

COMPARISON ANALYSIS OF THE MAIN ORGANIZATIONAL SUSTAINABILITY MANAGEMENT MODELS FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF VALUE GENERATION FOR ENERGY COMPANIES

[Rodrigo Brandão Fontoura, IEE/USP, 55 11 966178181, rodrigo.fontoura@usp.br]
[Virginia Parente, IEE/USP, 55 11 999728711, vparente@usp.br]

Overview

In the search for solutions related to corporate sustainability management that may add value to the businesses, the energy companies base themselves basically three conceptual models. The first of all is related to Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG); the second, to the Triple Bottom Line (TBL), also known as Sustainability Tripod and the third one refers to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). Trying to achieve the conformity in several areas related to the theme, these companies have been choosing for the adoption one of the above models, focused on value generation. However, even it can be found some synergic areas among the conceptual pillars of these models it also can be verified the existence of structural relevant differences concerning to the coverage of each of them.

In the search for solutions related to corporate sustainability management that may add value to the businesses, the energy companies basically take advantage of three conceptual models. The first one is the Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) model; the second, the Triple Bottom Line (TBL), also known as Sustainability Tripod; and the third refers to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) model. Focused on value generation and struggling to achieving conformity in several areas related to a sustainable value generation, these companies have been adopting one of the above models. However, even it can be found some synergy and overlapping among the conceptual pillars of these models it also can be verified the existence of structural relevant differences concerning to the coverage of each one of them, and, most relevant, none of them seems to covers all aspects that are considered relevant for a sustainable value generation. In this context, this article has the main purpose of doing a comparative analysis among these models mainly adopted by the energy companies (ESG, TBL and CSR), under two main aspects: first of all, in relation to its thematic-conceptual coverages and, additionally under the optics of corporate value generation.

Methods

To ensure compliance with the objective proposed here, an extensive survey was carried out on the ESG, TBL and CSR models. After completing the research, the main synergies and gaps between the models were verified. At the end, an evaluation was also carried out regarding the existing value generation characteristics.

Results

The results of the analysis indicated that there are clearly relevant synergies and gaps. The CSR model links environmental, social, economic and ethical dimensions to its scope. It is, therefore, the most complete of the three models researched in terms of thematic-conceptual scope. However, it does not see the dimension of corporate governance, which is an important gap, considering that the organization needs governance rules, structure and principles to ensure the effective management of sustainability. The TBL model, in turn, links to its scope the environmental, social and economic dimensions, which even form the so-called sustainability tripod. It should be noted, however, that the sustainability that is sought in this study goes beyond the semantic concept. The gaps found in this model in relation to the dimensions of corporate governance and ethics, this time, are considered as important fault. It should also be noted that all three models evaluated failed to consider, in their respective scopes, some essential thematic-conceptual dimensions. Take the risk management area as an example, encompassing topics such as the identification, assessment, treatment and monitoring of corporate risks, whose approach would deserve its own pillar. The compliance area should also be mentioned, whose scope would include the management of actions related to compliance with laws and regulations, the organization's regulatory management and, above all, the fight against corruption and the creation of a culture of integrity. All of this would certainly deserve a pillar of its own that should not be confused with the ethical theme, whose content would be encompassed by the pillar of conformity. Thus, under the assessment criterion based on the finding of gaps, the CSR proved to be less silent than the others, which grants it the status of a model that less relativizes the corporate value of organizations.

Conclusions

The results of these analysis indicate that not only there are clear conceptual differences among the models but also there are relevant gaps in each one of them. Notwithstanding, under the optics of value generation, it may be stated that, if for one side the analyzed models effectively contribute for the generation of corporate value, the identified gaps, for the other side, may contribute for its relativization. It should also be noted that all three models evaluated failed to consider, in their respective scopes, some essential thematic-conceptual dimensions. Take the risk management area as an example, encompassing topics such as the identification, assessment, treatment and monitoring of corporate risks, whose approach would deserve its own pillar. The compliance area should also be mentioned, whose scope would include the management of actions related to compliance with laws and regulations, the organization's regulatory management and, above all, the fight against corruption and the creation of a culture of integrity. All of this would certainly deserve a pillar of its own that should not be confused with the ethical theme, whose content would be encompassed by the pillar of conformity. Thus, under the assessment criterion based on the finding of gaps, the CSR proved to be less silent than the others, which grants it the status of a model that less relativizes the corporate value of organizations.

References

- Attig, N.; El Ghouli, S.; Guedhami, O.; Suh, J. 2013. Corporate Social Responsibility and Credit Ratings. *J Bus Ethics* 117, 679–694. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1714-2>, accessed in 04/21.
- Brundtland, Gro Harlem. “Our Common Future—Call for Action.” *Environmental Conservation*, vol. 14, no. 4, 1987, pp. 291–294. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/44518052, accessed in 04/21.
- Carroll, A.B. 1991. The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons*. <https://cf.linnbenton.edu/bcs/bm/gusdorm/upload/Pyramid%20of%20Social%20Responsibility.pdf>, accessed in 04/21.
- Carroll, A.B.; Shabana, K.M. 2010. The Business Case for Corporate Social Responsibility: A Review of Concepts, Research and Practice. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, v.12, p. 85–105.
- Elkington, J. 1997. The triple bottom line. *Environmental management: Readings and cases*. Books.google.com. https://books.google.com.br/books?hl=pt-BR&lr=&id=hRJGrsGnMXcC&oi=fnd&pg=PA49&dq=triple+bottom+line+elkington&ots=0fmxzNLucD&sig=EevOXhiSWEm_qi3SGheDrmjDVaM#v=onepage&q=triple%20bottom%20line%20elkington&f=false, accessed em 04/21.
- Elkington, J. 1998. *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. Gabriola Island, British Columbia: New Society Publishers.
- Friede, G.; Busch, T.; Bassen A. 2015. ESG and financial performance: aggregated evidence from more than 2000 empirical studies, *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, 5:4, 210-233, DOI: 10.1080/20430795.2015.1118917, accessed in 04/21.
- Friedman, M. A. 1970. Friedman doctrine: The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. *N. Y. Times Mag.*, 13, 32–33.
- Hubbard, G. 2009. *Measuring organizational performance: beyond the triple bottom line Business strategy and the environment, 2009* - Wiley Online Library. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/bse.564>, accessed in 04/21.
- ISO. International Organization for Standardization. ISO 26000:2010. *Guidance on social responsibility*. 2010.
- Patari S.; Jantunen A.; Kylaheiko K. Does sustainable development foster value creation? Empirical evidence from the global energy industry. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*. 2012. Wiley Online Library. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/csr.280>, accessed in 04/21.
- Slaper T.F., Hall T.J. The triple bottom line: What is it and how does it work. *Indiana business review*. 2011. <http://web.mit.edu/afs.new/athena/course/2/2.813/www/readings/TripleBottomLine.pdf>, accessed in 04/21.