

Table 1 - Feedback by researchers on draft Annual Report 2002-2003

Suggestions made by researchers	Changes made to report by the Team (due to time constraints some of these were implemented in later reports)
<p>Section on economic impacts should include economic indicators as suggested in the GRI guidelines, rather than financial statement information(a)</p> <p>Data identified by researchers, not included in draft report: customer and employee surveys; data on diversity in employment; and, water management activities were not fully reported. The employee survey, for example, was completed by more than three-quarters of employees and provided evidence of two-way communication. Customer and employment satisfaction surveys could be use to derive appropriate KPIs</p> <p>Include information about stakeholder engagement process and nature of the feedback</p> <p>Targets set for the coming year and areas identified for further improvement</p> <p>Benchmarking information although the organisation had access to KPIs of other organisations in the water sector</p> <p>The Purpose and Vision of the organisation should mention how it planned to deal with the long-term sustainability of its water supply</p> <p>What We Value should be expressed in terms of “we aim to”, e.g. maximise customer satisfaction.</p> <p>The Purpose, Vision and Values statements to be moved to the front of the report</p> <p>The Key Drivers were expressed in rather vague terms and it was suggested that these could be redefined as Current Issues</p>	<p>The “economic” and “financial” performance items were presented separately.</p> <p>The Economic Performance section in the 2004-2005 report in addition included a discussion on Essential Services Commission and Business Streams</p> <p>The 2003-2004 report included further quantified KPIs including KPIs relating to customer complaints on various aspects of the business</p> <p>The 2004-2005 report included information on the fourth Employee Opinion Survey conducted in February 2005</p> <p>Contribution of external stakeholder committees included. The 2004-2005 report included information on three external stakeholder committees, including their roles and membership (discussed below)</p> <p>The 2004-2005 report Corporate KPIs presented 26 indicators, provided historical performance from 2000-2005, measured the current years performance against targets set and identified where performance needed to be improved</p> <p>The 2004-2005 report included Water Industry Benchmarking</p> <p>The 2004-2005 report indicates that the organisation is focussed on long-term sustainability</p> <p>Implemented. In addition the Team used a diagram to show how the organisation’s Purpose, Vision and Values were linked to its employee’s individual performance plans illustrating how the organisation’s Vision resulted in the development of departmental targets and how those targets were associated with employee performance</p> <p>The 2004-2005 report included 26 indicators that spanned all areas of business, linked directly to both the Strategic Plan and the Australian Business Excellence Framework. Information was provided that seven indicators failed to meet the target and one was not able to be reported</p>

Table 1 - Feedback by researchers on draft Annual Report 2002-2003

<p>The Corporate KPI's should be linked to the Seven Areas of Strategic Focus and the strategic plan</p> <p>More detailed reporting of the process of reporting. For example, how do the various external stakeholder committees fit into the governance structure of the organisation? How are the committee members selected? Do they represent all key stakeholder groups? Who convenes these committees and how are their deliberations fed into Board level decision making?</p> <p>Users could be referred to the organisation's web site for information which could not be included in the hard copy report</p> <p>The Highlights of the year, being the top 10-15 business achievements could be linked to the Seven Areas of Strategic Focus</p> <p>Discussion of the Sustainability Self-Assessment and Self-Diagnostic Checklist</p> <p>Involve other environmental groups, obtain letters from experts in various fields and consider engaging an external verifier.</p>	<p>Implemented, put in tabular form and, where prior year data was available, comparative performance was illustrated graphically</p> <p>The 2004-2005 report included discussion of the three external stakeholder committees, including their roles, issues dealt with during the year, how often the committees met and their membership</p> <p>Done. Presented in tabular and bullet point format and presented earlier in the report. The 2004-2005 report included the top 27 business achievements</p> <p>Discussed in the 2003-2004 report. Not mentioned in 2004-2005 report, but information provided on participation in a number of industry benchmarking programs, including Water Services Association of Australia and Victorian Water Industry Association</p> <p>The 2004-2005 report and earlier reports were not externally verified</p>
---	---

Note: (a) This is a common failing of reports and was noted by the judges of the ACCA Australia Sustainability Reporting Awards (see ACCA Australia Awards for Sustainability Reporting 2002: Report of the Judges (ACCA, 2002))

This article is © Emerald Group Publishing and permission has been granted for this version to appear here (www.drcaroladams.net). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Article citation: Carol A. Adams, Patty McNicholas, (2007) "[Making a difference: Sustainability reporting, accountability and organisational change](#)", Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, Vol. 20 Iss: 3, pp.382 – 402 DOI (Permanent URL): [10.1108/09513570710748553](https://doi.org/10.1108/09513570710748553)