

NDEMS
National Database on Environmental Management Systems

Environmental Management Systems: Do They Improve Performance?

Richard (Pete) Andrews
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

EPA Innovation Action Council Briefing, Washington, DC, April 8, 2003
Adapted slightly for NEWMOA Web conference 4/28/03 Bob Minicucci
<http://ndems.cas.unc.edu/>

4/25/2003 ndems@unc.edu UNC-Chapel Hill 1

NDEMS
National Database on Environmental Management Systems

Why Study EMSs?

- Government recognition for implementing EMSs:
 - Is such recognition warranted?
- Regulatory uses of EMSs
 - Do the effects of an EMS justify regulatory flexibility?
 - Are regulatory mandates for EMSs desirable?
- Government investments in developing and promoting EMSs:
 - Are EMSs for government facilities an effective use of resources?
 - Are EMS assistance programs an effective use of resources?

4/25/2003 ndems@unc.edu UNC-Chapel Hill 2

NDEMS
National Database on Environmental Management Systems

The EMS Process

```

    graph TD
      MR[Management review] --> DEP[Develop environmental policy]
      DEP --> P[Planning]
      P --> IO[Implementation and operation]
      IO --> CCA[Checks and corrective action]
      CCA --> CI[Continual improvement]
      CI --> MR
  
```

4/25/2003 ndems@unc.edu UNC-Chapel Hill 3

NDEMS
National Database on Environmental Management Systems

Elements of an EMS

- Environmental policy statement:
 - A documented public commitment by top management to compliance, prevention of pollution, and continual improvement
- Planning process:
 - Environmental aspects and impacts, significance, objectives and targets
- Implementation and operation:
 - Assigned responsibilities, communication, training, documentation
 - Operational control, monitoring & measurement, emergency prep/response
- Corrective and preventive action procedures:
 - Root cause analyses, procedure updates, audits
- Top management review

4/25/2003 ndems@unc.edu UNC-Chapel Hill 4

NDEMS
National Database on Environmental Management Systems

Objectives of NDEMS Study

- What effects does EMS have on environmental performance, regulatory compliance, costs and benefits?
- What factors matter to these outcomes?
- What implications for public policy?

4/25/2003 ndems@unc.edu UNC-Chapel Hill 5

NDEMS
National Database on Environmental Management Systems

NDEMS Study Design

- Longitudinal study: three phases of data collection

Baseline:	EMS Design:	Performance Updates:
← 3 Years	1 Year →	2 Years →
- Facility-level data: 83 facilities in 20 sectors, 17 states
 - 58 provided design data, 30 provided update data
 - Included corporate, privately held, federal and local govt., both large and small
 - Sectors included chemicals, electronics, food, machinery, metals, pharmaceuticals, pulp and paper, printing, transportation, utilities

4/25/2003 ndems@unc.edu UNC-Chapel Hill 6

Key Findings

Finding #1: Performance

Introduction of an EMS had positive effects on the environmental performance of most facilities.

- More than half (56%) improved at least half of their environmental indicators
- Nearly two-thirds (64%) improved at least half of indicators related to EMS objectives
- Nearly three quarters (73%) eliminated compliance violations

Finding #2: Variability

The content of the EMS varied widely.

Aspects and Impacts

- **Aspects:**
 - Most focused on operations & production processes; very few addressed product impacts
- **Impacts:**
 - Most included waste generation, pollution, natural resources (energy, water, site, ...)
 - About half also included health & safety impacts.
 - Less than 1/3 included beneficial impacts
 - Govt. facilities more often included health & safety and beneficial impacts.

Significance Determinations

- For many, any compliance issue = significant
 - Even if environmental impact low
- For some, significance = major impact on envt.
 - E.g. hazardous wastes, major emissions and discharges
- For others, significance = every impact
 - E.g. non-hazardous trash, oily rags and swabs

Objectives and Targets

Example	Objective	Target	Category
A	Reduce hazardous waste by 10%	3,734 lbs. total (Average = 415 lbs. per month; monthly monitoring)	Performance
B	Recycle antifreeze	Install antifreeze recycling system	Project
C	Reduce solid waste disposal	Increase employee awareness	Management-Activity
D	Comply with FIFRA	Maintain contractor (grounds maintenance) requirements	Compliance

Finding #3: Costs

Costs varied greatly between business and government facilities.

- Median net cost of EMS introduction = ~\$40,000.
 - Main cost element for all facilities was labor.
 - Auditing and registration costs were a small fraction
- EMS costs per employee were 3-4x higher for government facilities than for businesses.
- Consultant costs were a major cost element for government facilities, though not for businesses.

Factors Affecting Outcomes

ISO certification: no difference

- Facilities that were certifying their EMS to ISO 14001 and using third-party auditors were not statistically different from the others

Motivations mattered

- Greater environmental performance improvement by facilities that saw market potential, competitive advantage, increased revenues, or support of other professionals as reasons for EMS adoption

Compliance history mattered

- Facilities that had reported non-compliance incidents during their baseline period scored lower on post-EMS environmental performance

Pre-existing capabilities mattered

- Facilities that had already developed some internal capabilities for EMS adoption improved more – and had lower costs – than those that had more limited pre-existing internal capabilities
 - Examples: quality-management systems, pollution prevention or waste management plans

Ownership mattered

- Facilities owned by publicly traded corporations generally improved their performance more than did either privately held or government facilities
- Businesses improved compliance more than did government facilities.
- Reason: greater internal capabilities

Govt. EMS assistance mattered

- Especially to government facilities and to privately-held businesses
 - Reason: no access to the management capabilities and resources of a parent corporation.
- Corporate subsidiaries generally not motivated by government assistance

Ownership, Capabilities, Resources

Resource & Capabilities	Ownership		
	Traded	Private	Gov't
Management Systems Experience	76%	50%	0%
Utilized Environmental Management Techniques	81%	25%	17%
Parent Provided EMS Template	68%	18%	0%
Gov't Assistance Motivated Adoption	10%	44%	83%

Policy Implications

1. EMSs are worth encouraging. On balance, performance and compliance appear to improve, and facilities also believe they benefit.

2. EMSs are not an automatic guarantee of superior performance – nor even of compliance.

3. The content of an EMS provides a clearer basis for public policy rewards than does the mere existence of an EMS – or of ISO 14001 EMS registration.

4. EMS is a valuable window into environmental impacts and performance improvements.

5. Government facilities might benefit more than they recognize from cost savings and management improvements associated with EMS introduction.

Businesses were more conscious of potential economic and management benefits, not just environmental performance and compliance.

6. EMS assistance programs are best targeted toward government facilities and small businesses.

7. Standard templates for many common government operations could reduce EMS costs, build management capabilities

- Examples: motor pools, construction and maintenance operations, water supply and wastewater treatment facilities, schools, ...

<http://ndems.cas.unc.edu>

- Also: www.mswg.org
- MSWG San Antonio 6/03
- MSWG Maine Fall '03

Why Do Facilities Adopt EMSs?

- Market forces
 - Customer and corporate mandates, brand image, public relations
- Cost savings (eco-efficiency)
 - Water, energy, and materials use, waste mgt., insurance, liability,
- Mainstreaming environmental responsibility
 - broaden employee awareness
 - integrate into all managers' responsibilities, and with quality management
 - standardize procedures, training, record-keeping
 - Consistency across multiple facilities, due diligence
- Regulatory benefits?
 - less spills, less violations; smoother inspections; regulatory flexibility?

Benefits Reported

Benefit Category	Percentage of Facilities Reporting Benefits
	n=32
Management Efficiency	94%
Operational Efficiency	78%
Liability	53%
Regulatory	53%
Customer/Supplier Relations	19%
Community Relations	13%

Design Costs (per employee)

Cost Category	Traded (20)		Private (16)		Gov't (6)	
	Mean	% Total	Mean	% Total	Mean	% Total
Labor	\$206	77.2%	\$317	59.7%	\$822	59.8%
Consultants	\$ 12	4.5%	\$ 37	7.0%	\$499	36.3%
Travel/Training	\$ 14	5.2%	\$ 34	6.4%	\$ 50	3.6%
Equipment	\$ 0	0.0%	\$ 33	6.2%	\$ 0	0.0%
Materials	\$ 7	2.6%	\$ 22	4.1%	\$ 1	0.1%
Auditors, ISO 14001 Registration	\$ 28	10.5%	\$ 88	16.6%	\$ 0	0.0%
Average Total Cost /Employee	\$267	100%	\$531	100%	\$1441	100%

Regulatory Mandates for EMSs?

- EMS per se is not a clear indicator of performance or compliance.
- EMSs encourage environmental improvement in many ways in addition to compliance.
 - Examples: eco-efficiency, root-cause correction, mainstreaming of environmental responsibilities
- Value could be reduced if emphasis mandated on single-medium regulatory compliance.

Study Limitations

- Small sample (37 facilities through 1st update)
- Short time period (~2.5 years from baseline to 1st update)
- Cooperating facilities (volunteers, recruited by states and EPA, technical and financial assistance, regulatory flexibility in some states)