



World Business Council for  
Sustainable Development

## Meeting Notes, WGC Meeting, Geneva

5 June 2000

1. As you know we spent a good deal of time discussing the overview/summary, because people felt this an important element in conveying the structure, approach and specific study content. It is the kind of thing that would be used for a management summary. You and I later discussed the concept of an abbreviated Battelle proposal, which could be used for briefing corporate executives and boards. I encourage you to take this approach. The people involved will find it much easier to digest a 10-12 page summary, than the 50+ pages of details. The summary should include a budget summary as well. I am expecting the revised exec. summary from ADLittle today, and will forward it to you as soon as received. You may be able to use some of that for background, etc.
2. There is need for greater clarity and consistency on the use of words such as clusters, phases, stages, implementation, sub-study, component, etc. Many of these words were used interchangeably, when they are not. In addition, there should be a better definition of Battelle's role in your proposal, so that it is clear that Battelle is both the "general contractor" managing subcontractors, as well as the Lead Consultant who will integrate the different sub-studies into a coherent final report. At some point, you may also be performing specific sub-studies, or parts thereof.
3. There was a strong sense from the group for you to make the connections between the AG suggestions, your proposal, and the project execution more explicit and clear.
4. Please have your team re-read the material and eliminate phrases which may seem too positive (or negative) in describing the sub-study approaches. For example, in Sub-study 3.2, page 3, last bullet, we suggest removing the phrase "Beneficial and innovative." As it currently stands, someone might assume that the sub-study would not examine any negative consequences. We know this is not your intent.
5. We agreed to combine Sub-study 1.1 and 1.2 into one item geared toward model building and particulars for the cement industry. There is a great deal of background work at the WBCSD on stakeholder dialogues that can be used. Stephanie Hanford is the contact person at WBCSD ([Hanford@wbcsd.ch](mailto:Hanford@wbcsd.ch)).
6. After the meeting You and I discussed three possible locations for early stakeholder dialogues: Portugal (covering Europe and Africa/Mid East), India (covering Asia/Pacific region), and Brazil (covering North and Latin America/Caribbean. The last location may offer an opportunity to combine



forces with the Sustainable Mobility project and their possible dialogue in Brazil.

7. The first stakeholder dialogue event(s) will be primarily to validate the work plan, issues, and approach obtained to date. These should be scheduled early on (but with enough time to organize them!) so that any adjustments can be incorporated into the work program. You agreed to develop a matrix which showed where stakeholder input would be important to each substudy, and if the desired input was more appropriate from “global,” regional, national or local stakeholders. You may want to refer to the ADLittle work on mapping stakeholder issues as a starting point.
8. There were no changes proposed for sub-study 1.3, External Communications. However, I suspect you will want to be kept aware of company plans in this area. There is a meeting in Geneva on July 11 to deal with this topic from the companies’ standpoint, and to provide a level of coordination for the project.
9. In a number of the sub-studies you have asked for or expect interactions with individual companies. To allow everyone to plan for this you were asked to provide a matrix showing which sub-study, and what kind of help you expect. I would like to get this to everyone as early as possible so that WGC members can lay the groundwork within their organizations. It may also be useful to have this as part of the proposal package.
10. I would encourage you to change the sub-study numbering system, and simply use numbers 1-13. That way, if things shift between clusters, the same numerical identifier can be retained.
11. The sub-study 2-E3 on innovation needs to account for factor 4 and factor 10 thinking. In addition, it would be helpful to emphasize that this is about more than technology—for example by listing an extended set of subject areas where innovation impacts will be evaluated.
12. The work on climate change mitigation (Substudy 3.1) needs to include Joint Implementation (JI) as well as trading and Clean Development Mechanisms (CDM). Again, a group at WBCSD is very active in this area and has a project going with World Resources Institute (WRI) called the Greenhouse Gas Initiative, which is geared toward establishing standard approaches for measurement and accounting in this area. We should take advantage of this work, and not re-invent it. The WBCSD contact here is Dave Moorcroft ([moorcroft@wbczd.ch](mailto:moorcroft@wbczd.ch)).
13. Sub-study 3.2 (industrial ecology) needs to discuss the waste hierarchy as well as other items. A possible resource for you on the question of world-wide material flows is Professor David Allen at the University of Texas at Austin. Dave has already done a good deal of work in this area. He is an editor of “The Journal of Industrial Ecology.” By the way, that journal has rather extensive editorial, management and advisory boards which may also



prove useful starting points for other potential sub-study contractors. In particular, I would call your attention to the programs at Rockefeller University (Prof. Ausubel), Princeton (Prof. Socolow), Yale (Prof. Graedel), and Leiden (Prof. Helias Udo de Haes).

14. Sub-study 3.3 (environmental performance) needs to have an equal weighting on cost and economics. Great technology that is too expensive, will usually not get used.
15. In sub-study 4.1 (socio-economics) we suggest the following changes. On page 2, Description, eliminate the word “global.” In the first bullet, the phrase “standard industry-wide” is not clear. Nor is it necessarily appropriate, given differences in cultural matters. One classic example I recall from some earlier work in a different industry was an attempt to set a uniform “facial-hair” policy. The intent was to make sure that people working in plants where exposure to hazardous chemicals was a possibility would be able to use respirator equipment and obtain a safe fit of the face mask. This demanded a policy of “no facial hair” because hair prevented a tight seal. In a number of countries this ran totally against cultural traditions and created a big problem.
16. In task 4 of sub-study (4.1), we do not think an “industry-wide” strategy is appropriate. We suggest substituting guidance for strategy in the first sentence.
17. In sub-study 4.2 (public policy instruments) you refer to “accountability standards” such as ISO9000 and ISO 14000. I am more accustomed to thinking of these as self-enforced management system standards. On your discussion of the Rationale, I believe it is equally worthwhile for the public policy community to understand how specific instruments and policies impact industrial performance. As usual, there are lessons to be learned from failures as well as successes. Some of the US media-specific regulations have driven pollutant transfers from air to water, water to solid waste, etc.
18. Again in sub-study 4.2, the benefits and disadvantages should cover the entire range of instruments, not just regulation. Also, in the last paragraph on page 3, please strike the phrase “such as would be used in an industrial ecology context.” Some approaches may be applicable in other settings, and we don’t want to unduly limit the focus.