



Maplecroft
Maplecroft House
Bath Road
Bradford on Avon
BA15 2PE
United Kingdom

T +44 (0) 1225 863 882
F +44 (0) 1225 864 950

<http://www.maplecroft.net>

Company report review

Shell

Sustainability Report 2005 –

‘Meeting the energy challenge’

Presented by: the Ethical Insight team at Maplecroft

Contents

1	Company background	3
2	Reporting practices	3
2.1	Materiality	3
2.2	Transparency	4
2.3	Comparability	4
2.4	Assurance and verification	5
3	Management structure	5
4	Review of core issues	6
4.1	The energy challenge and climate change	6
4.2	Biodiversity	7
4.3	Societal contribution	7
5	Certification	8
6	Ethical Insight's comment	9
7	Appendices	10
7.1	Maplecroft's Ethical Insight report review criteria	10
7.2	Previous Ethical Insight report reviews	11
7.3	Maplecroft's sustainability reporting services	12

Note

This review is based on information contained in the PDF download version of Shell's Sustainability Report 2005. The report is available at: <http://www.shell.com>. This review is intended as a summary only and does not provide full and complete discussion of all the issues contained in the report or on Shell's website.

1 Company background

In 2005, Royal Dutch Shell became the single, 100% parent company of Royal Dutch Petroleum Company (Netherlands) and Shell Transport and Trading Company Limited (UK). These two holding companies own 60 percent and 40 percent respectively of the following 3 subsidiaries, which are themselves holding companies for further operating subsidiaries: Shell Petroleum NV (Netherlands), Shell Petroleum Company LTD (UK) and Shell Petroleum Inc. (USA).

The three companies and their operating subsidiaries are managed worldwide by Shell International. Shell is incorporated in the UK with its corporate headquarters in The Hague, its tax residence in the Netherlands, and its primary listings on the London Stock Exchange and the Amsterdam Stock Exchange. The group operates in more than 140 countries and territories, and employs approximately 109,000 people.

Shell's upstream businesses – Exploration & Production and Gas & Power – explore for and extract oil and natural gas, and build and operate the infrastructure necessary to deliver these hydrocarbons to market. The Group produces approximately 2.5% of the world's oil and 3% of its natural gas. Shell's downstream businesses – Oil Products and Chemicals – engage in refining crude oil into a range of products including fuels, lubricants and petrochemicals. It operates the world's largest single branded retail network – some 45,000 service stations. Other small divisions include Coal, Hydrogen and Renewables and Shell aims to develop at least one alternative energy source, such as wind, hydrogen or advanced solar technology, into a substantial business.

Shell has been reporting annually on its social and environmental performance since 1997.

2 Reporting practices

Recommendations to Shell ('the Group') arising from this review have been indicated in **bold** below.

2.1 Materiality

The report takes a somewhat holistic approach to Shell's responsibilities, including not only details of the social and environmental impacts of its own operations but also acknowledging the unique relationship between energy, development and the environment. The report very clearly demonstrates the role of sustainable development in Shell's business strategy through an interview with the company's Chief Executive. The theme of 'the energy challenge' – meeting the growing demand for energy while managing the environmental and social impacts of fossil fuels – is discussed throughout the report, crosscutting the other key issues. Although the structure of the report is slightly unconventional, it covers the key issues more than adequately and makes the report very accessible.

The report focuses in detail on climate change, in particular on Shell's investment in the development of cleaner fuels, new technology and alternative energy sources. While this section is very informative, it could be improved by being clearer on **how new technologies might be used** and by setting out the company's **longer term strategic vision for cleaner and more sustainable energy**. There is also a slight danger that this information can distract from core performance data relating to the direct environmental impacts of Shell's operations which, although included, are not discussed in great detail.

Other environmental and societal concerns are addressed in a section entitled 'Other Issues', which covers biodiversity and 'Shell in Society' – split into 'Living by our Principles', 'Our People', 'Our Neighbours' and 'Our Contribution'. Shell is to be commended for its human rights reporting efforts, which extend to suppliers, contractors and joint venture partners. However, the focus is very traditional and **could be improved by greater attention to more complex issues**, such as wealth distribution in poorly governed countries and operating in conflict zones. In addition, it would be nice to see some **metrics relating to Shell's employee human rights training programmes**, for example the amount invested, number of managers trained, and a discussion of how the impacts of training might be evaluated. While adequately covered on its website, we would like to see **more on Shell's contribution to the Millennium Development Goals** in the report itself. Considering Shell's presence in Africa, we also feel that **the report should have contained more reference to the challenge of HIV/AIDS**. Again, this is discussed on Shell's website but is conspicuously absent from the report itself, especially considering that the company has a wide range of programmes in this area.

The report also contains a section discussing Shell's efforts to address environmental and societal concerns at specific projects, which is honest, well balanced and gives important context to some of the more complex issues, such as security in Nigeria. The overview of key performance data given at the end of the report is well presented but could be improved by the **inclusion of the additional metrics currently available only through the website.**

For 2005, Shell has re-focused its Sustainability Report on non-financial stakeholders and claims to have made improvements to the way it decides which issues, locations and projects should be covered by its reporting. The process involves engagement with external stakeholders through reader surveys, interviews, media reviews, public forums and scenarios workshops. The results of this engagement are combined with an assessment of which issues most affect business strategy to decide which issues should be included in the report, covered on the web or not reported. While the process for identifying material issues appears to be robust, there is a risk that it fails to identify issues of importance to wider society which are not the focus of pressure groups. We would also like to see **more qualitative and especially quantitative information on the results of external stakeholder engagement efforts** and progress towards the targets that arise from them.

2.2 Transparency

Overall, the transparency of Shell's public reporting is very good, with well-presented and comprehensive information on all issues covered. The KPI data presented in the report is complete and includes that from all companies and joint ventures where Shell owns a less than total share but has operational control. Some Shell companies voluntarily report on their social and environmental performance to their local stakeholders and these reports are available on the web. In addition to the views of the External Review Committee (see Assurance and verification), uncensored statements by members of communities affected by Shell's operations and external experts are incorporated into the report. While they are valuable and increase transparency, in future reports **we would like to see such external statements given more context.**

The report discloses positive and negative performance in all the areas covered. This includes reporting on accidents, workplace fatalities, contracts cancelled due to incompatibility with Business Principles, corruption investigations, the disclosure of fines and prosecutions for unfair practices, and the admission of mistakes made with regard to community concerns about specific projects, for example at Corrib, Ireland. The report offers comprehensive explanations of the reasons for positive and negative performance and is outstanding in that the Group's actions in response to negative performance are described for each issue.

Reporting on corruption and whistle-blowing is unusually comprehensive and includes quantitative information such as: the number and location of contractor contracts cancelled because of HSE concerns; the number of employees and contractors dismissed as a result of corruption investigations; and the number of proven incidents of bribery, facilitation payments and fraud, including resultant dismissals. This constitutes a level of transparency very rarely found in sustainability reports and substantially enhances credibility for the reader.

2.3 Comparability

The report's comparability is very good and it has been produced according to the Global Reporting Initiative's (GRI) 2002 guidelines. A full GRI index is presented on the Group's website. For future reports, it might be worth considering the **inclusion of the GRI index** in the actual report, so as to provide all relevant information in one document and increase accessibility for the reader.

Shell also continues to report in line with the International Petroleum Industry Environmental Conservation Association guidelines. Although only briefly covered in the report itself, information is available on Shell's website outlining the Group's contribution to the UN Global Compact and the Millennium Development Goals.

Shell's Health, Safety and Environment KPIs are reported according to the Group HSE Performance and Reporting Guide. Eight of the 11 KPIs are included in the new guidelines Shell has helped develop with two energy sector industry associations - the American Petroleum Institute (API) and International Petroleum Industry Environmental Conservation Association (IPIECA).

In terms of the data presented, comparability is good, and there is a clear commitment to continuous improvement. A summary section gives a brief overview of the company's operations, as measured by key performance indicators, and is supported by a clear data table which presents progress since 2001. The

section presents a clear explanation for the reasons for positive and negative performance giving further clarity and transparency. The Group recognises that some uncertainty remains in its safety and flaring data and is working to further improve data collection in the future, through further standardising procedures.

We feel the report could be improved **by inclusion of a more comprehensive data table, including all performance metrics and targets**, some of which are only available on the web. Shell could also consider **additional metrics**, for example pay discrepancies between nationals and non-nationals and reports of breaches of the Business Principles. Shell could significantly improve subsequent reports by working with other companies in the sector, perhaps through a forum such as the IPIECA, **to develop indicators that measure efforts towards a more environmentally friendly and sustainable energy future.**

2.4 Assurance and verification

For 2005, the Shell Sustainability Report as a whole was not subject to external assurance. Instead social and environmental data was included in the Group's Annual Report/Form 20-F, which is read by the Group Auditors to ensure there are no apparent misstatements or material inconsistencies with the Financial Statements. This is to be commended as it places social and environmental performance on the same level as financial performance. However, the approach does leave an assurance gap that includes the remainder of the report's content. Shell could work to close this in the future by **considering a combined Annual Report and Sustainability Report** or having **the entire Sustainability Report externally audited.**

Also in 2005, Shell piloted an External Review Committee of five experts to assess the report. The committee was guided in its appraisal by the AA1000 Assurance Standard and provided an unedited public statement, which is published in the report. Shell is one of only a small number of corporations that has used an external report review committee in this way and, as such, has taken an extremely commendable step. The inclusion of the uncensored views of communities affected by the Group's operations is also extremely worthwhile.

Without a doubt, these moves signal the Group's dedication to independent verification, transparency and continuous improvement. However, assurance could perhaps be further improved by **expanding both the size and role of the External Review Committee** to include a wider range of stakeholders and to allow for their greater involvement in decisions concerning content.

3 Management structure

The Social Responsibility Committee (SRC) of the Royal Dutch Shell plc Board, which is composed of three non-executive directors, reviews the Group's policies and performance with respect to its Business Principles, HSE standards and major issues of public concern. Sustainable development is part of the Chief Executive's responsibilities through his chairmanship of the Group Sustainable Development and HSE Planning Committee. Its members are the executives responsible for social performance, HSE and security in each business and the company-wide heads of these functions. The Committee reviews performance and sets priorities, key performance indicators and targets.

Sustainable development is part of the duties of every line manager, with support provided by HSE, security, human resources and social performance professionals. Each Shell business is responsible for complying with the Group's requirements and achieving its specific targets in this area. Compliance is monitored through an annual assurance letter process, which requires the relevant senior manager to report back to the Chief Executive on the performance of their business or country of operation in following the Group's Business Principles and standards. Results are reported to the Audit Committee of the Board.

External panels and observers are used to help monitor performance, for example, a panel of scientific experts reviews compliance with the company's animal testing standard. Community panels at a number of downstream facilities track social performance and independent observers are used to monitor Shell's efforts to reduce social and environmental impacts at specific projects, for example at the site of Sakhalin Energy's pipeline off Russia's east coast.

Although, the report gives a fairly comprehensive view of governance and structures, it is not entirely clear from the report what the **exact lines of responsibility regarding governance and reporting** from the individual business units up to the corporate level are. A **diagram** within the appropriate section could increase transparency in this respect.

Shell is a signatory of the UN Global Compact and, through its General Business Principles, the Group is supportive of a number of voluntary codes, for example the Transparency International Business Principles on Countering Bribery, and is also involved in a number of multi-stakeholder forums and partnerships, for example the World Business Council for Sustainable Development. Participation in such initiatives shows commitment to multi-stakeholder engagement but the report could be improved by giving more detail of the **extent and nature of Shell's involvement**.

4 Review of core issues

4.1 The energy challenge and climate change

4.1.1 Policy

Shell fully acknowledges the threat of climate change and the environmental crisis resulting from dependence on fossil fuels. It also recognises the importance of energy as an enabler of development and in maintaining prosperity in the developed world, while stating that 'managing the environmental and social impacts of this growing demand for fossil fuels is a crucial and complex task'.

4.1.2 Programmes

The report describes Shell's contribution to meeting the energy challenge through: increased investment; developing cleaner fuel for the transport sector; developing alternative sources of electricity; managing greenhouse gas and other environmental and social impacts from fossil fuels; maintaining a wide range of oil and natural gas sources from different regions; and working with governments, vehicle manufacturers and customers to help align incentives, raise awareness and promote new energy options.

With respect to its own greenhouse gas emissions, Shell has made a voluntary commitment to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 5% relative to 1990 by 2010, regardless of the effects of business growth. The Group plan to accomplish this in the main through continuing programmes to reduce the flaring of natural gas from oil wells (particularly in Nigeria) and to increase the energy efficiency of its oil refineries. The SPDC joint venture in Nigeria – responsible for two-thirds of total flaring – has invested \$2.3 billion dollars to reduce it, with the aim of ending it completely by 2009. Efforts to improve refinery efficiency are now incorporated into the new Business Improvement Review (BIR) process and all refineries will have completed the process by end 2006.

Other aspects of the energy challenge described relate to technical challenges regarding capture and storage of CO₂ and the development of cleaner transport fuels and commercially viable alternative energy sources. The report clearly articulates Shell's commitment to increase the use of 'greener' fossil fuels. It displays the company's quiet optimism that Shell can help meet the energy challenge by a simultaneous focus on: technological innovation; continued substantial investment in traditional and unconventional fossil fuel sources; and the development of at least one substantial renewable energy business by 2015.

4.1.3 Performance

Shell remains on track to meet its 2010 target of a 5% reduction of GHGs compared to 1990 levels. In 2005, Shell's facilities emitted 105 million tonnes of GHGs, 15% down on 1990 levels. Emissions fell seven million tonnes in 2005, reversing a slow six year rise. Energy efficiency has continuously improved since 2002 but the Group failed to meet its 2005 target, citing very ambitious targets set at several Asian refineries and interruptions due to hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico. Interestingly, the Group has chosen to report on absolute emissions, meaning it will have to cut emissions despite the move to more energy intensive methods of production (for example, from unconventional sources) and the possible effects of business expansion.

Shell's performance in relation to its other contributions to the energy challenge is difficult to measure since it is related closely to changes in business strategy and aspirations for the future. Performance metrics are not in place but the report cites a number of examples of the Group's performance, including that it: is the world's leading supplier of liquefied natural gas (LNG); is participating in projects to permanently store CO₂ underground; has invested \$1 billion in alternative energy since 2001, has the broadest alternative energy portfolio of any company; is the world's leading distributor of biofuels, has hydrogen filling stations in five

countries; is one of the largest wind power developers; and is the leading developer of next generation solar technology.

While Shell's apparent commitment to cleaner and alternative energy sources is welcome, clearer reporting on its performance in this respect would be useful. For example, it could **provide the annual spend on alternative energy** rather than cumulative figures for the last five years. Shell could significantly improve the quality of its reporting in this area by **working together with other companies in the sector to develop indicators which measure performance relating to development and roll-out of cleaner fuels and alternative energy sources**. However, it remains the case that the focus of the report on Shell's responsibility outside of its direct operations is a commendable step.

4.2 Biodiversity

4.2.1 Policy

Shell recognises the extent to which the world's ecosystems are being degraded and the report states that Shell is committed to helping to find the right balance between development and nature conservation. It was the first energy company to adopt a Biodiversity Standard and is the only one to have committed to not operating in natural World Heritage Sites. The Group has also committed to following a set of strict operating practices to minimise impact in places designated by the World Conservation Union (IUCN) as Category I-IV protected areas, and to report on activities in these areas.

4.2.2 Programmes

These commitments are in the process of being translated into specific operating requirements. The Group is preparing Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs) for operations in IUCN Category I-IV protected areas and 'High Biodiversity Areas'. It states that these should be complete by the end of 2007.

Shell has developed a Biodiversity strategy for the next five years with the emphasis on: closing the implementation gap; demonstrating delivery through improving communications and developing and implementing metrics; helping to develop best practice by participating in pilot activities; and making a positive contribution.

Shell states that its immediate challenge is to share expertise within the Group and make good practice part of everyday operations. It aims to address this through the new Project Academy and a biodiversity knowledge management system to be launched in 2006.

4.2.3 Performance

Shell remains a leader in its sector with regard to biodiversity and has made valuable commitments through adoption of its Biodiversity Standard. The report uses case studies to illustrate particular efforts to reduce biodiversity impacts at certain projects, for example work to minimise disturbance to migrating whales in the Beaufort Sea, off Alaska. The report also cites examples of Shell's work with external groups to reduce biodiversity impacts around their operations and support global biodiversity conservation. These include: work with the World Commission on Protected Areas Task Force and others to further develop the IUCN categorisation system; and a pilot programme with UNESCO to use business skills to improve the management of World Heritage Sites.

However, much work remains to be done, **including the development and implementation of metrics** and full reporting in line with the Global Reporting Initiative. Shell also needs to **articulate how it plans to implement and measure projects that make a positive contribution to conservation**. The report could also be clearer on how the new Project academy and biodiversity knowledge management system will **contribute to company-wide learning**.

4.3 Societal contribution

4.3.1 Policy

Shell believes that its biggest contribution to society is through its products, but also that its operations can make a strong, positive contribution to development.

4.3.2 Programme

Shell claims to encourage and support host government's efforts to use energy revenues widely and to enforce its policy of zero tolerance of bribes and facilitation payments. It tracks its performance against the policy in two ways. Firstly, the Shell People Survey asks all staff confidentially whether their part of the company was dealing with the outside world with integrity. Secondly, the number of proven incidents of bribery, facilitation payments and fraud is gathered by an internal system and reported to the Audit Committee of the Group's Board. Shell continues to support the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI).

Shell has programmes in place to actively promote the use of local suppliers and contractors. Actions range from providing business coaching and training, to helping local businesses meet Shell standards so they can bid for and manage contracts, to requiring participation by local contractors and suppliers. In some countries, the Group has insisted on minimum local participation in all major contracts.

Shell continues to participate in social investment but has changed the way it is managed. Programmes are now focussed on responding to issues directly linked to the Group's business and has formed partnerships with development NGOs, international agencies and national organisations. The Group encourages local communities to be closely involved in designing and running projects. For example, Shell LiveWIRE is a project established in 1982 which helps young entrepreneurs start and run their own business and now operates in over 20 countries.

Other examples of Shell's social investment include its participation as a founding member in the Climate Facility for Africa and the ongoing work of the Shell Foundation, an independent charity established in 2000 with a \$250 million endowment.

4.3.3 Performance

In 2004, 79% of respondents to the Shell People Survey said the company was dealing with the outside world with integrity and 5% said it was not. Scores have been fairly constant since the survey began in 1999. In 2005, 107 incidents of bribery, facilitation payments and fraud were reported. As a result, Shell ended their relationship with 175 staff and contractors – a significant drop from 2004. In 2005, Shell spent an estimated \$9.2 billion on goods and services from locally owned companies in low and medium income countries, up from \$6.3 billion in 2004. In 2005, Shell spent \$127 million on community programmes, up from \$106 million in 2004. The largest programmes were in Nigeria and the USA. Social investment in low income countries has risen fastest since it was first reported in 2003, almost doubling to reach \$26 million, compared to a 10% rise in high income countries.

While reporting on Shell's contribution to society is relatively thorough, there is room for improvement. The report could have **contained more discussion on how to mitigate 'the curse of oil'** and **more clarity on how economic benefits could be shared with local communities**. This could be **supplemented with additional indicators**, for example relating to pay discrepancies between nationals and non-nationals. It would also have been interesting to see **more information on Shell's contribution to the Millennium Development Goals**.

5 Certification

HSE management systems of Shell's facilities are regularly audited and all major plants are required to be externally certified to international environmental standards, for example ISO 14001. In 2005, Shell was again a constituent of the FTSE4Good and Dow Jones Sustainability indices of corporate sustainability leaders. It scored highest in the industry for 'environmental responsibility' in the 2005 Reputation Tracker Survey, which was conducted by MORI on Shell's behalf. These achievements, however, are only briefly mentioned in the report and, where possible, Shell should consider **providing the results of such assessments on its website to increase transparency and credibility** in reporting.

6 Ethical Insight's comment

4½ star rating: ★★★★★

General

Shell has produced a thorough, accessible and frank report that responds to the needs of the company's stakeholders. The report is fairly comprehensive but remains concise and readable, and is supported by an extensive web resource. There is a well balanced coverage of the issues and the report candidly discusses challenges and mistakes, setting out the steps being taken to address them. The inclusion in the report of an interview with Shell's Chief Executive on the role of sustainable development in Shell's business strategy demonstrates that sustainability issues and performance are taken seriously by the company.

Content

Worthy of special mention is the focus of the report on the challenge of providing secure and sustainable energy. Shell clearly sees that it has responsibilities in this regard, which lie outside of the direct social and environmental impacts of its operations. This is commendable and the next steps will be to work to develop performance metrics for the industry which can allow sound comparisons of the progress being made towards a sustainable energy future. However, in future reports Shell must be careful that the focus on its contribution to cleaner fuels and alternative energy sources does not distract from core performance metrics on the company's direct environmental and social impacts. Indeed, there is also a danger that aggregation of the other key issues in this report has led to Shell's efforts in these some areas – for example HIV/AIDS – being undersold.

Other positive steps Shell has taken this year include its use of an External Review Committee and the inclusion of stakeholder views in the report. In future reports we hope to see an expanded review committee, which includes a wider array of stakeholders and which has an expanded role in the decisions on report content. The inclusion of social and environmental data in the Group's Annual Report is welcome but Shell should be wary of an assurance gap relating to the remaining contents of its Sustainability Report. This could be resolved by the production of a combined financial and sustainability report, or by external assurance of the entire Sustainability Report.

Presentation

The report is extremely well laid out, with good mix of text, data and case studies. There is also good explanation of the more technical issues. The structure is slightly unconventional but works very well and has obviously been designed with the external stakeholder very much in mind. Particularly valuable are the case studies which document Shell's environmental and social performance and challenges at some of its strategic locations and projects, for example in Nigeria.

Some minor suggestions for improvement in terms of presentation would be: a slight shift in the balance of the report away from future aspirations and towards actual achievements; inclusion of the GRI index in the actual report; inclusion of a page which clearly lays out achievements and challenges; and inclusion of the full range of performance metrics which are available on the web.

7 Appendices

7.1 Maplecroft's Ethical Insight report review criteria

Maplecroft's Ethical Insight report reviews are based on a four-pillar framework, taking into account reporting practices, corporate responsibility management structure, management systems (policy, programme and performance), and certification. The review of management systems considers the company's core issues as identified by the company in its report and by Maplecroft on the basis of the company's industry sector. Maplecroft is currently developing a map of core issues by sector which will be available shortly. The report review criteria are not comprehensive, but are designed to highlight the most significant practices and performance within each company, as well as important omissions and areas for improvement in future reporting.

- **Reporting practices** are reviewed on the basis of four key reporting principles:
 - Materiality: Does the report cover all the key issues relevant to the sector? Does the report provide the context and relevance of each issue to the company? Has the company engaged with key stakeholders in identifying and exploring material issues?
 - Transparency: Does the report disclose regulatory non-compliance? Does the report make other sensitive or groundbreaking disclosures? Is there public reporting at the local level?
 - Comparability: Does the company report in accordance with the GRI guidelines or other external metrics? Have internal metrics and data collection/management systems been developed? Does the report clearly present key indicators and targets?
 - Assurance and verification: What type of assurance and verification are provided? What is the scope of assurance and verification? What are the feedback / results of the assurance and verification process?
- **Management structure** is assessed on the basis of three main criteria: Is there a board level CSR Committee (or equivalent) in place? Is there a dedicated CSR network in place? Has the company signed up to any best practice principles or external bodies?
- **Management systems** incorporate principles (governance level), policies (strategic level), procedure and guidance (executive level) and practise (operational level). For a selection of the company's core issues, Maplecroft reviews policy, programme and performance.
- **Certification** refers to the company's listing on sustainability indices, such as the FTSE4Good and Dow Jones; external certification such as SA8000 and ISO14001; and any external awards received during the reporting year.

7.2 Previous Ethical Insight report reviews

Ethical Insight includes a review of a company sustainability report in each fortnight's edition. These reviews, together with the original report, can be accessed from the Maplecroft website at <http://www.maplecroft.net>.

Previous Maplecroft reviews are as follows:

- ABN Amro Sustainability Report 2003 and 2005
- Alcan Corporate Sustainability Report 2004 and 2005
- Alcatel - Sustainable Development Report 2004
- Anglo American Report to Society 2004 and 2005
- BAA Annual Report 2003/2004
- BAE Systems Corporate Responsibility Report 2003
- BBC Corporate Sustainability Report 2004
- BHP Billiton Sustainability Report 2005
- BP Sustainability Review 2004
- Cadbury Schweppes Corporate and Social Responsibility Report 2004
- Citigroup Citizenship Report Review 2004
- Coca-Cola's 2004 Citizenship Report
- Commerzbank Corporate Responsibility Report 2005
- Co-operative Group corporate responsibility report 2003
- Ford Sustainability Report 2004/05
- HSBC Corporate Social Responsibility Report 2004
- Hydro Corporate Social Responsibility Annual Report 2003
- Marks & Spencer Corporate Social Responsibility Report 2005
- Merck Corporate Responsibility Report 2005
- NEC Corporate Social Responsibility Report 2005
- Nike Corporate Responsibility Report 2004
- Rio Tinto Sustainable Development Review 2004 and 2005
- Royal Bank of Scotland's Corporate Responsibility Report 2004
- Royal Mail Corporate Responsibility Report 2004
- RWE Corporate Responsibility Report 2003
- Shell Foundation 'Enterprise solutions to poverty' Report 2005
- Standard Chartered 2004 Corporate Responsibility Report
- TPG annual report 2003
- TPG Corporate Sustainability Report 2004
- Unilever Social and Environmental Reports 2004
- Vodafone Corporate Social Responsibility Report 2003/04
- Volkswagen Sustainability Report 2005/06
- WestLB Sustainability Report 2005
- Westpac Stakeholder Impact Report 2004

7.3 Maplecroft's sustainability reporting services

Maplecroft works with global organisations across all sectors, providing a range of specialist corporate responsibility advisory services. Further details about the wider range of Maplecroft services and the Maplecroft team are available at <http://www.maplecroft.net>.

In the area of sustainability reporting, we have considerable expertise in the full range of management systems that underlie effective social and environmental reporting, including auditing, indicators, monitoring, impact assessment and performance management. Maplecroft is also experienced in report writing, verification and assurance, having contributed substantively to several award winning reports.

The Ethical Insight team is also able to provide independent assurance and verification services of the highest standard, including in accordance with GRI and AA1000 criteria.

Maplecroft has developed a number of proprietary tools to assist companies in the reporting process. Specifically, we have developed the *Principles-plus multi-audit etool*, a practical and comprehensive auditing method that brings together a host of social and environmental standards, international best practice principles and instruments of corporate citizenship in a set of worksheets. The tool is designed to help companies assess their conformance with best practice requirements and identify the specific areas in which performance can be improved. A corrective action request form assists in the performance management process.

Maplecroft has also developed a *Human rights monitoring mechanism*, a straightforward electronic human rights survey, which can be used and adapted by companies to provide a detailed picture of human rights risk in its operations around the world. The survey assesses the human rights situation and management systems in place at the country level which, together with external country and issue specific human rights research, allow for a detailed analysis of the company's risk of complicity in human rights violations, and specific recommended action points.

The Ethical Insight team comprise fully trained and experienced SA8000 and ISO14001 auditors.

Please call us or email to discuss how our award winning Ethical Insight team might help:

info@maplecroft.com or + 44 (0)1225 863882.



Maplecroft
Maplecroft House
Bath Road
Bradford on Avon
BA15 2PE
United Kingdom

T +44 (0) 1225 863 882

F +44 (0) 1225 864 950

<http://www.maplecroft.net>