

THE GREEN BUSINESS

WWW.GREENBIZLETTER.COM

JUNE 2005

Letter

THE HANDS-ON JOURNAL FOR ENVIRONMENTALLY
CONSCIOUS COMPANIES

FIRST, DO NO HARM

*The Growing Business
Case for Toxic-free
Products and Processes*

For much of the history of corporate environmentalism, the idea of reducing toxics has been largely a compliance conversation, the result of various national and local laws limiting or prohibiting the emissions of poisons into the air, land, or soil. Ever since the publication of Rachel Carson's landmark book *Silent Spring* in 1962 there has been high awareness for more than four decades that even low doses toxics in the environment can be a significant threat to public health and the environment.

Increasingly, toxics seem well on their way to be becoming a threat to business, too.

A new body of research and activity suggests that toxics reduction and elimination may be a growing arena of regulatory,

activist, customer, and shareholder interest. And as awareness increases of the business risks of toxics, whether real risks or perceived ones, companies lacking established policies and processes may find themselves subject to competitive pressures and new, more intensive levels of stakeholder scrutiny.

A few trends and data points help to illustrate the current landscape:

- **New studies** are showing that toxic chemicals are accumulating in human fat tissue, and are found in mothers' breast milk, blood, and urine at rates never before seen. As scientists have refined their biomonitoring techniques, they have sounded the alarm about the effects of low doses of common chemicals on everything from autism to cancer. For example, recent reports on flame retardants show that levels of these neurotoxins are now present in humans at unprecedented levels.

- **Regulators** in Europe and at the state and local levels in the U.S. are passing laws that variously ban specific chemicals in products, or give procurement preference for government purchases of goods using fewer or no chemicals of concern. Some regulations — notably,

{continued on page 4}

INSIDE

U.K. Firms Want More Government Climate Action	2
Cradle-to-Cradle Certification Launches	2
Study Shines a Bright Light on LEDs' Retail Appeal	3
SC Johnson Sets the 'Gold Standard' with Greenlist	4
Product Toxicity Governance Framework	6
Toxics Reduction Resources	7
The E-Factor: In for the Long Run	8

A Matter of Policy A group of some of the UK's largest companies has **called on the British government to do more to help them reduce CO₂ emissions**, which are blamed for global warming.

The group, which includes oil giants BP and Shell, utility Scottish Power, and bank HSBC, said in a letter to Prime Minister Tony Blair on Friday they wanted clearer policy and more incentives. Specifically, they want the government to set targets for emissions trading and other related policies beyond 2012, the end of the last period for when detailed targets have been published.

The companies also called for incentives for investment in the development and application of new low-carbon technologies and asked the government to "eliminate the policy inconsistencies and perverse incentives that undermine the effectiveness of climate policy."

In return, the companies promised to support government action and to "dramatically" increase investment in low-carbon technologies and processes. The group said that while tackling climate change would impose costs on their businesses, the UK's overall competitiveness need not be hurt by stricter regulations.

Cradle to Grade Award-winning environmental architect and designer William McDonough has unveiled a new system to **evaluate and certify the quality of products based on the principles of cradle-to-cradle design** and invited companies to become the initial applicants.

Within the certification

system, a candidate material or product is assessed extensively and, if found to achieve the necessary criteria, will be certified as a Technical/Biological Nutrient or as a Silver, Gold, or Platinum product. Each material or product is evaluated using the following measures:

- Ingredient chemistry is researched for its potential impacts on human and environmental health, and strategies for phasing out any ingredients of concern must be in place;
- Product is recyclable following its use and a system for recovering and fully recycling the product has been identified;
- Manufacturing maximizes the use of current solar income and water quality; and
- Workplace and business practices are ethical and support employees and communities.

The deadline for submitting applications for initial certification review is August 15, 2005. The first certified products will be announced on September 1.

More information: www.c2ccertified.com.

Flower Power An international panel of industry experts have launched a **new U.S. eco-label for sustainably produced floral products**.

The Veriflora certification standard launched by Scientific Certification Systems, an independent certification firm, revolves around six principles: advanced agricultural practices, social responsibility, conservation of ecological resources, water conservation, waste management, and product quality.

The certification process addresses production practices ranging from soil preparation and seed planting through pro-

THE GREEN BUSINESS
The Hands-On Journal for
Environmentally Conscious Companies *Letter*

Joel Makower, Editor

SUBSCRIPTIONS

PRINTED EDITION: Published 12 times a year via e-mail in PDF format (requiring Acrobat Reader). Annual subscriptions: US\$95 a year (US\$45 for students and academics with an ".edu" e-mail address). Single copies: US\$15. Discounts available for site licenses. All subscribers receive password access to our archives at www.GreenBizLetter.com.

SAMPLE COPIES

We would be pleased to e-mail a free sample copy of THE GREEN BUSINESS LETTER to anyone you think should receive one. Please provide names, titles, and e-mail addresses.

REPRINTS AND SPECIAL EDITIONS

Please contact us if you are interested in reprints or customized editions for your organization. We also June be of help in developing customized educational materials covering environmental business topics.

HOW TO CONTACT US:

Tilden Press Inc.
6 Hillwood Place
Oakland, CA 94610 USA

Editorial: 510-451-3100

Circulation: 800-955-GREEN or 510-451-3100

E-mail: info@GreenBizLetter.com

World Wide Web: www.GreenBizLetter.com

©2005 Tilden Press Inc. All Rights Reserved.

Unless we have made arrangements with you in writing, this newsletter is licensed for individual use only. It June not be copied, e-mailed, or otherwise redistributed or reproduced by any means without written permission, except as stated below. Please contact us regarding site or companywide licenses.

Authorization to photocopy or transmit items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of clients, is granted by Tilden Press Inc., provided that the base fee of US\$2 per copy plus US\$2 per page is paid directly to Copyright Clearance Center, 27 Congress St., Salem, MA 01970, USA; 508-744-3350.

ISSN: 1056-490X

GreenBiz.com

Study Shines a Bright Light on LEDs' Retail Appeal

Retailers looking to add dazzle to their window displays may want to consider colored light-emitting diodes — LEDs for short. A recent field study from the Lighting Research Center at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute of Troy, N.Y., showed that colored lighting effects created with these tiny lamps can cut lighting energy in retail windows by 30% to 50% and attract more attention from shoppers.

Retailers use lighting in display windows to illuminate merchandise, attract attention and even send a message about the quality of their store. But it's a big drain: the U.S. Energy Department says lighting is the biggest energy expense for retailers, accounting for 37% of total energy use in U.S. retail buildings.

This energy drain could be eased by using LEDs, already a source of illumination for traffic signals, exit signs, and electronic displays. The potential benefits, including better efficiency and longer life (up to 50,000 hours, or 40 times longer than conventional incandescent lamps), have catalyzed

global research efforts in LED and solid-state lighting technology.

The Lighting Research Center conducted a study with the Los Angeles Department of Power & Water. As part of the study, researchers installed custom, slim-profile LED fixtures in the windows of three stores owned by a popular clothing retailer found in Los Angeles area shopping malls. To cut energy consumption by 30% to 50% in each window, they eliminated all general fluorescent lighting, reduced the number and wattage of halogen accent lights, and added LED systems to create colored backgrounds for interest. The researchers tested different window display and lighting scenarios over an eight-week period and surveyed shoppers about the attractiveness, visibility, and eye-catching ability of the windows. (Lighting inside the stores remained unchanged).

After eight weeks and more than 700 surveys, the researchers found that 84% of shoppers agreed that the LED display windows were visually appealing; 91% said that the reduced accent lighting did not diminish the visibility of the window mannequins and merchandise. And cutting

the lighting power consumption further to 50% in each window resulted in no significant difference in shoppers' opinions compared with the typical lighting, and a lower opinion compared with the 30% reduction.

Sales data gathered by the retailer showed no significant change in sales at the three test stores during the study period, even with a 50% reduction in power consumption.

The potential savings and payback that can come from using LED lighting can be significant. The Lighting Research Center estimated that the average store can reduce power demand from lighting store windows by up to 1 kilowatt, saving 5,500 kilowatt-hours per year (based on 2,000 watts of window lighting and 14 hours of use per day). Given current LED lighting system costs and estimated energy and maintenance savings, the typical system payback is less than two years.

For more information about LEDs, solid-state lighting, and their applications, visit www.lrc.rpi.edu/programs/solidstate. ❖

duction, harvest, and post-harvest handling. The standard also includes procedures for verifying the integrity of flowers and plants throughout the chain-of-custody.

Details: www.scs-certified.com/csrpurchasing/veriflora.

The Cutting Edge Lease for Less: The Development Bank of Japan, a government-affiliated financial institution, launched a climate-reduction loan program in April to facilitate household leasing of

energy-saving products, such as appliances, water heaters, and vehicles. Working with utilities, retailers, and others, the bank will provide low-interest loans to those who purchase energy-efficient products in bulk and lease them to households at low cost. . . . **Cause and Effect:**

A new study by Cone Communications of cause-related marketing campaigns found that three-fourths of Americans believe such partnerships lead to a more positive image — *of nonprofits*. . . . **Thought for**

Foods: A new organic fast food restaurant, launching in New York with national ambitions, is offering a cool \$1,000 to whom-ever comes up with a world-class brand name they use. Send submissions by July 1 to: anagy03@yahoo.com. . . . **Thought for Nudes:** Meanwhile, *Playboy* is planning a pictorial for an upcoming issue featuring women involved in environmental causes. In addition to a modeling fee to participants, the magazine will make a donation to each model's favorite cause. ❖

TOXICS

(Continued from page 1)

the European Union's REACH initiative — require companies to make public much more data than are currently available about the toxic ingredients of their products.

- **Investor groups**, especially pension funds, are beginning to partner with activist environmental and health groups to demand greater accountability in companies' management of toxic materials. Shareholder resolutions on the topic used to be limited to major chemical companies, but are now showing up at annual meetings of companies selling everything from cosmetics (Avon) to computers (Apple).

- **Customers**, especially at the supply-chain level, are becoming more proactive in limiting or banning certain ingredients from the products and materials they buy. Companies are variously using blacklists, graylists, and greenlists to determine desirable and undesirable chemicals. A few have systems in place that measure and track the steady decline of undesirable chemicals from their purchases.

- **Consumer concern** is growing, too. A survey by Harris Interactive released in April found that a majority (58%) of U.S. adults believe that chemicals and pollutants are more of a threat to people like them now than they were 10 years ago. Six in 10 adults reported having taken one or more steps to reduce their exposure to chemicals or pollutants, such as buying natural or biodegradable products, purchasing organic produce, purchasing chemical-free paints or furnishings, or having their homes tested for any of several indoor pollutants.

Much of this is not new.

Concern over the environmental and public health impacts of toxic chemicals go back to DDT, dioxins, and PCBs. And corporate pollution-prevention activities dating to the late 1980s have eliminated scores of toxic solvents and other polluting or hazardous materials from their operations. What's new is the confluence of concern among various stakeholders, the increased scrutiny and activism taking place around the globe,

It's no longer just chemical companies, or even just manufacturers, who are undergoing scrutiny. Every consumer product company is fair game.

and the breadth of companies and sectors affected. Indeed, it's no longer just chemical companies, or even just manufacturers. Every consumer product company is fair game.

At the same time, a small corps of companies are working in various ways to clean up their products, processes, and policies, according to Dr. Richard A. Liroff, a senior fellow at the World Wildlife Fund in Washington, D.C., focusing on corporate management of toxics. And the opportunities to gain business value from such endeavors is considerable. "Innovative, entrepreneurial companies can gain competitive advantage, increase profits, and grow shareholder value by systematically reviewing chemicals in their products, working with their suppliers to reduce or eliminate product toxicity, and responding creatively to the growing demand for environmentally preferable goods," he wrote in a paper on the topic published earlier this year by

the Rose Foundation for Communities and the Environment.

SONY'S SAGA

Liroff cites the saga of Sony as a cautionary tale about companies and toxics. In the fall of 2001, the Netherlands banned the sale of Sony's hot PlayStation consoles because the cadmium in accessory cables exceeded regulatory limits. Sony's lost sales and the costs to rework their product totaled about \$150 million and the experience led Sony to carry out a systematic supply-chain and internal management review to prevent similar problems from happening in the future.

Liroff says the Sony episode underscores why companies, especially consumer products companies, need to have full knowledge of the toxic chemicals in their products. "Companies that do not understand toxic hazards in their products and who do not take steps to reduce or eliminate them face the risk of disruption to their supply chains, exclusion from markets, damage to their reputation, foregone profits, and toxic tort litigation," he writes.

Liroff cites several companies that have begun to systematically review chemical use and to reduce or eliminate more problematic ones. Some examples:

- **Chiquita Brands** has made a commitment to certify all its farms in Latin America using a program that requires steady reductions in agrochemical use, based on analyses of soils, plants, and insect populations.

- **Fujitsu** is evaluating and aims to reduce the annual use by its facilities of approximately 70 chemicals that Japan's Ministry of Environment has designated as exerting potentially harmful endocrine effects.

- **Gerber** has a goal of no detectable pesticide residue in its baby food and has implemented

Setting the Gold Standard with 'Greenlist'

SC Johnson — the producer of such venerable consumer brands as Glade, Pledge, Raid, and Windex — has taken aggressive measures to reduce the toxic ingredients of its products and processes. World Wildlife Fund's Richard Liroff refers to SC Johnson, which has \$6.5 billion in annual revenue, as the "gold standard" in company toxics reduction efforts.

The centerpiece of SCJ's efforts is its "Greenlist," which classifies all of the ingredients of its products into a simple scale: 3 for "Best," 2 for "Better," 1 for "Acceptable," and 0 for "Restricted Use Material." Aggregate scores are derived based on the weight of the screened materials the company purchases. So far, the company has conducted screenings for the 15 material categories that constitute 95% of its raw materials purchases, including surfactants, solvents, propellants, insecticides, resins, and packaging. All of SCJ's new or reformulated products must go through the Greenlist process.

In creating Greenlist, SCJ opted for a pragmatic approach: "The data had

to be readily available," explains David C. Long, Sustainable Innovation Manager in the company's Global Environmental and Safety Actions department. "We didn't want to ask our suppliers to generate data that would cost them millions of dollars. We asked them for information that was readily available." SCJ supplemented that information with publicly available resources, such as the U.S. EPA's ECOTOX database (www.epa.gov/ecotox).

The goal of Greenlist is to continually ratchet up overall scores by reducing or eliminating low-scoring materials. When the first assessments were conducted, during 2000-01, the average score was 1.2 (out of a perfect score of 3.0). Long says he expects the current (2004-05) average to be about 1.4 — roughly the goal SCJ had set for itself for 2007-08; now he's in the process of resetting that goal.

Greenlist has provided other benefits, says Long. "We have been very successful at looking at how we can be innovative in our product formulating by putting in better chemicals. In some cases, we find synergies with other raw materials so we get better cleaning with fewer raw materials.

Sometimes we find raw materials that are less expensive."

For example, in reformulating a concentrated floor cleaner sold in Chile, SCJ was able to replace seven restricted materials with ones that were biodegradable and VOC-free. The reformulated product cleaned better, was less expensive to manufacture, and — because SCJ has a rule that it won't export a formula with restricted use materials beyond the country where it's manufactured — the new product could be rolled out to new markets.

Early this year, SCJ formalized Greenlist into project team success criteria, alongside such conventional metrics as sales, performance, and marketing. Up to now, SCJ's environmental success criteria focused primarily on global regulatory compliance. Now, success includes using Greenlist to determine whether tomorrow's products will be greener than today's.

To download a more in-depth presentation on Greenlist, go to www.scjohnson.com/community/pdf/Greenlist_presentation.pdf. ❖

a comprehensive pesticide reduction program, beginning in the farm field and ending in baby food preparation.

- **Marks & Spencer**, one of the UK's leading retailers, is implementing a program to phase out the use of 79 potentially harmful pesticides in the production of fruit, salad, and vegetables; has established a long-term goal of selling these items free from pesticide residues; and has assessed chemicals used in manufacturing its products against a wide range of emerging environmental concerns.

- **Nike** is working to identify and eliminate chemicals known or suspected to have adverse effects on human health or

biological systems and is targeting them for replacement. It is creating a "positive list" of preferred substances and is working with vendors to establish replacement guidelines.

- **Samsung** began in mid-2004 to conduct an inventory of chemicals and to formulate a substitute development program with targeted phase-out dates, including taking into account suspected-but-not-definitively-proved links between chemical causes and health effects.

- **SC Johnson** systematically reviews the toxicity of chemicals used in its product lines and, working with its suppliers, seeks to marry improved product performance with reduced toxicity.

(See sidebar, above.)

True, not all these companies acquired their nontoxic mantras willingly. Some were prodded or pushed by activists, but others launched initiatives as part of their proactive culture. How they came to address toxics matters little. What's significant is the path they are forging for themselves, and all that follow.

REDUCING EMISSIONS AND EXPENSES

As with many pollution-prevention activities, companies have seen costs drop as a result of using fewer problematic chemicals. For example, Dell expects to see cost savings resulting from its efforts to go lead-free in its computers, says Mark D.

Product Toxicity Governance Benchmarking Framework

The framework below, created by WWF's Richard Liroff, is intended for application to companies that purchase chemicals, as opposed to commodity or specialty chemical producers. Liroff says the framework can drive change by encouraging companies to shift their choices of chemicals and chemical suppliers, and by finding nonchemical methods to satisfy a product function.

Liroff notes that the word "toxicity" is used loosely throughout this checklist to denote chemicals of concern, including persistent and bioaccumulative substances, endocrine disruptors, carcinogens, mutagens, reproductive toxicants, and neurotoxicants.

CORPORATE COMMITMENT TO SAFER ALTERNATIVES POLICY

- Have the CEO issue a clear and proactive statement about the company's commitment to lowering product toxicity through elimination of known or suspected high-priority toxicants and substitution of safer chemicals or non-chemical methods. The commitment should establish short, medium, and long-term deadlines and measurable goals for chemical substitutions; provide for routine reporting on progress; favor reductions in toxicity even in the face of scientific uncertainty; and make attainment of reductions in product toxicity an explicit factor in employee compensation.

INVESTOR AND PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY

- In annual and quarterly SEC filings, discuss and analyze risks and opportunities to the company associated with hazardous and toxic chemicals, and with safer alternatives and cleaner production processes. Disclosures should include new government- or peer-reviewed studies of environmental and health hazards pertinent to toxic chemicals in company products; the range of potential liabilities and market risks associated with toxic chemicals in company products; and market trends associated with alternatives to toxic chemicals used in company products.
- Issue a sustainability report based on the Global Reporting Initiative or comparable "triple bottom line" format that includes a discussion of product toxicity and corporate milestones for and progress in reducing or eliminating hazardous or suspect chemicals.
- Engage in effective consumer disclosure practices regarding chemicals of concern (in product labeling, warning notices, and catalogue listings) so as to avoid potential "duty to warn" liabilities and, where safer alternatives are offered, to publicize the benefits of these alternatives.

DATA DEVELOPMENT

- Develop procedures for systematically reviewing the chemical composition of company products and promote generation of toxicity data by chemical suppliers.
- Assess the chemical composition of company products against published lists of known or suspected high-priority chemicals, with particular emphasis on such categories as persistent and bioaccumulative substances, carcinogens, mutagens, reproductive toxicants, neurotoxicants, and hormone disrupting chemicals.

INTERNAL CAPACITY BUILDING AND "GREENING" THE SUPPLY CHAIN.

- Create information, training, and incentive programs to help identify, research, and implement safer alternative ideas.
- Add "reduce inherent hazards" as a criterion for product formulation and chemical procurement, including a commitment to continuous improvement in use of safer materials and chemicals as effective, cost-competitive alternatives become available.
- Develop collaborative activities with vendors, including research and financial risk sharing, to procure or develop reduced toxicity chemicals or non-chemical alternatives.
- Devise supplier codes of conduct and certification programs, and associated corporate or third-party auditing methods, to identify suppliers' progress and problems in reducing toxicity of supplied materials.

Source: Richard A. Liroff, "Protecting Public Health, Increasing Profits and Promoting Innovation by Benchmarking Corporate Governance of Chemicals in Products," Rose Foundation, 2005.

TOXICS

(Continued from page 5)

Newton, manager of environmental affairs at the computer company. "In order to do lead-free, it has a higher-temperature process, meaning you have to control it more carefully. And every time you manage processes more carefully, you save money." Similarly, Richard Liroff tells of SC Johnson's efforts to "detoxify" Windex: in the process of removing potentially problematic chemicals, the company improved product performance — and market share.

And then there's Shaw Industries, the carpet giant, which spent millions engineering toxic polyvinyl chloride out of its carpet backing, according to Steve Bradfield, Shaw's director of environmental affairs. In its place Shaw developed EcoWorx, a food-grade polyolefin that eliminated the need

for PVC. The resulting product was 30% lighter weight than PVC, contained 40% recycled content, increased Shaw's ability to recover and recycle the nylon that makes up the bulk of its carpeting, and yielded better ergonomic qualities, resulting in fewer accidents. The new technology is used in nearly all of Shaw's carpet tile production. The company ran its last batch of PVC backing in December.

Economic benefits or not, Liroff believes that the marketplace increasingly will be driving toxics out of the system. "If you have a Kaiser-Permanente, with \$22 billion in revenues, saying, 'We don't want persistent bioaccumulative chemicals,' that's a lot of money talking. If you have a big company that's buying computers and they have a green procurement screen, and you have a supplier that's gotten ride of brominated flame retardants, it may be that the greener company can win."

Liroff believes that pension funds and procurement programs could be major players in pressing companies to reduce toxics. "It's in the fiduciary interest of state pension funds to pay attention to environmental health issues," he explains. "The pension funds raise funds to take care of their pensioners' needs, and those needs include health care. An argument can be fashioned that state pension funds should be encouraging companies to produce safer products so as to reduce health care treatment burden.

"In a related vein," Liroff continues, "scientists have been suggesting that toxic chemicals may be contributing to behavioral and learning problems in kids. Given the demands on state and local education budgets for special education and the like, it's in the interest of the funds to encourage companies to move toward safer chemicals.

"And that would also be congruent with state and local environmentally preferable purchasing programs. All the state and local governments that have adopted these programs — it seems to me that if there are going to be winners among companies that compete for state and local contracts that they be aligned with the investor interests of state and local pension funds."

All of which is to say that when it comes to reducing toxics, everyone's interests are aligned: that of companies, their customers, their investors, their regulators, the public — and, of course, the environment.

"The thing that struck me," says Liroff, "is that this makes sense in so many ways — from a business perspective, from a public health perspective, and from an environmental perspective. I get the sense from quite a few people that it's an action whose time has come." ♦

Select Toxics Reduction Resources

Additional resources can be found at www.greenbiz.com

Cleaner Technologies Substitutes Assessment

www.greenbiz.com/toolbox/tools_third.cfm?LinkAdvID=26190

Green Chemistry Institute

www.greenbiz.com/reference/organizations_record.cfm?LinkAdvID=8992

National Toxicology Program

www.greenbiz.com/reference/organizations_record.cfm?LinkAdvID=5710

Protecting Public Health, Increasing Profits and Promoting Innovation by Benchmarking Corporate Governance of Chemicals in Products

www.greenbiz.com/toolbox/reports_third.cfm?LinkAdvID=64352

Reducing Toxics: A New Approach to Policy and Industrial Decisionmaking

www.greenbiz.com/reference/bookstore_record.cfm?LinkAdvID=145

Toxics Directory

www.greenbiz.com/reference/webguide_record.cfm?LinkAdvID=8112

Toxics Use Reduction Case Studies

www.greenbiz.com/toolbox/reports_third.cfm?LinkAdvID=6184

Toxics Use Reduction Institute

www.greenbiz.com/reference/organizations_record.cfm?LinkAdvID=4508

U.S. EPA Cleaning Products Wizard

www.greenbiz.com/toolbox/tools_third.cfm?LinkAdvID=4868

U.S. EPA Green Chemistry Program

www.greenbiz.com/reference/government_record.cfm?LinkAdvID=5038

In for the Long Run

WITH THIS ISSUE, WE BEGIN OUR 15th year of publication. In honor of the occasion, I'm taking the liberty of reprinting verbatim the "E-Factor" essay from our inaugural issue. It's nearly as relevant now as it was way back then. — JM

LET'S START WITH THE BASICS: There is no such thing as a perfectly green company. Being in business is an inherently polluting activity, even for companies in "clean" industries.

True, not every organization is burdened with having to dispose of toxic-laden wastewater, or with discharging black smoke into the sky. But everyone in every business does at least two things: consumes energy and other resources, and creates wastes that must be disposed of. How your company does these two things can make the difference between it being perceived as "green" or "ungreen." Increasingly, it can also make the difference between profitability and lack thereof.

Businesses are facing some of the same challenges — and confusion — as consumers face in trying to "go green." The challenge is to be more environmentally responsible on a day-to-day basis, to reduce one's negative impact on the earth as much as practical.

The confusion begins with the overwhelming amount of seemingly conflicting information out there about the real problems and their would-be solutions. Added to that are issues of time and money: There never seems to be enough of either, never mind having to allocate additional resources to deal with environmental issues. And then there is the sheer scope of

the subject matter: There are so many serious problems, it seems; how can one company make a difference?

Add to this mix the myriad of daily pressures faced by most businesses — from bosses, employees, customers, suppliers, stockholders, regulators, banks, and all the rest — and it's easy to see how "saving the earth" can take a back seat to simply saving the day.

The inevitable result: Organizational paralysis, at least as far as the environment is concerned.

THAT NEEDN'T BE THE CASE, NOT by a long shot. The fact is, making a few moves in the name of the environment can be as good for your bottom line as it is for the earth's.

Let's take a look at what "going green" really means. At its essence, it boils down to two fundamental goals: reducing waste and maximizing resource use, whether those resources are your own (raw materials, supplies, facilities, inventory, capital, people) or everyone else's (water air, plants, animal, land). When you do these two things, whether you are running a business, heading a government agency, or shopping for groceries, you can't help but get a better return on your investment over the long run.

Becoming a greener company, then, is just good business sense.

TO BE SURE, TRANSLATING THAT "good business sense" into good, green practices is easier said than done. But it's far easier than you may think.

Perhaps what's most impor-

tant is to not try to be perfectly green. You simply can't do it, and if you try you'll no doubt get frustrated and discouraged. Start small. If all you do is issue ceramic mugs to replace those mountains of Styrofoam cups your people go through each week, or instigate a modest paper recycling program, you've just taken a good, green step. Over time, as you gain confidence and experience, you can take on other things.

Take it slowly. There's simply no need to turn your finely honed policies, products, and processes topsy-turvy in the name of Planet Earth. It's a normal part of daily business to fine-tune your operations. This is simply another part of that process.

Think of the greening process as something like running a marathon. If you start out sprinting, or running in the wrong direction, you'll either burn yourself out or never reach your destination. Even if you pace yourself, you generally can't go the distance if you're out of shape. It takes time and commitment, even to get off the starting block, let alone reach the finish line.

THE REWARDS OF YOUR EFFORTS can be considerable. Your company's investment in the environment can yield dividends far beyond the good it does for the earth. Its actions can also send a loud and clear message to employees, customers, suppliers, competitors, and the communities in which it does business. That makes your company, and everyone in it, a key player in our planet's future.

— *Joel Makower*