This briefing presents the key rationale for and added value of producing free, publicly accessible league tables to help investors, civil society, and governments assess corporate performance in delivering the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The topics and questions listed within do not represent prescriptive aspects to be discussed but rather considerations to help kick-start the formal consultation that will take place on 29 October 2017 in Jakarta on the margins of the EAT Asia-Pacific Food Forum. This document will be updated and expanded based on feedback, with the aim of developing recommendations around the need to develop, fund, house, and safeguard SDG-related league tables within a formal institution, tentatively described here as the World Benchmarking Alliance.
Table of Contents

Foreword by the founding members 3
Content and objective of the WBA consultation 4
Why benchmarks? 8
What would the WBA bring to key stakeholders? 12
Why is an alliance needed? 13
  Harmonisation 13
  Economies of scale and resilience 16
  Platform for dialogue 19
  Representation 22
Progress on the SDGs in Asia and the Pacific 24
What type of benchmarks should the WBA focus on? 28
Questions for the consultation 33
What happens after this consultation? 34
ANNEX I - Mapping the added value of the WBA 35
ANNEX II Landscaping the benchmarking ecosystem 38
Foreword by the founding members

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are the milestones marking the path towards the future we want. Collectively, they provide one of the most ambitious yet achievable agendas the world has ever set. Delivering these goals will help to ensure all people can live in dignity and collectively succeed in preserving our environment.

These goals cannot be achieved without the firm commitment of the private sector to work with government and civil society to deliver the solutions and investments needed to achieve them. The economic opportunity this represents is clear and it is inspiring to see some of the world’s leading companies starting to align their business with the SDGs. Nevertheless, the scale of what needs to be achieved requires us to do more: we must make explicit society’s expectations of companies and incentivise engagement by making it easy and accessible to all.

A powerful and potentially transformative way to achieve this is to produce international league tables that measure and compare performance of companies on the SDGs. The global need for such league tables is widely acknowledged, from the Business & Sustainable Development Commission (BSDC) to the EU High-Level Expert Group on Sustainable Finance. Creating such league tables requires sophisticated benchmarks that can provide financial institutions, companies, governments, and civil society with information they can use to allocate capital, increase transparency, track and compare corporate sustainability performance, as well as identify gaps and opportunities.

To this end Aviva, the UN Foundation, BSDC, and Index Initiative are putting forward the idea of a World Benchmarking Alliance (WBA). We envision that the WBA would become an institution that will develop, fund, house, and safeguard publicly available, free corporate sustainability benchmarks aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals. Of course, benchmarks and league tables are only powerful tools if they are considered robust, credible, and used by a large number of actors. Only through the formation of a genuine alliance can the WBA be effective as a global institution and develop high-quality benchmarks.

Over the course of the coming months, we will be holding a series of global and regional consultations with stakeholders to refine the WBA vision, outline its institutional structure, and inform its priorities in terms of SDGs and industries.

All feedback is welcome and we look forward to insightful comments, questions, and suggestions on how to make this consultation phase a success.
Collectively, the SDGs provide one of the most ambitious yet achievable agendas the world has ever set, with the ultimate aim to “leave no one behind” in their realisation. While people and the planet are at the heart of this agenda, the SDGs also represent an enormous economic opportunity for business. Delivering these goals could create 380 million jobs by 2030 and stimulate US$12 trillion of annual economic opportunities in just four sectors of the economy, according to a recent report by the Business and Sustainable Development Commission. The total economic gain could be two to three times larger when considering the benefits across the economy as a whole.

These goals cannot be achieved without the firm commitment of the private sector to work with government and civil society to deliver the solutions and investments needed to achieve the SDGs. Early estimates show that achieving the SDGs requires US$5-7 trillion in annual spending, with the potential economic opportunities outlined above paying dividends in return. Already, several of the world’s leading companies are taking clear action to align their business models with the SDGs, by making sustainability and energy efficiency commitments, incorporating circular economy models into their supply chains and sourcing practices, tying executive compensation to sustainability performance, and doubling down on investments that will yield positive social returns for the communities in which they operate.
This energy and enthusiasm from the private sector has not gone unnoticed. The 2017 High-level Political Forum (HLPF), the UN’s formal mechanism for country-level reporting on SDG implementation progress, saw more than 1,500 business leaders attend its SDG Business Forum – an eight-fold increase from the year before. Furthermore, 90% of the voluntary national reviews presented by UN member states at the 2017 HLPF made specific reference to the vital role of the private sector in financing and catalysing SDG implementation. UN Secretary-General António Guterres has also pledged his commitment to working with the private sector, stating his particular interest in “the alignment of the core business of the private sector with the strategic goals of the international community.”

Despite the promulgation of business’s role in achieving the SDGs, information and analysis of corporate performance on sustainable development is often hard to access or compare. Among the factors contributing to this are high paywalls, lack of transparency, complexity of data collection, and lack of a common approach to measuring performance. As a result, investors, civil society, governments, and consumers have no common mechanisms through which to review corporate action, credit leading companies, or hold laggards to account. Companies’ efforts – or lack thereof – often go unrecognised, diluting competitive advantage, reducing incentives to improve sustainability performance, and making it difficult to identify industry leaders.

The scale of what needs to be achieved requires us to do more. Several actors, including the UN Global Compact and the Global Reporting Initiative, have made important efforts to provide stakeholders with valuable information on corporate sustainability performance. We must build on these important contributions, continue to make society’s expectations of companies explicit, and facilitate engagement on sustainability issues by making information on corporate performance easy to understand and accessible to all.

A powerful and potentially transformative way to achieve this is to use corporate benchmarks to measure and compare performance of companies in delivering the SDGs. This idea is based on a recommendation outlined in the BSDC’s flagship report about the need for such benchmarks, as they can provide financial institutions and other stakeholders with vital information they can use to allocate capital, increase transparency, track and compare corporate sustainability performance, and ultimately catalyse action and accelerate SDG delivery.

This is why Aviva, the UN Foundation, BSDC, and Index Initiative are exploring the concept of a proposed World Benchmarking Alliance (WBA) that would produce, fund, house, and safeguard free, publicly available corporate sustainability benchmarks aligned with the SDGs. By providing all stakeholders with access...
Context and objective of the WBA consultation

to league tables and benchmarks, the WBA would enable civil society, governments, and individuals to exert their full influence to improve corporate sustainability performance and help the private sector play its role in delivering the SDGs. The WBA is also expected to play an important role in leveraging and harmonising the incoming wave of SDG-related benchmarking initiatives that are currently being developed (see Annex II).

Benchmarks, and the league tables that derive from them, are only as powerful as the number of actors that use them. To build ownership and ensure benchmarks reflect societal expectations, it will thus be critical that they be designed through multi-stakeholder dialogues. Only through the formation of a true alliance can the WBA become an effective global institution and develop high quality SDG-related corporate benchmarks.

True to this belief in multi-stakeholder dialogue, and thanks to support from the UK, Dutch and Danish governments, as well as Aviva, we are undertaking a series of consultations aimed at gathering inputs and insights on the proposed WBA objectives, governance, and areas of focus. The official launch of the consultation phase took place on 21 September, on the margins of the United Nations General Assembly in New York City. The high-level event was attended by numerous development ministers as well as senior executives from all major stakeholder groups, including companies, institutional investors, international organisations, foundations, civil society organisations and research institutions. The first global consultation took place that same week, with a focus on the value of corporate SDG benchmarks and the merits of establishing the proposed World Benchmarking Alliance. The first regional consultation will take place on 30 October in Jakarta, Indonesia, with a focus on SDG challenges in the Asia-Pacific region, the value of corporate SDG benchmarks, and on refining the case for establishing the WBA.

Momentum is growing. From the International Chamber of Commerce to the World Business Council for Sustainable Development, the UN Global Compact, the World Wildlife Fund and the International Finance Corporation, major actors have now endorsed the consultation phase and pledged their support as allies of the WBA. We invite others that support this inclusive consultation process to also join as allies.

This briefing presents the key rationale for and added value of creating the proposed WBA. The topics and ideas listed herein do not represent prescriptive issues to be discussed but rather considerations to help kick-start the discussion. This document will be updated and expanded based on discussions at the consultation.
The World Benchmarking Alliance
Proposed vision, mission and milestones

Vision: In our vision of a sustainable future, everyone can access information about how companies perform on sustainability issues, enabling investors, civil society, governments and individuals to exert their full influence to improve corporate sustainability performance. This environment of enhanced transparency and understanding delivers a change in the quality of multi-stakeholder engagement, critical for unlocking the private sector’s potential to maximise their contribution to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and corresponding SDGs.

Mission: WBA’s mission is to provide everyone with access to information that indicates how companies are contributing to the SDGs. It will do so by developing, funding, housing, and safeguarding free and publicly available corporate sustainability benchmarks that rank companies on their sustainability performance and contribution to achieving the SDGs.

Key milestones envisaged (to be refined/modified based on consultations outcomes)

September: Launch of the WBA consultation process

October – March: 10 Roundtables (five in the Northern and five in the Southern hemisphere). Some of the roundtables are expected to take place alongside key events such as the World Bank & IMF Spring meetings and the World Capital Market Symposium in Kuala Lumpur.

The online consultation will run in parallel from October 2017 to February 2018

May: Publication of the synthesis report, recommendations, and next steps.

More information on the consultation phase, the allies that have endorsed it, and the WBA roundtables can be found at: www.worldbenchmarkingalliance.org.

Why benchmarks?

Benchmarks, and the league tables they help create, have multiple advantages when it comes to aligning corporate action with sustainability objectives.

**They clarify what society expects from industries and companies.** Companies often deal with a wide range of stakeholders with diverging expectations and priorities. Through an extensive multi-stakeholder consultation process, benchmarks can identify common ground among key stakeholders and build consensus around these expectations. Benchmark methodologies can then translate these expectations into clear metrics, providing companies with a path forward. As one corporate participant to the New York consultation noted: “a benchmark would help us understand where the gaps are for us and what stakeholders want us to focus on.”

**They clarify where and how companies can contribute to sustainability.** The potential contribution of an industry to sustainable development is influenced by an industry’s core business and position in the value chain. This both determines and limits the influence of industries and companies. Benchmarks clarify the role of companies in achieving particular SDGs but also highlight the responsibilities of other stakeholders.

**They promote a race to the top.** Provided they are robust, credible, and provide a fair and scrutinized analysis, benchmarks are powerful tools with which to raise awareness on an issue and shape the debate on what industries can do about it. The league tables that derive from benchmarks leverage the forces of competition to improve corporate performance: leaders are motivated to do more,
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while laggards are motivated to catch up (see box).\textsuperscript{4} For top-performers, the results can also be used a source of competitive advantage. For instance, East-West Seed, which ranked first for the East Africa region in the 2016 Access to Seeds Index, used this information in most of their external communications, including to customers in markets it was trying to enter. Used in the SDG context, this could provide a powerful incentive for companies to improve their sustainability performance and alignment with the 2030 Agenda, and could help reduce the SDG investment gap.

\textbf{They help track progress.} For companies and investors, regular issuance of league tables helps measure progress both relative to peers and to societal expectations. A corporate climate action benchmark, for instance, would track both how a company performs relative to its peers and whether these efforts are aligned with the objectives of the Paris Agreement.

\textbf{They are a proven and effective engagement tool.} Both investors and civil society frequently rely on benchmarks and league tables to engage companies and promote corporate change. CalPERS, for example, used a benchmarking approach to identify the highest carbon emitters in its portfolio. The results showed more than half of their portfolio’s carbon footprint came from just 80 companies. This league table was then used to create an effective and targeted engagement campaign, with CalPERS most recently requiring these “systemically important carbon emitters” to assess and disclose their exposure to climate-related risks.\textsuperscript{5} Benchmarks can also be used to recognise and celebrate leaders for their success and encourage them to do more. As one participant to the New York consultation put it: “\textit{the real value lies in the dialogue that is created before, during and after the benchmark.”}

\textsuperscript{4} The Access to Medicine Index, for instance, made a “commendable contributions to advancing the engagement of the pharmaceutical industry with the issue of access to medicine”, according to an independent third-party evaluation.

\textsuperscript{5} \url{www.responsible-investor.com/article/calpers_sice/}
BOX 1. WBA benchmarks vs. investment benchmarks (possible approach)

The benchmarks the WBA aims to develop and house are expected to differ from traditional investment benchmarks (e.g. benchmarks used for passive strategies). One important difference is that WBA benchmarks might not necessarily track the entire investable universe, but rather focus on the largest and most impactful companies – the underlying assumption being that moving the larger, more visible players is an effective way to create momentum at scale. This focus on impact also means that WBA benchmarks are likely to differ from the environmental, social and corporate governance (ESG) benchmarks that focus on sustainability issues material to companies – whereas a WBA benchmark would track which companies can have a positive impact on a sustainability issue.

Another difference is that, in some instances, WBA benchmarks may track both listed and non-listed companies. This might be necessary in some industries to ensure that the most important players – in terms of impact on the SDGs – are included in the ranking.

Last but by no means least, WBA benchmarks are designed to be free and publicly available. This is essential to maximise the impact of a benchmark: only when data is freely available to all can companies be truly held accountable, leaders celebrated, and best practices disseminated. Free and publicly available information is also necessary to ensure that all relevant stakeholders – including investors, civil society, employees, boards of directors, and governments – can engage.
What would the WBA bring to key stakeholders?

There are two main ways in which the WBA provides benefits to all: as a multi-stakeholder platform using benchmarks as a tool for dialogue; and as an institution aimed at developing, funding, housing and safeguarding publicly available SDG-related corporate sustainability benchmarks.

Companies will find in the WBA-labelled benchmarks and league tables a powerful way to inform corporate strategy development across the SDGs relevant to their industry. These league tables can also be used to raise awareness around sustainability issues within the organisation and align corporate actions with societal expectations. Since benchmarks give credit to sustainability leadership and highlight best practices, those who choose to engage in the WBA multi-stakeholder dialogue will also have a chance to refine their analytical thinking, stimulating learning within and across industries, improve sustainability performance, and secure competitive advantage in the long term.

“For the ultimate goal is that all companies report on their contributions to the SDGs. This allows us to compare commitments and performance to our peers and shows us where we must improve.”

Paul Polman, CEO of Unilever and co-chair of the BSDC

For investors and banks, WBA-labelled benchmarks and league tables would provide a set of common engagement tools with which to interact with companies – tools that will deal with, but also go beyond, the discussions around materiality. Actors in the investment and lending chain can also use league tables to identify sustainability risks and opportunities and assess the performance of individual companies. This information can then be used to al-
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Locate capital in support of the sustainable development agenda – by facilitating screening of companies, for instance, but with the ultimate goal of ensuring positive social and economic dividends that directly address the SDGs.

“Our clients expect us to meet investment objectives as well as those of society over the long term. The efforts of the WBA will assist asset managers to achieve this alignment.”

Hendrik du Toit, CEO of Investec Asset Management & BSDC Commissioner

For civil society, the WBA provides an opportunity to amplify the voice of civil society constituents by engaging the entire private sector, rather than just a few companies. The economy of scale this generates is particularly useful given that company engagement can be quite resource intensive. The benchmark results can also help direct advocacy efforts, making it more efficient. Finally, while the multi-stakeholder process may not always fully align with any actor’s initial advocacy objective, it does offer the advantage of broad support – thus providing increased leverage for civil society organisations and facilitating cross-sector partnerships for the achievement of the SDGs.

“Competition makes us faster, collaboration makes us better. The World Benchmarking Alliance aims to do both. By ranking companies based on their contribution to the SDGs competitive benchmarking can be a powerful catalyst for change.”

Dr. Gunhild A. Stordalen, Founder & President, EAT Foundation.

For governments, WBA benchmarks translate the SDGs into an industry and corporate agenda, creating transparency and accountability in the process. Taken as a set, WBA benchmarks also provide governments with insights on the impact of policy on SDG-related corporate performance. The league tables derived from these benchmarks can also help governments identify – or at least assess – potential partners for government procurement programmes or public-private partnerships. Lastly, but by no means least, the WBA’s funding model would enable governments to use public money to mobilise private finance to fund a public good.

“Civil society, investors and governments need to collectively voice what we expect from industry. And then work together with industry to unlock the full potential of the private sector. Initiatives like the World Benchmarking Alliance enable us to embrace a more productive and sustainable approach that benefits all of us.”

Lilianne Ploumen, Minister of Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation, the Netherlands

These, and other examples of WBA added value are summarised in Annex I.
Two years into the 2030 Agenda, focus is shifting from defining success to measuring progress. With this shift comes a wave of new initiatives that are attempting to promote the rise and reporting of SDG-related private investments. These are being developed across the investment and lending chain, from institutional investors to asset managers and companies, as well as banks and civil society. The focus of these initiatives varies widely, with some focusing on scoping out the investible universe (e.g. KPMG) or defining taxonomies for SDG investments (e.g. APG), while others put the emphasis on corporate reporting (e.g. UNGC & GRI) or country level performance (e.g. SDG Index). A preliminary classification of this ecosystem of efforts is provided in Annex II. The classification, along with the examples it contains, will be refined through consultations and research, with the objective of creating a free and publicly available database of this ecosystem on the WBA website.

For success to be delivered at scale and in time, efforts will need to be coordinated and harmonised. Initiatives are already underway to help standardise corporate reporting on the SDGs (e.g. UNGC & GRI). Corporate SDG benchmarks can greatly benefit from this work by aligning indicators and using the information companies will disclose based on the guidelines. A benchmark then takes it a step further by actively comparing the performance of companies, including those that do not yet use this standard
Why is an alliance needed?

for disclosure.11 With 17 SDGs and 24 industry sectors,12 it is easy to see how large the upcoming wave of SDG-related benchmarking efforts will grow. Much like the global effort undertaken by the Financial Stability Board on the issue of climate risk, there is now a need to establish a set of guiding principles for benchmarks aiming at tracking corporate performance on the SDGs.

One of the first priorities of the WBA will thus be to establish a set of common design principles that will act as a quality standard for all WBA benchmarks. These principles, to be developed through global and regional stakeholder consultations, will help ensure all WBA benchmarks and league tables are robust, credible, fair, and recognisable. This development process must be global and collaborative, with input provided by a diverse range of actors including companies, civil society, investors, (multilateral) government organisations, financial institutions, and independent rating providers. Initial discussions with key partners and stakeholders have led to the identification of the design principles listed in the table below. These will be updated and refined through the consultation process.

6 For instance, APG and PGGM’s effort at starting a defining a taxonomy for Sustainable Development investments.
7 For instance, UN PRI’s efforts to set up two PRI SDG working groups. See http://bit.ly/2vED4LL
8 KPMG’s and PWC’s efforts to map the investible universe of the SDGs.
9 Efforts include the launch of SDG-themed funds by Spanish bank Bankia. See http://bit.ly/2tVGDuW
10 World Benchmarking Alliance
11 Note however that since the nature of most disclosure standards is generic and benchmarks are industry or SDG specific, the latter will likely use additional indicators, thus providing more in-depth insight as well as more precise guidance to companies.
12 According to MSCI’s global industry classification standard. See: https://www.msci.com/gics
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**Preliminary WBA Design principles - for consultation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflect societal expectations</td>
<td>The influence of a benchmark rests in its legitimacy and credibility. The SDGs were developed via an extensive and inclusive multi-stakeholder process. Any benchmark designed to track performance against them should thus ensure it reflects societal expectations aligned with the SDGs. The broader this multi-stakeholder consensus, the more likely stakeholders will use the insights generated by the benchmarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent and impartial</td>
<td>Benchmarks can only play a pivotal role in bringing together stakeholders with divergent views if they are independent. A benchmark needs to be equally responsive to all stakeholders in order to remain impartial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free and publicly available</td>
<td>Only when data is freely available to all can companies truly be held accountable, leaders celebrated, and best practices identified and disseminated. Free and publicly available information is also necessary to ensure that all relevant actors can engage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on impact</td>
<td>A benchmark clarifies and assesses the areas where companies can make substantial contributions to achieving specific SDGs and corresponding targets. It should also assess responsible business conduct to ensure that business operations do not undermine any dimensions of sustainable development not explored by the benchmark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on relevance</td>
<td>A benchmark should include all the companies that fall within its scope, irrespective of whether or not they are listed. Companies that choose not to participate actively in the data collection phase will be scored on the basis of publicly available information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on commitment, transparency and performance</td>
<td>Corporate benchmarks rank companies’ performance relative to each other and publish the result in the form of league tables. Being the best in class doesn’t necessarily mean a company’s actions are perfectly aligned with stakeholder expectations, however. Therefore, in addition to ranking companies relative to each other, benchmarks will also assess whether the companies are committed to sustainability, whether they are transparent about their policies and practices, and whether their performance matches with existing commitments and with societal expectations around what the industry should contribute to the SDGs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of intent and of method</td>
<td>A benchmark should be transparent about its methodology, development process, and outcomes. It is vital that companies understand how and why their performance is measured in order to drive change and engage different parts of the business. It is equally essential that companies are regularly consulted during the benchmarking process and have multiple opportunities to provide input and feedback, notably during the data collection and assessment phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementarity</td>
<td>Benchmarks build upon the work done by others and add value to existing initiatives and mechanisms, including international standards and other initiatives resulting from a robust multi-stakeholder process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsive and iterative</td>
<td>Societal expectations over the role of businesses evolve; so do the nature and quantity of information available on a given issue. Benchmarks respond by updating their methodologies accordingly. Boundaries are set to ensure comparability of information across iterations. The cyclical nature of a benchmark provides companies with an incentive to improve and show progress and accountability over time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Economies of scale and resilience

Responsible engagement is a public good, as should be the data and benchmarks that underpin it. Only when data is freely available to all can companies truly be held accountable, leaders celebrated, and best practices identified and disseminated. Free and publicly available information is also necessary to ensure that all stakeholders along the value chain can engage. This matters for civil society, governments and investors. In the case of climate, for instance, the “relatively limited availability, accessibility, and relevance of publicly available environmental data have been an obstacle for many financial firms to begin their engagement in green finance activities,” according to the G20’s Green Finance Study Group. This argument is even more relevant in the case of SDGs, which include – but have a broader scope than – green finance.

The production of benchmarks is a resource intensive process, the workload of which varies over time. As a result, producers of single benchmarks often rely on specialised private firms for data collection and analysis. While this is economically feasible for the production of a single index, this approach has limited benefits for the production of a comprehensive set of benchmarks tracking corporate SDG performance.
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It would be more efficient – and more affordable – for the global community if this research service is provided by (or through) a non-profit organisation such as the WBA. Alternatively, the WBA could act as a single purchaser for WBA-labelled benchmarks, thus reducing the unit costs for each individual benchmarking effort.

The added value of – and need for – such a ‘one-stop-shop’ platform providing publicly available data has been widely recognised at the international level. In its latest report, the G20’s Green Finance Study Group notes that: “Gathering and disseminating such information requires employing individuals with specific skill sets [...] and investments into building data platforms. It is very difficult for individual financial services institutions to use such investments sustainably and profitably within their typical business model. Public institutions (including some NGOs), however, do have business models suited for and comparative advantages in producing data of this type.” [emphasis added] “From this perspective,” the report continues, “the public sector has a responsibility to ensure its provision and accessibility. This is analogous to existing models in the finance sector where some data (e.g., monthly labour and inflation statistics) are produced by the government but used by financial institutions free of charge.” This call for free and public information was also echoed by the EU high level expert group on sustainable finance, which identified the creation of “a public goods research unit that monitors ESG disclosure by firms and financial institutions, provides public league tables of firms’ performance on key sustainability issues and reports on the state of disclosure annually” as an important tool to align financial markets with sustainability objectives.
A common platform for research capacity would also improve the resilience of SDG-related corporate benchmarking efforts. League tables and benchmarks only help measure progress if they are produced on a regular basis (see design principles). Benchmark producers relying on external providers can find themselves in a difficult situation when their private counterpart rotates between cycles, however. For instance, the new counterpart may not necessarily be fully familiar with the previous cycle or agree with the benchmark’s overall public mission. Meanwhile, companies providing the data see their primary contact for data change. Relying on an external private provider therefore creates a risk of institutional knowledge loss. Providing a common platform for research capacity, by contrast, would help maintain institutional knowledge and ensure the analysts share a sense of common purpose with the members of the WBA.

Being well capitalised is another way the WBA can ensure resilience of corporate sustainability benchmarks. The natural cycle of benchmarks, which is typically around 1-2 years, is not well aligned with donor budget cycles (which tend to be longer). This creates a challenge for individual producers of league tables, who often must rely on ad-hoc funding as a result. By creating a stable institution that can secure funding across the different cycles of a wide range of donors, the WBA would be able to address this problem. This, in turn, would help provide more stability to the funding of SDG-related corporate benchmarks as a whole.

In the same way, the WBA would be able to attract a larger group of actors - both public and private. Individual benchmark initiatives, by definition, are focused on a particular subject area, thus narrowing down the scope of potential funders they can engage or rely on. By diversifying the scope, the WBA becomes a channel for donors and investors interested in supporting fact-based analysis of corporate performance against the SDGs as a whole, giving the organisation a broader capacity for fundraising. With that functionality in mind, the WBA intends to develop a model through which partners can not only use but also financially contribute to the development and operations of WBA-labelled benchmarks. This financing model will have to be developed in a way that does not compromise on the fact that the benchmarks should remain independent, public, and free for all to use.

Why is an alliance needed?

Platform for dialogue

The 2030 Agenda cannot be delivered without the private sector’s involvement. The potential contribution of an industry to sustainable development is influenced by an industry’s core business and position in the value chain. This both determines and limits an industry’s and company’s influence. Benchmarks clarify the role of companies in achieving a particular SDG but also highlight the responsibilities of other stakeholders.

Yet, integrating the SDGs into corporate strategies remains a challenge for many companies. Part of this stems from the fact that the SDGs were initially designed for governments, not business. In fact, according to a recent survey by BSR and GlobeScan, less than one in three companies (30%) use the SDGs as input for setting corporate objectives, making it difficult to turn these goals into operational strategies. Another challenge is the scope of the SDGs, which, as a set, often goes beyond any single company’s activities. This can make it hard for companies to identify where they can have the strongest impact. In fact, just 30% of companies think they have the tools they needed to assess their impact on the SDGs.

Efforts to identify the catalytic areas at the intersection between SDGs and industry are already underway. A preliminary mapping of the contribution that 15 global industries can make to the SDGs was outlined in 2015 under Index Initiative’s landscape study...
“Unravelling the Role of the Private Sector”. Similar efforts have since been undertaken by large consultancies such as KPMG and PWC, as well as by investors such as APG and PGGM and banks such as UBS. The SDG-Industry matrix below represents some of the latest work on mapping this intersection between SDGs and industry.

The nature and size of the impact of different industries on a single SDG will differ. The pharmaceuticals, biotechnology and life sciences industry, as well as the consumer durables and apparel industry groups, can make important contributions to SDG 5 (gender equality), for instance. Yet the nature of this contribution is fundamentally different. Consumer durables and apparel companies employ millions of women in their supply chains, mostly in developing countries. Pharmaceutical, biotechnology, and life sciences companies can make important contributions to improving maternal, sexual, and reproductive health. Similarly, whereas many industry groups have an impact on SDG 13 (climate action), the impact of the oil and gas sector (energy), electric utilities, and transport is particularly large.

Using the latest research and an inclusive consultation process, the WBA will identify and develop benchmarks focusing on the industries and companies best positioned to deliver a significant and actionable contribution to the SDGs. This need to focus on areas where companies could most significantly have an impact on the SDGs was echoed by participants of the global consultation in New York. In line with the call to “leave no one behind” that underpins the entire 2030 Agenda, the WBA will prioritise the production of benchmarks that focus on industries and SDGs that are most relevant to marginalised and vulnerable communities and individuals, including blue-collar workers, smallholder farmers, and women living in developing economies. A robust public consultation process will identify and prioritise such new benchmarks.

This approach makes the WBA one of the few evidence-based, multi-stakeholder platforms for dialogue through which global, industry-relevant change can be actioned to align the private sector with the SDG Agenda.

14 https://www.globescan.com/component/edocman/#download-modal-content
17 https://www.unglobalcompact.org/library/3111
18 https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/sustainability/SDG%20Research_FINAL.pdf
19 https://www.apg.nl/pdfs/SDI%20Taxonomies%20website.pdf
20 http://bit.ly/2vn16g4
How to read this map:

While each industry can be linked to the 17 SDGs, this map focuses on where a given industry can have the greatest impact and where solutions are more likely to be financially sustainable and scalable. The list of industries is based on the Global Industry Classification System (GICS), a classification widely used by groups involved in the investment process. For each of the SDGs (excluding SDG 17), we analyzed which industries can make the most substantial contribution. A final report detailing descriptions for each of the identified intersections, including references to relevant sources, will be published at the end of this consultation phase. The present matrix is thus intended to act as a conversation starter and will be continuously refined and updated based on roundtable outcomes, interviews and additional research. The ultimate purpose of this analysis is to identify critical links between different industries and the SDGs. Stakeholders can then use this analysis to identify the most urgent and critical intersections and prioritise the development of new benchmarks.
Why is an alliance needed?

Creating the World Benchmarking Alliance would provide an international, independent, and authoritative voice on the status of corporate performance in achieving the SDGs. While for-profit indices have their own association, there is currently no equivalent for benchmarks created with a public mission in mind. This makes it hard for any individual SDG-related benchmark producer to speak beyond the particular scope of its work, reducing its outreach and ability to engage on the SDGs as a whole. Designed as an organisation that would cover the full range of SDG-related benchmarks, the WBA is in an ideal position to fill this gap.

It would also prove critical in promoting evidence-based discussions in international bodies. Given its focus on the SDGs, an observer status to the United Nations would enable the WBA to provide the UN SDG process with a valuable, fact-based overview of corporate performance that goes beyond the financing issues explored by the Inter-Agency Task Force on Financing for Development. Such a move would also complement the recent decision to give a UN Observer status to the International Chamber of Commerce – a decision that reflects the central role of the private sector delivering sustainability objectives. Another possible and no less important arena for the WBA could be the International Organization of Securities Commissions, where the WBA may be able to qualify for affiliate membership and thus bring the voice of societal expectations to the world’s major stock
market regulators. It might also be worth exploring how the WBA could join the OECD Global Forum on Responsible Business Conduct, where the WBA might be able to provide valuable input and help inform OECD guidance and guidelines.

Last but by no means least, the WBA would add important value to the SDG-monitoring ecosystem. Most of the key private-sector focused international initiatives such as PRI, UN Global Compact, WBCSD, the OECD’s Global Forum on Responsible Business Conduct, or the World Economic Forum have now engaged in the process of aligning their members with the SDGs. As part of this, they are starting to establish working groups, develop guidelines, and define common reporting methodology on the impact of the private sector on the SDGs. By providing them with an independent, evidence-based analysis on the state of corporate performance on the SDGs, the WBA would act as a powerful ally for these initiatives, helping them speed up their members’ journey towards the delivery of the SDGs.

21 http://www.indexindustry.org
23 Under current IOSCO by-laws, WBA could qualify for affiliate membership as an “international bodies other than governmental organisations with an appropriate interest in securities regulation”. Depending on its final design, and role, it might also be able to qualify for associate membership as an “intergovernmental international organisations and other international standard-setting bodies”. Source here: http://bit.ly/2vXsUpz
In its report “Statistical Yearbook for Asia and the Pacific 2016: SDG Baseline Report”\textsuperscript{24}, ESCAP, the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, assesses progress since 2000 (starting of the MDGs) and the acceleration required for the region to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals 2030 (SDG 17 is excluded from the assessment). Findings of the report are represented in the figure below. Each bar or arrow indicates either the average progress made or regression since 2000 on the SDG indicators used for the assessment, as well as the additional progress required to achieve the 2030 targets, assuming the same pace of progress over the past 15 years. The number in the box is the number of indicators used to calculate the index.

Existing data points used in the assessment show that the region is on the path to achieve five SDGs: SDG 1 (no poverty), SDG 4 (quality education), SDG 8 (decent work and economic growth), SDG 9 (industry, innovation and infrastructure) and SDG 14 (life below water). Slow or stagnating process is observed for about a third of the SDGs and data suggest that the region is moving in the wrong direction and needs to reverse trends for SDG 10 (reduced inequalities), 11 (sustainable cities and communities), 12 (responsible consumption and production) and 15 (life on land).
Progress made since 2000
Progress needed to achieve target in 2030
Regressed since 2000

Sources:

KEY SDG FACTS

Over half of the world’s poor people live in Asia and the Pacific [2].

Asia and the Pacific has a double burden of malnutrition, it is home to nearly half of both the stunted and the overweight children in the world [1], [2].

Between 1993 and 2013, the region lost 35 million hectares of arable land due to land degradation and conversion to other uses [1].

Two thirds of the world’s undernourished people live in Asia and the Pacific [1].

Non-communicable diseases account for 73% of deaths in Asia and the Pacific [2].

In 2015 almost 94% of the region had access to an improved drinking water supply [1].

In 2014 an estimated 440 million people lived in slums or informal settlements, over a quarter of the regions total urban population [1].

45% of global climate-related disasters that occurred in 2011-2015, occurred in the Asia-Pacific region [2].

Only around one-third of Asia-Pacific countries report that they have disaster risk-reduction strategies [2].

Between 2000 and 2013 approximately 135,333 km2 of natural forest area was lost in the region, roughly three times the size of Denmark and accounting for 10.6% of the world’s natural forest loss [1].
### The SDG-Industry Matrix

#### Examples from the Asia-Pacific region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containers &amp; packaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metals &amp; mining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper &amp; forest products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial &amp; professional services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobiles &amp; components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer durables &amp; apparel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; staples retailing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food, beverage &amp; tobacco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural commodity traders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seafood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household &amp; personal products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care equipment &amp; services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceuticals, biotechnology &amp; life sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversified financials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software &amp; services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology hardware &amp; equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiconductors &amp; semiconductor equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunication services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: see page 43
Differentiated approaches are required to cover the nuances of corporate impact on the SDGs. While some SDGs have direct business relevance for a large number of industries (e.g. climate change, decent work, or gender equality), for other SDGs the contribution of specific industries is key, such as the impact of the seafood industry for SDG 14 (life below water) or that of the pharmaceutical industry for SDG 3 (good health and well-being). Depending on the industry and the issue, therefore, there are likely to be two main possible approaches to the benchmarking process: industry-centred and SDG-centred.

An industry-centred benchmark focuses on a sector’s impact on and contribution to the SDGs closest to their core business and supply chain. This includes the development of indicators serving as proxies of performance on the SDGs, as well as the identification of critical pathways and issues where companies can make a significant positive contribution – both within their organisation and throughout their supply chain. Because they are sector-specific, these benchmarks – and the league tables that derive from them – allow the ranking of companies against their peers and the exploration of how industry trends, risks, and contexts affect the ability of a particular sector to deliver on the SDGs. An existing example of such an industry-centred benchmark is the Access to Seeds Index, which assesses the contribution of leading global and regional seed companies to SDG 2 (zero hunger), SDG 12 (sustainable production and consumption), SDG 13 (climate action), and SDG 15 (life on land).
GENDER EQUALITY
- Media reflects – but also anchors – gender biases.
- Only 1 in 4 people heard, read about or seen in media is female.
- Gender stereotypes embedded in news media output.
- Only 4% of stories challenge gender stereotypes.
- Media can contribute to shifting gender norms.

PEACE, JUSTICE AND STRONG INSTITUTIONS
- Media critical in providing information and informed opinion.
- Key to conflict prevention and resolution.
- Independent watchdog role.
- Empowering people to participate in civil society.

QUALITY EDUCATION
- Particularly media providing editorial content play central role in how education material is produced, distributed and consumed.
- Media promote lifelong learning.
- Ensuring educational materials are accessible.

REDUCED INEQUALITIES
- Digitalization can help to overcome information barriers.
- Concern that knowledge gap between and within countries is exacerbating inequalities.
- New financing models needed to ensure reliable information is accessible to all.

SDG-Industry Intersection Media
Subindustries: advertising, broadcasting, cable & satellite, movies & entertainment, publishing

Media have great influence in shaping how we perceive and understand the world. It holds a powerful position through the influence of their content and their capacity to inform, create debate and engage people around key sustainability and development issues. Media enables messages to move further, faster and to places all over the world. The industry has considerable influence on the following SDGs:

The average time a person spends consuming media daily
Only 1 in 4 people heard, read about, or seen in newspapers, television and radio news is female
What type of benchmarks should the WBA focus on?

SDG-centred benchmarks, by contrast, focus on how a select group of industries contribute to a given sustainable development goal. This, in effect, makes them the dual of industry-centred benchmarks. Because SDG-centred benchmarks include multiple industries, the number of companies in scope is often larger than that of industry-centred benchmarks. An example of an SDG-centred benchmark is the recently launched Corporate Human Rights Benchmark, which covers three industries and assesses 98 publicly traded companies on their human rights performance and implementation of global human rights standards. The benchmark tracks policies, processes, and practices companies have in place to systematise their human rights approach and how they respond to serious allegations. It follows a specific approach for each industry covered, allowing indicators to be tailored to industry contexts and for the identification of industry best practices – thus driving improvements within and across industries. Its ultimate goal is to rank the world’s top 500 listed companies.

Both the Industry-centred and SDG-centred benchmarks are likely to be relevant for the WBA. Many participants of the New York consultation, for instance, noted that specific issues and/or SDGs would likely apply across multiple industries – gender equality and decent work being two prominent examples. The consultation also signalled a clear interest in developing industry-focused benchmarks, with some noting that a sector approach might resonate with a larger audience.

To explore the advantages and limitations of each approach, the WBA founding partners will explore multiple benchmarks during the consultation phase. The WBA expects to pilot a benchmark on seafood (focused on SDGs 1, 2, 5, 8, 12, 14, and 15) and, in partnership with CDP, a benchmark related to SDG 13 (climate change) that would assess key industries’ contributions to – and alignment with – the Paris Agreement. Intermediate approaches, such as an Access to Internet benchmark will also be explored, along with other priority benchmarks that come out of the consultation phase.

The scoping of these potential new benchmarks will also be used to identify the best possible approaches to methodology development. This includes questions on how best to build on existing normative standards provided by multilateral organisation such as the ILO, FAO and OECD as well as standards that have been set through a thorough multi-stakeholder process such as RSPO, FSC. It will also inform how benchmark methodologies can best be aligned with existing disclosure standards like GRI, TCFD, CDP, etc. Last but not least, this should explore how to ensure methodologies are aligned with science-based targets, such as decarbonisation consistent with the Paris Agreement or scientifically advised catch limits for fish stocks.
What type of benchmarks should the WBA focus on?

For each benchmark and league table produced by the WBA, the consultation process will determine the most appropriate approach. The aforementioned SDG-Industry Matrix can be a useful tool to initiate discussions on where industries and the SDGs meet. It will also be important to consider the potential impact the industry has on achieving a particular SDG, how close the SDG is to an industry's core business, and whether a benchmark will be the right tool for stimulating companies in the industry to enhance their contribution to the SDGs. To ensure maximum business relevance, it is also important to consider and refer to existing international standards (OECD, ILO, etc.). Ultimately, what determines the approach is the impact the information can have on aligning corporate practice with sustainability.
TRANSPORT

- Responsible for 28% of total energy consumption, mainly oil, and 23% of energy-related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Road transport accounts for three quarters of transport emissions.
- Fastest growing source of CO2 emissions, strongly coupled to GDP growth.
- Electric vehicles key contributor to reducing sector’s GHG emissions although impact depends on type of electricity used to charge the battery.
- New solutions required for long-haul freight transport, aviation and shipping as potential for electrification with current technologies is low.

ELECTRICITY AND HEAT PRODUCTION

- Electricity and heat production responsible for 42% of CO2 emissions from fuel combustion due to heavy reliance on coal.
- Renewables comprise about 30% of world’s power generating capacity, supplying an estimated 25% of global electricity. To achieve the 66% 2°C scenario, 95% of electricity would need to be low-carbon by 2050.
- Redesign of electricity market required to integrate large shares of variable renewables such as wind and solar.

OIL AND GAS

- Oil (34%) and gas (20%) together responsible over half of fuel combustion emissions. Most emission related to final use of products.
- Limiting global temperature rise to well below 2°C requires halving share of fossil fuels in energy demand between 2014 – 2050.
- Oil and gas will continue to supply nearly half of the world’s energy in 2040 according to the International Energy Agency’s 450 scenario.
- Carbon intensities of oil and gas reserves vary: unconventional sources more carbon intensive.
- Increasing share of renewables in portfolios and carbon, capture, use and storage (CCUS) can contribute to lowering sector emissions.

LIVESTOCK

- Sector represents about 14.5% of anthropogenic GHG emissions, cattle being responsible for most.
- Growing populations, rising affluence and urbanization drives demand for animal products, mainly in developing countries.
- Clearing of land for feed crop production and expansion of pastures driving force behind deforestation. Deforestation and forest degradation account for 10-15% of global GHG emissions.
- Sector can reduce emissions by addressing deforestation, and improving practices and technologies. Main potential with ruminant systems operating at low productivity.

SDG-Industry Intersection Climate change

Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts

Climate change represents the single biggest threat to development, and its impacts have disproportionate effects on the poorest and most vulnerable. Urgent action to combat climate change and minimize its impacts are integral to achieving all SDGs. Without the active contribution of the private sector, the goals set by the Paris Agreement will not be achieved.
As the first regional consultation, the Jakarta meeting is particularly important for the WBA to build on insights from the first global consultation in New York, as well as from informal discussions held throughout 2017. The consultation will explore the value of corporate SDG benchmarks for the Asia-Pacific region and work to solidify the case for establishing the proposed World Benchmarking Alliance.

Each consultation is meant to be a conversation. With that in mind, the consultations are held in a participatory and engaging manner, with a view to collecting as much information and inputs as possible on the different strategic aspects needed to promote corporate alignment with sustainability and the role that the WBA can play in delivering it.

With the above objectives and approach in mind, it is proposed that the first regional consultation explores the three questions below. These questions are in no way prescriptive and we therefore welcome any other questions or issues participants feel are important to discuss in order to deliver on the objectives of this consultation.

• What kind of global and regional institutions need to be part of the alliance to help ensure the WBA is credible and legitimate? And what value does the WBA need to create in return for these institutions?

• What are critical intersections between SDGs and industries for the Asia-Pacific region?

• How can corporate SDG benchmarks be designed to ensure they create value for stakeholders as well as the companies being assessed?
What happens after this consultation?

Over the coming months, the WBA will engage in a series of formal global and regional consultations aimed at refining the concept, added value, governance, and focus of the WBA. These consultations will be complemented by additional research, interviews and online consultations. Participants interested in sharing their thoughts via a personal, in-depth interview can contact e.chachoua@indexinitiative.org to schedule a conversation. The collective findings and recommendations on next steps will be compiled in a synthesis report, to be published in May 2018.
As a multi-stakeholder platform using benchmarks as a tool for dialogue, and as an institution aimed at developing, funding, housing, and safeguarding publicly available SDG-related corporate sustainability benchmarks, the WBA would provide a wide range of benefits to stakeholders across the investment and lending chain. Some of the main advantages the WBA would provide are summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>WBA (as an institution developing, funding, housing, and safeguarding publicly available SDG-related corporate sustainability benchmarks)</th>
<th>WBA (as a platform for multi-stakeholder, benchmark-based dialogue)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| For all     | • One-stop-shop for tracking corporate performance on SDGs.  
              • Coherent set of publicly available engagement tools and data across industries and the SDGs. | • Embodiment of putting SDG 17 into practice.  
              • Translates societal expectations for companies into clear and measurable benchmarks.  
              • Keeps track of performance via regular publication of league tables. |
| Companies   | • Unique point of orientation in strategy development (as benchmarks reflect consensus in societal expectations).  
              • Benchmarks compare companies to their peers across more than one area, using the competitive nature of the market as a powerful driver for change.  
              • Efficiency gains as open, credible benchmarks become accepted measures of performance, reducing duplication in ratings and reporting | • Benchmarks – and the league tables that derive from them – give credit to sustainability leadership and highlight best practices, stimulating learning within and across industries.  
              • Opportunity to contribute to the methodology (for companies that actively take part to the multi-stakeholder process). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>WBA (as an institution developing, funding, housing, and safeguarding publicly available SDG-related corporate sustainability benchmarks)</th>
<th>WBA (as a platform for multi-stakeholder, benchmark-based dialogue)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Investors and banks | • Helps the individual investor or bank prioritise which companies to engage.  
• WBA benchmarks and league tables provide information beyond material issues.  
• Strategic direction for allocating capital, influencing capital flows in support of the sustainable markets fast-check screening tool.  
• League tables help identify sustainability risks and opportunities and assess the performance of individual companies.  
• Easier to justify support to the public good due to a broader portfolio of benchmarks. | • Creates a common process and output with which both investors and civil society can engage and discuss with companies.  
• Ability to identify how their approach to stewardship and investment align with broader societal expectations (relevant for fiduciary duty). |
| Civil society     | • Easy access to open, publicly available data facilitates the creation of new benchmarks and league tables.  
• Civil society could have a significant voice in helping the WBA prioritise benchmarks production. | • Tools to amplify and further reflect the voice of civil society organisations – providing reach across the entire private sector.  
• By engaging in a multi stakeholder, benchmark-oriented process, civil society organisations can ensure their advocacy informs standardised monitoring at the industry level – as opposed to having to do the same engagement to different companies.  
• Issues that matter for impact are considered, irrespective of their materiality.  
• Ensures that the voice of the beneficiaries and the on-the-ground challenges are reflected in the methodologies.  
• The legitimacy of WBA benchmarks will rely in large part in its ability to engage all stakeholders in a balanced manner. This means the position of civil society is as strong as that of any other stakeholder.  
• While the multi-stakeholder process may not always fully align with any actor’s initial advocacy objective, it does offer the advantage of broad support – thus providing increased leverage for civil society organisations and facilitating cross-sector partnerships for the achievement of the SDGs. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>WBA (as an institution developing, funding, housing, and safeguarding publicly available SDG-related corporate sustainability benchmarks)</th>
<th>WBA (as a platform for multi-stakeholder, benchmark-based dialogue)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Donors                   | • Provides an institution that can absorb funding for a wide variety of benchmarks on a timeframe that matches government budget cycles. Reduction of transactions costs thanks to a single focal point.  
|                          | • Reduces benchmark fatigue by offering a one-stop-shop that can a) absorb funding at scale, b) identify most promising and impactful benchmarks, and c) act as a re-granting mechanism.  
|                          | • Lower risk of funding competing initiatives thanks to increased alignment between benchmarking initiatives.  
|                          | • Cost reductions (by enabling both public and private actors to support the effort).                                          | • Tool to influence companies beyond national jurisdictions.       
|                          |                                                                                                                                 | • Assessing the relevance and impact of benchmarks can be difficult from a donor’s point of view. The WBA multi-stakeholder process ensures public money is spent on issues that matter most to the largest number of actors. |
| Governments              | • Fast-check screening tool for public-private partnerships on SDGs. Identification of potential partners in public-private partnerships focused on specific sustainable development outcomes.  
|                          | • The access to a comprehensive set of benchmarks of similar quality provides a broader insight on the impact of the policy environment on corporate performance.  
|                          | • Access to evidence-based information that can inform the creation of guidelines or policies.                                  | • A public institution which, through transparency and accountability, helps to align businesses with the interest of society. |
|                          |                                                                                                                                 | • Ensures that the private sector plays a significant role in delivering the SDGs.                                  |
|                          |                                                                                                                                 | • Provides a tool through which policy guidelines can transform into an actionable private sector agenda (via the use of benchmarks). For instance, a ‘responsible business conduct’ benchmark would help measure the degree to which the associated guidelines are adopted. |
| Public benchmark producers| • An opportunity to have their voice represented in key international fora.  
|                          | • Greater brand recognition due to WBA label and core principles. Ability to build on members’ work thanks to the WBA open platform.  
|                          | • More freedom and flexibility to innovate thanks to a more stable and more long-term funding approach.                      | • Greater visibility for any individual benchmark and league tables.                                                 |
|                          |                                                                                                                                 | • Greater legitimacy for the design of indices as a result of a comprehensive stakeholder group.                      |
Two years into the 2030 Agenda, focus is shifting from defining success to measuring progress. With this shift comes a wave of new initiatives that are attempting to promote the rise and reporting of SDG-related private investments. These are being developed across the investment and lending chain, from institutional investors to asset managers and companies, as well as banks and civil society. The focus of these initiatives varies widely, with some focusing on scoping the investible universe (e.g. KPMG) or defining taxonomies for SDG investments (e.g. APG), while others put the emphasis on corporate reporting (e.g. UNGC & GRI) or country level performance (e.g. SDG index). Similarly, some benchmarks focus on SDGs, while others focus on industries and their impact on the SDGs as a set.

A preliminary classification and corresponding mapping of this ecosystem of efforts is provided in the detailed table below. This classification, along with the examples it contains, will be refined through consultations and research, with the objective of creating a free and publicly available database of this ecosystem on the WBA website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description and function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SDG-related benchmarks and league tables | SDG Index | - Helps countries “assess its current state of progress relative to peers (e.g. countries at a given income level or in a given geographic region), to the SDG targets, and to the ‘best’ possible scores on the various indicators.”  
- Ranks governments on SDG performance.  
- Ranking is in its 2nd year (methodology was updated therefore results are not comparable).  
- Relies on publicly available data. |
| SDG-related benchmarks and league tables | Corporate Human Rights Benchmark | - The Corporate Human Rights Benchmark provides a comparative snapshot year-to-year of the largest companies on the planet, looking at the policies, processes, and practices they have in place to systematise their human rights approach and how they respond to serious allegations. This is a public good for all stakeholders.  
- First benchmark (2017) focuses on 98 companies from three industries: agricultural products, apparel, and extractives. |

26 For instance, APG and PGGM’s effort at starting a defining a taxonomy for Sustainable Development investments  
27 For instance, UN PRI’s efforts to set up two PRI SDG working groups. See http://bit.ly/2vED4LL  
28 KPMG’s and PWC’s efforts to map the investible universe of the SDGs.  
29 Efforts include the launch of SDG-themed funds by Spanish bank Bankia. See http://bit.ly/2tVGDuW  
30 World Benchmark Alliance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description and function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SDG-related benchmarks and league tables | Transition Pathway Initiative | This initiative:  
  - Evaluates and tracks the quality of companies’ management of their greenhouse gas emissions and of risks and opportunities related to the low-carbon transition.  
  - Evaluates how companies’ future carbon performance would compare to the international targets and national pledges made as part of the Paris Agreement.  
  - Publishes the results of this analysis through an online tool.  
  The initiative is backed up by funds that commit to using the information for their investment decision. |
| SDG-related benchmarks and league tables | Asset Owner Disclosure Project | - Ranked the world’s largest asset owners on their climate change policies and practices. The project has now been absorbed by ShareAction. |
| SDG-related benchmarks and league tables | Equileap Gender Equality Global Report | - The Global Report is comprised of the Top 200 companies, insights per sector and country as well as key findings on gender equality.  
  - Over 3,000 companies ranked based on 19 criteria covering leadership, career development, work-life balance, equal pay, family leave, as well as health & safety.  
  - The top three companies leading the field in terms of gender equality in 2017 are L’Oreal (France), Pearson (United Kingdom), and National Australia Bank (Australia). |
| SDG-related benchmarks and league tables | Climetrics | - Climate impact rating for equity funds and ETFs in Europe, representing US€2.5 trillion of AUM.  
  - Methodology developed by CDP and ISS-Ethix Climate Solutions in consultation with NGOs, asset owners and managers, and members of the academic community. |
| SDG-related benchmarks and league tables | Access to Nutrition Index | - The Access to Nutrition Index (ATNI) is founded on the premise that Food & Beverage manufacturers can make a strong contribution to addressing poor nutrition and related diseases. By assessing and ranking the world’s largest manufacturers on their nutrition-related commitments, practices and performance globally, ATNI aims to encourage companies to:  
  - Increase consumer access to nutritious and affordable food and beverages through actions related to product formulation, pricing, and distribution, and  
  - Responsibly exercise their influence on consumer choice and behaviour through actions in areas such as marketing, labelling and promoting healthy diets and active lifestyles. |
| SDG-related benchmarks and league tables | Workforce Disclosure Initiative | - Initiative modelled on CDP and calling for more disclosure on workers issues throughout the supply chain.  
  - Launched by ShareAction in collaboration with Oxfam.  
  - Currently backed by 79 institutional investors representing US$8 trillion of assets under management.  
  The 2017 survey was sent to FTSE 50 as well as 25 mega cap companies and assesses governance of the workforce, workforce composition, workforce stability, workforce development, and worker engagement. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description and function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry-related benchmarks and league tables</td>
<td>Access to Medicine Index</td>
<td>The ATMI independently ranks pharmaceutical companies’ efforts to improve access to medicine in developing countries. Focuses on 107 countries, including 50 conditions and diseases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-related benchmarks and league tables</td>
<td>Access to Seeds Index</td>
<td>The Access to Seeds Index ranks seed companies by measuring and comparing their efforts to improve access to quality seeds of improved varieties for smallholder farmers in developing countries. The methodology was developed through a process of extensive stakeholder consultation and expert review. The Index 2016 focuses on global seed companies and regional companies in Eastern Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-related benchmarks and league tables</td>
<td>The Higg Index</td>
<td>Set of self-assessment tools to measure environmental and social and labour impacts and identify areas for improvement. The tools generate standardised performance scores that can be shared with supply chain partners. Scores are anonymized and aggregated, which allows businesses to benchmark their results against the industry and serves as a powerful incentive to strive for greater improvements and raise the sustainability bar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-related benchmarks and league tables</td>
<td>Seafood Stewardship Index</td>
<td>The benchmark, currently in development, will rank the world’s largest 30 seafood companies on their policies, commitments, and performance in delivering sustainable seafood. It explores what seafood companies are doing and what they can do to improve responsibility and sustainability in seafood supply chains. By highlighting best practices, the Index will stimulate learning and accelerate the uptake of best practices throughout the industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-related benchmarks and league tables</td>
<td>Global Sustainable Seafood Initiative (GSSI)</td>
<td>Benchmarks seafood certification programmes worldwide based on the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CRRF), the FAO Guidelines for Ecolabelling of Fish and Fishery Products from Marine/Inland Capture Fisheries, and the FAO Technical Guidelines for Aquaculture Certification (FAO Guidelines). GSSI used this foundation to create a Global Benchmark Tool for seafood certification schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-related benchmarks and league tables</td>
<td>Behind the Brands</td>
<td>The Behind the Brands Scorecard assesses the agricultural sourcing policies of the world’s 10 largest food and beverage companies. It exclusively focuses on publicly available information that relates to the policies of these companies on their sourcing of agricultural commodities from developing countries. The project ran for three years as part of the GROW Campaign. It has been discontinued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-related benchmarks and league tables</td>
<td>KnowTheChain Benchmarks</td>
<td>In 2016, KnowTheChain benchmarked 60 large global companies in the Information &amp; Technology Communication, Food &amp; Beverage, and Apparel &amp; Footwear sectors on their efforts to address forced labour and human trafficking in their supply chains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description and function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-related benchmarks and league tables</td>
<td>SPOTT (Sustainable Palm Oil Transparency Toolkit)</td>
<td>SPOTT assessments scores 50 of the largest palm oil producers and traders on the public availability of corporate information relating to Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) issues. Initially designed for the palm oil industry, the methodology has now been extended to assess timber, pulp, and paper companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-related benchmarks and league tables</td>
<td>Ranking Digital Rights</td>
<td>In 2015, Ranking Digital Rights launched its inaugural Corporate Accountability Index, which evaluated 16 companies based on 31 indicators focused on corporate disclosure of policies and practices that affect users’ freedom of expression and privacy. In March 2017, Ranking Digital Rights released the second edition of its Corporate Accountability Index, which ranked 22 companies according to an expanded list of 35 indicators. The 2018 Index applies the same 35 indicators and the methodology to the same 22 companies evaluated in 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-related benchmarks and league tables</td>
<td>Responsible Mining Index</td>
<td>Responsible Mining Index (RMI) will rank 30 of the world’s largest mining companies. The goal of the RMI is to encourage continuous improvement in responsible mining by transparency – ranking the performance of mining companies on Economic, Environmental, Social and Governance (EESG) issues – and highlighting leading practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-related benchmarks and league tables</td>
<td>Fair Finance Guide International</td>
<td>League tables enabling consumers to identify the performance of their banks on issues ranging from climate change to human rights and decent work. Currently active in nine countries (mostly EU).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial benchmark providers</td>
<td>Dow Jones Sustainability Index</td>
<td>The DJSI are a family of best-in-class benchmarks for investors who have recognised that sustainable business practices are critical to generating long-term shareholder value and who wish to reflect their sustainability convictions in their investment portfolios. The indices serve as benchmarks for investors who integrate sustainability considerations into their portfolios, and provide an effective engagement platform for investors who wish to encourage companies to improve their corporate sustainability practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial benchmark providers</td>
<td>FTSE4Good Index</td>
<td>Series of ethical investment stock market indices. Designed to measure the performance of companies demonstrating strong Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial benchmark providers</td>
<td>MSCI ESG Indices</td>
<td>Set of indices designed to support common approaches to Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) investing and help institutional investors more effectively benchmark to ESG investment performance as well as manage, measure, and report on ESG mandates. USD $62 billion in assets are benchmarked against these indices. MSCI ESG Sustainability Indices has recently been renamed MSCI ESG Leaders Indexes, while the MSCI Global Socially Responsible Indexes have been re-named as MSCI SRI Indexes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description and function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial benchmark providers</td>
<td>Global Compact 100 Index</td>
<td>Developed by Sustainalytics, this stock index is composed of a representative group of UN Global Compact signatories. Selected companies must have implemented and demonstrated executive commitment to the principles, in addition to maintaining a base-line profitability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description and function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting/information/guidance</td>
<td>Business Reporting on the SDGs</td>
<td>Two-year project focusing on standardising corporate reporting on SDGs using GRI indicators. <strong>Phase I (2017)</strong>: Consolidating, filling gaps, and prioritising SDGs business disclosures. <strong>Phase II (2018)</strong>: Alignment/merging GRI Standards &amp; UNGC Communication on Progress. Address accessibility to all users. Aggregation of data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting/information/guidance</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Investments Taxonomy</td>
<td>Methodology developed by APG and PGGM to identify investment opportunities linked to 13 of the United Nations’ 17 SDGs. Sweden’s four main buffer funds and Australia’s Construction and Building Unions Superannuation fund are said to have explicitly expressed their support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting/information/guidance</td>
<td>Future-Fit SDG Industry Matrix</td>
<td>Developed by KPMG in collaboration with UN Global Compact. Maps out areas where six selected industries can contribute to each of the SDGs and provides examples of actions where a given industry can deliver a positive contribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting/information/guidance</td>
<td>Environet</td>
<td>Free online web portal to allow easy comparison of corporate environmental financial disclosures. Enables users to quickly access environmental and climate-related financial disclosures provided in financial filings. Also reveals where corporations have omitted information relevant to investors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting/information/guidance</td>
<td>Engage the Chain</td>
<td>Investor guide covering: Descriptions of potential areas of financial risk in agricultural supply chains, including climate change, deforestation, land use, biodiversity, land rights, water scarcity, pollution, and working conditions. Detailed briefs on the eight commodities that include descriptions of the value chain for each and an assessment of how the risks identified can impact them. A ‘table’ showing the exposure of major US food and beverage companies to each of the commodities. Guidance for investors on the steps they can take to evaluate material risks in their portfolios due to these supply chain impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting/information/guidance</td>
<td>SDG Business Dashboard</td>
<td>Focused on SDG 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12 &amp; 17. Looks at materiality related to a) operational risks, b) licence to operate risk, and c) technology risk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The consultation phase of the World Benchmarking Alliance is funded by:
As of this consultation, the following organisations have endorsed the consultation phase of the WBA.