

# Rate the Raters Phase Five

## Questionnaire for Raters

### EIRIS

### February 2013

---

## Overview of Questionnaire

The questionnaire covers five areas: Rating Overview, Governance and Transparency, Inputs, Research Process and Outputs. SustainAbility developed a methodology to evaluate raters' responses in the latter four areas, and we used this to identify the good practices and areas for improvement described in [Rate the Raters Phase III: Uncovering Best Practices](#). We have made our methodology available on our website for readers to use while reviewing the raters' responses.

## Directions for Raters

Please use space below each question to input your answers. While we have not set a minimum or maximum number of words for your responses, please answer the questions in sufficient detail for us to understand your practices. We have included guidance notes in italics. We recognize that certain questions may not be pertinent to every rating. If you find this to be the case, please indicate this and provide a brief explanation.

---

## 0 Rating Overview

### 0.1.1 Rating Name

#### EIRIS

Please note: We have interpreted 'rating' to mean the assessments EIRIS makes of a company within discreet research areas that can generally be categorized as environmental, social, corporate governance related and ethical. We do not impose a single rating framework on our clients; instead we offer them the flexibility of defining their own ratings and assessments using EIRIS data. If they prefer not to develop their own rating, clients can opt to use the EIRIS Sustainability Rating service. The EIRIS Sustainability Rating service has an overall default rating. This can sit alongside our Climate Change and PRI Toolkit products that also contain default ratings that clients can use if it suits their purposes. Although EIRIS does offer a Sustainability Rating service, we encourage clients to select and weight criteria and policies as they see fit.

**0.1.2 Please describe the primary objectives and motivations for your rating**

Within the context of the mission of its parent body, the EIRIS Foundation, EIRIS aims to provide clients with independent assessments of company activities, risks, policies, management, performance and disclosure, to multiple markets covering a broad range of issues and concerns via a software platform (or other requested means) that allows clients to pursue their investment policies and make decisions according to their particular investment criteria. This includes support for engagement, integration of ESG issues within investment processes, the creation of screened portfolios and the application of international norms based approaches.

**0.1.3 How do you evaluate the impact or success of your rating? If so, how?**

The impact of EIRIS' assessments is demonstrated in a number of ways. For example, engagement activities driven by EIRIS' assessments may lead to a change in company activities and management approach to an issue. Many companies are keen to learn of their assessment and strive to achieve a higher assessment. At another level, winning or renewing client contracts will (at least in part) be indicative of the relevance and impact of the ratings / assessments in enabling clients to do and achieve what they want. Investment decisions are made on the back of information EIRIS provides. There is no one simple measure for all this.

**0.1.4 Please identify your audience or customer base, and, if possible how they use your rating in their decision making.**

Our clients are diverse and global in scope. They include institutional investors who typically operate retail funds, pensions funds, responsible investment index creators, charities, etc. We identify them within broad categories such as basic (issue) screeners, best of sector screeners, engagers, value seekers etc. A list of EIRIS clients can be viewed on our website at [www.eiris.org](http://www.eiris.org).

Our software platform, EIRIS Portfolio Manager (EPM), a database that is exportable into Excel and other client data systems, contains assessments and grades for specific research areas in a company profile. EPM also includes assessment details which can be treated as raw data. This allows clients to apply their own weightings to our assessment grades and turn them into their own assessments / rankings / scores / levels of acceptability, etc.

EPM assists clients by offering a number of strategies that can be used with the assessments such as: i) simple avoidance (especially for screeners); ii) scoring all companies e.g. allows weightings to be used, identifies best or worse performers; iii) simple balance, that allows attributing what issues or thresholds should be treated as negative or positive; iv) a combined approach e.g. some negative factors should exclude a company from the portfolio, but other factors should be balanced and scored. This approach might suit an investor with a particularly developed policy who wanted to combine a number of the other approaches. The client may make decisions on EIRIS data alone or to supplement their own research.

EPM also enables benchmarking. Reports can be produced on an issue by issue basis against chosen peer groups, and the overall assessment can be compared with relevant sector, size and country peers as well. A client can also provide a portfolio and ask EIRIS to determine how compliant it is with their ESG criteria. This can also be produced by the client from within EPM.

EPM serves a range of different client types with a high degree of in built user flexibility.

---

## 1 Governance and Transparency

### 1.1 Disclosure of methodology

#### 1.1.1 Describe how you make available the details of your methodology to the public, rated companies and other stakeholders.

The full details of the EIRIS methodology are currently available only to clients. Elements of our methodology and research process can be found in the Transparency Matrix that we issue as part of the ARISTA certification process ([http://www.aristastandard.org/content\\_files/file/TM%202012/EIRISCSRR-TM2012.pdf](http://www.aristastandard.org/content_files/file/TM%202012/EIRISCSRR-TM2012.pdf)). In order to address specific company queries, some aspects of the methodology may be provided to companies. In other circumstances an abbreviated or summary version of the methodologies for particular areas may be provided without undermining our intellectual property. FTSE4Good uses a subset of EIRIS criteria. Information about the EIRIS criteria used by FTSE4Good can be found on the FTSE4Good website.

### 1.2 Conflict Management

#### 1.2.1 Do you have a policy (or guidelines, standards, etc.) that addresses conflicts of interest? If so, is it disclosed publicly?

Yes. It is contained within a broader Code of Conduct to which EIRIS employees are required to adhere. This is available on the EIRIS website. Key extracts are:

Conflicts of interest when researching companies:

There are various situations that would prevent a researcher from analysing a particular company. These include:

- Having worked for the company in question in the last six months
- Having an immediate relation (spouse, partner, parent, sibling or offspring) who works for, or has a significant interest in, that company
- Where the researcher holds shares directly in the company being analysed without having declared them to their line manager (see below)
- Having a close relationship with the competitors of the company being researched

If a staff member is unsure whether a particular relationship with a company is a cause for concern they should raise it immediately with their line manager, who should consult with the compliance officer if necessary. A record must be kept of all potential conflicts of interest and how these are being managed. Perceived, potential and actual conflicts are all equally deserving of attention.

Equal treatment of companies:

All companies must be researched in the same way following EIRIS' research methodology and associated guidelines. Companies must not be treated in a more favourable fashion due to any kind of special relationship with that company e.g. if the company is also an EIRIS client or a supplier of goods and services. If a researcher believes a company is placing undue pressure on them, then they should refer the matter to their line manager.

**1.2.2 Do you disclose the relationships and independence of board members, advisory panel members, partners and/or other involved third-parties? If so, how? How do you manage conflicts of interest with these entities?**

A register of interests for Board and Trustees has been created to avoid or manage any possibility of conflicts of interest. Conflict of interest policies and reports are updated regularly, particularly in the run up to an ARISTA audit. EIRIS Independence policies and the EIRIS Code of Conduct can be found on the EIRIS website.

**1.2.3 Do you offer for-fee services to the companies that you rate (including benchmark reports)? If yes, please describe these services. How do you avoid conflicts of interest in these situations?**

Yes.

When companies who are also clients are also part of the research coverage, they will be assessed in the same way as any other company. For some companies that are also very significant clients EIRIS will pass these companies to one of our Research Partners to cover. Likewise, we take some companies from them when the same or similar potential conflicts arise. Potential conflicts of interest are covered under the code of conduct. The relevant paragraph is:

“Researching companies that are also clients:

It is vital in these cases that clear working separations between the client team and the research team are maintained. Client team members must not liaise with company members such as the Head of CSR or Head of Sustainability or other corporate personnel who provide and communicate with EIRIS on the provision of data. This is the role of the research team. An exception may apply when it is appropriate for client team members to speak to corporate CSR staff to clarify if a company pension’s scheme is interested in developing socially responsible investment approaches. If a staff member has any doubts they should consult with their line manager.”

We have recently extended this commitment to avoiding conflicts of interest by agreeing to have a research partner research companies that are also clients. In exchange, as part of this arrangement, EIRIS has agreed to research some of the companies that the partner’s business arm also did consultancy for.

**1.2.4 Do you have any other financial relationships (e.g. sponsorships, advertising) with companies you rate?**

No.

### **1.3 Regular Review**

**1.3.1 Do you have a regular approach to updating your methodology over time? If yes, describe this approach.**

Yes. EIRIS employs an annual prioritisation exercise for reviewing existing and/or developing new areas and/or criteria, the results of which are then fed into the following year’s annual research plan. The prioritisation will be informed by a mixture of client feedback, quality reviews,

research partner input, developments in the field, global events, trends and developments such as the existence of international norms and other stakeholder concerns.

**1.3.2 Describe how you communicate any changes in your methodologies to affected companies and other stakeholders, and how you work with them to adapt to and understand the implications of the changes.**

There is no one way of undertaking this. Clients are informed of launches of new or revised methodologies for particular research areas in conjunction with changes made to facilitate them in EPM.

Companies may be informed by way of a special mailings (especially if company information is sought for developing a new research area) or by highlighting amendments to the regular survey. More minor changes using existing information such as incorporating an additional turnover threshold are unlikely to be given advance notice but will appear in the Company profile allowing them to comment or provide additional information if they so wish.

**1.4 Stakeholder Involvement (excluding rated companies)**

**1.4.1 Does the rating have an external and/or independent advisory body in place? If so, describe how this body is involved in the rating's construction and maintenance and the scoring, rating, or selection of companies.**

No. EIRIS has no external / independent body that overviews individual company assessments. EIRIS does not pursue a regular programme of stakeholder meetings specifically for methodology reviews. EIRIS uses its discretion in assessing what approach with stakeholders is suitable for each particular research area development.

**1.4.2 Describe how you involve / solicit feedback from external stakeholders in the development and ongoing maintenance of the rating. Please provide an example of how you revised your methodology based on stakeholder input.**

Stakeholder involvement is primarily at the methodological development / review stage, although clients can provide feedback and additional information on specific companies from their own engagements.

During the methodological development / review stage, the views of various stakeholders are sought. The number and means will depend upon the issue and its context. Engagement may be one-offs or continue over a more extended period of time. It may be undertaken by various means including focus groups (e.g. climate change), one-to-one dialogue (water) and surveys. Input from these is used to modify or augment the final methodological approach to the given issue.

Data from sources such as regulatory bodies or other authoritative third parties is used for specific areas. Views and positions of indirect stakeholders are very occasionally used for some Convention Watch assessments, other news monitoring activities and some other areas e.g. military. We also apply our general approach and research principles to bespoke criteria / areas requested by particular clients.

In general, stakeholder involvement is approached in a manner that does not undermine EIRIS' objectivity and independence.

A notable example of how this process can occur relates to the work EIRIS has undertaken with the Johannesburg Stock Exchange (JSE). Discussions were held directly with the JSE to determine a set of criteria and their underlying indicators. In doing so, approaches developed by other groups were considered including FTSE4Good, and GRI. In addition, region specific sources were consulted including the South African King II report. This has resulted in the adoption of modified EIRIS standard criteria (to greater or lesser extents depending on the research area) and the introduction of South African-specific criteria for black empowerment and HIV/Aids. Further amendments have been undertaken within this arrangement.

**1.4.3 How do you communicate the output / summary from this engagement? For example, do you make public the stakeholder comments?**

At a methodological level, no public disclosure of stakeholder comments is made, although some summary or collective comments may be made when presenting new research developments at EIRIS client seminars.

At an individual company assessment level, stakeholder views, especially those of NGOs and campaign groups, may be used within Convention Watch assessments. This is most likely to be integrated into the assessment, linking with specific indicators or issues, rather than as stand-alone statements from stakeholders.

---

## **2 Inputs**

### **2.1 Information Sources**

**2.1.1 Please list and describe the information sources that you utilize to develop your rating.**

They are wide-ranging covering:

- Company annual reports and accounts
- Company CSR, sustainability, environment or similar reports
- Company websites
- Other occasional company documents such as staff manuals, newsletters, brochures etc.
- Profile mailing (including survey) responses
- Other company engagement / communication
- Regulatory data (e.g. Environment Agency)
- External directories and databases etc.
- Specialized published stakeholder information (reports on particular issues)
- Screening of the media, news services (e.g. Factiva)
- Internet research (non-corporate websites)

**2.1.2 Please describe how this information is obtained (i.e. from publicly available documents, partner organizations, directly from companies). If your rating is based on other ratings or third-party research firms, please describe how they obtain their information.**

Hopefully above is largely self-explanatory. Research partners undertake assessments in accordance with the same methodology, but may be able to incorporate local sources that are consistent / complementary with the above.

**2.1.3 How often do you refresh information / inputs on companies?**

EIRIS adopts an annual schedule for company profile updates based upon defined levels of risk in relation to key areas and anticipated publication dates of annual and CSR-type reports. For lower risk companies in some countries including Canada, Japan, Singapore and Hong Kong, EIRIS undertakes a full profile update every two years and in the intervening year sends the companies their profile asking them to indicate if any material changes are required to the profile. If any changes are provided, then EIRIS will amend the profile accordingly.

Changes to company profiles and assessments can occur outside of the research or mailings cycle when other sources of information from third parties are processed and attributed to individual companies. Changes may also occur from time to time due to disposals, acquisitions, sector changes and other corporate actions.

**2.1.4 How do you deal with non-disclosure by companies in your rating?**

Companies are assessed in part on information provided in the public domain. Where a company provides little or no information for a given research area, the grade will reflect that i.e. 'no evidence' or 'no data' is a possible assessment level. However, all companies are given a chance to provide missing or extra data. If a company does not take the opportunity to supply additional information the assessment is not changed or downgraded due to a lack of response. In specific areas, such as Convention Watch, the assessment may state that a company did not respond to specific requests / queries.

## **2.2 Company Engagement**

**2.2.1 Describe the process by which you engage / interact with the companies that you rate (i.e. frequency, nature, format).**

Profiles are sent to companies after each annual company update, and can be sent at other times if requested by companies. All comments received from companies are reviewed and amendments made to the databases / profile as appropriate in accordance with the methodology.

Engagement occurs with companies on a more ad hoc basis when necessary in relation to Convention Watch, or as a result of special client requests, or when developing new research areas / criteria.

As data provider for the FTSE4Good index series, we have worked closely with FTSE on their company engagement programme. We also offer an Engagement Service that facilitates clients' engagement programmes with companies.

**2.2.2 On average, how much time do your analysts spend engaging with each rated company on an annual basis?**

This can be very variable depending upon the issues and context. A rough average may be two hours per company. This would include drafting a letter or survey for a company to accompany the profile, sending the profile, and acting on responses for a standard update. Additional engagement for particular clients will add to this. There are some cultural differences that influence the amount of time researchers spend on engagement. For example, engagement with Japanese companies can be more time demanding. Companies identified by Convention Watch allegations can be considerably longer, anything from one to two days or in extreme

cases - this includes preparing the reports of the allegations ahead of asking the company for their comments / response.

**2.2.3 Please describe if and how feedback from rated companies is incorporated into your research and ratings process.**

All comments received are reviewed and amendments made to the databases / profile as appropriate in accordance with the assessment methodology and our quality commitments. Only information provided that directly relates to the indicators and criteria are used for the assessments, although some extra data may be included in the profile as extra detail, even though not assessed.

## **2.3 Input Verification**

**2.3.1 Describe your approach to verifying the information used to assess companies. Is this approach captured in any sort of policy or guidance document?**

The assessment methodology is set out in the Guide to EIRIS Research and its companion, Practical Guide to EIRIS Research. Each research area has a lead specialist who is responsible for approving records before they are released to clients. They will provide feedback to researchers or research partners if corrections or amendments need to be made. Some criteria are automatically generated and automated checks have been developed to ensure they are working properly or inconsistencies are identified.

Generally there is no internal committee that reviews information and/or assessments, but Convention Watch does have a 'sign-off' committee comprising the Head of Responsible Investment Development, Convention Watch project manager, area specialist and lead researcher for each convention to review on a quarterly basis the assessment of allegations covered.

**2.3.2 Is external or third-party verification a consideration in assessing the quality of information sources? If so, please explain.**

EIRIS takes into consideration whether information reported by a company has undergone external or third-party verification in assessments for some areas of the EIRIS criteria.

---

## **3 Research Process**

### **3.1 Experience and Capacity of Research Team**

**3.1.1 On average, how many years of experience do your analysts (internal or contract) have working in or analyzing the industries they cover?**

Years of experience vary across levels within the research department. The average length of service in the research team is approximately four years, but more senior members of the department have greater length of experience. Approximately half the team has between one and three years experience.

**3.1.2 Describe your approach to ongoing training and industry education for your analysts.**

New analysts receive a four week induction program. Further refresher trainings occur when revisions or refinements are made to particular methodologies. Feedback is also provided to analysts through the approvals process. Each individual has a personal development plan and annual review (with mid year progress review) linked to organizational needs regarding training and industry education to keep abreast of developments and initiatives in the CSR / RI field. Support is also provided to analysts pursuing additional qualifications or attending courses that are also seen to be beneficial to EIRIS.

**3.1.3 On average, how many companies do your analysts cover each year?**

EIRIS currently covers over 2300 companies on full criteria in-house with overseas research partners undertaking over 600 companies for its standard universe. Other companies may be covered on a more limited or bespoke basis. A researcher who is largely focussed on company updates will typically have a portfolio of companies of around 60-80.

## **3.2 Quality Management**

**3.2.1 Describe your approach to ensuring quality control throughout the ratings process. Is this process documented or codified?**

EIRIS has developed a quality management system which received re-certification to the ARISTA Voluntary Quality Standard in early 2012. The next ARISTA audit is expected to occur in late Spring 2013. At the higher / broader level the assessment process reflects the general objectives and annual business plans of the organization. Within that context, the relevance and identification of gaps in research areas / criteria are reviewed annually with stakeholder involvement and inform the following year's research plan. Criteria and indicators are developed taking into account client requirements, availability of information, and delivery in EPM. Analysts then have a rigorous methodology to apply consistently across all companies for their portfolio. An approvals process is used to check the creation of assessments. Various automated in other data integrity checks (e.g. database inconsistencies, out of date sources, sense checks etc.) are undertaken to ensure the quality is maintained. Companies are also sent their profiles for comment, to provide extra data or to correct any factual inaccuracies. Index and other company changes such as name or sector changes are monitored to ensure the right companies are covered for the right reasons. A diagrammatic portrayal of the QMS is available.

**3.2.2 Have your research systems or processes been certified, assured or verified by an external organization?**

Yes. We received certification to the ARISTA Voluntary Quality Standard (formerly called the AI-CSRR Voluntary Quality Standard) in early 2009 and achieved re-certified in Feb 2012. The most recent certified transparency matrix can be seen at:

[http://www.aristastandard.org/content\\_files/file/TM%202012/EIRISCSRR-TM2012.pdf](http://www.aristastandard.org/content_files/file/TM%202012/EIRISCSRR-TM2012.pdf)

This was produced in February 2012.

### 3.3 Sector Specificity

**3.3.1 Does your rating use the same criteria and weightings for all sectors and companies? If so, explain why.**

No. For several areas such as human rights, climate change, bribery, companies are given a risk or impact rating (typically high, medium or low). Assessments of policy and management systems, for instance, will then be attached to this risk or impact level.

**3.3.2 Describe how you take into account industry and company specific issues and context.**

EIRIS has criteria around specific sectors e.g. Access to medicines (pharmaceuticals), Mobile phone health concerns (telecommunications), Obesity concerns (food & beverages); Project finance (financial). Other areas such as global sourcing and greenhouse gases are also restricted to particular sectors. Human rights and labour & bribery criteria are also linked to sectors to some extent. For other areas such as Climate Change we expect different companies in different sectors to meet different requirements e.g. IT on climate change is different than Chemicals. Some other areas, although theoretically applying to all sectors, tend to be concentrated in particular sectors e.g. gambling, alcohol.

EIRIS maintains a knowledge catalogue of current and emerging sector issues and plans to continue developing sector methodology in response to market demand.

### 3.4 Basis for Rating

**3.4.1 Describe the basis for your rating of companies, including how you determine what constitutes the different degrees of performance. For example, if you grade companies on an A-F scale, how do you determine these levels?**

EIRIS does not impose a single rating framework on our clients; instead we offer them the flexibility of defining their own ratings and assessments using EIRIS data. If they prefer not to develop their own rating, clients can opt to use the EIRIS Sustainability Rating service. The EIRIS Sustainability Rating service has an overall default rating. This can sit alongside our Climate Change and PRI Toolkit products which also contain default ratings that clients can use if it suits their purposes.

The EIRIS Sustainability Rating draws from a broad range of ESG criteria which are selected and weighted according to their relevance to the sustainability debate. Our research philosophy is driven by the need for companies to meet the concerns of their current stakeholders whilst managing the impact of their businesses upon society and the environment, both now and for the future. We look for corporate leadership in tackling ESG challenges through policies, systems, reporting and demonstrated performance improvements. Our ratings also consider how companies deal with public controversies where they arise. Those companies with a higher ESG impact are expected to do more to mitigate these impacts. Ratings are on an A-F scale and take into account each company's sector, business activities and geographical location, in addition to how it is managing key ESG impacts and controversies.

EPM allows clients to define ratings in accordance with their own policies and concerns if they so choose. EIRIS does, however, provide assessments within discreet research areas. The approach to the bulk of EIRIS' research is to first identify a company's potential impact or risk exposure as High, Medium or Low in the various areas such as environment, climate change,

biodiversity, bribery, human rights, supply chain; and then to assess of the related policy, management systems, reporting and (where possible performance) in each of these areas on a 5 level grading scheme. Typically, there is a ladder of assessment grades from no evidence to limited, intermediate, good and advanced. These are produced by the mix of indicators met (derived from the information sources used) for each specific area.

For screened areas such as military, alcohol, gambling etc, the approach is more typically on identifying involvement and then the amount of turnover derived from such activities, commonly according to turnover thresholds or bands.

**3.4.2 Do you factor company-specific context into your rating?**

Yes, especially for risk-based areas. Countries of operation are embedded into and help determine assessments of human rights and bribery. A similar approach is used for the water management criteria.

**3.4.3 Do you incorporate external norms, standards or principles (e.g. UN MDGs, GRI, UNGC, etc.) into your rating or process? If so, describe how you use these to calibrate or assess company performance.**

Yes. Convention Watch has been designed and developed to assess how a company has addressed any allegations that breach various international norms and conventions.

Some of these standards or initiatives (e.g. UN Global Impact, ISO14001) are factored in as 'proxies' for particular elements in specific areas and may allow a company to be assessed at a particular default grade as a minimum. This might be improved if additional information is available from the company.

**3.4.4 How do you deal with unforeseen, negative company events in your ratings process (e.g. environmental incidents, ethics breaches)?**

Convention Watch and other news monitoring processes are the principle means of capturing and addressing such 'negative' company events. Special client requests may lead us to do more in depth research e.g. BP & Gulf of Mexico.

---

## **4 Outputs**

### **4.1 Validation of Results**

**4.1.1 Describe the steps you take to verify your rating results (including scores and reports) prior to their finalization.**

As described above, a system of approvals and other quality checks are employed and are embedded in the research approach. Such monitoring occurs at different stages or places e.g. checks that the right data is showing correctly when launching or revising research areas, initial approvals process for individual records, automated checks during the weekly updating process, further checks on the data update before final weekly release to clients, other ongoing data integrity checks.

**4.1.2 Do you give rated companies an opportunity to review draft scores or reports? If yes, describe this process, including timeframe given for review.**

Yes. Companies are provided with a copy of their profile shortly after the research has been completed / updated and approved. A response period is allowed to give companies the opportunity to provide additional data or supply new data to prevent a downgrade in an area where the existing data is out of date (as determined by the methodology). Companies sometimes ask to see their profile at other times and we comply with their request. There may be other ad hoc cases when a company may be asked to comment / review their profile e.g. special client concerns, needing information to be current for a report or publication.

**4.1.3 Do you have a formal policy and/or process for addressing challenges or disputes presented by companies or other stakeholders?**

Yes. From companies, a dedicated complaints email address is provided. Complaints or inquiries are responded to within three working days. Comments from companies as a result of the profile mailing are acted upon within three weeks.

From clients, EIRIS' Client Care Plan standards contain the following commitment: All complaints should be addressed or fully responded to within 48 hours. As part of this, any research issues arising will be taken up with the analyst(s) concerned.

## **4.2 Accessibility**

**4.2.1 Describe how you disclose and explain your results to rated companies. Do you share the full details of the assessment or results? If no, explain why not.**

Yes, the full company profile is provided to the company for comment and transparency. Several areas will state what the company meets and does not meet (or not found), and/or what will be required to achieve a higher assessment grade. Whilst much of this will be fairly self explanatory, analysts can respond to queries and explain more fully the methodology as necessary.

**4.2.2 Describe how and to what extent stakeholders (other than rated companies) can access the details and results of your rating.**

Clients can access the assessments and company profiles via EPM. The client can choose what level of data they wish to see e.g. top level assessment grades only or full profile with assessment details.

EIRIS also makes data available to stakeholders through CSRHub. CSRHub provides access to corporate social responsibility and sustainability ratings and information on over 6,700 companies from 135 industries in 82 countries. Managers, researchers and activists use CSRHub to benchmark company performance, learn how stakeholders evaluate company CSR practices and seek ways to change the world.