

Comparative Summary of Existing Indicator Sets Part 2 - Corporate, Community, State Levels

	GRI	Sustainable Seattle	Santa Monica	Oregon	New Jersey
1. Overview Information					
a. Initiator, Institutional Home, Date Project Established	CERES (Coalition for Environmentally Responsible Economics) 1997	Citizen Group called Sustainable Seattle 1992	Task Force on Environment began in early 1990's. Program adopted by City Council and first report published in 1994	Oregon Progress Board – an independent state planning and oversight agency. 1989 – created OPB to advance the 20 year strategic plan	Initiated by NJ Future, NGO representing a diverse group of non-profits, businesses. Later, a joint project with the Governor's Office. NJ Sustainable State Institute created in 2002 as permanent institutional home with formal links to, but independent of, government. Begun in 1995. Goals and indicators released in 1999.
b. Scale and Aggregation	Business (primarily corporate) Low level of aggregation; mostly simple indicators	City/Country No aggregation; mostly simple indicators to address specific issue.	City No aggregation	State (Oregon) but can be used at county level Low level of aggregation; mostly simple indicators	State (NJ), intended to be scaleable to communities. A few simple ratios but generally not aggregated.
c. Scope and Resulting Indicator Categories (see crosswalk for list of indicators)	Wide scope to include: - Economic - Environmental - Social Indicator selection done by individual companies	Scope covers environment, social and economic issues. Five main categories: 1. Environment 2. Population and Resources 3. Economy 4. Youth and Education 5. Health and	Initial scope included 4 goal areas with environmental emphasis; currently expanded to 8 broader areas. The 2001 revision included 8 goal areas: 1. Resource	Broad scope to cover environmental, economic and social issues. Seven main categories with 90 indicators (or benchmarks) in total: 1. Economy 2. Education 3. Civic engagement 4. Social support	Comprehensive, 11 goal areas: 1. Economic Vitality 2. Equity 3. Strong Community, Culture and Recreation 4. Quality Education 5. Good Government 6. Decent Housing

	GRI	Sustainable Seattle	Santa Monica	Oregon	New Jersey
		Community	Conservation 2. Transportation 3. Environmental and Public Health 4. Economic Development 5. Open Space/Land use 6. Housing 7. Community Education and Civic Partnership 8. Human Dignity	5. Public safety 6. Community development 7. Environment	7. Healthy People 8. Efficient Transportation and Land Use 9. Natural and Ecological Integrity 10. Protected Natural Resources 11. Minimal Pollution and Waste
d. Goals, Targets, and Benchmarks	No	No	Yes, Continuous process since 1994 of setting goals and indicators. Most goals met. In 2001 revised the goals and indicators.	Three main goals, several objectives related to the goals; targets set for 2005 and 2010.	Indicators related to 11 broad goals. Targets, developed or adopted by state gov., exist for 1/3 of 41 indicators. Target setting ongoing and included as part of public process.
e. Framework/ Concepts	Economic-environmental-social aspects framework; Hierarchy for indicators: - Categories - Aspects - Indicators	Social, economic, environmental themes	Simple indicators organised in an issue-based framework of 4 key areas (in 2001 these have been expanded to 8 areas. Each indicator is linked to a goal and/or target.	Vision – goals (three key goals from above) – categories (see above) – benchmarks.	Broad strategic (outcome/state) indicators linked to broad goals, with quantitative targets attached to some indicators. Sister entity inside state government develops strategies to implement goals. Intended to achieve separation of target setting and indicator tracking from policy and politics.

	GRI	Sustainable Seattle	Santa Monica	Oregon	New Jersey
f. Presentation and Communication	2000 Guidelines available both online and as hard copy. Web links to individual companies reports.	Printed report available for purchase. Some indicators available online.	Printed reports with the indicators and targets for several years available.	Oregon Benchmarks are available both online and as hard copy version.	Clear graphs and compelling narrative. Sophisticated media outreach. Available online.
2. Indicator Development Process					
a. Purpose of and Audience for Indicators	To harmonise sustainability reporting by companies worldwide; the audience is primarily businesses	Primarily educational – to raise awareness about sustainability in the city of Seattle.	City of Santa Monica. To track progress toward sustainability. Intended users are the local government, community	Raise awareness; assist local decision making; goals – educated workforce, healthy surroundings, safe, caring & engaged communities.	Goals and indicators are for general consumption, but are intended to be one part of new governance scheme integrating other levels of detail.
b. Organizational Setup and Participation	GRI Secretariat is aiming to become an independent institution Wide range of stakeholders consulted – NGOs, business and financial services, government, consultants, foundations, academia, labour	Volunteer group collects the data and published reports Broad community participation – academia, NGOs, consultants, community members, etc.	Initiated by the local government. Wide range of local participants.	OPB consists of 10-member panel, including citizens, and chaired by the governor. Broad community involvement	Independent Institute with formal sanction from state government. Housed at a consortium of universities, governed by a board with representation from state agencies, NGOs, academics and businesses. Not dominated by any entity. Broad stakeholder process, controlled by governing board of NJSSI, with formal input from state government. Parallel strategic planning process, to achieve goals, occurs in state agencies and results in state government implementation report.

	GRI	Sustainable Seattle	Santa Monica	Oregon	New Jersey
c. Authority/ Institutional Arrangements for Ongoing Reporting/ Funding	<p>Voluntary reporting by companies; currently about 100 companies are using the indicator guidelines.</p> <p>Foundations (UN, Gates, Ford, Rockefeller Brothers, US EPA, etc)</p>	Grassroots group volunteered time and fund raising was ongoing issue	The SCM is part of the City of Santa Monica, Environmental Programs Division.		<p>Legislative funding, executive order, relatively broad support from business, media and NGO community.</p> <p>NJSSI will release goals, indicators and targets on an annual or biannual basis. At regular intervals NJSSI will convene a broad formal public process to revise them.</p> <p>Initial funding from State Government. In the future funding is intended to be 1/3 gov, 1/3 business, 1/3 foundations.</p>
3. Results					
a. Achievements and Known Impacts	Achieved broad international, multi-stakeholder support. Revised and improved the guidelines. Moving toward establishing an independent GRI institution of companies using the guidelines.	Created a vision, provided data, raised awareness, brought people together, affected decisions, influenced nation-wide and internationally. . Has influenced many other initiatives worldwide.	Developed and tracked the progress toward small set of indicators.	Several legislative bills initiated; state government involved; raised awareness.	Developing (in progress) a new institute, and function and technique of governance for NJ. Many state agencies made specific, yet modest, changes to meet the goals. They are impacting many NGOs and businesses in non-linear ways. The whole shebang survived two Gubernatorial transitions.

	GRI	Sustainable Seattle	Santa Monica	Oregon	New Jersey
b. Lessons Learned	Developed indicators are useful primarily for large corporations; difficult to use at facility level; good for external communication but not for internal decision-making; need to define sustainable company.	Need to focus more on the process of developing the indicators rather than “burn” all resources on calculating and publishing the indicators	When program has key management support and funding it can flourish	Difficult to monitor such a large number of indicators	To be credible and meaningful, indicators can not be wholly a function or subsidiary of government. They must have formal links to government. Indicators are only as important and valuable as the people, process, and institutions that created them. The purpose and use of indicators should be clearly identified before they are created.

1. Global Reporting Initiative, <http://www.globalreporting.org>
2. Sustainable Seattle, <http://www.scn.org/sustainable/susthome.html>
3. Santa Monica Sustainable City Program, <http://pen.ci.santa-monica.ca.us/environment/policy/>
4. Oregon Benchmarks, <http://www.econ.state.or.us/opb/>
5. New Jersey Living with the Future in Mind, <http://www.njfuture.org/HTMLSrc/SSR/>