Abstract: The prospects for implementation of the Caux Principles for Business on a broader scale. Caux code compared to other global codes (e.g. UN Global Compact, Global Sullivan Principles) and their relative strengths and weaknesses. The role of transparency and public accountability, along with examples of successes in implementation and reporting, will be compared. Also examined will be mandatory public reporting of firm’s activities, independent monitoring, rewards and/or sanctions for adherence to code.
The Caux Round Table *Principles for Business:*

*Comparison and Prospect*

In the aftermath of World War II the nations of the world attempted to develop codes that would encourage international business to be more just. Seeking a mechanism for negotiating international disputes and to avoid another world war, they formed the United Nations in 1946. Representatives of the assembled nations then wrote The United Nations *Declaration of Human Rights* in 1948 as an example of such an early code. Following this the International Labor Organization (ILO) formulated the *Tripartite Declaration* in 1977, as an attempt to encourage fair wages and humane working conditions. These early attempts of the United Nations to develop codes of conduct received considerable publicity, but the codes had little impact on business behavior.

The contemporary global economy is guided by market competition which brings efficiencies, so to provide better quality goods and services at a lower cost. Globalization has also brought jobs, investment and new technologies to many poor peoples. However, reports have documented the disparities in income and wealth that develop, as those people and nations who possess resources are able to obtain a greater share of benefits, while those who have little resources or skills fall further behind (World Development Report, 2003; Tavis, 2000). Hence, there is a need for effective guidelines for the operation of the international economy that will take into account current inequities, and thus the interests of all people. Globalization, or as some call it Americanization, or marketization, accelerates this problem. The experience of every country in the early stages of industrialization is that market forces in themselves
encourage lower wages, long hours, poor working conditions and shifting the costs stemming from pollution onto others in the larger community.

One generally expects it to be the responsibility of the host country to set fair standards for wages, working conditions and pollution. However, this does not work well in poor countries. There is an overabundance of potential workers and work sites in poorer nations; therefore these countries do not have the negotiating power to insist on living wages, humane working conditions and reducing pollution (Sethi, 2003). Or put as a question, What can be done about global resources that are directed at productivity and growth at the expense of so many who are left behind with no institution to represent them? (Tavis, 2000).

Let us examine the prospect of formal international treaties as an attempt to address this inequity. International treaties and agreements have been effective in encouraging world trade. Note, for example, NAFTA, The European Union and the World Trade Organization. However, on issues such as human rights and the environment, international agreements have not been very effective. The United States, for example, has refused to support many of these proposed agreements. President George W. Bush withdrew the U.S. from the Kyoto Protocol on global warming (now often referred to as global climate change). Even though most countries of the world supported these agreements, the U.S. has also refused to support the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the International Agreement to Ban Antipersonnel Land Mines and the International Criminal Court. Some commentators have characterized U.S. policy over the last few decades as incoherent and inconsistent. In addition, the G. W. Bush administration’s posture is seen by people in other countries as isolationist and unilateral (Kupchan, 2002). The U.S. is the wealthiest and most powerful nation in the world, so this U.S. policy which is not restricted
to the Bush administration makes it unlikely that there will be effective worldwide agreements on policies that effect child labor, working conditions, and environmental degradation. This makes the possibility of voluntary codes of business conduct one of the few remaining avenues available to address the problems of wages, working conditions and the environment.

**Origin of the Caux Round table Principles for Business**

This conference focuses on global codes of business conduct. One of the more notable global codes of conduct is the Caux Round Table’s (CRT) *Principles for Business*. The Caux Round Table consists of senior business executives from Europe, Japan, United States, Mexico, Thailand, Ghana, Lebanon, Czech Republic and many other nations. The group was founded in 1986, and their *Principles for Business* were formulated in 1994. CRT now has active members on all continents. The *Principles* have been translated into more than 15 languages, and have been used as benchmarks for firm’s codes throughout the world.

The Caux *Principles* are aspirational. That is, they are proposed as a model, starting point and benchmark when executives write or attempt to improve their own firm’s code of business conduct. The *Principles* have credibility because they were written by and have been actively supported by senior business executives from around the world. For example, shortly after the development of the Caux *Principles*, Japanese business executive Ryuzaburo Kaku, Canon founder and CEO, described how the *Principles* established a solid business foundation for Canon and how they provided a rationale for equitable stakeholder relations and for working together for the common good (Kaku, 1997). In addition, executives at the Bank of America, as well as business leaders in Russia, China, Lebanon, Malaysia, Australia and the Netherlands have
used the Caux *Principles* as a starting point in developing their own codes of conduct (Cavanagh, in press; MacGregor, 2000). The Caux Round Table continues as an active group of executives who meet regularly. They care about the well being of all peoples, and present position papers on issues of global concern. A more proactive recent focus of the CRT is to contribute to the alleviation of world poverty and to make it possible for poor nations to share in global prosperity (CRT website). Note a hopeful element here: we witness an organization of top international business executives from large corporations who are attempting to bring justice and equity to all, including poor peoples of the world.

Early global dissemination of the *Principles for Business* occurred in 1995 at the Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, when the International Association of Jesuit Business Schools (IAJBS) opted to support the *Principles* (See International Association of Jesuit Business Schools website). The deans of some 60 business schools from around the world agreed to make the *Principles* known to their students, alumni/ae and their local business community. Thus in the late 1990s the *Principles* were taught in business schools in Barcelona, Bogota, Buenos Aires, Detroit, Los Angeles, Mexico City, Milwaukee, Monterrey, New Orleans and numerous other cities world wide (Cavanagh, 2000). This commitment of the IAJBS was renewed in 2004. In addition, the Caux Principles are also deemed appropriate in China to help the adaptation of previously state-owned firms to the free market (Enderle, 2000).

The Caux *Principles* are more comprehensive than, for example, the *UN Global Compact with Business* or the *Global Sullivan Principles*. The philosophical foundations of the *Principles*, human dignity and living and working together for the common good, are clearly articulated. In addition the CRT has sponsored conferences demonstrating that the *Principles* are
supported by the three of the major world religions: Jewish, Islamic and Christian. Moreover, the CRT *Principles* are broader than the other codes. Nevertheless, some issues are not covered by Caux. Among the issues not covered are: paying fair taxes, right of employees to organize collectively, accurate advertising and labeling, safe packaging, preventive measures to avoid environmental harm, promotion of international environmental standards, and a special concern for the poor and disadvantaged. However, it can be argued that some of the omitted items are contained implicitly in the Caux *Principles*, especially in the Caux general principles.

Business executives often object to global codes for at least two reasons. First, they are suspicious that such a code will be a forerunner to global regulation. Most domestic or international regulations are opposed by executives, because the regulations limit their freedom of action. Second, executives fear that activists will abuse such good faith pledges by publicly criticizing or even suing a firm if that firm is unable to accomplish its own pledge to meet the standards set by a code (Kline, 2000).

The Caux Round table has sought to sidestep the above criticisms by developing a self-assessment and improvement process (SAIP). This process enables a firm to check its own policies and activities against the *Principles for Business* code. This information is fed back to executives in the firm, so that improvements can be made. The process is also set up such that an executive can compare her/his own operations against the operations of other firms (Goodpaster, Maines and Rovang, 2002). This process, and a case history demonstrating how SAIP works, is discussed in another paper in our panel at this conference.

**Comparison of Global Codes**

The global codes that we will compare to the Caux *Principles for Business* are *The
Business Charter for Sustainable Development, The CERES (Coalition for Environmentally Sustainable Development) Principles, the Global Sullivan Principles and the United Nations Global Compact with Business. The first two of these codes were written in the early 1990s and focus largely on environmental issues. The latter three of these codes are broader in scope and were written a few years later. These codes, including the Caux Principles, cover human rights, the working person, as well as environmental issues each of the five codes had input from business executives, and each has received considerable international attention. The codes, the authors and their sponsors, and the dates in which they were first published are listed in Table 1.
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The CERES Principles were occasioned by the disastrous accident of the U.S. oil tanker, Exxon Valdez, belonging to Exxon Mobil (then Exxon Corp.) which ran aground in Prince Edward Sound, Alaska, on March, 24, 1989. The tanker ruptured and lost more than 240,000 barrels or 11 million gallons of crude oil. The resulting thick black toxic goo spread and thus ruined fisheries, 1,100 miles of shoreline and killed 33,000 birds and tens of thousands of marine life. Exxon eventually paid more than $1.2 billion in clean-up, fines and compensation costs. And they are still being sued by the Native Americans for destroying their livelihood of fishing. The CERES Principles were written by a coalition of investor, environmental and business firms in an attempt to bring order, safety and responsibility to businesses on environmental issues. The CERES coalition see themselves as a leader in standardizing corporate reporting on the environment and as a catalyst for making measurable improvements in companies environmental
practices (Waddock, 2002). The CERES Principles have received wide attention and have accomplished much, especially in North America. In 1997 the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) was spun off from CERES. We will discuss GRI later.

*The Business Charter for Sustainable Development* was written by executives and government representations from the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), which is headquartered in Paris, France. The charter writing committee was chaired by executives from BP and Dupont, two firms that have relatively good environmental records. It was written because of the conviction that business shares the view that there should be a common goal, not a conflict, between economic development and environmental protection, both now and for future generations. The *Charter* consists of 16 principles, and firms are asked to sign that they will abide by it. The *Charter* has been translated into 20 languages, including all the official languages of the United Nations. According to ICC, 2300 firms have signed the *Charter* (see International Chamber of Commerce website). Note that the CERES and ICC environmental principles were written in the early 1990s, whereas the UN Compact, Sullivan and Caux codes that also embrace human rights and workplace issues were written several years later.

The first Sullivan Principles focused the attention and eventually the pressure of global business firms on changing the blatantly segregationist government of South Africa. They were successful in peacefully shifting the government of then apartheid South Africa to a democracy, giving voting power to black citizens (Sethi and Williams, 2001).

Two decades later in 1999, when facing global exploitation, discrimination and unsafe treatment of many workers, Rev. Leon Sullivan announced the *Global Sullivan Principles*. The *Global Principles* urge firms to work toward the common goals of human rights, social justice and economic opportunity (Global Sullivan Principles website). Similar to the earlier set of principles, firms are asked to endorse them and thus pledge to live by these principles. The eight simple principles have been endorsed by many large, mostly U.S. based multinational firms, such
as American Airlines, British Airways, Coca-Cola, Ford Motor, General Motors, Hallmark Cards, Hershey Foods, Hughes Electronics, PepsiCo, Pfizer, Procter & Gamble, Quaker Oats and Shell. Charismatic Rev. Leon Sullivan died in 2001, but the signers of the Principles are still invited to an annual meeting, and are asked to submit a report which is posted on the *Global Sullivan Principles* website. There was independent monitoring of the firms which signed the earlier *Sullivan Principles* on South Africa, but this is not true for the *Global Sullivan Principles*; there has been no independent audit or monitoring of how firms adhere to them.

The United Nations *Global Compact with Business* was born when United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan was invited to give a major address to world business and political leaders at the World Economic Forum in 1999. He warned global business leaders that we have underestimated the fragility of the global economy. People around the world fear and distrust the resulting loss of jobs, trashing the environment and the huge rewards that go to a few, while leaving the vast majority very poor. Annan warned that this could lead to widespread unrest and even civil wars and terrorism.

To counter potential civil strife, Annan proposed a global compact for business firms. For firms that sign, the United Nations would on one hand support the open global market and signing business firms on the other hand would pledge to support human rights, worker standards and sustainable environmental practices. The resulting *United Nations Global Compact* consists of nine principles that seek to protect human rights, worker rights and the environment. In order to join the *Compact*, the CEO of the signing firm is expected to send a letter to the UN Global Compact office to that effect. The firm also pledges to report once a year on how they have accomplished some element of the nine principals (*Global Compact*, 2003; Kell and Levin, 2002). Eight hundred firms have signed the *Global Compact*, among them, BP, Cisco Systems, DaimlerChrysler, Deloitte Touche, Dupont, Hewlett-Packard, Novartis, Shell, Unilever and Volvo (Kell, 2003). The United Nations, NGOs and signatory firms are currently working on a
The United Nations is unable politically nor does it have the resources, to police the signing firms. It does post on the United Nations Global Compact website the reports that each firm submits. There is no monitoring, so the United Nations has been accused of providing its logo for companies that sign, and that many of those firms use the logo as a public relations ploy, yet continue to act in the same irresponsible fashion. This behavior has been dubbed bluewashing (Sethi, 2003). The United Nations Global Compact with Business would be more effective if there were third party audits to certify the claims in the annual reports. This could be done by means of a mandate that member firms follow the protocol set forth in the Global Reporting Initiative. Shell and a few other firms have already have implemented this step. Some outside groups such as CorpWatch and World CSR choose a few firms who have signed the Compact to do independent monitoring, and they offer specific comments on those firms and the ICC (Bruno, 2002; CorpWatch website).

The CERES Principles and the Business Charter for Sustainable Development address environmental issues. The Global Sullivan Principles are most concerned about human rights and equal employment opportunity. The CRT Principles for Business and the United Nations Global Compact with Business cover environmental, worker rights and working conditions. In recent years each of the above organizations have begun to support each other in making the codes known and in implementation schemes. See Table 2 for an overview of the issues that are covered by each of the codes.

Table 2 about here

Transparency and Public Accountability

A code that does not have some method of providing transparency and public
accountability is not much more than good intentions. As a scholar who has contributed to and examined codes for several decades put it, a code without teeth is not worth the commitment (Post, 2000). Many of the large accounting and consulting firms have developed staffs that will do monitoring. However, some claim that such firms face a conflict of interest, since they are hired and paid by the very firms on which they are expected to issue an objective report.

Clothing retailer, The Gap, has enlisted independent monitoring of some of its facilities that manufacture clothing (Schilling, 2000). On environmental issues, reporting on performance has become more common, although the monitors are often not independent (Massie, 2000).

The International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) helped to shape and was one of the first organizations to join the *United Nations Global Compact with Business*, which will be discussed below. On the other hand, the ICC has been criticized as being merely a lobbying group for 7000 corporate members, which currently violates several principles of the *UN Global Compact*. In addition, CorpWatch charges that the ICC has a long history of vigorously working to weaken international environmental treaties, such as the Kyoto Protocol and the Convention on Biodiversity. CorpWatch charges that when posting on its website the report of a firm which has signed the *Business Charter for Sustainable Development*, the ICC presents: isolated, non-verifiable initiatives however insignificant and unrepresentative of the company’s record (Bruno and Karliner, 2002; CorpWatch website). Note however that the critique suffers from the same weakness: it is largely based on anecdote, rather than any systematic data gathering.

There has been some independent monitoring of apparel retailers and their suppliers. In a U.S. Department of Labor survey of 42 U.S. firms which sell apparel, few of those firms said that they had taken steps to make certain that workers in overseas manufacturing facilities know that they have a code of ethics for the workplace. Only three retailing firms said that they require all contractors to post their code. These firms, The Gap, Liz Claiborne and Phillips Van Heusen, have translated their codes into numerous local languages and require that the code be posted in
all facilities. Nike and Sara Lee said that their code is posted in some facilities (U.S. Department of Labor, 1996).

Managers in two thirds of 70 foreign apparel supplier firms surveyed indicated that they were aware of the codes of their U.S. customers. When the survey directors visited the supplier countries they found that awareness of the codes was highest among managers in El Salvador, Guatemala, Dominican Republic, Honduras and the Philippines (in that order). However, few of the workers were aware of the codes of conduct and fewer still understood the implications of the code. Ethics training programs for managers or workers were even less common among the apparel manufacturers, as were a firm's ombudsperson; less than 20% had either.

In this survey, 8 of 42 U.S. retailers had no monitoring system. Another 28 firms had placed the monitoring responsibility on their own internal managers. Twelve firms relied on their own purchasing agents to monitor. Only 4 of the 42 used an outside monitor, and of these only two used a non governmental organization (NGO) as an independent monitor. Of the 70 plants manufacturing apparel and exporting to the U.S., 90% said that their customers monitored some workplace safety and health issues, such as ventilation systems and fire escapes. Most of the monitoring visits were announced in advance; only 18% were unannounced. Most of the monitoring is focused on product quality, health and safety issues. Few inquire about issues such as child labor. When the supply chain leading to the U.S. purchaser is longer (for example, manufacturer, to subcontractor, to contractor, to buying agents, etc.), it is more difficult to monitor working conditions. While retailers such as Wal-Mart or Macy have contracts that contain a section excluding child labor, there is no independent monitoring of this provision of the contract. The retailer takes the word of the subcontractor that they do not employ child labor.

Manufacturers and suppliers to U.S. markets very much want to keep this business, because it is most profitable. If they loose their U.S. or European customers, they must rely on their far less profitable domestic markets. Therefore, this gives the firms from wealthy countries
which purchases and sells the product considerable leverage to insist on fair labor standards, a safe and clean environment and even decent wages, if they choose to do so.

The Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) began in 1997, after it was spun off from the Coalition for Environmentally Responsible Economies (CERES). GRI provides a structure whereby a firm can publicly report on its business activities over three sets of criteria: economic, social and environmental (sometimes called the triple bottom line). It currently has 416 organizations in 43 countries that participate in doing an annual report on economic, social and environmental issues (Global Reporting Initiative website). In the U.S. 51 firms participate and thus report. These firms include: 3M, AMD, Alcoa, Dupont, Ford Motor, General Motors, Hewlett Packard, IBM, Intel, Interface, J&J, and 40 other large firms. The annual report of each of these firms is on the website of GRI, and can be accessed by anyone (see the Global Reporting Initiative website).

The GRI also operates as an environmental reporting mechanism for the United Nations Global Compact and also for the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises. The OECD, in cooperation with many intergovernmental and nongovernmental groups, has also developed A Working Set of Core Indicators for Measuring Global Development Progress. These indicators are straightforward and quite useable measures of economic, social, environmental and general development in the respective countries (see Waddock, 2002; Development Indicators, OECD website). Some firms have taken the lead in auditing and monitoring their own suppliers. Mattel, the toy retailer, has been cited as a leader in charging an independent monitor to audit and monitor its suppliers (Sethi, 2003).

The Caux Round Table's Principles for Business are not intended to be a code that is to be signed and on which one reports. It is intended as a guide and benchmark for building a firm’s own code of ethical conduct. A method for the implementation of the Principles is the
Self-Assessment and Improvement Process (SAIP). The SAIP is a mechanism for self
examination for the purpose of improving performance on the major issues that are presented in
the CRT *Principles for Business*.

There are now many organizations that have presented codes and instruments for
measuring corporate social and environmental performance. These codes and instruments vary
widely in their goals, authors, country of origin and effectiveness. Each contributes something to
the effort to monitor corporate performance and inform corporate stakeholders of a firm’s
successes and failures. Given this variety, there is an increasing need for cooperation and
focusing among the various global organizations that seek to bring transparency, fairness and
trust to global business operations. For an overview of the strengths and weaknesses of the five
codes examined here, see Table 3.

----------------------------------

Table 3 about here

c----------------------------------

**Summary and Conclusion**

Each of the social and environmental initiatives for global businesses reported on in this
paper have brought about some social and environmental benefits to society, even though the
benefits might not be great. Currently some cooperation exists among these organizations, such
that they are now working together appropriately to bring better information to citizens and
potential investors. They are part of a social contracting process that is gradually evolving global
norms and changing the rules of the game. As such, these codes, even though they will probably
never attain the strength of law through binding global agreements, contribute to the
development of these international policy regimes. Such regimes encourage governments and
corporations to engage in functionally useful behaviors, as if they were the rules of the game
(Windsor, 2003).
On the other hand, given the present state of global free market anarchy, and the resulting difficulty of obtaining transparency and monitoring, let alone sanctions, of business firm’s activities, one might be pessimistic about the future of international business behavior. However, the five codes we have discussed above plus dozens of other more focused codes, have contributed to increasing public expectations of a firm’s responsibilities, and thus form international policy regimes that may eventually change the rules of the game itself. Nevertheless, we must admit that day is still a long way off.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Authors of Code</th>
<th>Year Initiated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CERES Principles</td>
<td>Business executives and environmentalists</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Coalition for environmentally responsible economics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Charter for</td>
<td>International Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caux Round Table’s</td>
<td>Business executives from Europe, Japan and the U.S.</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles for Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Sullivan Principles</td>
<td>Rev. Leon Sullivan and business executives</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>Kofi Annan and global business executives</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Compact with Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

**Issues Covered by Global Codes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues Covered in Code</th>
<th>CERES Principles</th>
<th>C. for Sustainable Development</th>
<th>Global Sullivan Principles</th>
<th>UN Global Compact</th>
<th>Caux RT Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental management</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate consumers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable materials &amp; Practices</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support human rights</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Equal Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow employees to organize</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not bribe</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclose info to investors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair to suppliers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster open markets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize government’s role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect local cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report firm performance</td>
<td>GRP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SAIP³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure and audit</td>
<td>GRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>GRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Business Charter for Sustainable Development
2. Global Reporting Initiative
3. Self-Assessment and Improvement Process —— a self-monitoring process
## Table 3
Advantages and Disadvantages of Selected Global Codes for Businesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CERES</strong></td>
<td>Authors: bus, NGOs, investors</td>
<td>Limited to environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support of institutional investors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of GRI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charter</strong></td>
<td>International origin</td>
<td>Limited to environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on the environment</td>
<td>Criticized for being too pro-business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authored by ICC</td>
<td>Little input from NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No monitoring or sanctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sullivan</strong></td>
<td>Prestige of Rev. L. Sullivan</td>
<td>Death of Rev. Leon Sullivan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post annual report on website</td>
<td>Uncertain future of Principles &amp; reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No monitoring or sanctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UN Compact</strong></td>
<td>Global prestige of UN as sponsor</td>
<td>No outside monitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post annual report on website</td>
<td>No sanctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grassroots Learning forums</td>
<td>Few standards for reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sign, but do little: Bluewashing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRT</strong></td>
<td>Authors are business executives</td>
<td>No outside monitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principles</strong></td>
<td>Global reach of CRT</td>
<td>No sanctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit ethical foundations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principles are broad goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self improvement assessment (SAIP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Charter = Business Charter for Sustainable Development  
CERES = Council for Environmentally Responsible Economics *Principles*  
Sullivan = *Global Sullivan Principles*  
UN Compact = *United Nations Global Compact with Business*  
CRT Principles = *Caux Round Table Principles for Business*