5.1 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. It is found that all the selected index based Indian and Australian companies’ have reported on all the three aspects of Triple Bottom Line, i.e., Environmental, Social and Financial (Economic) to more or less extent during the study period.

2. It is found that out of all the selected companies’, 17 Australian companies’ have prepared a separate report on “TBL” in either all years or at least few years, while only 10 Indian companies’ have prepared the said report separately during the study period.

3. It is also found that all the selected companies’ who have not prepared a separate report on TBL aspects, have included the said information in their annual reports, in one or the other form, viz., directors’ report, report on corporate social responsibility, environment and social report, management discussion & analysis report, etc.

4. It is found that out of the 20 selected Indian companies’, only 9 companies’ have reported on “Global Reporting Initiative” (GRI) Complaint Application Level Status (as per GRI reporting framework) in the reports, so prepared.

Further, it has been found that out of the 20 selected Australian companies’, 15 companies’ have reported on “Global Reporting Initiative” (GRI) Complaint Application Level Status (as per GRI reporting framework) in the reports, so prepared.

5. Looking to the attainment of ISO 14000 Series Certification (Environment Management Systems) under Environmental
Performance Reporting aspect, it is found during the study period that 15 Indian companies’ (except BHA Ltd., DLF Ltd., HUL Ltd., IFO Ltd. and L & T Ltd.) (out of total 20 Indian companies’) have reported the said in clear terms.

While, 14 Australian companies’ (out of 20 companies’) (except AWC Ltd., BHP Ltd. GBG Ltd., ILU Ltd., SGP Ltd. and TLS Ltd.) have reported the same in clear terms during the study period.

6. It is found that 12 Indian companies’ (except BAJ Ltd., BHE Ltd., CIP Ltd., HMC Ltd., HUL Ltd., JPA Ltd., L & T Ltd. and MSU Ltd.) and 10 Australian companies’ (except ABC Ltd., BXB Ltd., CSL Ltd., GBG Ltd., ILU Ltd., IPL Ltd., RIO Ltd., SGP Ltd., TLS Ltd. and WPL Ltd.) have reported on achieving awards pertaining to Environmental Performance during the study period.

7. Looking to the Environmental Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Materials used by weight/volume (except materials consumption costs)” (EN-1) (MAT-C1) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 2 Indian companies’ viz., IFO Ltd. and ITC Ltd. and 2 Australian companies’ viz., NCM Ltd. and WOW Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative terms”, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, MSU Ltd. an Indian company is found to be the best at disclosing this aspect and scores the
highest i.e., 30 points among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

In addition, it is found that REL Ltd. - an Indian company, reported the said aspect in “Qualitative” terms i.e., “Non-Monetary” (tabular form) manner only and not in “Quantitative” terms during the study period.

It can be concluded that Indian companies’ although not up to the mark, but are found to be better than Australian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 370 points in this aspect as compared to Australian companies’ scoring only 350 points during the study period.

8. Looking to the Environmental Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Percentage of Materials used that are recycled input materials” (EN-2) (MAT-C2) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 2 Indian companies’ viz., IFO Ltd. and ITC Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 4 Indian companies’ viz., HUL Ltd., IFO Ltd., ITC Ltd. and TAM Ltd. and 4 Australian companies’ viz., AMC Ltd., BXB Ltd., WES Ltd. and WOW Ltd. are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect, scoring 20 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.
In addition, it is found that REL Ltd. reported the said aspect in “Qualitative” terms i.e., “Non-Monetary” (tabular form) manner only and not in “Quantitative” terms. Further, CCL Ltd. and NCM Ltd. have also reported the said aspect in only “Qualitative” means and not by “Quantitative” means during the study period.

It can be concluded that Indian companies’ although not up to the maximum desired level, but are found to be better than Australian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 280 points as compared to Australian companies’ scoring only 200 points during the study period.

9. Looking to the Environmental Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Direct Energy Consumption by primary energy source” (EN-3) (ERGY-C1) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 2 Indian companies’ viz., ITC Ltd. and REL Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, DLF Ltd., an Indian company is found to be the best at disclosing this aspect and scored the highest i.e., 30 points among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.
Also, it is found that JSP Ltd. and AMC Ltd. reported the said aspect in “Qualitative” terms and not in “Quantitative” terms during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not at the maximum possible, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 670 points as compared to Indian companies scoring only 580 points in this aspect during the study period.

10. Looking to the Environmental Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Indirect energy consumption by primary source” (EN-4) (ERGY-C2) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 2 Indian companies’ viz., DLF Ltd. and ITC Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, DLF Ltd., an Indian company is found to be the best at disclosing this aspect and scored the highest i.e., 30 points among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

Also, it is found that JSP Ltd., REL Ltd. and AMC Ltd. reported the said aspect by only “Qualitative” terms and not in “Quantitative” terms during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not up to the mark, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 570 points as compared to
Indian companies’ scoring only 450 points in this aspect during the study period.

11. Looking to the Environmental Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Initiatives taken to save energy” (EN-5) (ERGY-A) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 8 Indian companies’ viz., HMC Ltd., IFO Ltd., JPA Ltd., JSP Ltd., L & T Ltd., M & M Ltd., ONG Ltd. and REL Ltd. while, WDC Ltd. – an Australian company are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 4 Indian companies’ viz., CIP Ltd., HMC Ltd., JSP Ltd. and ONG Ltd. scoring the highest (i.e., 30 points each) are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Indian companies’ although not at their fullest possible, but are found to be better than Australian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 1130 points as compared to Australian companies’ scoring only 740 points during the study period.

12. Looking to the Environmental Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Total water withdrawal by source” (EN-8) (WTR-C1) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that
3 Indian companies’ ITC Ltd., ONG Ltd. and REL Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 8 Indian companies’ viz., HDI Ltd., IFO Ltd., ITC Ltd., ONG Ltd., REL Ltd., STI Ltd., TAM Ltd. and WIP Ltd. and 15 Australian companies’ viz., ABC Ltd., AWC Ltd., BHP Ltd., CSL Ltd., GBG Ltd., ILU Ltd., IPL Ltd., NCM Ltd., RIO Ltd., STO Ltd., SGP Ltd., WES Ltd., WDC Ltd., WPL Ltd. and WOW Ltd. scoring 20 points each are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

Also, it is found that AMC Ltd. reported the said aspect in “Qualitative” terms and not in “Quantitative” terms during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not up to the mark, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 720 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 450 points during the study period.

13. Looking to the Environmental Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Initiatives taken to save water” (WTR-A) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 6 Indian companies’ viz., HDI Ltd., HUL Ltd., ITC Ltd., JSP Ltd., L & T Ltd., and M & M Ltd and 4 Australian companies’ viz.,
AWC Ltd., BHP Ltd., NCM Ltd. and RIO Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, GBG Ltd., an Australian company scored the highest (i.e., 30 points) and is found to be the best at disclosing this aspect among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not up to the maximum possible, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 850 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 820 points during the study period.

14. Looking to the Environmental Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Location and size of land owned, leased, managed in, or adjacent to, protected areas and areas of high biodiversity value outside protected areas” (EN-11) (BIO-C1) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that REL Ltd., an Indian company and BHP Ltd., an Australian company are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, DLF Ltd., an Indian company scored the highest (i.e., 30 points) and is found to be the best at
disclosing this aspect among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not up to their best possible, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 410 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 300 points during the study period.

15. Looking to the Environmental Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Description of significant impacts of activities, products, and services on biodiversity in protected areas and areas of high biodiversity value outside protected areas” (EN-12) (BIO-C2) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that REL Ltd., an Indian company is best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 4 Indian companies’ viz., IFO Ltd., REL Ltd., STI Ltd. and TAM Ltd., and 5 Australian companies’ viz., AWC Ltd., BXB Ltd., ILU Ltd., SGP Ltd., and WOW Ltd. scoring 20 points each are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not up to the maximum possible, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored
360 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 240 points during the study period.

16. Looking to the Environmental Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Strategies, current actions, and future plans for managing impacts on biodiversity” (EN-14) (BIO-A) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that AWC Ltd., an Australian company is best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 2 Indian companies’ viz., ONG Ltd. and TAM Ltd. and 5 Australian companies’ viz., AWC Ltd., ILU Ltd., SGP Ltd., WES Ltd. and WOW Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not at their best, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 480 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 300 points during the study period.

17. Looking to the Environmental Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Total direct and indirect greenhouse gas emissions by weight (EN-16) (EEW-C1) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 2 Australian companies’-
SGP Ltd., and WOW Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 9 Indian companies’ viz., HDI Ltd., IFO Ltd., ITC Ltd., M & M Ltd., ONG Ltd., REL Ltd., STI Ltd., TAM Ltd. and WIP Ltd. and 16 Australian companies’ viz., ABC Ltd., AWC Ltd., AMC LTD., BHP Ltd., BXB Ltd., CCL Ltd., CSL Ltd., GBG Ltd., IPL Ltd., NCM Ltd., RIO Ltd., STO Ltd., SGP Ltd., WES Ltd., WDC Ltd., and WOW Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

Also, it is found that WPL Ltd. disclosed its information in only “Qualitative” terms and not by “Quantitative” terms during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not up to the mark, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 710 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 420 points during the study period.

18. Looking to the Environmental Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Other relevant indirect greenhouse gas emissions by weight” (EN-17) (EEW-C2) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that AWC Ltd., SGP Ltd. and
WOW Ltd. (3 Australian companies’) are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 6 Indian companies’ viz., HDI Ltd., IFO Ltd., ITC Ltd., M & M Ltd., ONG Ltd. and WIP Ltd. and 12 Australian companies’ viz., ABC Ltd., AWC Ltd., AMC Ltd., BHP Ltd., BXB Ltd., CSL Ltd., GBG Ltd., NCM Ltd., STO Ltd., SGP Ltd., WES Ltd. and WOW Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

Also, it is found that TAM Ltd. (an Indian company) and RIO Ltd., WDC Ltd. and WPL Ltd. (Australian companies’) disclosed its information in only “Qualitative” terms and not in “Quantitative” terms during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not at their best possible, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 600 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 280 points during the study period.

19. Looking to the Environmental Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Emissions of ozone-depleting substances by weight” (EN-19) (EEW-C3) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 5 Indian companies’ viz., IFO Ltd.,
ITC Ltd., ONG Ltd., STI Ltd., and WIP Ltd., while, WOW Ltd., an Australian company, are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring 20 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 5 Indian companies’ viz., IFO Ltd., ITC Ltd., STI Ltd., TAM Ltd. and WIP Ltd. while, WOW Ltd., an Australian company scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

Also, it is found that BHP Ltd., NCM Ltd. and WPL Ltd. (Australian companies’) disclosed its information in only “Qualitative” terms and not in “Quantitative” terms during the study period.

It can be concluded that Indian companies’ although not at their best, but are found to be better than Australian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 230 points as compared to Australian companies’ scoring only 130 points during the study period.

20. Looking to the Environmental Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “NOx, SOx, and other significant air emissions by type and weight” (EN-20) (EEW-C4) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that AWC Ltd., an Australian company is best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms,
scoring the highest i.e., 50 points among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 7 Indian companies’ viz., IFO Ltd., ITC Ltd., ONG Ltd., REL Ltd., STI Ltd., TAM Ltd. and WIP Ltd., while, 6 Australian companies’ viz., AWC Ltd., AMC LTD., IPL Ltd., NCM Ltd., RIO Ltd., and WOW Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

Also, it is found that BHP Ltd. and WPL Ltd. (Australian companies’) disclosed its information in only “Qualitative” terms and not in “Quantitative” terms during the study period.

It can be concluded that Indian companies’ although not up to the mark, but are found to be better than Australian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 310 points as compared to Australian companies’ scoring only 280 points during the study period.

21. Looking to the Environmental Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Total water discharge by quality and destination” (EN-21) (EEW-C5) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that HDI Ltd., an Indian company is best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 10 Indian companies’ viz., HDI Ltd., IFO Ltd., ITC Ltd., L & T Ltd., MSU Ltd., ONG Ltd.,
REL Ltd., STI Ltd., TAM Ltd. and WIP Ltd., while, 5 Australian companies’ viz., ILU Ltd., IPL Ltd., NCM Ltd., WPL Ltd. and WOW Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

Also, it is found that BHP Ltd. and STO Ltd. (Australian companies’) disclosed its information in only “Qualitative” terms and not in “Quantitative” terms. In addition, it is found that SGP Ltd. although scoring “0” points during the study period, has clearly reported to disclose the said aspect in the coming years.

It can be concluded that Indian companies’ although not up to their best, but are found to be better than Australian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 450 points as compared to Australian companies’ scoring only 310 points during the study period.

22. Looking to the Environmental Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Total weight of waste by type and disposal method” (EN-22) (EEW-C6) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 2 Indian companies’-HUL Ltd., and TAM Ltd. and an Australian company- SGP Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.
While, in “Qualitative” terms, 10 Indian companies’ viz., HDI Ltd., HUL Ltd., IFO Ltd., ITC Ltd., M & M Ltd., ONG Ltd., REL Ltd., STI Ltd., TAM Ltd. and WIP Ltd., while, 14 Australian companies’ viz., ABC Ltd., AWC Ltd., AMC LTD., BXB Ltd. (partially), CCL Ltd., CSL Ltd., IPL Ltd., NCM Ltd., RIO Ltd., SGP Ltd., WES Ltd., WDC Ltd., WPL Ltd. and WOW Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

Also, it is found that BHP Ltd. and STO Ltd. (Australian companies’) disclosed its information in only “Qualitative” terms and not in “Quantitative” terms during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not up to the mark, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 640 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 570 points during the study period.

23. Looking to the Environmental Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Total number and volume of significant spills” (EN-23) (EEW-C7) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 4 Indian companies’ viz., ITC Ltd., ONG Ltd., REL Ltd. and STI Ltd. and 3 Australian companies’ viz., STO Ltd., WPL Ltd. and WOW Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in ‘Quantitative” terms, scoring 20 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.
While, in “Qualitative” terms, 2 Indian companies’ viz., ONG Ltd. and STI Ltd. while, 4 Australian companies’ viz., NCM Ltd., STO Ltd., WPL Ltd. and WOW Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Indian companies’ with a marginal difference, although not up to their best, but are found to be better than Australian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 220 points as compared to Australian companies’ scoring only 210 points during the study period.

24. Looking to the Environmental Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Initiatives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and reductions achieved/ (Reduce Pollution)” (EN-18) (EEW-A1) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that HUL Ltd., an Indian company and 3 Australian companies’-AWC Ltd., STO Ltd. and WPL Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, BHP Ltd., an Australian company scored the highest i.e., 30 points and is found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies during the study period.
It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not up to their best, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 750 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 480 points during the study period.

25. Looking to the Environmental Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Waste Management Initiatives” (EEW-A2) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 2 Indian companies’ viz., HUL Ltd. and JSP Ltd. and an Australian company- AWC Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

Further, in “Qualitative” terms, 9 Indian companies’ viz., BHA Ltd., HDI Ltd., HUL Ltd., IFO Ltd., JSP Ltd., M & M Ltd., STI Ltd., TAM Ltd. and WIP Ltd., while, 12 Australian companies’ viz., AWC Ltd., AMC LTD., BXB Ltd., CSL Ltd., NCM Ltd., RIO Ltd., TLS Ltd., WES Ltd., WDC Ltd., WBC Ltd., WPL Ltd. and WOW Ltd. are found to be the best at disclosing the said aspect and scored 20 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not to the maximum extent, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 770 points as compared to Indian companies scoring only 640 points during the study period.
26. Looking to the Environmental Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Initiatives to mitigate environmental impacts of products and services, and extent of impact mitigation” (EN-26) (P & S-C1) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 6 Indian companies’- HDI Ltd., HUL Ltd., IFO Ltd., ITC Ltd., ONG Ltd. and WIP Ltd. and 3 Australian companies’ viz., AMC Ltd., IPL Ltd. and SGP Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 2 Indian companies’- HDI Ltd. and ONG Ltd. scored the highest i.e., 30 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Indian companies’ although not at its maximum, but are found to be better than Australian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 680 points as compared to Australian companies’ scoring only 610 points during the study period.

27. Looking to the Environmental Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Percentage of products sold and their packaging materials that are reclaimed by category” (EN-27) (P & S-C2) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that WPL Ltd., an Australian company is best at disclosing this aspect
in “Quantitative” terms, scoring 30 points among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 4 Indian companies’ viz., IFO Ltd., ITC Ltd., M & M Ltd. and TAM Ltd. and 2 Australian companies’ viz., BXB Ltd. and CSL Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not at their maximum, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 210 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 170 points during the study period.

28. Overall, it can be concluded that ITC Ltd., an Indian company is found to be the best (company wise) (based on the score board entirely) at disclosing “Environmental” Performance information (both quantity and quality wise) scoring the highest 1060 points among all the selected index based Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

On the other hand, it can be concluded that Indian companies’-BHA Ltd. and CIP Ltd. –scores the least (i.e., 100 points) at disclosing “Environmental” Performance information among all the selected index based Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

29. It is found that 15 Indian companies’ (except BHE Ltd., CIP Ltd., HMC Ltd., HUL Ltd., and L & T Ltd.) and 19 Australian...
companies’ (except WDC Ltd.) have reported on achieving awards pertaining to Social Performance during the study period.

30. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on “Total workforce by employment type, employment contract, and region” aspect of Labor Practices & Decent Work (LPDW) indicator (LA-1) (EM-C1) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that an Indian company- HDI Ltd. and 6 Australian companies’ viz., AWC Ltd., BXB Ltd., RIO Ltd., SGP Ltd., TLS Ltd. and WOW Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

Further, in “Qualitative” terms, 8 Indian companies’ viz., BAJ Ltd., HDI Ltd., IFO Ltd., ITC Ltd., JPA Ltd., ONG Ltd., REL Ltd. and TAM Ltd., while, 17 Australian companies’ viz., ABC Ltd., AWC Ltd., AMC Ltd., BHP Ltd., BXB Ltd., CCL Ltd., CSL Ltd., ILU Ltd., NCM Ltd., RIO Ltd., STO Ltd., SGP Ltd., TLS Ltd., WES Ltd., WDC Ltd., WPL Ltd. and WOW Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

Further, it is found that 2 Indian companies’ – STI Ltd. and WIP Ltd. and 2 Australian companies’- IPL Ltd. and WBC Ltd. have reported the said aspect in only “Qualitative” terms i.e., “Non-Monetary” means and not in “Quantitative” terms during the study period.
It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not up to the mark, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 930 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 380 points during the study period.

31. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Total workforce by employment type, employment contract, and region” aspect of Labor Practices & Decent Work (LPDW) indicator (LA-2) (EM-C2), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that WOW Ltd., an Australian company is best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 4 Indian companies’- IFO Ltd., ITC Ltd., STI Ltd. and TAM Ltd. and 6 Australian companies’ viz., AMC LTD., BHP Ltd., RIO Ltd., SGP Ltd., NCM Ltd. and WOW Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not at its maximum, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 390 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 180 points during the study period.
32. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Benefits provided to full-time employees that are not provided to temporary or part-time employees, by major operations (Employee benefits)” aspect of Labor Practices & Decent Work (LPDW) indicator (LA-3) (EM-A) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that GBG Ltd., an Australian company is best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, ITC Ltd., an Indian company is found to be the best at disclosing this aspect and scored the highest i.e., 30 points among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Indian companies’ although not at the maximum possible, but are found to be better than Australian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 750 points as compared to Australian companies’ scoring only 480 points during the study period.

33. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Percentage of employees covered by collective bargaining agreements” aspect of Labor Practices & Decent Work (LPDW) indicator (LA-4) (LMR-C1), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that AWC Ltd., an Australian company is best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms,
scoring the highest i.e., 50 points among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 4 Indian companies’- HDI Ltd., REL Ltd., STI Ltd. and TAM Ltd. and 7 Australian companies’ viz., AWC LTD., BHP Ltd., RIO Ltd., STO Ltd., TLS Ltd., WES Ltd. and WOW Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

Further, it is found that NCM Ltd., an Australian company disclosed the said aspect in only “Qualitative” terms and not in “Quantitative” terms during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not at its maximum, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 350 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 260 points during the study period.

34. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Minimum notice period(s) regarding significant operational changes, including whether it is specified in collective agreements” aspect of Labor Practices & Decent Work (LPDW) indicator (LA-5) (LMR-C2), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 2 Indian companies’- HDI Ltd. and ITC Ltd. and an Australian company WPL Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring
20 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 2 Indian companies’- HDI Ltd. and STI Ltd. and an Australian company- WOW Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Indian companies’ although not at its maximum, but are found to be better than Australian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 200 points as compared to Australian companies’ scoring only 140 points during the study period.

35. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Rates of injury, occupational diseases, lost days, and absenteeism, and total number of work-related fatalities by region” aspect of Labor Practices & Decent Work (LPDW) indicator (LA-7) (OHSAS-C1), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 3 Indian companies’ viz., IFO Ltd., ITC Ltd. (partially) and ONG Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 8 Indian companies’- HDI Ltd., IFO Ltd., ITC Ltd., ONG Ltd., REL Ltd., STI Ltd., TAM Ltd. and WIP Ltd. and 18 Australian companies’ viz., ABC Ltd.,
AWC LTD., AMC Ltd., BHP Ltd., BXB Ltd., CCL Ltd., CSL Ltd.,
GBG Ltd., ILU Ltd., IPL Ltd., NCM Ltd., RIO Ltd., STO Ltd.,
SGP Ltd., TLS Ltd., WES Ltd., WDC Ltd. and WBC Ltd. scored
20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this
aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian
companies’ during the study period.

Further, it is found that WPL Ltd. and NCM Ltd., Australian
companies’ disclosed the said aspect in only “Qualitative” terms
and not in “Quantitative” terms during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not at its
maximum, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in
reporting this aspect and have scored 820 points as compared to
Indian companies’ scoring only 450 points during the study
period.

36. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the
selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the
aspect “Education, training, counseling, prevention, and risk-
control programs in place to assist workforce members, their
families, or community members regarding serious diseases”
aspect of Labor Practices & Decent Work (LPDW) indicator
(LA-8) (OHSAS-C2), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative”
terms, it is found that 3 Indian companies’ viz., IFO Ltd.,
ONG Ltd. and WIP Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in
“Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each
among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during
the study period.
While, in “Qualitative” terms, RIO Ltd., an Australian company scored the highest points i.e., 30 points and is found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not at its maximum, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 610 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 560 points during the study period.

37. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “OHSAS certification 18000 series and/or efforts put in for OHSAS” aspect of Labor Practices & Decent Work (LPDW) indicator (OHSAS-A) in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 3 Indian companies’- HUL Ltd., STI Ltd. and TAM Ltd., while, 2 Australian companies’ viz., SGP Ltd. and WPL Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 5 Indian companies’- HUL Ltd., REL Ltd., STI Ltd., TAM Ltd. and WIP Ltd. and 6 Australian companies’ viz., CSL Ltd., RIO Ltd., SGP Ltd., TLS Ltd., WES Ltd., and WBC Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.
It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not at its maximum, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 660 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 580 points during the study period.

38. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Average hours of training per year per employee by employee category” aspect of Labor Practices & Decent Work (LPDW) indicator (LA-10) (TE-C1), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that REL Ltd., an Indian company and AWC Ltd., an Australian company are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, AWC Ltd., an Australian company scored the highest points i.e., 30 points and is found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

Further, it is found that 3 companies’ viz., STO Ltd., SGP Ltd., and WOW Ltd. reported the same in “Non-Monetary” form i.e., only in “Qualitative” terms and not in “Quantitative” terms during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ with a very marginal gap although not at their maximum, are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have
scored 440 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 420 points during the study period.

39. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Programs for skills management and lifelong learning that support the continued employability of employees and assist them in managing career endings” aspect of Labor Practices & Decent Work (LPDW) indicator (LA-11) (TE-A), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 3 Indian companies’ viz., IFO Ltd., ONG Ltd. and WIP Ltd. and 2 Australian companies’ BHP Ltd. and SGP Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, STI Ltd., an Indian company scored the highest points i.e., 30 points and is found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Indian companies’ although not at its best means, but are found to be better than Australian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 660 points as compared to Australian companies’ scoring only 610 points during the study period.

40. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Composition of governance bodies and breakdown of
employees per category according to gender, age group, minority group membership, and other indicators of diversity” aspect of Labor Practices & Decent Work (LPDW) indicator (LA-13) (DEO-C1), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 3 Indian companies’ viz., IFO Ltd., ONG Ltd. and REL Ltd. and 3 Australian companies’ ABC Ltd., SGP Ltd. and WPL Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 6 Indian companies’- IFO Ltd., ITC Ltd., ONG Ltd., REL Ltd., STI Ltd. and TAM Ltd., while 14 Australian companies’ viz., ABC Ltd., AMC Ltd., BHP Ltd., BXB Ltd., CSL Ltd., ILU Ltd., IPL Ltd., NCM Ltd., RIO Ltd., STO Ltd., SGP Ltd., WDC Ltd., WPL Ltd. and WOW Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not at its best means, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 870 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 370 points during the study period.

41. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Ratio of basic salary of men to women by employee category” aspect of Labor Practices & Decent Work (LPDW)
indicator (LA-14) (DEO-C2), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that HDI Ltd., an Indian company is best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring 30 points among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 6 Indian companies’- HDI Ltd., ONG Ltd., REL Ltd., STI Ltd., TAM Ltd. and WIP Ltd., while 2 Australian companies’ viz., BHP Ltd. and WBC Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

Further, it is found that 4 Australian companies’ viz., ILU Ltd., NCM Ltd., SGP Ltd. and WOW Ltd. reported the same in “Qualitative” terms only and not in “Quantitative” terms during the study period.

It can be concluded that Indian companies’ although not at its best means, but are found to be better than Australian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 270 points as compared to Australian companies’ scoring only 150 points during the study period.

42. It is found that BAJ Ltd., an Indian company, has disclosed information on the aspect “Human Rights” in its reports not as per GRI framework but included the same, making it score 10 points each for “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms during the study period.
43. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Percentage and total number of significant investment agreements that include human rights clauses or that have undergone human rights screening” aspect of Human Rights (HR) indicator (HR-1) (IPP-C1), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that AWC Ltd., an Australian company is best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring 30 points among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, an Indian company, ITC Ltd. scored the highest i.e., 30 points and is found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies during the study period.

It can be concluded that Indian companies’ although not at their best means, but are found to be better than Australian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 220 points as compared to Australian companies’ scoring only 180 points during the study period.

44. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Percentage of significant suppliers and contractors that have undergone screening on human rights and actions taken” aspect of Human Rights (HR) indicator (HR-2) (IPP-C2), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that WOW Ltd., an Australian company is best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring 40 points among all the
selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 3 Indian companies’- IFO Ltd., ITC Ltd., and REL Ltd. and an Australian company -BHP Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing the said aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Indian companies’ although not at its maximum, but are found to be better than Australian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 230 points as compared to Australian companies’ scoring only 190 points during the study period.

45. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Total hours of employee training on policies and procedures concerning aspects of human rights that are relevant to operations, including the percentage of employees trained” aspect of Human Rights (HR) indicator (HR-3) (IPP-A), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that WIP Ltd., an Indian company is best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring 30 points among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 2 Indian companies’- IFO Ltd. and TAM Ltd. and 3 Australian companies’ viz., AWC Ltd., BHP Ltd. and NCM Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best
at exhibiting the said aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

Further, it is found that WOW Ltd., an Australian company disclosed the said aspect in only “Qualitative” terms and not in “Quantitative” terms during the study period.

It can be concluded that Indian companies’ although not at their best means, but are found to be better than Australian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 230 points as compared to Australian companies’ scoring only 180 points during the study period.

46. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Total number of incidents of discrimination and actions taken” aspect of Human Rights (HR) indicator (HR-4) (ND-C1), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 2 Indian companies’ viz., ITC Ltd. and STI Ltd., while 2 Australian companies’- BHP Ltd. and WOW Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring 20 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 2 Indian companies’- STI Ltd., and WIP Ltd. and 2 Australian companies’- BHP Ltd. and NCM Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing the said aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.
It can be concluded that Indian companies’ although not at their maximum, but are found to be better than Australian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 180 points as compared to Australian companies’ scoring only 160 points during the study period.

47. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Operations identified in which the right to exercise freedom of association and collective bargaining may be at significant risk, and actions taken to support these rights” aspect of Human Rights (HR) indicator (HR-5) (FACB-C1), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that ONG Ltd., an Indian company is best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring 30 points among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, an Indian company- STI Ltd. and an Australian company- NCM Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Indian companies’ although not at their maximum, but are found to be better than Australian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 200 points as compared to Australian companies’ scoring only 170 points during the study period.
Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Operations identified as having significant risk for incidents of child labor, and measures taken to contribute to the elimination of child labor” aspect of Human Rights (HR) indicator (HR-6) (CL-C1), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 2 Australian companies’-WES Ltd. and WOW Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring 20 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, an Indian company- ONG Ltd. and an Australian company- NCM Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Indian companies’ although not up the mark, but are found to be better than Australian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 210 points as compared to Australian companies’ scoring only 190 points during the study period.

Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Operations identified as having significant risk for incidents of forced or compulsory labor, and measures taken to contribute to the elimination of forced or compulsory labor” aspect of Human Rights (HR) indicator (HR-7) (FL-C1), in both
“Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that WOW Ltd., an Australian company is best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring 20 points among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, an Australian company- NCM Ltd. scored 20 points and is found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not at its best, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 160 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 140 points during the study period.

50. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Nature, scope, and effectiveness of any programs and practices that assess and manage the impacts of operations on communities, including entering, operating, and exiting. (Social initiatives like training and education, etc.)” aspect of Society (SOC) indicator (SO-1) (COMM-C1), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 9 Indian companies’ viz., BAJ Ltd., DLF Ltd., ITC Ltd., JSP Ltd., M & M Ltd., ONG Ltd., REL Ltd., TAM Ltd. and WIP Ltd. , while 9 Australian companies’ viz., BHP Ltd., ILU Ltd., IPL Ltd., RIO Ltd., SGP Ltd., WES Ltd., WDC Ltd., WPL Ltd. and WOW Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative”
terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 5 Indian companies’ viz., BAJ Ltd., DLF Ltd., ONG Ltd., REL Ltd. and TAM Ltd. and 3 Australian companies’ - BHP Ltd., RIO Ltd. and STO Ltd. scores the highest points i.e., 30 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ with a marginal difference are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 1080 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 1050 points during the study period.

51. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Percentage and total number of business units analyzed for risks related to corruption” aspect of Society (SOC) indicator (SO-2) (CORUP-C1), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 3 Indian companies’ viz., ITC Ltd., ONG Ltd. and WIP Ltd., while 5 Australian companies’ viz., BXB Ltd., CSL Ltd., SGP Ltd., WES Ltd. and WOW Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring 20 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.
While, in “Qualitative” terms, 7 Indian companies’ viz., IFO Ltd., ITC Ltd., ONG Ltd., REL Ltd., STI Ltd., TAM Ltd. and WIP Ltd. and 8 Australian companies’, out of which 6 companies’ viz., BHP Ltd., BXB Ltd., CSL Ltd., SGP Ltd., WES Ltd. and WOW Ltd. exhibited the said aspect in “Qualitative” terms while, 2 companies’- AWC Ltd. and NCM Ltd. disclosed their information in “Non-Monetary” form (i.e., in “Qualitative” terms only and not in “Quantitative” terms) and scored 10 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not at its best, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 190 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 170 points during the study period.

52. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Percentage of employees trained in organization’s anti-corruption policies and procedures” aspect of Society (SOC) indicator (SO-3) (CORUP-C2), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 3 Indian companies’- ITC Ltd., ONG Ltd. and STI Ltd., while 9 Australian companies’ – AWC Ltd., BXB Ltd., CSL Ltd., NCM Ltd., STO Ltd., SGP Ltd., WES Ltd., WPL Ltd. and WOW Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring 20 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.
While, in “Qualitative” terms, 3 Australian companies’- AWC Ltd., BHP Ltd. and WOW Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not at their best, but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 320 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 170 points during the study period.

53. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Actions taken in response to incidents of corruption (Anti-corruption initiatives)” aspect of Society (SOC) indicator (SO-4) (CORUP-C3), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that an Indian company ONG Ltd. is best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring 30 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 2 Indian companies’ viz., STI Ltd. and WIP Ltd. and an Australian company- NCM Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Indian companies’ with a marginal difference but not at their best are found to be better than
Australian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 270 points as compared to Australian companies’ scoring only 250 points during the study period.

54. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Public policy positions and participation in public policy development and lobbying (Public Advocacy)” aspect of Society (SOC) indicator (SO-5) (PP-C1), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 2 Indian companies’ viz., REL Ltd., and WIP Ltd., while an Australian company SGP Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, an Australian company WOW Ltd. scored 20 points and is found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ although not at their best but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 400 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 330 points during the study period.

55. It is found during the study period that BAJ Ltd., an Indian company has disclosed information on the aspect “Product Responsibility” in its reports not as per GRI framework but included the same in their reports, making it to score a total of 30
points i.e., 20 points for “Quantitative” terms and 10 points for “Qualitative” terms during the study period.

56. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Life cycle stages in which health and safety impacts of products and services are assessed for improvement, and percentage of significant products and services categories subject to such procedures” aspect of Product Responsibility (PR) indicator (PR-1) (CHS-C1), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that 3 Indian companies’ viz., HUL Ltd., ITC Ltd. and TAM Ltd., while an Australian company- BXB Ltd. are best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 5 Indian companies’- HUL Ltd., ITC Ltd., ONG Ltd., TAM Ltd. and WIP Ltd. and 3 Australian companies’- BXB Ltd., IPL Ltd. and WOW Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Indian companies’ although not at their best possible, but are found to be better than Australian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 390 points as compared to Australian companies’ scoring only 320 points during the study period.
Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Customer Health and Safety Initiatives” aspect of Product Responsibility (PR) indicator (CHS-A), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that an Indian company HUL Ltd. is best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 3 Indian companies’- HUL Ltd., L & T Ltd. and REL Ltd. and an Australian company- WOW Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies during the study period.

It can be concluded that Indian companies’ although not at their best possible means, but are found to be better than Australian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 470 points as compared to Australian companies’ scoring only 380 points during the study period.

Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Type of product and service information required by procedures and percentage of significant products and services subject to such information requirements” aspect of Product Responsibility (PR) indicator (PR-3) (PSL-C1), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that an Australian company- IPL Ltd. is best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring the highest i.e., 50 points each
among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 2 Indian companies’- HUL Ltd., and WIP Ltd., while, an Australian company- NCM Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that both Indian companies’ and Australian companies’ scored equally i.e., 280 points in reporting this aspect during the study period.

59. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Practices related to customer satisfaction, including results of surveys measuring customer satisfaction (Customer Satisfaction Survey/ Programs)” aspect of Product Responsibility (PR) indicator (PR-5) (PSL-A), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that an Australian company SGP Ltd. is best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring 40 points among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, 4 Indian companies’- IFO Ltd., MSU Ltd., STI Ltd. and TAM Ltd. and 2 Australian companies’- TLS Ltd. and WPL Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.
It can be concluded that Indian companies’ with a marginal difference are found to be better than Australian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 350 points as compared to Australian companies’ scoring only 340 points during the study period.

60. Looking to the Social Performance Reporting practices of all the selected 40 index based Indian and Australian companies’, on the aspect “Programs for adherence to laws, standards, and voluntary codes related to marketing communications, including advertising, promotion, and sponsorship” aspect of Product Responsibility (PR) indicator (PR-6) (MC-C1), in both “Quantitative” and “Qualitative” terms, it is found that an Indian company- ONG Ltd. is best at disclosing this aspect in “Quantitative” terms, scoring 30 points among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

While, in “Qualitative” terms, an Indian company- ONG Ltd. and an Australian company- CSL Ltd. scored 20 points each and are found to be the best at disclosing this aspect from among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

It can be concluded that Australian companies’ not at their maximum level but are found to be better than Indian companies’ in reporting this aspect and have scored 300 points as compared to Indian companies’ scoring only 250 points during the study period.
61. Overall, it can be concluded that ITC Ltd., an Indian company is found to be the best (company wise) (based on the score board entirely) at disclosing “Social” Performance information (both quantity and quality wise) scoring the highest 1110 points among all the selected index based Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

On the other hand, it can be concluded that an Indian company-CIP Ltd. -scores the least (i.e., 110 points) at disclosing “Social” Performance information among all the selected index based Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

62. It is found that all the Indian and Australian companies’ have reported on the variables pertaining to Net Profit Ratio, Return on Capital Employed, Operating Ratio, Current Ratio, Quick Ratio, Interest Coverage Ratio, Earnings per share and Activity Ratio.

63. It is found that 12 Australian companies’ have not disclosed any information pertaining to “Gross Profit” in their reports during the study period, while all the Indian companies have reported the same.

64. It is found that only 10 Indian companies’ have disclosed some information pertaining to “Credit Rating” in their reports during the study period, while all the Australian companies have reported the same.

65. It is found that only GBG Ltd., an Australian company has not disclosed any information relating to “Dividend per share” during the study period.
66. It is found that only 2 Indian and 2 Australian companies’, out of total 40 companies’ have disclosed information on “Value Added Statement” during the study period.

67. Overall, it can be concluded that WPL Ltd., an Australian company is best at Financial (Economic) reporting practices (based on the score board entirely) scoring the highest (company wise) i.e., 120 points among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

68. It is found that ITC Ltd., an Indian company is the best at TBL reporting practices (based on the score board entirely) among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

69. It is also found that CIP Ltd., an Indian company is the least scorer in TBL reporting practices (based on the score board entirely) among all the selected Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

70. Statistical hypothesis indicates that there is no significance difference in the mean scores of TBL Reporting in terms of Environmental Quantity, Quality and Total, Social Quantity, Quality and Total & Financial (Economic) Total of Indian and Australian companies’ during the study period.

71. It is also found that there is a highly positive relationship between Environmental and Social Reporting (Quantity and Quality) with TBL Reporting and also it is statistically significant. While, there is a weak relationship between Financial (Economic) with TBL Reporting during the study period.
5.2 SUGGESTIONS

1) It is suggested that all the companies’ should prepare a separate report on “TBL” (by whatever nomenclature) to have a better and a clear idea to the readers of the reports and also for better decision making.

2) Indian and Australian index based companies’ are suggested to check their “GRI Application Level” as per GRI framework guidelines and report their status (irrespective of any level) clearly, which would give a better idea about their TBL reporting/disclosure practices and standards followed in this respect.

3) It is suggested that all the companies’ should report on each and every Environmental and Social indicators as per GRI framework, (if applicable) and in detailed and clarified manner in order to ensure uniformity.

4) It is preferably suggested that all the companies’ should prepare a separate table showing all the Environmental, Social and Financial (Economic) Performance indicators (as per GRI framework) and the status achieved by them on each such indicator, along with the page number/s mentioned therein in the table, which would serve a ready reference, an ease and clarity to the user/s in locating them and further, interpreting them.

5) It is strongly suggested that all the companies’ should clearly indicate “Not Applicable” or “Not Relevant”, in case, if the
indicator does not apply or is irrelevant to their business, for better and clear understanding & interpretation.

6) It is also suggested that the companies’ should clearly indicate “Not Reported” if, in case, they have not reported on any of the indicator (both Environmental and Social) as per the GRI framework. This will help in better evaluation of TBL reporting practices.

Further, it is suggested that the companies’ should clearly mention in their reports about the reason/s therein, if “Not Applicable” and/or “Not Reported”.

Also, in case, if “Not Reported”, the year wherein they are likely to start it’s reporting in the future, to have a clear understanding.

7) It is suggested that the companies’ should apply (if, not applied) for ISO 14000 series (Environmental Management Systems) in specific, (apart from other ISO series) and include the same in their report/s in order to ensure “Best Environmental Management Practices” followed.

8) It is preferably suggested that the companies’ should allot a separate page for reporting on “Awards and Recognitions” achieved pertaining to their Environmental and Social performance/activities (year-wise) and also push themselves in achieving such awards year after year to ensure best practices.

9) It is suggested that all the companies’ should apply and report on their Credit Rating status (with description, if possible) to ensure its “Credit Worthiness” to the stakeholders.
10) It is suggested that all the companies’ should preferably prepare a separate table showing all the important financial ratios and/or the components/variables pertaining to these ratios.

11) It is strongly suggested that all the companies’ should have uniform terminologies pertaining to the variables/components of various ratios which would serve ease and clarity to the user/s in locating, computing and further, interpreting them.

12) It is also suggested that all the companies’ should report on the contents relating to “Value Added” in detail, (if, not reported at all) which in turn would help to know the overall value of the companies and application of the total value added.