CSR 2.0: Transforming The Role Of Business In Society

Corporate Social Responsibility (or CSR) comes in different forms and shades. But according to **Wayne Visser**, it also comes in different stages, most of which have failed. Save, perhaps, for one.

Wayne Visser is the author of *The Age of Responsibility: CSR 2.0 and the new DNA of Business* (Wiley, 2011). He is the founder and director of CSR International and a senior associate at the University of Cambridge Programme for Sustainability Leadership. He is also Professor of Sustainability at Oxford's Magna Carta College and Adjunct Professor of Responsible Business at La Trobe Graduate School of Management.

In my opinion, CSR—as a business, governance and ethics system—has failed. Here, we measure success or failure in terms of the net impact (positive or negative) of business on society and the environment and conclude that if many of the world's most pressing social, environmental and ethical trends are to be reversed, a different kind of CSR is needed.

If CSR is the answer, what's the question?

I take CSR to stand for Corporate Sustainability and Responsibility, rather than Corporate Social Responsibility, although readers are free to use whichever definition they are most comfortable with.

My definition is as follows: CSR is the way in which business consistently creates shared value in society through economic development, good governance, stakeholder responsiveness and environmental improvement. Put another way, CSR is an integrated, systemic approach by business that builds, rather than erodes or destroys, economic, social, human and natural capital.

The logic to explain the failure of CSR is simple and compelling. I set out my case for this elsewhere,[1] but this failure can be clearly demonstrated.

A doctor judges his/her success by whether the patient is getting healthier or sicker. Similarly, we should judge the success of CSR by whether our communities and ecosystems are getting better or worse. And while at the micro level—in terms of specific CSR projects and practices—we can show many improvements, at the macro level, almost every indicator of our social, environmental and ethical health is in decline.

I am not alone in my assessment. Indeed, in 1993, Paul Hawken stated in *The Ecology of Commerce* that "If every company on the planet were to adopt the best environmental practice of the 'leading' companies, the world would still be moving toward sure degradation and collapse."

Unfortunately, this is still true nearly 20 years later. Jeffrey Hollender, co-founder and former CEO of Seventh Generation, a company that makes eco-friendly household cleaning products, says he believes "the vast majority of companies fail to be 'good' corporate citizens, Seventh Generation included. Most sustainability and corporate responsibility programmes are about being less bad rather than good. They are about selective and compartmentalised 'programmes' rather than holistic and systemic change."

The Failure of CSR 1.0

These corporate social responsibility programmes are what I call CSR 1.0 and it has proven to have failed so spectacularly to address the very issues it claims to be most concerned about. This situation comes down to three factors which we can call the Triple Curse of Modern CSR:

- **Curse 1: Incremental CSR**
  Here, CSR has adopted the quality management model, which results in incremental improvements that do not match the scale and urgency of the problems. One of the great revolutions of the 1970s was total quality management. Conceived by American statistician W. Edwards Deming and perfected by the Japanese, it was then exported around the world as ISO 9001. At the very core of Deming's TQM model and the ISO standard is continual improvement, a principle that has now become ubiquitous in all management system approaches to performance. It is no surprise, therefore, that the most popular environmental management standard, ISO 14001—an internationally accepted standard that is designed to address the fine balance between profitability and environmental impact—is built on the same principle.

> CSR does not always make economic sense, as the **short-term markets still reward companies that externalise their costs to society.**

There is nothing wrong with continuous improvement per se. On the contrary, it has brought safety and reliability to the very products and services that we associate with modern quality of life. But when we use it as the primary approach to tackling our social, environmental and ethical challenges, it fails on two critical counts: Speed and scale. Consider for example the fact that an estimated 20 million people worldwide work, or have worked, in ISO 14001 companies since the standard was introduced about a decade ago.[2]

Yet, as the UN Millennium Ecosystem Assessment of 2005 would inform us, there is substantial catching up to do with 60% of world ecosystem services having been degraded and species extinction rate at 100-1,000 times above the background rate. The incremental approach to CSR, while replete with evidence of micro-scale, gradual improvements, has completely and utterly failed to make any impact on the massive sustainability crises that we face.

- **Curse 2: Peripheral CSR**
  This is where CSR has remained largely restricted to the largest companies—and then, mostly confined to PR, or other departments—rather than being integrated across the business.

Ask any CSR manager what their greatest frustration is and they will tell you: Lack of top management commitment. This is "code-speak" for saying that CSR is, at best, a peripheral function in most companies. There may be a CSR manager, a CSR department even, a CSR report and a public commitment to any number of CSR codes and standards. But these do little to mask the underlying truth that shareholder-driven capitalism is rampant and its obsession with short-term financial measures of progress is contradictory in

Business is naturally creative and innovative. What is different about the Age of Responsibility is that **business creativity needs to be directed to solving the world's social and environmental problems.**

almost every way to the long-term, stakeholder approach needed for high-impact CSR.

The reason Enron collapsed, and indeed why our current financial crisis was allowed to spiral out of control, was not because of a few rogue executives or creative accounting practices. It was because of a culture of greed embedded in the DNA of the company and the financial markets. Whether you agree or not (and despite the emerging research on "responsible competitiveness"), it is hard to find any substantive examples in which the financial markets consistently reward responsible behaviour.

- **Curse 3: Uneconomic CSR**
  CSR does not always make economic sense, as the short-term markets still reward companies that externalise their costs to society

If there was ever a monotonously repetitive, stuck record in CSR debates, it is the one about the so-called "business case" for CSR. That is because CSR managers and consultants, and even the occasional saintly CEO, are desperate to find compelling evidence that "doing good is good for business," i.e. CSR pays. The lack of corroborative research seems to be no impediment for these desperados endlessly incanting the motto of the business case, as if it were an entirely self-evident fact.

The rather more "inconvenient truth" is that CSR sometimes pays (in specific circumstances), but more often, it does not. Of course, there are low-hanging fruits—like eco-efficiencies around waste and energy—but these only go so far.

Most of the hard-core CSR changes that are needed to reverse the misery of poverty and the sixth mass extinction[3] of species currently underway require strategic change and massive investment. They may very well be lucrative in the long term, economically rational over a generation or two, but we have already established that the financial markets do not work like that; at least, not yet.

From CSR1.0 to CSR2.0

It is useful to view the evolution of business responsibility in terms of five overlapping periods, each of which typically manifests a different stage of CSR.

Economic Age	Stage of CSR	Modus Operandi	Key Enabler	Stakeholder Target
Greed	Defensive	Ad hoc interventions	Investments	Shareholders, government & employees
Philanthropy	Charitable	Charitable programmes	Projects	Communities
Marketing	Promotional	Public relations	Media	General public
Management	Strategic	Management systems	Codes	Shareholders & NGOs/CSOs
Responsibility	Systemic	Business models	Products	Regulators & customers

My contention is that companies tend to move through these ages and stages (although they may have activities in several stages at once), and that we should be encouraging business to make the transition from CSR 1.0—defensive, charitable, promotional and strategic CSR—to CSR 2.0 or Systemic CSR. If companies remain stuck in any of the first four stages, we will not turn the tide on the environmental, social and ethical crises that we face. Simply put, CSR will continue to fail.

In brief, the various ages and stages of CSR are:

- **Defensive CSR in the Age of Greed:** All CSR practices— which are typically limited—are undertaken only if and when it can be shown that shareholder value will be protected as a result. Hence, employee volunteer programmes (which show evidence of improved staff motivation, commitment and productivity) are not uncommon, nor are targeted expenditures (for example, on pollution controls) which are seen to fend off regulation or avoid fines and penalties.

- **Charitable CSR in the Age of Philanthropy:** A company supports various social and environmental causes through donations and sponsorships, typically administered through a foundation, trust or chairman's fund that's aimed at empowering community groups or civil society organisations.

- **Promotional CSR in the Age of Marketing:** CSR is seen mainly as a public relations opportunity to enhance the brand, image and reputation of the company. Promotional CSR may draw on the practices of Charitable and Strategic CSR and turn them into PR spin, which is often characterized as "greenwash."

- **Strategic CSR in the Age of Management:** Relates CSR activities to the company's core business (like Coca-Cola's focus on water management). Often, this is achieved through adherence to CSR codes and implementation of social and environmental management systems, which typically involve cycles of CSR policy development, goal and target setting, programme implementation, auditing and reporting.

- **Systemic CSR in the Age of Responsibility:** Focuses its activities on identifying and tackling the root causes of our present unsustainability and irresponsibility, typically through innovative business models, revolutionising their processes, products and services and lobbying for progressive national and international policies.

Hence, while Strategic CSR is focused at the micro level—supporting social or environmental issues that happen to align with its strategy (but without necessarily changing that strategy)—Systemic CSR focuses on understanding the interconnections of the macro level system—society and ecosystems—and changing its strategy to optimise the outcomes for this larger human and ecological system.

The Rise of CSR 2.0

If CSR or corporate sustainability and responsibility (by my definition) is to be realised, Systemic CSR or CSR 2.0 is needed. This stage can be characterised by five principles:

- **Principle 1: Creativity (C)**

  In order to succeed in the CSR revolution, we need innovation and creativity. We know from Thomas Kuhn's work on *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* that step-change only happens when we can re-perceive our world, when we can find a genuinely new paradigm, or pattern of thinking. First introduced by German sociologist Werner Sombart and later elaborated and popularised by Austrian economist Joseph Schumpeter, this process of "creative destruction" is, today, a well accepted theory of societal change. We cannot, to paraphrase Einstein, solve today's problems with yesterday's thinking.

  Business is naturally creative and innovative. What is different about the Age of Responsibility is that business creativity needs to be directed to solving the world's social and environmental problems. Apple, for example, is highly creative, but their iPhone does little to tackle our most pressing societal needs.

  By contrast, Vodafone's M-PESA innovation by Safaricom in Kenya, which allows money to be transferred by text, has empowered a nation in which 80% of the population have no bank account and where more money flows into the country through international remittances than foreign aid. Or consider Freeplay's innovative battery-free wind-up technology for torches, radios and laptops that has given millions of people in Africa access to products and services in areas that are off the electricity grid.

  Supported by the likes of American Swiss entrepreneur Stephan Schmidheiny, Ashoka's Bill Drayton, e-Bay's Jeff Skoll, the World Economic

Forum's Klaus Schwab, Grameen Bank's Muhammad Yunus and Volans Venture's John Elkington, these are examples of the exciting trend towards social enterprise. It is not a panacea, but for some products and services, directing the creativity of business towards the most pressing needs of society is the most rapid, scalable way of ushering in the Age of Responsibility.

- **Principle 2: Scalability (S)**
  The CSR literature is liberally sprinkled with charming case studies of truly responsible and sustainable projects and a few pioneering companies. The problem is that so few of them ever go to scale. It is almost as if, once the sound-bites and PR-plaudits have been achieved, no further action is required. They become shining pilot projects and best practice examples, tarnished only by the fact that they are endlessly repeated on the CSR conference circuits of the world, without any vision for how they might transform the core business of their progenitors.

  The sustainability problems we face—be they climate change or poverty—are on such a massive urgent scale that any CSR solution that cannot match that scale and urgency is a red herring at best and an unwarranted diversion at worst. How long have we been tinkering away at ethical consumerism (organic, Fairtrade and the like), with hardly any impact on the world's major corporations or supply chains? And yet, it was only when Wal-Mart's former CEO, Lee Scott, had his post-Katrina Damascus experience and decided that all cotton sold by Wal-Mart will be organic and all fish MSC-certified, that we started seeing CSR 2.0-type scalability.

  Scalability is not limited to the retail sector. In financial services, there have always been charitable loans for the world's poor and destitute. But when Muhammad Yunus, in the aftermath of a devastating famine in Bangladesh, set up the Grameen Bank and it went from one US$74 loan in 1974 to a US$2.5 billion enterprise, spawning more than 3,000 similar microcredit institutions in 50 countries reaching over 133 million clients, that became a salutary lesson in scalability. Or contrast Toyota's laudable but premium-priced hybrid Prius for the rich and eco-conscious with Tata's US$2,500 Nano, a cheap and eco-friendly car for the masses. One is an incremental solution with long term potential; the other is scalable solution with immediate impact.

> "The reason CSR 1.0 has failed is not through lack of good intent, nor even through lack of effort. The old CSR has failed because **our global economic system is based on a fundamentally flawed design.**

- **Principle 3: Responsiveness (R)**
  Business has a long track-record of responsiveness to community needs—witness generations of philanthropy and heart-warming generosity following disasters like 9/11, the Sichuan Earthquake and the recent tsunami in Japan. But this is responsiveness on their own terms, responsiveness when giving is easy and cheque-writing does nothing to upset their commercial apple-cart. The severity of the global problems we face demands that companies go much further. CSR 2.0 requires uncomfortable, transformative responsiveness, which questions

whether the industry or the business model itself is part of the solution or part of the problem.

When it became clear that climate change posed a serious challenge to the sustainability of the fossil fuel industry, all the major oil companies formed the Global Climate Coalition, a lobby group explicitly designed to discredit and deny the science of climate change and undermine the main international policy response, the Kyoto Protocol. In typical CSR 1.0 style, these same companies were simultaneously making hollow claims about their CSR credentials. By contrast, the Prince of Wales's Corporate Leaders Group on Climate Change has, since 2005, been lobbying for bolder UK, EU and international legislation on climate change, accepting that carbon emission reductions of between 50-85% will be needed by 2050.

CSR 2.0 responsiveness also means greater transparency, not only through reporting mechanisms like the Global Reporting Initiative and Carbon Disclosure Project, but also by sharing critical intellectual resources. The Eco-Patent Commons—set up by the World Business Council for Sustainable Development to make technology patents available, without royalty, to help reduce waste, pollution, global warming and energy demands—is one such step in the right direction. Another is the donor exchange platforms that have begun to proliferate, allowing individual and corporate donors to connect directly with beneficiaries via the web, thereby tapping "the long tail of CSR."[4]

- **Principle 4: Glocality (2)**
  The term "glocalisation" comes from the Japanese word *dochakuka*, which simply means global localisation. Originally referring to a way of adapting farming techniques to local conditions, dochakuka evolved into a marketing strategy when Japanese businessmen adopted it in the 1980s. It was subsequently introduced and popularised in the West in the 1990s by Manfred Lange, Roland Robertson, Keith Hampton, Barry Wellman and Zygmunt Bauman. In a CSR context, the idea of "think global, act local" recognises that most CSR issues manifest as dilemmas, rather than easy choices. In a complex, interconnected CSR 2.0 world, companies (and their critics) will have to become far more sophisticated in understanding local contexts and finding the appropriate local solutions they demand, without forsaking universal principles.

  For example, a few years ago, BHP Billiton was vexed by their relatively poor performance on the (then) Business in the Environment (BiE) Index, run by UK charity Business in the Community. Further analysis showed that the company had been marked down for their high energy use and relative energy inefficiency. Fair enough. Or was it?

  Most of BHP Billiton's operations were, at that time, based in southern Africa, home to some of the world's cheapest electricity. No wonder this was not a high priority. What was a priority, however, was controlling malaria in the community, where they had made a huge positive impact. But the BiE Index didn't have any rating questions on malaria, so this was ignored. Instead, it demonstrated a typical, Western-driven, one-size-fits-all CSR 1.0 approach.[5]

  Archie Carroll's widely accepted CSR pyramid has four parts: Economic responsibility followed by legal, ethical and philanthropic responsibilities in that order. A sugar farming co-operative in Guatemala has its own CSR pyramid—economic responsibility is still the platform, but rather than legal, ethical and philanthropic dimensions, its pyramid includes responsibility to the family (of employees), the community and policy engagement.

  Clearly, both Carroll's pyramid and the Guatemala pyramid are helpful in their own appropriate context. Hence, CSR 2.0 replaces "either/or" with "both/and" thinking. Both SA 8000—a global social accountability standard for decent working conditions—and the national labour standard in China have their role to play. Both premium branded and cheap generic drugs have a place in the solution to global health issues. In short, CSR 2.0 is a search for the Chinese concept of Yin Yang, which implies a dynamic yet productive tension of opposites.

- **Principle 5: Circularity (0)**
  The reason CSR 1.0 has failed is not through lack of good intent, nor even through lack of effort. The old CSR has failed because our global economic system is based on a fundamentally flawed design. For all the miraculous energy unleashed by Adam Smith's "invisible hand" of the free market, our modern capitalist system is faulty at its very core. Simply put, it is conceived as an abstract system without limits. As far back as the 1960s, pioneering economist, Kenneth Boulding called this a "cowboy economy", where endless frontiers imply no limits on resource consumption or waste disposal. By contrast, he argued, we need to design a "spaceship economy," where there is no "away;" instead, everything is engineered to constantly recycle.

In the 1990s, in The Ecology of Commerce, Paul Hawken translated these ideas into three basic rules for sustainability: Waste equals food; nature runs off current solar income; and nature depends on diversity. He also proposed replacing our product-sales economy with a service-lease model, famously using the example of Interface's "Evergreen" carpets that are leased and constantly replaced and recycled. William McDonough and Michael Braungart have extended this thinking in their Cradle to Cradle industrial model. Cradle-to-cradle is not only about closing the loop on production, but about designing for "good," rather than the CSR 1.0 modus operandi of "less bad."

Hence, CSR 2.0 circularity would, according to cradle-to-cradle aspirations, create buildings that, like trees, produce more energy than they consume and purify their own waste water; or factories that produce drinking water as effluent; or products that decompose and become food and nutrients; or materials that can feed into industrial cycles as high quality raw materials for new products.

Circularity need not only apply to the environment. Business should be constantly feeding and replenishing its social and human capital, not only through education and training, but also by nourishing community and employee well-being. CSR 2.0 raises the importance of meaning in work and life to equal status alongside ecological integrity and financial viability.

These principles are the acid test for future CSR practices. If they are applied, what kind of shifts will we see? In my view, the shifts will happen at two levels: Macro and micro.

At a macro-level, there will be a change in CSR's ontological assumptions or ways of seeing the world:

CSR 1.0	CSR 2.0
Philanthropic	Collaborative
Risk-based	Reward-based
Image-driven	Performance-driven
Specialised	Integrated
Standardised	Diversified
Marginal	Scalable
Western	Global

Paternalistic relationships between companies and the community based on philanthropy will give way to more equal partnerships. Defensive, minimalist responses to social and environmental issues will be replaced by proactive strategies and investment in growing responsibility markets, such as clean technology. Reputation-conscious public-relations approaches to CSR will no longer be credible and, so, companies will be judged on actual social, environmental and ethical performance. In other words, are things getting better on the ground in absolute, cumulative terms?

Although CSR specialists still have a role to play, each dimension of CSR 2.0 performance will be embedded and integrated into the core operations of companies. Standardised approaches will remain useful as guides to consensus, but CSR will find diversified expression and implementation at very local levels. CSR solutions, including responsible products and services, will go from niche "nice-to-haves" to mass-market "must-haves." And the whole concept of CSR will lose its Western conceptual and operational dominance, giving way to a more culturally diverse and internationally applied concept.

How might these shifting principles manifest as CSR practices? Supporting these meta-level changes, the anticipated micro-level changes are:

CSR 1.0	CSR 2.0
CSR Premium	Base of the pyramid
Charity projects	Social enterprise
CSR indexes	CSR ratings
CSR departments	CSR incentives
Product liability	Choice editing
Ethical consumerism	Service agreements
CSR reporting cycles	CSR data streams
Stakeholder groups	Social networks
Process standards	Performance standards

Reliance on CSR departments will disappear or disperse, **as performance across responsibility and sustainability dimensions are increasingly built** into corporate performance appraisal and market incentive systems.

CSR will no longer manifest as luxury products and services (as with current green and Fairtrade options), but as affordable solutions for those who most need quality of life improvements. Investment in self-sustaining social enterprises will be favoured over cheque-book charity. CSR indexes, which rank the same large companies over and over (often revealing contradictions between indexes) will make way for CSR rating systems, which turn social, environmental, ethical and economic performance into corporate scores (A+, B-, etc. scores that are not dissimilar to credit ratings) and which analysts and others can usefully employ in their decision making.

Reliance on CSR departments will disappear or disperse, as performance across responsibility and sustainability dimensions are increasingly built into corporate performance appraisal and market incentive systems. Self-selecting ethical consumers will become irrelevant, as CSR 2.0 companies begin to choice-edit, i.e. they will cease offering implicitly "less ethical" product ranges, thus allowing guilt-free shopping. Post-use liability for products will become obsolete, as the service-lease and take-back economy goes mainstream. Annual CSR reporting will be replaced by online, real-time CSR performance data flows. Feeding into these live communications will be Web 2.0-connected social networks that allow "crowdsourcing," instead of periodic meetings with rather cumbersome stakeholder panels. And typical CSR 1.0 management systems standards like ISO 14001 will be less credible than new performance standards, such as those emerging in climate change that set absolute limits and thresholds. These practical shifts are summarised below.

Pulling it all together, I believe that CSR 2.0—or Systemic CSR (I also sometimes call it Radical CSR or Holistic CSR)—represents a new holistic model of CSR. The essence of the CSR 2.0 DNA model are the four DNA Responsibility Bases, which are like the four nitrogenous bases of biological DNA. In the case of CSR 2.0, the DNA Responsibility Bases are:

DNA Code	Strategic Goals	Key Indicators
Value creation	Economic development	Capital investment *(financial, manufacturing, social, human & natural capital)* Beneficial products *(sustainable & responsible goods & services)* Inclusive business *(wealth distribution, bottom of the pyramid markets)*
Good governance	Institutional effectiveness	Leadership *(strategic commitment to sustainability & responsibility)* Transparency *(sustainability & responsibility reporting, government payments)* Ethical practices *(bribery & corruption prevention, values in business)*
Societal contribution	Stakeholder orientation	Philanthropy *(charitable donations, provision of public goods & services)* Fair labour practices *(working conditions, employee rights, health & safety)* Supply chain integrity *(SME empowerment, labour & environmental standards)*
Environmental integrity	Sustainable ecosystems	Ecosystem protection *(biodiversity conservation & ecosystem restoration)* Renewable resources *(tackling climate change, renewable energy & materials)* Zero waste production *(cradle-to-cradle processes, waste elimination)*

In summary, these DNA Codes are:

- **Value Creation:** It is clear we are talking about more than financial profitability. The goal is economic development, which means not only contributing to the enrichment of shareholders and executives, but improving the economic context in which a company operates, including investing in infrastructure, creating jobs, providing skills development and so on. There can be any number of key performance indicators, but I want to highlight two that I believe are essential: Beneficial products and inclusive business. Do the company's products and services really improve our quality of life, or do they cause harm or add to the low-quality junk of what Charles Handy calls the *"chindogu society,"* or a society that enjoys economic growth by producing useless things that people are tempted to buy. And how are the economic benefits shared? Does wealth trickle up or down? Are employees, SMEs in the supply chain and poor communities genuinely empowered?

- **Good Governance:** This is another area that is not new, but which, in my view, has failed to be properly recognised or integrated in CSR circles. The goal of institutional effectiveness is as important as more lofty social and environmental ideals. After all, if the institution fails, or is not transparent and fair, this undermines everything else that CSR is trying to accomplish. Trends in reporting, as well as other forms of transparency like social media and brand- or product-linked public databases of CSR performance, will, increasingly, be important indicators of success, alongside embedding ethical conduct in the culture of companies. Tools like Goodguide, KPMG's Integrity Thermometer and Covalence's EthicalQuote ranking will become more prevalent.

- **Societal Contribution:** This is an area that CSR, with its goal of stakeholder orientation, is traditionally more used to addressing. This gives philanthropy its rightful place in CSR—as one tile in a larger mosaic—while also providing a spotlight

for the importance of fair labour practices. It is simply unacceptable that there are more people in slavery today than there were before it was officially abolished in the 1800s[6] and that high-brand companies continue to be exposed for their use of child-labour. This area of stakeholder engagement, community participation and supply chain integrity remains one of the most vexing and critical elements of CSR.

- **Environmental Integrity:** This sets the bar way higher than minimising damage by aiming to maintain and improve ecosystem sustainability. The KPIs give some sense of the ambition required here—100% renewable energy and zero waste. We cannot continue the same practices that have, according to World Wildlife Fund's Living Planet Index, caused us to lose a third of the biodiversity on the planet since it began monitoring in 1970. Nor can we continue to gamble with the prospect of dangerous—and perhaps catastrophic and irreversible—climate change.

A final point to make is that CSR 2.0—standing for corporate sustainability and responsibility—also proposes a new interpretation for these terms. Like two intertwined strands of DNA, sustainability and responsibility can be thought of as different, yet complementary elements of CSR. Hence, sustainability can be conceived as the destination—the challenges, vision, strategy and goals, i.e. what we are aiming for; while responsibility is more about the journey—our solutions, responses, management and actions, i.e. how we get there. The challenge now is to admit that CSR 1.0 has failed, and to make CSR 2.0—weaving the strands of sustainability and responsibility—into the new DNA of business.

1. Data and arguments to back up this claim are in the author's most recent book, *The Age of Responsibility: CSR 2.0 and the new DNA of business* (John Wiley and Sons, 2010)

2. Reinhard Peglau and Martin Baxter, "A Decade of ISO 14001," *ISO Management Systems*, May – June 2007.

3. The previous five mass extinctions happened in different periods of history, the earliest one in c. 440 million years ago and the latest, most famous perhaps, took place in the c. 65 million years ago with the extinction of dinosaurs.

4. This is a reference to Chris Anderson, *The Long Tail: Why the future of business is selling less of more* (US, New York: Chris Anderson, 2008), as it might apply to CSR. Also refer to Wayne Visser, "The Long Tail of Corporate Social Responsibility," *CSR Inspiration Series No. 5* (2008).

5. The index has subsequently been reformed and now runs as a more integrated Corporate Responsibility Index. See www.bitc.org.uk.

6. According to Free the Slaves, a non-profit organisation based in the US, in its 400 years of existence, the transatlantic slave trade is estimated to have shipped up to 12 million Africans to various colonies in the West. According to CNN, the estimated number of slaves in the world today is between 10 million and 30 million. See http://thecnnfreedomproject.blogs.cnn.com/2011/03/09/slavery-numbers/.