

## The Corporate Responsibility Research Conference 2006

4-5 September 2006

Trinity College Dublin, Ireland

# Sharing Responsibility along Supply Chains – A New Life–Cycle Approach and Software Tool for Triple–Bottom–Line Accounting

**Thomas Wiedmann<sup>1)</sup>** and **Manfred Lenzen<sup>2)</sup>**

- 1) ISA<sup>UK</sup> Research & Consulting, Durham, UK and  
Stockholm Environment Institute, University of York, York, UK  
Tel.: +44 (0) 1913 710 872, Email: [tommy@isa-research.co.uk](mailto:tommy@isa-research.co.uk)
- 2) Integrated Sustainability Analysis (ISA), The University of Sydney, NSW 2006,  
Australia, Web: [www.isa.org.usyd.edu.au](http://www.isa.org.usyd.edu.au)

## Conference Subject Areas

Reporting, Benchmarking and evaluation, Standards and tools, Environmental & Social  
Accounting, Supply chain management

## Contents

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.1. Corporate Sustainability Reporting and the Triple Bottom Line .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.2. The concept of shared responsibility.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. MEASURING ALL INDIRECT IMPACTS.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3. UNRAVELLING THE SUPPLY CHAIN.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4. ASSIGNING RESPONSIBILITY ALONG SUPPLY CHAINS .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4.1. Full producer and consumer responsibility.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4.2. Quantifying responsibility shares.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>5. SOFTWARE TOOL BOTTOMLINE<sup>3</sup> .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>6. CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>8. REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>20</b>

## Abstract

Companies wishing to realise broader societal and environmental objectives often chose Triple Bottom Line (TBL) accounting as a reporting approach, covering social, economic and environmental indicators and thus enabling decision-makers to quantify trade-offs between different facets of sustainability. Two issues are critical when considering TBL accounting. First, indicators must include both the direct (on-site, immediate) effects of the company as well as the indirect (off-site, upstream, embodied) effects associated with purchasing from a potentially large and distant web of suppliers. The incorporation of all indirect or upstream impacts removes problems related to the choice of boundaries. Second, it is important to address the question of how to assign responsibility for the indirect impacts as they are shared between all partners in a supply chain and must not be double-counted.

The ISA group at the University of Sydney have developed a new TBL software tool ([www.bottomline3.com](http://www.bottomline3.com)) which meets both requirements. We present the UK version of this tool, co-developed by ISA<sup>UK</sup> Research & Consulting. An organisation's financial accounts, together with on-site impact data, act as input. Software outputs include aggregate figures, detailed breakdowns and rankings of economic, social and environmental indicators. Sector benchmarking, structural path analysis (upstream supply chain analysis) and production layer decomposition are available for all TBL indicators. Quantification of 'shared responsibility' is realised by delineating impacts into mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive portions of responsibility to be shared by all agents along a supply chain.

## Keywords

triple-bottom-line accounting, corporate responsibility, shared responsibility, reporting, input-output analysis, benchmarking, supply chain analysis

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Corporate Sustainability Reporting and the Triple Bottom Line

A broadly agreed definition of sustainability is: practices and development that meets the needs of the current generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987). Although this definition has been widely accepted, applying it in a meaningful way to all levels of society is a major intellectual and governance challenge. Sustainability is ultimately an absolute condition: a country, community or company is either sustainable or it is not. However, un-sustainability may be less recognisable over immediate or short time scales that are at odds with the accepted principle of sustainability defined in terms of future generations. Therefore, in an operational sense and with our current limited knowledge, sustainability is best viewed as a process. It is likely therefore that the sustainability 'goal posts' will be continually moved as our understanding of the importance of social and natural capital increases. Whilst it is difficult to make an absolute assessment of what sustainability means, proxy indicators of sustainability, many of which are currently in use, are essential for determining relative performance.

Corporations are beginning to apply the concept of sustainability at a practical level in terms of corporate citizenship or corporate social responsibility (CSR). CSR is currently dominated by the notion of the Triple Bottom Line. Triple Bottom Line (TBL) was a term originally coined by John Elkington<sup>1</sup> in 1994 to describe corporations moving beyond reporting only on their financial “bottom line” to assessing and reporting on the three spheres of sustainability: economic, social and environmental.

The difference between economic bottom line and financial bottom line is blurred. Some say there is no difference and others draw a distinction between the traditional financial reporting and what they see as reporting on the economic impact of the organisation’s activities on the life of a community.

Triple Bottom Line can be viewed as a reporting device (e.g. information presented in annual reports) and/or an approach to improving decision-making and the fundamental functions of organisations (e.g. the provision of tools and frameworks for considering the economic, environmental and social implications of decisions, products, operations, future plans).

The concepts of Triple Bottom Line and associated systems and reporting frameworks are increasingly being taken up by companies worldwide as the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI)<sup>2</sup> and the work of bodies such as the OECD build momentum. In the wake of this work

---

<sup>1</sup> His book “Cannibals with Forks: The Triple Bottom Line of 21<sup>st</sup> Century Business” introduced the concept of the Triple Bottom Line to a wider audience in 1997 (Elkington, 1997).

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.globalreporting.org>

national and international regulations are changing and companies are more and more required to report their environmental performance.<sup>3</sup>

TBL provides a framework for measuring and reporting corporate performance against economic, social and environmental benchmarks. Reporting on TBL makes transparent the organisation's decisions that explicitly take into consideration impacts on the environment and people, as well as on financial capital.

The notion of the Triple Bottom Line has many meanings to many people, and can be applied at different levels in society by different stakeholders. However, there is general agreement that the Triple Bottom Line principle is a useful approach for examining the operations of an entity, from a local council to a major corporation.

Reporting on the TBL can reduce risk, assist in delivering better outcomes for employees, shareholders, customers and clients, and enhance reputation. Management of risk, better outcomes for stakeholders and enhanced reputation can interact to produce a healthy operating environment and a reasonable expectation of company longevity past the quarterly report of key performance indicators.

The ISA group at the University of Sydney have developed a new TBL software tool, termed BottomLine<sup>3</sup> ("BL-cubed"). The UK version is available from ISA<sup>UK</sup> Research & Consulting.<sup>4</sup> An organisation's financial accounts, together with on-site impact data, act as input. Software outputs include aggregate figures, detailed breakdowns and rankings of economic, social and environmental indicators. Sector benchmarking, structural path analysis (upstream supply chain analysis) and production layer decomposition are available for all TBL indicators. Quantification of 'shared responsibility' is realised by delineating impacts into mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive portions of responsibility to be shared by all agents along a supply chain (see Sections 1.2 and 4.2).

The need for robust tools and advice on environmental and sustainability reporting is growing rapidly and will persist in the future. A recent report from Trucost, published by Defra (DEFRA, 2006), hints at significant gaps:

- "... there is still a lack of quantification in most reporting. The Environment Agency study of Annual Reports and Accounts of the FTSE All Share companies, noted that the majority of reports lack depth, rigour or quantification. The study concluded that quantified environmental disclosure levels in Annual Reports and Accounts were found to be low..." (page 14)
- "Most business will have supply chain impacts that they should understand and consider reporting. There is no single, quantifiable measure that companies can use as a KPI [Key Performance Indicator] for the effect of their upstream supply chain on the environment." (page 63).

---

<sup>3</sup> The EU Accounts Modernisation Directive (AMD), for example, introduces requirements for (large) companies to include a balanced and comprehensive analysis of the development and performance of the business in their Directors' Report. The analysis should "include both financial and, where appropriate, non-financial key performance indicators relevant to the particular business, including information relating to environmental and employee matters". This part of the EU Accounts Modernisation Directive is effective for financial years beginning on or after 1 April 2005.

<sup>4</sup> [www.bottomline3.com](http://www.bottomline3.com) and [www.bottomline3.co.uk](http://www.bottomline3.co.uk)

The methodology and the BL<sup>3</sup> tool described in this paper was developed to address this lack of quantification and comparability. It is science-based, consistent and robust. It uses regularly published, publicly available National Accounts data. It ensures that the real bottom line is quantified, not a figure determined by an arbitrary cut-off point that could be different in different organisations. Reporting on the real bottom line can deliver the full benefits of TBL reporting, including: the ability to make comparisons within and between organisations; completely transparent communication of an organisation's impacts to all stakeholders; and detailed information across the whole supply chain as a basis for strategic decision making (e.g. environmental purchasing policy, see below).

## 1.2. The concept of shared responsibility

It is perhaps because of the tendency of economic policy in market-driven economies not to interfere with consumers' preferences that the producer-centric representation is the dominant form of viewing the environmental impacts of industrial production: In statistics on energy, emissions, water etc, impacts are almost always presented as attributes of industries ('on-site' or 'direct' allocation) rather than as attributes of the supply chains of products for consumers. On a smaller scale, most existing schemes for corporate sustainability reporting include only impacts that arise out of operations controlled by the reporting company, and not supply-chain impacts (World Business Council on Sustainable Development and World Resources Institute, 2001). According to this world view, "upstream and downstream [environmental] impacts are [...] allocated to their immediate producers. The institutional setting and the different actors' spheres of influence are not reflected" (Spangenberg and Lorek, 2002, p. 131).

On the other hand, a number of studies have highlighted that final consumption and affluence, especially in the industrialised world, are the main drivers for the level and growth of environmental pressure. Even though these studies provide a clear incentive for complementing producer-focused environmental policy with some consideration for consumption-related aspects, demand-side measures to environmental problems are rarely exploited (Princen, 1999, p. 348).

The nexus created by the different views on impacts caused by industrial production is exemplified by several contributions to the discussion about producer or consumer responsibility for greenhouse gas emissions (e.g. Munksgaard and Pedersen, 2001; Bastianoni et al., 2004; Lenzen et al., 2004; Munksgaard et al., 2006). Emissions data are reported to the IPCC as contributions of producing industries located in a particular country (Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 1996) rather than as embodiments in products consumed by a particular population, irrespective of productive origin. However, especially for open economies, taking into account the greenhouse gases embodied in internationally traded commodities can have a considerable influence on national greenhouse gas balance sheets. Assuming consumer responsibility, exports have to be subtracted from, and imports added to national greenhouse gas inventories.

Similarly, at the company level, "when adopting the concept of eco-efficiency and the scope of an environmental management system stated in for example ISO 14001, it is insufficient to merely report on the carbon dioxide emissions limited to the judicial borders of the company" (Cerin, 2002, p. 59). "Companies must recognise their wider responsibility and manage the

entire life-cycle of their products ... Insisting on high environmental standards from suppliers and ensuring that raw materials are extracted or produced in an environmentally conscious way provides a start” (Welford, 1996, as cited in Cerin, 2005, p. 34).

The need for capturing impacts across the entire upstream and downstream supply chain (the boundary problem) is of particular importance and has therefore been noted in the Guidelines of the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) and by the World Business Council on Sustainable Development (Global Reporting Initiative, 2002 and 2005).

A life-cycle perspective is also taken in Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) frameworks: “Producers of products should bear a significant degree of responsibility (physical and/or financial) not only for the environmental impacts of their products downstream from the treatment and disposal of their product, but also for their upstream activities inherent in the selection of materials and in the design of products” (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2001, p. 21-22). “The major impetus for EPR came from northern European countries in the late 1980s and early 1990s, as they were facing severe landfill shortages. [... As a result,] EPR is generally applied to post-consumer wastes which place increasing physical and financial demands on municipal waste management” (Environment Protection Authority New South Wales, 2003, p. 2-4).

Environmental purchasing and supply-chain management are practical implementations of Extended Producer Responsibility. Recently, a range of companies have implemented policies that are aimed at reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and packaging waste from upstream suppliers and increasing recyclability, or supplier environmental awards. At times, queries by users of products about the environmental performance of the supplier have initiated knock-on effects that lead upstream organisations to begin conducting environmental audits and implementing environmental management systems (Barry, 1996).

The Chartered Institute of Purchasing and Supply UK have launched voluntary guidelines for environmental purchasing and recommends achieving seven goals (Chartered Institute for Purchasing and Supply, 1999, 2000 and 2002): (1) establishment of a business case to make environmental purchasing viable and part of day-to-day operations, (2) an understanding of the environmental issues affecting the organisation and its supply chain, (3) the development of a purchasing policy which addresses environmental issues, (4) environmental criteria for ranking suppliers, (5) improved communication with suppliers, (6) suitable methods for collecting relevant information, and (7) agreed targets for further environmental performance improvements. The software tool BottomLine<sup>3</sup> presented in this paper is able to contribute to all of these issues.

On the downstream side of a supply chain, McKerlie, Knight, and Thorpe (2006, p. 620) report that the concept of product stewardship “suggests that all parties with a role in designing, producing, selling or using a product are responsible for minimising the environmental impact of the product over its life. In practice, this “shared responsibility” extends beyond the producers and users of a product to include local governments and general taxpayers who incur the expense of managing products at their end-of-life as part of the residential waste stream. This shared approach does not clearly designate responsibility to any one party, diluting the impetus to advance waste prevention.” Indeed, at present, most of extended-responsibility initiatives proceed in a more or less qualitative and ad-hoc, rather than quantitative and systematic way in selecting, screening, ranking or influencing other

actors in their supply chain. We agree with Lloyd (1994), who states that “it will be impossible to produce a sufficiently credible ranking of suppliers without quantitative rating”.

In this paper we

- describe the analytical approach to measure the indirect impacts of a comprehensive Triple Bottom Line account of a producing entity,
- present a quantitative concept of shared responsibility as a solution to assigning responsibility to both producers and consumers, in a mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive way, and
- describe the new software tool BottomLine<sup>3</sup> that allows a quantification of indirect impacts, supply chain contributions and shared responsibility.

## 2. Measuring all indirect impacts

In this study, the principle of the Triple Bottom Line (TBL) is assessed using input-output analysis (IOA). Input-output analysis is a top-down economic technique, which uses sectoral monetary transactions data to account for the complex interdependencies of industries in modern economies. The result of generalised input-output analyses is a  $f \times n$  matrix of TBL factor multipliers, that is embodiments of  $f$  TBL indicators (such as exports, labour, energy, etc.) per unit of final demand of commodities produced by  $n$  industry sectors. A multiplier matrix  $\mathbf{M}$  can be calculated from a  $f \times n$  matrix  $\mathbf{Q}$  containing the direct, sectoral TBL indicator scores (e.g. from national economic, social and environmental accounts), and from a  $n \times n$  direct requirements matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  according to

$$\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \quad \text{Eq. (1)}$$

where  $\mathbf{I}$  is the  $n \times n$  unity matrix. For many countries, the direct requirements matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  can be compiled from the input-output tables published by the national statistical agencies.

The  $f \times 1$  TBL inventory  $\mathbf{F}$  of a given sectoral final demand represented by a  $n \times 1$  commodity vector  $\mathbf{y}$  is then simply

$$\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{M}\mathbf{y} \quad \text{Eq. (2)}$$

An introduction into the input–output method and its application to environmental problems can be found in Leontief and Ford, 1970; Proops, 1977; Miller and Blair, 1985 and Lenzen, 2001.

Input-output theory was pioneered by Nobel Prize winning economist Wassily Leontief in the 1940s and applied by Herendeen and others (Herendeen, 1973, 1974 and 1981; Herendeen et al., 1975 and 1976) to many energy analyses problems from the mid-1970s to today. It had

always been Leontief's intention that IOA be extended from purely financial considerations to a range of social and physical elements (Leontief and Ford, 1970). However, such methods have not been widely employed in government planning and policy circles, except for the European NAMEA movement, in which physical tables are set up as satellite accounts to the National Accounts (de Haan and Keuning, 1996; de Haan, 1999; see also Stahmer, 2000 and Statistisches Bundesamt, 2001). These physical accounts as well as our work aim at integrating the structure and function of the financial economy (as described by the national IO tables) with other national social and environmental accounts such as energy, greenhouse emissions, water, land use, employment and so on.

There is a well-known precedent for IO analysis techniques improving assessment processes: In life cycle assessment (LCA), which aims to calculate the total environmental burdens associated with a product, IOA has experienced a significant role in overcoming what is known as the boundary problem, or the problem of incompleteness of an LCA inventory due to the arbitrary truncation of the system by a subjectively set boundary (Suh et al., 2004), thus preventing decision-makers from overlooking important hidden upstream impacts.

In an empirical application the IO formalism was applied by the ISA team at the University of Sydney to compile a comprehensive TBL account of the Australian economy. National- and state-level economic sector level data for 344 sectors of the Australian economy were compiled, using input-output tables and additional data. A part of these accounts are published<sup>5</sup> and contain information on the aggregate and average performance of 135 economic sectors for ten TBL indicators together with their main data sources.<sup>6</sup> The synthesis of disparate data sources is a major component of the development of a generalised IOA framework.

The Australian TBL sector accounts also describe in hard numbers economic, social and environmental indicators against a common unit of one dollar of final demand. The latter constitutes a convenient and meaningful numeraire, because it is the destination of GDP, the common measure of national economic performance, and as Adam Smith concluded already in 1776, it is "the sole end and purpose of all production". Thus economic indicators of surplus, exports and imports can be reported as "dollars of surplus per dollar of final demand". Social indicators such as employment, wages and government revenue can be described as "the minutes of employment generated per dollar of final demand". Environmental indicators such as greenhouse gas emissions, water requirement and land disturbance can be described as "kilograms of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions per dollar of final demand" or the like. However, the presentation of such complex analyses is always fraught with the tension between simplicity and complexity.

---

<sup>5</sup> [www.isa.org.usyd.edu.au/publications/balance.shtml](http://www.isa.org.usyd.edu.au/publications/balance.shtml), see also Foran et al. (2005a, b)

<sup>6</sup> The ten macro TBL indicators published were: primary energy, greenhouse gas emissions, water use, land disturbance, value of imports, value of exports, surplus, government revenue, employment (hours) and income. However, the extended data set features many more indicators than the published set: it also includes material flows, the Ecological Footprint, emissions of more than 100 toxic, ozone-depleting, acidifying and eutrophication substances to air, water and soil, and two prominent Dutch LCA sets (the CML midpoint set and PRé's endpoint Eco-indicator99). In total the whole database distinguishes 1270 indicators for 344 industry sectors ([http://www.isa.org.usyd.edu.au/research/ISA\\_TBL\\_Indicators.pdf](http://www.isa.org.usyd.edu.au/research/ISA_TBL_Indicators.pdf)).

### 3. Unravelling the supply chain

The boundary within which an organisation accounts for its environmental, social and/or economic effects is usually defined as that over which the company has direct influence and can exercise control. However, such a definition faces a number of challenges. The level of influence and control will vary from organisation to organisation and from year to year, invalidating comparisons within and between organisations. Moreover, extending the boundary beyond the immediate control of the organisation still begs the question of exactly where to draw the line. Decisions will differ between organisations and over time. Establishing a clear boundary for an analysis that is consistent across all indicators seems at first sight to be almost impossible.

Notwithstanding these challenges, the boundary problem can be solved by taking a full life-cycle perspective and by taking into account the structure of the economic system as described in the national input-output tables. This structure is best depicted as an ever-expanding "tree of interdependence" that starts at a particular economic entity, and stretches across upstream production layers, containing sectors at different production stages linked together by supply chains. Thus a particular impact associated with a good or a service cascades from primary industries producing raw materials, via secondary (manufacturing) industries into the sector or company that delivers the final product to the consumer.

The general decomposition approach described in the following was introduced into economics and regional science in 1984 under the name 'structural path analysis' (Crama et al., 1984; Defourny and Thorbecke, 1984). In order to systematically determine environmentally important production chains, the total factor multipliers derived in Eq. (1) can be decomposed into contributions from all input paths, by 'unravelling' the Leontief inverse using a series expansion. A multiplier  $m_i$  for industry  $i$  can then be derived, representing the sum over a direct factor input  $q_i$ , occurring in industry  $i$  itself, and higher order input paths (see Lenzen, 2002 and 2003 for details).

Such a structural path analysis covers the entire upstream supply chain. It "unravels" a company's impacts into single contributing supply paths. It gives extensive detail of the impact of a sector's or company's activities. It allows investigating the location of impacts within the supply chain. In the case of a company, the control over the input procurement process then provides the possibility of substituting impact-intensive suppliers with more sustainable suppliers.

Detailed outputs of the Bottomline<sup>3</sup> tool derived from the application of structural path analysis include:

- a description of the path
- the path value (e.g. the greenhouse gas impact in grams of CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalent per £ of final output of business management services),
- the path order (that is, from which upstream supply layer the path originates),
- the path coverage, that is, the relative contribution (in %) to the total TBL impact of the company.

## 4. Assigning responsibility along supply chains

### 4.1. Full producer and consumer responsibility

Traditional company environmental reports and national environmental statistics accounts are based on a producer responsibility perspective. Companies usually report on-site emissions to air and water and other direct impacts such as noise, waste, direct use of energy and resources etc. (see e.g. DEFRA, 2006) With the same principles, the national Environmental Accounts are compiled, summing up all the emissions, resource use etc. that can be directly attributed to specific industrial sectors (see e.g. ONS, 2005).

In the following example we look at the carbon dioxide emissions caused by one particular economic chain: the production and consumption of glass containers and their food contents. Assume for the sake of illustration that the participants of this economic chain do not supply anyone other than their successor. According to the traditional perspective of producer responsibility accounting, we note down the direct (on-site) emissions of each member of the supply chain (Figure 1 and Table 1). The final consumer does not emit CO<sub>2</sub> in this particular process and therefore gets no emissions attributed.




Figure 1: Example for a full producer responsibility account of direct CO<sub>2</sub> emissions along a supply chain.

Note that there would be double counting if the producers of glass, containers and food used traditional LCA to calculate and publicise their CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. This is because the full 'life cycle' from 'cradle-to-gate' would be taken into account. The emissions caused by the sand miner, the glass maker and the glass container maker would appear in the food company's

CO<sub>2</sub> emission account as they are all suppliers. Hence the ‘embodied’ CO<sub>2</sub> emissions of this final production stage, derived by traditional LCA, would be 8400 t. It is hence multiple-counted.

Thus, LCA is a method that assumes full consumer responsibility. In life-cycle thinking, the consumer is placed at the very end of the supply chain. All impacts incurred during production are heaped onto the consumer of products. Therefore, if double-counting is to be avoided, LCA can only be used for the final consumers in an economy: the impacts of any producer must be zero.<sup>7</sup> This is a full consumer responsibility account as depicted in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Example for a full consumer responsibility account of all CO<sub>2</sub> emissions along a supply chain.

A particular disadvantage of full producer or consumer responsibility is that neither allows for both producers and consumers to evaluate their TBL impacts without double-counting. Full producer and consumer responsibility therefore appear somewhat unrealistic in their extremeness. Both producers and consumers wish to report their respective part of the impact, and it is intuitively clear that responsibility is somehow to be shared between the supplier and the recipient of a commodity, because the supplier has caused the impacts directly, but the recipient has demanded that the supplier do so.

When thinking about environmental impacts of producers and consumers, crucial questions arise such as: who is responsible for what, or: how is the responsibility to be shared, if at all? For example: Should a firm have to improve the eco-friendliness of its products, or is it up to the consumer to buy or not to buy? And further: should the firm be held responsible for only

<sup>7</sup> This is also the perspective taken by traditional Ecological Footprint estimates such as the National Footprint Accounts (see e.g. WWF, 2004; Wackernagel et al., 2005; Lenzen et al., 2006).

the downstream consequences of the use of its products, or – through its procurement decisions – also for the implications of its inputs from upstream suppliers? And if so, how far should the downstream and upstream spheres of responsibility extend? Similar questions can be phrased for the problem of deciding who takes the credits for successful abatement measures that involved producers and consumers: Who has the best knowledge of, or the most influence over how to reduce adverse impacts associated with the transfer of a product from producer to consumer?

## 4.2. Quantifying responsibility shares

As with many other allocation problems, an acceptable consensus probably lies somewhere between producer and consumer responsibility. In order to assign responsibility to actors participating in these transactions, one has to know the respective supply chains or inter-industry relations. Hence, a problem poses itself in form of the question: “How can one devise an accounting method that allows apportioning environmental (or other TBL) impacts to both producers and consumers while avoiding double-counting?” This problem has been addressed in two recent publications by Gallego and Lenzen (2005) and Lenzen et al. (2006).

The result is that in reality, both the final consumers and their upstream suppliers play some role in causing environmental impacts: The suppliers use resources and energy in order to produce, and make decisions on how much and what type of resources and energy they use. Consumers decide to spend their money on products coming from those upstream suppliers. And this role-sharing probably holds for many more situations in business and in life. The concept of shared responsibility recognises that there are always two (groups of) people who play a role in commodities produced and impacts caused, and two perspectives involved in every transaction: the supplier’s and the recipient’s. Hence, responsibility for impacts can be shared between them. Naturally, this applies to both benefits and burdens, and therefore to all positive and negative TBL indicators.

The idea of shared responsibility is not new. However, shared responsibility has only recently been consistently and quantitatively conceptualised by Gallego and Lenzen (2005).<sup>8</sup>

Sharing impacts between each pair of subsequent supply chain stages gets rid of the double-counting problem described above. One question that remained unresolved in the exposition by Gallego and Lenzen (2005) was in which proportion impacts should be shared between supplier and recipient in an economic chain. One possibility could be a 50%-50% split, where 50% of an on-site impact is retained by the producer and 50% is passed on to the producer’s downstream client. However, as outlined in Lenzen et al. (2006), a 50%-50% share leads to a methodological inconsistency: the part of the impact that is passed on and eventually reaches the final consumer is dependent on the number of participants in a supply chain. This dependence of responsibility allocations on the vertical integration of sectors is inconsistent and undesirable, because it creates incentives for de-merging in reporting practice.

---

<sup>8</sup> See also Rodrigues et al. (2006) for the definition of an indicator of environmental responsibility that accounts for transactions between countries in a ‘fair’ manner and Lenzen et al. (2006) for a discussion.

A solution to this problem, as suggested by Lenzen et al. (2006), is to peg the percentage split of responsibility retained by the supplier ( $1-\alpha$ ) to a quantity that is independent of sector classification. Value added is such a quantity: No matter whether a supply chain is represented as many or few stages, total value added is always the same at the end of the chain. Lenzen et al. (2006) therefore propose to use

$$1-\alpha_{ij} = \frac{V_i}{x_i - T_{ii}} \quad \text{Eq. (3)}$$

where  $v_i$  is value added of industry sector  $i$ , and  $x_i - T_{ii}$  is gross output minus intra-industry transactions, in other words net output. Intra-industry transactions  $T_{ii}$  have to be understood as transactions between different branches of the same industry sector.

Using the supply chain from above, we apply Eq. (3) with example values for value added (VA) and net output (NO) for each supplier as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Quantitative example of allocating CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in a supply chain by applying the shared responsibility approach described in Lenzen et al. (2006).

	SAND MINING	GLASS MAKING	GLASS CONTAINER MAKING	FOOD PROCESSING	FINAL CONSUMER
Value added (VA) [m£]	0.4	1.6	2.1	16.0	
Net output (NO) [m£]	1.6	3.2	5.3	21.3	
$1-\alpha = \text{VA}/\text{NO}$	0.25	0.50	0.40	0.75	
Responsibility share	25% (retained)- 75% (passed on)	50% (retained)- 50% (passed on)	40% (retained)- 60% (passed on)	75% (retained)- 25% (passed on)	
On-site CO <sub>2</sub> emissions [t]	2000	5000	1000	400	
CO <sub>2</sub> received [t]		1500	3250	2550	738
CO <sub>2</sub> retained [t]	500	3250	1700	2213	738
CO <sub>2</sub> passed on [t]	1500	3250	2550	738	

Assume the sand mine supplies 1.6 million £ worth of sand to the glass maker, to which the latter adds m£1.6 of value to produce m£3.2 worth of glass net output. To this, the glass container manufacturer adds m£2.1 of value, producing m£5.3 worth of glass containers. To this, the food manufacturer adds m£16 of value, producing m£21.3 worth of food.

The sand mine adds 25% of value to sandstone by turning it into sand. It will hence retain a shared responsibility of 25% of their CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (500 t of 2000 t) and send the remaining 75% (1500 t) down the supply chain to the glass manufacturer. The glass maker will add 50% of value to sand by turning it into glass. The glass maker is hence assigned 50% of 1500 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> passed down from sand, plus 50% of 5000 tonnes used while manufacturing glass. The remainder (3250 t) is passed on to glass containers. The glass container manufacturer will add 40% of value to glass, and is thus assigned 40% of the emissions embodied in glass containers, and so on. Finally, the food manufacturer adds 75% of value to

glass containers, and is therefore assigned 75% of emissions embodied in packed food. Final consumers (households, the government) are at the end of the supply chain, and receive the remainder (738 t of CO<sub>2</sub>). This process of sharing responsibility by using a VA/NO allocation is depicted in Figure 3; the final results are shown in Figure 4.




Figure 3: Process of applying shared, value-added-allocated responsibility to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in one particular supply chain (blue columns = on-site impact; grey columns = share that is passed on from one supplier to the next; purple columns = retained impact)




Figure 4: Results of applying shared, value-added-allocated responsibility to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in one particular supply chain (identical to purple columns in Figure 3).

The logic of this allocation scheme (as opposed to a 50%-50% split) is that an organisation that controls its production to a high extent, retains a high share of the responsibility for the emissions. High control, or influence over the product can be approximated by high value added: Production processes that add a high percentage of value onto inputs usually transform these to a high extent, while low-value adding entities operate more like an “agent” of their inputs.

## 5. Software tool BottomLine<sup>3</sup>

At the University of Sydney, TBL Accounting has been formulated as a quantitative framework using an input-output-based LCA method. This framework has been applied to dozens of organisations in reporting on their sustainability performance – companies, government departments, NGOs. Experiences were collected in a 3-year pilot project. It became clear that the data collection burden for the organisation has to be as small as possible. As a result, a software tool was developed in collaboration with the using organisations, enabling users to create a comprehensive sustainability report solely by importing their existing financial accounts.

This software tool is called BottomLine<sup>3</sup>, or short BL<sup>3</sup> (“BL-cubed”). A version for the UK economy has been co-developed by ISA<sup>UK</sup> Research & Consulting, who are also licensing the tool in the United Kingdom.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> See [www.bottomline3.co.uk](http://www.bottomline3.co.uk) and [www.isa-research.co.uk](http://www.isa-research.co.uk)

BL<sup>3</sup> accepts any organisation's financial accounts as imported input, and uses this financial information to calculate upstream, indirect impacts in terms of physical indicators chosen by the user. On-site physical impacts are entered separately. The TBL indicator set of BL<sup>3</sup> UK features a number of economic, social and environmental indicators, including greenhouse gases; toxic, ozone-creating, acidifying and eutrophication air pollutants; heavy metals; energy and resource use; the Ecological Footprint; and material flows. In total the whole database distinguishes well over 100 indicators.




Figure 5: User input page of the BottomLine<sup>3</sup> software

Software outputs include aggregate figures, detailed breakdowns, sector benchmarking and rankings of indicators into supply chain contributions (example are shown in the following Figures).




Figure 6: A spider diagram presentation of Triple Bottom Line performance of an example company in key financial, social and environmental indicators (red line). The regular polygon in the centre of the diagram (thick black line) shows the average TBL performance of the food sector, allowing a benchmark comparison between the company and its sector. Indicators with above average performance are closer to the centre, while below average indicators are positioned closer to the outside boundary.




Figure 7: Depiction of responsibility shares of a material flow impact. 1.5 tonnes of the total 2.6 t impact are retained by the example company whereas 1.1 tonnes are passed on further down the supply chain (0.4 t to other businesses and 0.7 t to final consumers).

Ranked Structural Paths - Total energy consumption				
Rank	Path Description	Path Value	Path Order	Percentage in total impact
1	Food and drink > Old Yorke Bakery	313 kWh	2	24.4 %
2	Agriculture > Old Yorke Bakery	191 kWh	2	14.9 %
3	Fertilisers > Agriculture > Old Yorke Bakery	121 kWh	3	9.45 %
4	Iron and steel > Machinery and equipment > Old Yorke Bakery	69.1 kWh	3	5.40 %
5	Machinery and equipment > Old Yorke Bakery	60.1 kWh	2	4.69 %
6	Gas distribution > Old Yorke Bakery	42.8 kWh	2	3.34 %
7	Electricity production and distribution > Food and drink > Old Yorke Bakery	34.2 kWh	3	2.67 %
8	Electricity production and distribution > Old Yorke Bakery	33.6 kWh	2	2.63 %
9	Coke ovens, refined petroleum & nuclear fuel > Agriculture > Old Yorke Bakery	27.2 kWh	3	2.13 %
10	Electricity production and distribution > Agriculture > Old Yorke Bakery	27.0 kWh	3	2.11 %
11	Agriculture > Food and drink > Old Yorke Bakery	19.4 kWh	3	1.51 %
12	Food and drink > Agriculture > Old Yorke Bakery	18.9 kWh	3	1.47 %
13	Electricity production and distribution > Machinery and equipment > Old Yorke Bakery	18.5 kWh	3	1.44 %
14	Electricity production and distribution > Gas distribution > Old Yorke Bakery	15.9 kWh	3	1.24 %
15	Fertilisers > Agriculture > Food and drink > Old Yorke Bakery	12.3 kWh	4	0.96 %
16	Pulp and paper > Food and drink > Old Yorke Bakery	12.3 kWh	3	0.96 %
17	Non-ferrous metals > Machinery and equipment > Old Yorke Bakery	12.1 kWh	3	0.94 %
18	Other land transport > Food and drink > Old Yorke Bakery	9.41 kWh	3	0.73 %
19	Coke ovens, refined petroleum & nuclear fuel > Food and drink > Old Yorke Bakery	7.54 kWh	3	0.59 %
20	Plastic products > Food and drink > Old Yorke Bakery	7.01 kWh	3	0.55 %

Figure 8: Results of a BL<sup>3</sup> structural path analysis of an example company. The total energy consumption embodied in the supplies from upstream producers is broken down into contributions from the supplying sectors. The list shows path values and orders (i.e. how large and how far away the impacts are).

These outputs enable the user to determine

- which of the operating inputs embody the largest impacts,
- whether these impacts occur at direct suppliers, or at more remote supply chain locations,
- and which single input paths carry the largest impacts (through structural path analysis).

Users perceive especially the latter information as very helpful, because it can be used for organisational planning and priority setting for informed action towards financial, social and environmental sustainability. In particular, it shows organisations alternatives for effective procurement policy changes, which may be applied instead of perhaps costly on-site measures.

The BL<sup>3</sup> software has been extensively road-tested over three years. Users had no difficulty in understanding and accepting indirect impacts occurring off-site, in addition to on-site direct impacts. Users felt that assessing their organisation's indirect impacts was a valuable feature because it increases abatement options, enables meaningful benchmarking, avoids loopholes in reporting and informs about real risk. Sydney University's TBL software has been designed so it can readily be implemented for any economy for which input-output data complemented with physical data are available. Trial versions include Australia, the UK, Japan, the US, and Germany. In principle it is possible to develop a version based on a multi-national IO framework that covers international trade flows.

## 6. Conclusions

Numerate Triple Bottom Line accounting at the company level highlights a number of key issues important to the sustainable development agenda. Especially if all upstream impacts stemming from a web of supply chains are taken into account, new insights and useful information for corporate decision-making can be gained. With the approach described in this work we are able to allocate TBL loadings amongst the actors of economic chains, including all producers and consumers of commodities, in a mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive way, that is without double counting of any impacts. As a result we introduce the concept of shared responsibility to the overarching theme of corporate responsibility.

The main differences between the principle of shared responsibility, and that of either full producer or full consumer responsibility are:

- in contrast to full producer responsibility, in shared responsibility, every member of the supply chain is affected by their upstream supplier and in turn affects their downstream recipient, hence it is in all actors' interest to enter into a dialogue about what to do to improve supply chain performance. There is no incentive for such a dialogue in full producer responsibility. In shared responsibility, producers are not alone in addressing the issue of TBL impacts, because their downstream customers play a role, too.
- in contrast to full consumer responsibility, shared responsibility provides an incentive for producers and consumers to enter into a dialogue about what to do to improve the profile of consumer products. It gives consumers information about where the impacts occur that are embodied in the products they buy.

It is important to harmonise this analytical approach, with its strengths of integration and lack of boundaries, with international approaches rapidly gaining headway such as 'The Global Reporting Initiative' and 'The Equator Principles'. These approaches have widespread support through many globalised companies and national governments. However they are currently orientated to a 'within the factory fence' approach, but do acknowledge a number of first order issues such as the origin of water and energy, and some second and third order effects particularly the labour practices used to supply intermediate inputs to production. Part of the harmonisation process will require the development of indicator datasets that match the requirements of these initiatives, as well as collaborating in the development of international software tools that enable the fluent use of whole economy accounting without boundaries.

## 7. Acknowledgement

This work builds substantially on a 'Triple Bottom Line Accounting' research contract undertaken for the Department of Environment and Heritage in the Federal Australian Government. However this work lies outside that contracted research and represents the interpretations and opinions of the authors only.

## 8. References

- Barry, Anthony, 1996. Buyers start to spread the "green" message. *Purchasing & Supply Management* Feb, 21.
- Bastianoni, S., F. M. Pulselli, and E. Tiezzi, 2004. The problem of assigning responsibility for greenhouse gas emissions. *Ecological Economics* 49, 253-57.
- Cerin, P. 2002. Communication in corporate environmental reports. *Eco-Management and Auditing* 9, 46-66.
- Cerin, P. 2005. Environmental Strategies in Industry - Turning Business Incentives into Sustainability. Report 5455. Swedish Environmental Protection Agency: Stockholm, Sweden.
- Chartered Institute of Purchasing and Supply, 1999. Ethical business practices in purchasing and supply. CIPS Positions on Practice, <http://www.epolitix.com/data/companies/images/Companies/Chartered-Institute-of-Purchasing-and-Supply/ethics.pdf>. Chartered Institute of Purchasing and Supply: Easton on the Hill, Stamford, Lincolnshire, UK.
- Chartered Institute of Purchasing and Supply, 2000. Environmental purchasing and supply management summary. CIPS Policies and Positions, <http://www.epolitix.com/data/companies/images/Companies/Chartered-Institute-of-Purchasing-and-Supply/environmental.pdf>. Chartered Institute of Purchasing and Supply: Easton on the Hill, Stamford, Lincolnshire, UK.
- Chartered Institute for Purchasing and Supply, 2002. Environmental Purchasing in Practice – guidance for organisations, 2002, Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment, Chartered Institute for Purchasing and Supply, NHS Purchasing and Supply Agency, UK)
- Crama Y, Defourny J, Gazon J. 1984. Structural decomposition of multipliers in input–output or social accounting matrix analysis. *Economie Appliquée*, 37:215–22.
- de Haan, M. and Keuning, S.J., 1996. Taking the environment into account: the NAMEA approach. *Review of Income and Wealth* 42, 131-148.
- de Haan, M., 1999. On the international harmonisation of environmental accounting: comparing the National Accounting Matrix including Environmental Accounts of Sweden, Germany, the UK, Japan and the Netherlands. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 10, 151-160.
- Defourny J, Thorbecke E., 1984. Structural path analysis and multiplier decomposition within a social accounting matrix framework. *Economic Journal*, 94:111–36.
- DEFRA, 2006. Environmental Key Performance Indicators - Reporting Guidelines for UK Business. Trucost and DEFRA, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, London, UK.
- Elkington, J., 1997. *Cannibals with Forks: The Triple Bottom Line of 21<sup>st</sup> century Business*. Capstone Publishing, Oxford, UK.
- Environment Protection Authority New South Wales 2003. Extended Producer Responsibility Priority Statement. Consultation Paper 2003/10. EPA NSW: Sydney South, NSW, Australia.
- Foran, Barney, Lenzen, Manfred, and Dey, Christopher, 2005a. Balancing Act: A triple bottom line analysis of the 135 sectors of the Australian economy. CSIRO Technical report,
- Foran,B., Lenzen,M., Dey,C., and Bilek,M., 2005b. Integrating sustainable chain management with triple bottom line accounting. *Ecological Economics*, 52:143-157 pp.
- Gallego,B. and Lenzen,M., 2005. A consistent input-output formulation of shared producer and consumer responsibility. *Economic Systems Research*, 17:365-391 pp.
- Global Reporting Initiative 2002. Sustainability Reporting Guidelines. Global Reporting Initiative: Boston, USA.
- Global Reporting Initiative 2005. GRI Boundary Protocol. Internet site <http://www.globalreporting.org/guidelines/protocols/BoundaryProtocol.pdf>. Global Reporting Initiative, GRI: Amsterdam, Netherlands.

- Herendeen, R. and Sebald, A., 1975. Energy, employment and dollar impacts of certain consumer options. In Williams, R.H. (Eds.), *The Energy Conservation Papers*. Ballinger Publishing Company, Cambridge Ma, USA, 131-170.
- Herendeen, R. and Tanaka, J., 1976. Energy cost of living. *Energy* 1, 165-178.
- Herendeen, R.A., 1973. Use of input-output analysis to determine the energy cost of goods and services. In Macrakis, M.S. (Eds.), *Energy: Demand, Conservation, and Institutional Problems*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA, 141-158.
- Herendeen, R.A., 1974. Affluence and energy demand. *Mechanical Engineering* 96, 18-22.
- Herendeen, R.A., 1981. Energy intensities in ecological and economic systems. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 91, 607-620.
- Lenzen, M., Murray, J., Sack, F., and Wiedmann, T., 2006. Shared producer and consumer responsibility - Theory and practice. *Ecological Economics* In Press, Corrected Proof.
- Lenzen, M., 2001. A generalised input-output multiplier calculus for Australia. *Economic Systems Research*, 13:65-92 pp.
- Lenzen, M., 2002. A guide for compiling inventories in hybrid life-cycle assessments: some Australian results. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 10:545-572 pp.
- Lenzen, M., 2003. Environmentally important paths, linkages and key sectors in the Australian economy. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 14:1-34 pp.
- Lenzen, M., Pade, L.-L., and Munksgaard, J., 2004. CO2 Multipliers in Multi-region Input-Output Models. *Economic Systems Research*, 16:391-412 pp.
- Leontief W., Ford D. 1970. Environmental repercussions and the economic structure: an input-output approach. *Review of Economics and Statistics*; 52:262-71.
- Leontief, W. and Ford, D., 1970. Environmental repercussions and the economic structure: an input-output approach. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 52, 262-271.
- Lloyd, Michael 1994. How green are my suppliers? - Buying environmental risk. *Purchasing & Supply Management* Oct, 36.
- McKerlie, K., N. Knight, and B. Thorpe 2006. Advancing Extended Producer Responsibility in Canada. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 14, 616-28.
- Miller, R.E. and Blair, P.D., 1985. *Input-Output Analysis: Foundations and Extensions*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Munksgaard, J. and Pedersen, K.A., 2001. CO2 accounts for open economies: producer or consumer responsibility? *Energy Policy*, 29:327-334 pp.
- Munksgaard, J., Pade, L.-L., Minx, J., and Lenzen, M., 2006. Influence of trade on national CO2 emissions. *International Journal of Global Energy Issues*, ?? pp.
- ONS, 2005. *Environmental Accounts, Autumn 2005*. Office for National Statistics, London.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development 2001. *Extended Producer Responsibility: A Guidance Manual for Governments*. Paris, France: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Princen, T. 1999. Consumption and environment: some conceptual issues. *Ecological Economics* 31, 347-63.
- Proops JLR, 1977. Input-output analysis and energy intensities: a comparison of methodologies. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*; 1:181-6.
- Rodrigues, J., Domingos, T., Giljum, S., and Schneider, F., 2006. Designing an indicator of environmental responsibility. *Ecological Economics* (in press, corrected proof).
- Spangenberg, J. H. and S. Lorek 2002. Environmentally sustainable household consumption: from aggregate environmental pressures to priority fields of action. *Ecological Economics* 43, 127-40.

- Stahmer, Carsten, 2000. The Magic Triangle of Input-Output Tables. 13th International Conference on Input-Output Techniques, 21 - 25 August 2000, Macerata, Italy.
- Statistisches Bundesamt, 2001. Endbericht zum Projekt "A Physical Input-Output-Table for Germany, 1995". 98/559/3040/B4/MM. Umweltökonomische Gesamtrechnungen, Material- und Energieflussrechnungen, Statistisches Bundesamt, Wiesbaden, Germany.
- Suh, S., Lenzen, M., Treloar, G.J., Hondo, H., Horvath, A., Huppes, G., Jolliet, O., Klann, U., Krewitt, W., Moriguchi, Y., Munksgaard, J. and Norris, G., 2004. System boundary selection in Life-Cycle Inventories. *Environmental Science & Technology* 38, 657-664.
- Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories 1996. Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories - Reporting Instructions (Volume 1).<http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gl/invs4.htm>. Institute for Global Environmental Strategies, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change - IPCC National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme: Tokyo, Japan.
- Wackernagel, Mathis, Monfreda, Chad, Moran, Dan, Wermer, Paul, Goldfinger, Steven, Deumling, Diana, and Murray, Michael, 2005. National Footprint and Biocapacity Accounts 2005: The underlying calculation method.
- Welford, R. 1996. Corporate Environmental Management: Systems and Strategies. Earthscan Publications Ltd: London, UK.
- World Business Council on Sustainable Development and World Resources Institute 2001. The Greenhouse Gas Protocol.<http://www.ghgprotocol.org/standard/ghg.pdf>, <http://www.ghgprotocol.org/>. World Business Council on Sustainable Development: Conches-Geneva, Switzerland.
- World Commission on Environment and Development (1987). Our Common Future; Oxford, UK
- WWF, 2004. Living Planet Report 2004. World-Wide Fund for Nature International (WWF), Global Footprint Network, and UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre. World-Wide Fund for Nature International (WWF), Gland, Switzerland.