA at conferences to talk about strategies and achievements.

Eleven people report to Bergmark. Nine are located at IKEA’s headquarters in Helsingborg, one is in Shanghai and one is in Ho Chi Minh City. These staff include:

- **Head of compliance**: leads and coordinates the work of calibrating working methods with the code of conduct covering issues such as social, working, and environmental conditions.
- **Four compliance specialists**: report to the head of compliance. These specialists perform the actual auditing of compliance by IKEA suppliers over the world. Two of these compliance specialists work on the Asian code of conduct (in Beijing and Bangkok).
- **Forestry expert**: reports directly to Bergmark and acts as internal expert as well as coordinating external projects such as those in cooperation with WWF.
- **Development Manager**: reports directly to Bergmark, working on projects related to the environment at an international level, including climate change.

Bergmark gives the CEO regular updates on CR issues, but he also benefits from frequent informal conversations with the CEO, who is closely involved with setting the CR strategy. This strategy is always discussed in group-management meetings. The CEO is also chair of a company council that oversees the code of conduct relating to home-furnishing suppliers.

The Social and Environmental Coordination Group

As it sells its range of products in 24 countries, for IKEA, embedding corporate responsibility in the business means making sure corporate responsibility is taken into account during the life cycle of those products.

In order to do this, IKEA convenes 15 people from across the business in a Social and Environmental Coordination Group chaired by Thomas Bergmark. This group considers how social and environmental issues can be addressed through product development, production and distribution, and at the point of sale. The members of the group are mainly environmental and social managers for their respective functions along the product lifecycle. The group also includes a head of PR and communications.

It is through this group that Bergmark reaches a larger network of about 500 people that work full- and part-time on social and environmental issues.
Some international companies form “Communications Advisory Panels,” as one company calls it. These companies are gathering representatives from different public sectors, governments, academia, communities, and elsewhere in face-to-face settings for feedback on CR protocols and reporting.

• Key Finding 2 | Stakeholders often find communicating with companies to be difficult

One major company vigorously courts an array of what they call “sophisticated CR stakeholders,” such as CR academics, economists, politicians and government representatives, top SRI analysts, high-profile NGOs, and members of the activist community.

Edelman’s 2007 Trust Barometer refers to such influencers as “TrustHolders™.” Each comes with his or her own style and ability, varying greatly from country to country according to biases in industry sectors and local trust profiles. Many companies are increasingly engaging the opinion leaders or influencers for two very practical reasons: They serve as filters of CR information for many stakeholders, and they hold the key to instilling trust in company behavior.

The particular company in question uses TrustHolders not to influence any one stakeholder directly, but as one important element of building trust and a strong reputation around the company as a whole. The company views communication as a continual conversation whereby the company engages all stakeholders from the center.

How do stakeholders view the engagement process—and what would make it easier to manage?

Time and again we heard from companies that a CR program is only as good as its ability to connect with stakeholders—that CR communications must be fine tuned to stakeholder needs and interests if the engagement process is to take root and yield positive results.

This sounds good, but begs the question: Is it true in practice? How successful has the engagement process been, for instance, from the perspective of NGOs?

In speaking to NGOs, it became clear that companies hoping to leverage public-private partnerships must consider the NGOs’ own pressures.

The larger international NGOs clearly have their reputations to safeguard, especially under increased scrutiny for their own compliance with stringent standards of conduct. The result: NGOs today are far more risk-averse in their management of corporate partnerships than in recent years.
That’s why it is hardly a given that an NGO will be ripe for engagement at any time. NGOs have systems in place for determining which corporate partners will best help them fulfill their strategic goals and build capacity. In our survey, they stated how important corporate CR communications were in deciding which companies to work with. One international NGO we spoke to said that they conduct due diligence analyses on the precise issues a prospective partner has faced. They tag certain industries as red-light sectors to be avoided, or as yellow-light prospects to be dealt with cautiously.

Moreover, these major NGOs conduct very thorough risk assessments before partnering with a company in order to protect both their values and their brands. In certain cases it will even use independent consultants to provide third-party assurance. The upshot of all this is that the companies—especially those in the same sector—will increasingly compete for substantial partnerships addressing major issues. By comparison, it’s like companies competing for exclusive sponsorship rights of major sporting events.

What can companies do differently to improve the effectiveness of private-public sector partnerships?

NGOs report that lack of corporate internal organization and having to communicate with many layers within a given company is a major impediment to constructive engagement. For several companies, the answer is to hold regular workshops or community meetings, with division reps present, so that key issues are aired and addressed. NGOs concur, saying that face-to-face encounters are the most productive means of soliciting information and facing the issues.

And NGOs are not shy about admitting the extent to which they delve into CR reports. “[The reports are] very important and central to our decision to work with companies,” said one well-connected NGO. Another stated emphatically: “The most important [information] comes from the company itself.” We frequently heard that the reports are a very useful place to start a dialogue with a company in that they can “help diffuse some of the more polarized topics in advance.”

Yet opinions of corporate CR reporting varied tremendously. A representative from an NGO told surveyors that he didn’t trust CR reports since they are by definition biased and therefore unreliable sources. He said he was more comfortable using more legitimate external sources. Proactively sourcing information from a variety of resources emerged as the most effective and credible approach. To offset their concerns about biased reporting, NGOs stated they often use third-party information to assess corporate CR performance, such as financial (SRI) rating reports, media, or other NGO reports. Little wonder then that companies are now assiduously courting the SRI community. This leads to assurances that their data and communications are vetted by third parties, and demonstrate the all-important balance that SRI analysts and NGOs prize.

For some NGOs, especially those more activist-oriented, criticism centered on content. Specifically, they see a lack of balance between current, hard data and forward planning. One NGO said it is “crucial...to have a coherent strategy for change,” and to be less artistic in presentation.

**Best Practice**

Companies’ most effective CR communications tactics:

- Communicating with third-party groups (such as NGOs) as a means of connecting with other key stakeholders;
- Using opinion leaders to generate media coverage, which garners employees’ attention, and in turn influences consumers;
- Conducting NGO workshops or town-hall meetings as a means of consensus building for addressing and reporting on CR issues.
- Engaging business students to independently verify CR reports, as Intel and McDonald’s have done.
New Rules for Business Success 2006

David McLaughlin, senior director of environmental affairs for Chiquita, and Tensie Whelan, executive director of the Rainforest Alliance, like to tell this story. It begins in the early 1990s, when, as McLaughlin says, “Our license to operate was being severely questioned by a lot of environmental activists.”

Historically, Chiquita operated in countries with limited social infrastructures. Consequently, Chiquita established a patriarchal base in these countries, taking care of everything from telecommunications to road maintenance.

Early in the 1990s, Chiquita faced serious challenges to its practices. Recognizing the need to sit down with its adversaries to understand their grievances instead of reacting to them in isolation, Chiquita’s management opened the door to the Rainforest Alliance, a New York-based NGO committed to protecting ecosystems and the people and wildlife that depend on them, by transforming land-use practices, business practices, and consumer behavior.

“We really had to go beyond any traditional boundaries that we had in our corporate culture,” says McLaughlin, a 27-year veteran of the company. “We had to change our decision framework, completely open up, accept these viewpoints, and figure out whether we could accept them and fit them into our production process. We also recognized the need for a credible standard.”

This engagement between the two organizations, while at times uncomfortable and confrontational, led Chiquita’s management to a greater understanding of the issues and grievances at play. It also led to one of the most successful corporate-NGO partnerships of the past decade. The partnership is founded on what was originally called the Better Banana Program (BBP), the Rainforest Alliance’s certification standard.

Complying with these exacting standards has not been inexpensive for Chiquita. The company spent over $20 million from 1992 to 2000 to certify the environmental performance of its farms in Latin America.

Given the costs involved, notes McLaughlin, Chiquita’s management wanted to establish a clear-cut business case before fully signing on to the standard. Thus began an in-depth 18-month pilot project involving two Chiquita farms that adopted the standards.

Certification proved to contribute to increased productivity and reduced costs, according to Chiquita. For all its farm operations, NGO collaboration and consumer activism, reputational cachet has been quick to follow. Chiquita is reaping the business benefits from an improved brand reputation and image granted by consumers interested in ethical practices and willing to pay a premium for companies with better performance on social and environmental issues. The company was recently added to KLD’s Social Index and listed in the top 20 of Sustainable Business’s green stocks for the fourth year in a row.

Recognizing the increasing importance of social and environmental issues for consumers, in 2005 the company started a high-profile consumer campaign with the Rainforest Alliance to raise awareness for the organization’s standard. Ninety-three percent of all the bananas Chiquita produces are Rainforest Alliance certified and can proudly display the Alliance’s green frog on the banana’s stickers.
How do the media regard CR communications?

Of the various CR communications stakeholders, the media is undoubtedly the most skeptical of the lot. One Financial Times reporter we spoke to made her antipathy for CR communications of any stripe abundantly clear: “They’re absolutely pointless... The company is the least credible source of information...” For controversial information, she said, unlike an annual report, which is governed by legal codes in some countries, “[the CR report] is the last place you go.”

The FT reporter, who stated that “99 percent of what companies say about CSR is rubbish” and claims to throw all received CR reports “straight into the recycling bin,” did acknowledge when pressed that HSBC was an exception. HSBC in this reporter’s view “takes environmental issues seriously. They actually do something; they don’t just talk about what they’re doing.”

A number of reporter interviews underscored what we already recognize: Reporters do not view companies as reliable sources of information about their own social and environmental footprint. This is true especially as long as companies resist transparency about controversial issues, or hesitate to verify data externally. Moreover, given the media’s skepticism about official company documents, only one approach seems to make sense. That is, for companies to engage these TrustHolders “unofficially” via one-on-one, off-the-record interactions.

One bright note: Business media have generally accepted that “enlightened self-interest” is a perfectly reasonable motivation for CR initiatives. In fact, when companies pitch CR stories in this business context—that is, are candid about enlightened self-interest being the impetus for action—it tends to resonate better with the media than declarations like, “We did it because it was the right thing to do.”

Outlets People Use to Obtain Information About Companies’ CSR Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outlet</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream media</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate web sites</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs or nonprofits</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR/Sustainability reports</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No longer does it suffice for companies simply to manage risks on certain global issues such as climate change, human rights and poverty alleviation. Stakeholders expect companies to take the initiative on these issues even if they do not relate directly to a company’s core business.

As a part of Edelman’s 2007 Trust Barometer research, 3,100 individuals from around the world were asked to rank the issues that they believed to be the most important issues for global companies to address. Eight priority issues emerged, with climate change and human rights the most pressing for corporations to address.

The challenge for companies is prioritizing the issues they should address. Should it be an issue directly related to the company’s business? Should it be an issue in an area where the company can make a significant impact? Or should it be an issue that has global implications? As one director of corporate responsibility said: “There is always room to do more. It is a matter of understanding how to spread your resources so that you can make the greatest impact.” Naturally, in order for these initiatives to be sustainable they must make a positive contribution to society and to the company’s own bottom line.

Climate change has unquestionably become the most visible CR issue in the public discourse in the past year. And many companies are responding to the green fervor by making substantive business changes to minimize their environmental impact. A November 2007 New York Times special section, the “Business of Going Green,” reported that companies have progressed to “Phase 3 of the greening of corporate America” as companies have moved far beyond office recycling programs and carpools to proactively create more sustainable operations. But companies should think twice before issuing a press release after an environmental change: Unless they are leading the way with innovative solutions, touting these efforts will only be viewed as “greenwashing.”
The Bottom Line on Climate Change
In 2007, Ceres, a coalition of environmental activists and investors, along with Environmental Defense and investors managing $1.5 trillion in assets, petitioned the S.E.C. to require companies to disclose the risks that climate change may pose to their bottom lines.

Going Beyond “Do No Harm”
Which are the most important issues that global companies you trust should address?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rankings:</th>
<th>EU</th>
<th>North America</th>
<th>Latin America</th>
<th>Asia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty alleviation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global warming</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural disasters, such as hurricanes or earthquakes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The AIDS epidemic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandemic flu, e.g. bird flu</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDELMAN 2007 TRUST BAROMETER – 3,100 GLOBAL RESPONDENTS

“We are much better as a company getting ahead of [climate-change policy] than we are pretending like it doesn’t exist…[GE will] develop and drive the technologies of the future that will protect and clean our environment.”

Jeffrey Immelt, CEO, General Electric from The Wall Street Journal, September 14, 2007
Employees and socially responsible investors have emerged as key CR communications audiences

Directing CR communications at employees is empowering for them and for CR programs.

The two most important CR communications audiences—employees and the socially responsible investment (SRI) community—are discrete groups with very different interests and needs. But one commonality is their direct impact on a company’s bottom line.

**Employees**

Most companies interviewed agreed unequivocally that employees are the most important audience for CR communications. Why? Because directing CR communications at employees further ingrains CR into the company’s culture, while also providing personal satisfaction and empowerment among the employees. These companies have nurtured their CR initiatives by encouraging employees to be active on issues most important to them.

The platform for dialogue with employees can take multiple forms: subscription-based update e-mails and newsletters, town-hall meetings (where a film like “An Inconvenient Truth” might be screened), multi-media web formats such as intranets or the corporate web site.

In the case of one prominent tech company, the focus is on helping employees’ sense of mission and self-fulfillment. Special employee-tailored CR communications encouraged the formation of an “Employee Sustainability Network”—a self-selected group that has its own internal web site and holds regular meetings with guest speakers. The release of the annual CR report (received internally with much fanfare) is very much geared to this network and the wider employee base for whom it’s a source of pride. The network gives report feedback to the CR team and has helped prompt the company to explore more sustainable packaging options.
Listening to Employees Builds Trust

Which are the THREE most important actions for a global company seeking to build trust among its employees?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening to employees</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrating its corporate social responsibility</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating the company's business strategy</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having CEO be accessible to employees</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging dialogue across different parts of the business</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating the company's financial performance</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating openly about layoffs</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing information about career advancement</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case Study

Issues in the Practice of Corporate Citizenship

“We have evolved in our employee engagement initiatives.”

Julia Fuller, manager of corporate responsibility at Reuters recognizes that the impetus for the company’s citizenship initiatives was that the company “didn’t really reach out to a wide variety of people within the organization—it was all quite insular.” In order to broaden the reach and engage more employees around formulation of its corporate responsibility policies, Reuters has set up four employee working streams, looking at the community, the environment, the workplace and the marketplace through the lens of corporate responsibility. Although still in its early days, this initiative has had some notable successes, but there is room for growth.

Truly representative work streams:

“There are 8-15 members of staff from around the world working in each stream,” said Fuller.

These streams include employees from a whole range of job functions and tenure within Reuters. There are secretaries involved, graduates, senior managers—basically anyone who expressed an interest in CR [corporate responsibility] issues when the opportunity was posted on the intranet.”

Progress made on formulation of company-wide strategy around corporate responsibility, as noted by Fuller:

“For the community-work stream team, one of its major objectives is to work on the community events and figure out which countries and projects we should focus on in the future. The team is also working on strategy and how to align the work we are doing with our core brand values.”

“With regard to the workplace stream, it has been working with HR to consider how the package of working policies such as flexi-time and maternity leave are communicated to staff...It is also looking at Reuters values and how these align with workplace policies and it is coordinating with Reuters Global Diversity Advisory Council to promote activities there.”

“In terms of the marketplace work stream, it is looking at current policies and asking where these need to be updated or re-aligned. The environmental work stream is considering a range of plans structured around the objectives of ‘Reuse,’ ‘Reduce,’ and ‘Recycle.’”
**Socially Responsible Investment (SRI) Community**

Companies are increasingly aware of the rising clout of SRI analysts. Investors are realizing that CR management is a proxy for good management in general, and that solid CR practices mark a healthy approach to risk and opportunities.

Analyst ratings influence big institutional shareholders as well as potential business partners. As fund managers’ hunger has grown for details on social and environmental performance, companies have learned to feed analysts information they hope will strengthen their stock. The difficulty is how and what exactly to feed a community that demands robust, current data for close analysis.

The SRI fund managers prefer regularly updated web-based information or e-mail alerts—a preference that could pose problems for companies still determined to produce a formal, printed annual CR report. The good news is that companies producing formal reports tend to be the leaders in developing sophisticated data-gathering and reporting systems. The not-so-good news is that the more robust the data and reporting capability, the more analysts want flexible, updatable communications platforms like the web to deliver the data (so they can readily search it, compare it, and otherwise slice and dice it as they see fit).

The truth is that SRI fund managers will take data in multiple forms, but they typically begin with CR reports as they assess company’s CR performance. Several fund managers surveyed were less concerned about format than about the accuracy and integrity of data, or about the importance of its validation by a third party. To the degree that SRI primary analysts’ role is to compare company performance within a given industry—and to elucidate trends of year-on-year progress—it makes sense they would view data (preferably graphs) delineating progress as extremely helpful. Moreover, fund managers stated they make full use of CR reports if they are deemed accurate and balanced and if they provide context—namely, how the data on a given issue stands up to the industry average, and how benchmarking data will be leveraged for significant improvements. And narrative information that elucidates this context is useful, as long as it doesn’t degenerate into “anecdotal fluff.”

When it comes to company e-mails offering CR updates, SRI fund managers appreciate them for getting a handle on trends and issues as they emerge. However, they don’t wish to see CR updates eclipsing the annual CR report. It’s clear that the annual CR report is sacrosanct as a vehicle articulating annual progress.

But of course fund managers don’t rely purely on reports. They examine an array of data sources such as media reports/alerts, NGO reports, etc. This stakeholder group is no different from others, such as employees, NGOs and media, in cultivating an all-important network of balanced information and analysis.

A CR practitioner would do well to keep this network in mind when crafting CR messaging. Messaging that’s intended for employees will find its way to the media and other stakeholders; while SRI fund managers will seek out independent research and opinion (like Innovest Value Advisors or KRC Research) and NGOs for corporate-performance assessments.

“There are companies that are leaders in sustainability and will be better off financially for it....There is money to be made on all this.”

*Walden Asset Management*
Social Responsibility Yields Positive Return
If you consider a company to be socially responsible, which of the following are you MOST inclined to do?

- Purchase their products or services: 39%
- Recommend them to others: 17%
- Invest in them or buy their stock: 12%
- Do business with them: 9%
- Pay a premium for their products or services: 7%
- Work for them: 7%
- Forgive them for occasional missteps: 5%
- Forgive them for inferior quality or service: 2%

“Today even private companies have to be transparent about their operations if they want the public’s trust.”

Marc Gunther, Senior writer at FORTUNE Magazine quoted from MarcGunther.com, June 11, 2007
• Key Finding 5  

Companies often neglect an important CR communications audience: prospective employees

Corporate communicators could do much more to leverage CR as a recruiting tool, especially since today’s job seekers tend to research a company’s CR performance. In fact, according to report partner Net Impact’s 2007 membership survey, over the past decade there has been a surge in talented candidates actively seeking careers with socially responsible and progressive companies. Net Impact’s membership of socially conscious business leaders has grown 137 percent since 1997, encompassing more than 17,000 members with affiliations at more than 85 graduate programs around the world, and a chapter at all of the top 50 business schools in North America.

Employees’ and potential employees’ interest in CR is hardly passive. They are not simply interested in their company’s CR practices, but are clearly willing to participate—that is, to be directly involved with “working on products or services that advance social causes” and promote environmental responsibility. Employees are eager to be involved in CR programs, especially those directly linked to a company’s core business. Producing products and services with positive impacts on society and care towards the environment generate excitement, and even pride.

“I really value and enjoy working in a traditional brand management role while simultaneously leveraging my interest and knowledge in sustainability. I start and end each day feeling good that I worked on a project and for a company that has a positive impact on end consumers.”

Net Impact Member, MBA Student on internship with McNeil Nutritionals, a Johnson & Johnson Company
Best Practice

JPMorgan, a global leader in financial institutions, hosts an annual social venture competition open to undergraduate and graduate students. Students are given the opportunity to select a nonprofit organization and make the business case as to why JPMorgan should invest in their organization. The best cases are selected to present to JPMorgan executives at the company’s global headquarters in New York. The winning team’s nonprofit organization receives $25,000, while JPMorgan is awarded with the chance to closely interact with an intelligent, ambitious and socially responsible group of potential employees.

Findings from the Net Impact Member Survey show just how deep the instinct for meaningful, ethical employment runs:

If offered two job opportunities, one with an organization that you consider to be more socially responsible than the other, what percent less salary would you be willing to accept to work for the organization that you consider to be more socially responsible?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Less Salary</th>
<th>Response Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% or more</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings beg the question: “What are potential employee candidates looking for in a company and how do they get information about companies’ CR performance?”

When considering working for a company, how important are the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Belief that your job will make a positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>difference in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Opportunity for career advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reputation of the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Belief that your job will make a positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>difference in the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Belief that the company is socially responsible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of the following sources do you use to obtain information about companies’ CR activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mainstream media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Corporate web sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CR reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CSR media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How credible do you find the following sources when it comes to providing information on CR issues and activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Credibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CSR media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CSR Sustainability reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Current and or past employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Friends/Family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very likely 60.3%
Somewhat likely 29.6%
Somewhat likely 14.5%
Not at all likely 2.8%
Not very likely 7.4%
In 2005 GE’s CR process uncovered a contract GE inherited through a recently acquired business that was producing a cluster bomb component. GE realized the contract was contradicting its published pledges that it did not manufacture land mines or cluster bombs “in any way.” GE let the contract lapse and then, in full disclosure, explained the issue in its 2007 citizenship report.

**Key Finding 6**   Transparency is a key indicator of a socially responsible company

Increasingly more companies understand that CR involves far more than philanthropy initiatives and donations. Being transparent about business operations, future goals, and treatment of the workforce are vital indicators for stakeholders assessing responsibility and sustainability.

Transparency doesn’t come naturally to business, especially for certain industries where there’s a culture of secrecy. This includes markets where intellectual property is closely guarded or margins are tight, and even seemingly insignificant tactical moves can affect strategies and, ultimately, business fortunes. In business it’s crucial to find the right balance of communicating: Convey just enough information to satisfy stakeholders in the CR domain, without becoming vulnerable to too much scrutiny.

Companies have moved toward greater transparency largely through increased, candid stakeholder outreach. And engaging stakeholders is proving to yield real business thanks to honest assessments of social and environmental performance—with many companies actually developing “a feel” for how transparency in this context serves their interests.

Communications departments are well positioned to manage strategic transparency, including marshaling information from across the company, as well as shoring up senior management buy-in on reporting parameters.
### Transparency is a Key Trust Builder

When you think of the major global companies that you trust, which are the three most important activities for a socially responsible company to engage in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair treatment of employees</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that products meet accepted environmental/social standards</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication of both positive and negative performance</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO commitment to responsible business practices</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social or environmental reporting</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic donations or activities</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships with NGOs or nonprofits</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage of responsible business practices</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Balance is the key word, if the executive summary (of a report) is 100% positive; I worry and put a filter on when viewing the report. If it is all good news, then they do not understand the evolving nature of CR.”

Global environmental NGO executive
The Most Valuable Asset of a CR Report is Not the Publication Itself, but the Sum of Its Parts

Until the past several years, the CR report has been the decisive vehicle for transparency on environmental and social conditions. Companies have tried to formalize consistent annual reporting structures, but according to our respondents, the reporting process is changing significantly. The report is now “one piece among many that tell a story,” said one.

The report has steadily undergone a kind of deconstruction, as the printed format is augmented by web-based reporting. The mainstays of reporting—key performance indicators (KPI) and frameworks like global reporting initiatives (GRI)—are increasingly refined, generating data more relevant to stakeholders.

The challenge in reporting is communicating events and issues that don’t fit the quantitative framework. Of course event-specific issues and activities and all of their complexities still factor into communications programs, always with lessons to be learned. The trick is to break the data apart and tailor useful details for one or two constituencies at a time, as opposed to the full multi-stakeholder audience addressed by the annual CR report.

As CR reporting becomes more embedded in the ongoing conversation among stakeholders, reporting has become more fluid: Companies are using a greater variety of communications vehicles and tools to reach multiple audiences. There are the annual CR reports, supplemented by e-mail or web site updates; town-hall meetings that address regional issues for employees and communities; and quarterly webcasts for corporate audiences. Community advisory panels, blogs, and face-to-face encounters with stakeholder representatives all act as a means of receiving constructive external input, while demonstrating transparency and the good will it promotes.

Many companies are moving outside traditional reporting structures and channels to engage stakeholders in a more effective, bi-lateral manner. This can be through direct stakeholder contact, new web-based CR reporting efforts, or other means that improve responsiveness to stakeholder issues and recommendations.

One corporate respondent told us that their CR department works “hand-in-glove” with both the corporate-communications department and a global partnership team to craft all-inclusive media plans that heighten stakeholder engagement.

The CR report becomes truly valuable if it is an instrument of CR, not merely a yearly routine to produce a tangible publication

Companies considered to be CR leaders understand the publication of their CR report is just a milestone in—not the finale of—the CR communications continuum. The reporting process, although initiated with a report as the final output, has many roles: a launch pad for initiating stakeholder conversations, a catalyst for internal evaluation and goal-setting, and a content generator for targeted communications to stakeholders.

With the challenge of encapsulating unwieldy data and getting CR buy-in from operating divisions, companies also are charged with structuring communications to be part of a feedback loop. The idea is to motivate stakeholders and foster dialogue—a reason for and an indirect benefit of CR reporting. But while many companies are able to engage stakeholders through reporting, others are struggling. One practitioner explained the difficulties his company is facing:

“A major issue is the increasingly interactive nature of reporting, that is, making the reporting function a key part of engagement ... While we have the architecture for a feedback loop in place, we’re not fully leveraging it yet. What’s required is a formalized process for incorporating feedback into CSR management.”

Best Practice

CR report content most valued by NGOs:

- Accurate appraisals of sector issues
- Clear delineation of the company’s position on key issues—and above all, delineation of a company’s entire footprint
- Stakeholder input
- An accurate assessment of progress to date (including failure to meet targets)
- A work plan for improvement with clear targets, including timeline

Social reporting transparency and accountability

While the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) is arguably the most commonly used reporting standard, a single standard used by all reporting companies does not exist. In fact, a number of different standards have been created to guide the development and evaluation of social reports. Most companies use one of the following four standards:

- Nike, Bristol-Myers Squibb Company, ING Group, Baxter International, Exxon Mobil and Chiquita use Global Reporting Initiative (GRI)
- Chiquita Brands International uses Social Accountability International’s SA8000
- Exxon Mobil uses the International Organizations of Standardization’s ISO 14000
- Premier Oil and Nike endorses the Institute of Social and Ethical Accountability’s AA1000

CR report content most valued by NGOs:

- Best Practice
- Accurate appraisals of sector issues
- Clear delineation of the company’s position on key issues—and above all, delineation of a company’s entire footprint
- Stakeholder input
- An accurate assessment of progress to date (including failure to meet targets)
- A work plan for improvement with clear targets, including timeline

Social reporting transparency and accountability

While the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) is arguably the most commonly used reporting standard, a single standard used by all reporting companies does not exist. In fact, a number of different standards have been created to guide the development and evaluation of social reports. Most companies use one of the following four standards:

- Nike, Bristol-Myers Squibb Company, ING Group, Baxter International, Exxon Mobil and Chiquita use Global Reporting Initiative (GRI)
- Chiquita Brands International uses Social Accountability International’s SA8000
- Exxon Mobil uses the International Organizations of Standardization’s ISO 14000
- Premier Oil and Nike endorses the Institute of Social and Ethical Accountability’s AA1000

One corporate respondent told us that their CR department works “hand-in-glove” with both the corporate-communications department and a global partnership team to craft all-inclusive media plans that heighten stakeholder engagement.

With the challenge of encapsulating unwieldy data and getting CR buy-in from operating divisions, companies also are charged with structuring communications to be part of a feedback loop. The idea is to motivate stakeholders and foster dialogue—a reason for and an indirect benefit of CR reporting. But while many companies are able to engage stakeholders through reporting, others are struggling. One practitioner explained the difficulties his company is facing:

“A major issue is the increasingly interactive nature of reporting, that is, making the reporting function a key part of engagement ... While we have the architecture for a feedback loop in place, we’re not fully leveraging it yet. What’s required is a formalized process for incorporating feedback into CSR management.”
2007 Edelman Trust Barometer

The Edelman Trust Barometer is an annual global survey of opinion leaders’ views of corporate credibility and trust now in its 8th year. The 2007 Trust Barometer surveyed 3,100 people in 18 countries around the world. The breakdown of individuals surveyed included:

- 400 people in the United States
- 300 in China
- 150 each in Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Poland, Russia, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

The 30-minute telephone interviews were conducted in October and November 2006.

The demographic profile of those interviewed in the 2007 survey is as follows:

- College-educated
- 35 to 64 years of age
- Report a household income in the top quartile of their country
- Report a significant interest in and engagement with the media, and economic and policy affairs

The margin of error is +/- 1.8% globally.

2007 Net Impact Membership Survey

Report partner Net Impact is an international nonprofit organization whose mission is to make a positive impact on society by growing and strengthening a community of new leaders who use business to improve the world. The organization offers a portfolio of programs to educate, equip, and inspire more than 10,000 members to make a tangible difference in their universities, organizations, and communities.

Spanning six continents, Net Impact’s membership makes up one of the most influential networks of MBAs, graduate students, and professionals in existence today. Net Impact members are current and emerging leaders in CR, social entrepreneurship, nonprofit management, international development, and environmental sustainability who are actively improving the world through business.

Data for this report was collected during the spring 2007 Net Impact member survey of 778 Net Impact members from around the world. Members participated in the survey through a confidential, online survey.

A demographic profile of Net Impact members interviewed in the 2007 survey is as follows

- College-educated
- 44% have or are pursuing advanced degrees
- 87% currently reside in the U.S.
- 13% reside in Europe (61 respondents), Asia (27 respondents), Central or South America (17 respondents), Africa (8 respondents) and Australia (3 respondents)
- 82.4% report that they are currently highly-moderately applying business skills to create a better world
Qualitative Survey
The qualitative sample for this study included in-depth, one-on-one interviews with:

- Executives from global Fortune 500 companies. The companies were randomly selected from the following broad industry sectors: equipment & manufacturing, telecommunications/electronics, food & beverage, energy/utility and retail. The executives represented a variety of functions, including public affairs, corporate responsibility, government relations, sustainable development, corporate citizenship, health & safety, human resources, global communications, and community relations.

- Senior executives at global NGOs whose work is focused on a range of environmental, human rights, social enterprise, and development issues.

- Journalists who cover business, environmental issues, or corporate responsibility/sustainability for global top-tier English-language media outlets.

- Analysts from SRI funds.

All respondents were assured of complete anonymity and confidentiality.

The following is a sampling of the qualitative survey participants:
Corporate Responsibility involves stakeholders across a clear range of sectors—employees, shareholders, NGOs, governments, communities—each corner of the business world has a stake in CR. However the irony is that while CR touches each aspect of business, it all too often stands on its own within a company—still separate from the crowd.

CR Communications Going Forward

As the field of Corporate Responsibility evolves there is a pressing need to coordinate data capture, manage stakeholder outreach, involve employees around a CR mission, and garner new ideas. These practices will help to integrate CR through business operations, adding immense value to both the company and its stakeholders.

Essentials for effective CR:

**Derive value from your CR practices**
- Take a stance on issues;
- Play an active role in the perpetual CR conversation; and
- Drive engagement across stakeholder groups.

**Produce respected CR reports**
- Use web-based reporting and other dynamic communication tools;
- Elicit and include stakeholder feedback;
- Establish tangible goals and report benchmarks of progress; and
- Report successes and failures, with the inclusion of strategies for improvement.

**Maximize stakeholder relationships**
- Provide SRI funds with data-driven content;
- Capitalize on employees’ interests to advance CR goals; and
- Communicate CR efforts and opportunities to job seekers.

**Communicate CR initiatives to the public**
- Bring the media newsworthy items, not press releases;
- Help the media to tell your story; and
- Communicate simultaneously across multiple channels.
World Business Council for Sustainable Development

The World Business Council for Sustainable Development is a CEO-led, global association of some 200 companies dealing exclusively with business and sustainable development. The Council provides a platform for companies to explore sustainable development, share knowledge, experiences and best practices, and to advocate business positions on these issues in a variety of forums, working with governments, non-governmental, and inter-governmental organizations. Members are drawn from more than 35 countries and 20 major industrial sectors. The Council also benefits from a global network of about 55 national and regional business councils and regional partners.

Boston College Center for Corporate Citizenship

For 20 years The Boston College Center for Corporate Citizenship has provided research, executive education, and convenings on corporate citizenship topics. The center works with global corporations to help them define, plan and operationalize their corporate citizenship. The center functions as an educational institution, a think tank and an informational research center—all in one place. The center’s goal is to help business leverage its social, economic, and human assets to ensure both its success and a more just and sustainable world.

Net Impact

Net Impact is an international nonprofit organization whose mission is to make a positive impact on society by growing and strengthening a community of new leaders who use business to improve the world. Net Impact offers a portfolio of programs to educate, equip, and inspire more than 10,000 members to make a tangible difference in their universities, organizations, and communities. Net Impact members are current and emerging leaders in CSR, social entrepreneurship, nonprofit management, international development, and environmental sustainability who are actively improving the world.

Edelman

Edelman is the world’s largest independent public relations firm, with 3,000 employees in 48 offices worldwide. Edelman believes that companies’ responsible conduct and sustainability strategies go beyond just reputation considerations and are directly related to business continuity, employee morale, and market expansion. Its Global CSR & Sustainability practice provides counsel and programming to multi-national companies in a variety of sectors around issues management, communications campaigns, CR/sustainability reporting, management training, strategic philanthropy, public-private partnerships, and public affairs. Edelman also provides counsel and programming for multilateral organizations and global NGOs.

Edelman Design Communications

Edelman Design Communications is a full service design consultancy within Edelman, and was established in Chicago more than 15 years ago. Its award-winning design professionals are specialists in the design of sustainable communications including CSR reports, brochures, factsheets, and event materials. Working in close partnership with Edelman’s global CSR account staff, it has played a key role creating strategic CSR communications initiatives for clients such as Bunge Limited, Edelman, Evraz, Kraft International, Merck & Co., Inc., The Scotts Miracle-Gro Company and the World Bank.
The Boston Center for Corporate Citizenship, the World Business Council for Sustainable Development, Net Impact, and Edelman, first and foremost would like to thank the individuals from the business, NGO, media, and investment communities whom the research partners interviewed for the qualitative research portion of this report. We appreciate their time, frankness, and valuable insights, a majority of which have been impossible to cover in their entirety in this report. We would also like to extend our appreciation to all Net Impact members who participated in the survey.
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Survey Methodology
Please see page 26 for a complete overview of the qualitative and quantitative data collection for this report. This study was based on data collection from the 2007 Edelman Trust Barometer, the 2007 Net Impact Membership Survey and in-depth one-on-one interviews.
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