Q1: Explain what is meant by 'Corporate Social Responsibility' (CSR). (1.1) Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is a fairly recent change in business practice. Previously businesses were told that they had one major responsibility, profit; lower costs, increasing sales, making more money brought, in the words of Mr Macawber, 'happiness!' Any social responsibility was purely philanthropic in nature and depended on a number of super-rich businessmen with a social conscience.
Recently social responsibility has become more embedded in business, particularly in regard to stakeholders and the environment, introducing an ethical dimension to business behaviour. The CSR model 'considers a company's social and environmental impact in addition to its economic performance.' Now that people are more aware of social and environmental responsibilities they and the businesses they may or may not support will benefit from taking CSR seriously.
Businesses of any size can embrace CSR, looking after employees and other stakeholders as well as the environment and the wider community. Stakeholders can be classified as primary, those who are directly involved in the business, customers, suppliers, employees, shareholders and the local community, and secondary, who are not directly related to the business, competitors, regulators, pressure groups and the government. By embracing CSR businesses make a choice to do the right thing, which is ethical, rather than what legislation forces them to do.
The Harvard Business School (online.hbs.edu) comments on the 4 types of CSR, which it identifies as:-

1. Environmental. A business should be as environmentally responsible as possible, reducing harmful practices, investing in renewables, sustainable resources and recycling, and offsetting negative impacts.
2. Ethical. Fair treatment of all stakeholders, embracing free trade, fair trade and providing liveable wages.
3. Philanthropic. Donating some of the profits to charities and trusts.
4. Economic. Making profits, but doing it ethically by investing in sustainable sources and methods.

Q2: Explain the importance of social responsibility in businesses in terms of how it supports sustainability. (1.2)
Businesses can have a major impact on sustainability whether they are large transnational corporations, large companies, small companies or one man businesses. In terms of carbon emissions the top 100 companies are responsible for 71% of the total, but it has also been calculated that there are over 30 million small businesses in the US alone, so counted together small businesses can have a large impact on the environment and therefore need to be socially responsible (greenbusinessbenchmark.com).
Large corporations are every bit as responsible for sustainability issues as countries themselves. In terms of economic size and impact companies such as Apple and Microsoft are larger and therefore may have more impact on the environment than all but a few countries with the largest economies. The ranking of countries and companies depends on the criteria used for ranking. Countries are usually measured in terms of their Gross Domestic Product (GDP), the total value of all the goods and services they provide, a company can be measured similarly in terms of revenue, but increasingly are measured in terms of their market capitalisation calculated by the present share value and number of shareholders. Using market capitalisation Apple, Nvidia and Microsoft are top with values of over 3 trillion $ each, which makes them larger than every country in the world except the top 5 of USA, China, Japan, Germany and India, and on par with the UK in 6th place (globalpeoservices.com).
The main ways in which businesses can support sustainability are:-
1. Reduce carbon footprint
Reducing carbon footprint by cutting carbon emissions or offsetting is vital to slow down global warming, climate change and sea level rise that will have a devastating impact on the planet and society.
2. Choose ethical and responsible suppliers
Build partnerships with companies that have diversity and inclusion as a major ethos in their employee strategies, are concerned for their employees health and safety, and provide fair wages. Ensure they source material from recycled or sustainable sources.
3. Support local communities and charities
Companies should buy local where possible to support local businesses and the local economy. Donations can be made to local charities and other organisations to foster close links with local communities, and local projects and initiatives should be funded.
4. Fund employee voluntary work
Give employees paid time off during working hours. Encourage them to work with teams in house or outside the office on projects that benefit the local community.
5. Educate staff about sustainability
Understand that staff awareness about sustainability issues is now almost a business imperative. Offer information and training days that help to change the culture and ethos within the company.
6. Support the wellbeing of employees
Introduce workplace wellness programmes that consider the mental, physical, social and financial wellbeing of employees. This can be done by using information dissemination or training days.
7. Use sustainable products, processes and practices
Monitor and improve energy efficiency. Source sustainable or recycled materials, including packaging, to help prevent resources depletion.

The work of the Microsoft corporation (microsoft.com/en-us/corporate-responsibility) illustrates how a major transnational can work towards policies and practices that support sustainability. Microsoft have made major sustainability commitments; to be carbon neutral by 2030, and to have removed historical emissions by 2050, zero wastage by 2030 and eventually to replenish more than they consume, to protect ecosystems and invest in nature.
Recent data (financial year 2023) indicates that they have invested in 23.6 million MWH of renewable energy, replenished 61.7 million cumecs of water, more than 18500 metric tonnes of solid waste was diverted from landfill and over 15800 acres of land protected. They have also invested in AI to conserve water and accelerate sustainability and introduced a Microsoft Science Research Initiative.
Companies such as Microsoft are taking their commitment to sustainability seriously by implementing Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) to measure their impact on society and the environment. ESG, a recent development is a bit of a minefield as there is, as yet, no standard system of measurement but it will undoubtedly be a way that a company's impact is assesses in the near future. Most systems score each of the 3 areas, Environment, Social and Governance on a scale up to 100, where 0-50 is poor, 50-60 is average, 60-70 good and 70-100 excellent, and an average total score is then calculated. A recent score for Microsoft (esg.permutable.ai) was environment 95, social 76, governance 49, giving an average of 73. The Altindex measure (altindex/ticker/msft/esg), however, set the figure at 91, so there will still be confusion in this area until a definitive measure is set. When this happens it will give reputable third party certification of a company's sustainability progress.

Q3: Explain why businesses might take action to improve their social responsibility. (1.3) A business may take action to improve its social responsibility because of altruism. A feeling of respect for fellow humans and the environment in which we live and a belief that it should be preserved for future generations are laudable qualities.
There is evidence, however, that improving social and environmental attitudes and approaches within a company can have a beneficial impact on the success of the company. Research shows that 70% of consumers want to know about the actions a company takes regarding sustainability and 66% will pay more for products from a sustainable brand. Improving the social responsibility of a business can therefore be used as a marketing tool. This must be tempered somewhat by the same research indicating that only 9% of consumers believe all the claims made by a company. Millennials, however, were found to be more concerned about social and environmental issues than older people so the marketing value of social responsibility will probably increase in the future.
Evidence also suggests that sustainable methods should cost companies no more than traditional methods and that companies with sustainability embedded in their culture improve effectiveness by 24%. Small businesses that engage in social responsibility have been shown to increase the innovation of sustainable initiatives which can bring financial success.
Being perceived as socially responsible gives customers and investors a favourable view of the company improving its reputation, increasing sales and investment. Employees are also more likely to be happy, well motivated and more engaged, retention of valuable staff will be easier, as will the attraction of talented new staff.
Customers may develop brand loyalty, and good press and publicity will allow potential customers to differentiate the brand from its competition. As well as establishing links with consumer groups the company will be able to more easily engage with NGO's and environmental groups, and satisfy regulators and legislation.
The Microsoft IT transnational corporation has made strenuous efforts to address its social responsibility (microsoft.com). Its social responsibility mission statement sets out a goal of being a holistic business, with a positive impact on society, and it has 4 commitments which it says align with the UN sustainability targets.
1. Expand opportunities for people and communities.
2. Earn trust.
3. Protect rights through fair and inclusive policies.
4. Advance sustainability.

Microsoft does this through schemes such as the Employee Voluntary Program where staff are encouraged to engage with NGO's and 'tech solutions for social change' which helps social impact initiatives and societal change through education. These initiatives have been shown to make the organisation more competitive, engage employees, attract recognised certification and help with regulatory compliance.

Q4: Outline what is meant by the 'Triple Bottom Line' (TBL). (2.1) Traditionally businesses and businessmen considered that the bottom line in any enterprise was money, finance, profit as a measure of the success or failure of a company. This came from the traditional accounting practice that the final line, at the bottom of the page, of any accounting statement was the profit, or loss. Some organisations produced 'super-rich' individuals, who might consider society as well as their companies as they developed a philanthropic approach. Notable among these were Rockefeller an oil tycoon who spent vast sums on public health and scientific/medical research, and Carnegie who made his money in steel and set up foundations to fund education, the arts and culture. More recently Bill Gates the Microsoft founder has set up several foundations involved in aspects of health, poverty, education and the environment. While philanthropists have had a great and positive impact on society it is only in recent years that a consideration for society and the environment have been embedded in the ethos of companies.
The concept of a Triple Bottom Line (TBL) was introduced by Elkington in 1994, and today businesses are more likely to look at their TBL, considering the social and environmental impacts of their company as well as the economic. This has been called Profit, People and Planet. Profit being the financial success of the company and its cash flow, People, the impact of the company on the health, education and well being of all stakeholders, in particular the workers and local and wider community, and Planet, the impact on the environment, both local ecosystems and habitats and the wider world in terms of the atmosphere

and waste disposal. Sustainability is now viewed in this wider sense by many organisations.
Companies now set up a sustainable business strategy (online.hbs.edu) where success depends on not just the financial performance but also on positive societal and environmental impacts. Companies have often separated shareholders and the need to maximise profit and reduce costs to reward them, from other stakeholders, employees, customers and the community. In doing so they embrace the mantra 'do well and do good,' in other words do the right thing and make money. In order to do this they need to consider all aspects of the business, not just what they do, but also supply chains, partners and end usage.

Q5: Describe ways in which the Triple Bottom Line (TBL) can impact on sustainability. (2.2) The TBL system has been taken up by many companies, but it is increasingly being seen by communities, counties and countries as a way of auditing sustainability. Since it covers the 3 basic areas of sustainability, Profit, economic, prosperity, Planet, environmental quality and People, social well-being and equality, it should have a very positive impact on sustainability and sustainable development (ibrc.indiana.edu/2011/spring).
Economic issues and indicators include:
Income
Taxes paid
Profit
Environmental issues and indicators include:
Pollutant volumes
Electricity consumption
Solid waste volumes
Social issues and indicators include:
Unemployment
Poverty
Health
Since these are all very important sustainability parameters, by addressing them companies should be able to demonstrate that they are making a positive contribution towards improving sustainability. Implementing, measuring, quantifying and being successful in the social and environmental fields is more complex, however, than the economic field. Profit can be easily measured in $ or £, but what about the people/social and planet/environmental aspirations, can these be monitored and even if they could what should the relative weightings be?
Some sustainability parameters can be measured for a society using the UN sustainability targets and progress towards the goals can be noted, but it is more difficult for individual companies to assess their impact. In the UK for instance the National Census conducted every 10 years can provide social data such as unemployment, measures of deprivation and educational achievement down to the level of wards and even enumeration districts (ons.gov.uk/census/maps), this data is not so readily available for areas impacted by businesses. By highlighting and reporting targets, however, knowledge and awareness in all sectors of society will increase and greater transparency may result. But will TBL policies actually change anything and will actions follow intentions?
Companies may be better to concentrate on specific environmental targets that relate to their particular activities such as carbon footprint, air miles and commuter miles. They may have more success using Key Performance Indicators (KPI) (researchgate.net) and leave larger entities such as communities, counties, states and countries to introduce the TBL to their accounting as they are more likely to generate meaningful data.
Companies that do this, however, while undoubtedly having a positive impact on some sustainability issues, may be accused of 'cherry-picking' and greenwashing in order to enhance their reputation and their economic prosperity. Apple is an example of a company that has attempted to introduce TBL into its corporate accounting system (apple.com/uk/environment/). They have picked a number of KPI in the 3 areas that are measurable:-
Social:
Employee welfare
Diversity and inclusion
Economic:
Revenue growth
Profitability
Re-investment
Environmental:
Using renewable energy
Carbon zero by 2030
Lower greenhouse gas emissions
Increased energy efficiency
Responsible waste management
They have recently cited success in the environmental sphere to show the positive impact they are having on the environment.
- 18.5 million tonnes of carbon dioxide avoided by using clean energy sources in 2023
- 55% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions since 2015
- 22% of materials form recycled and renewable sources in 2023
- An expanded range of carbon neutral products

This apparently successful application of TBL systems looks impressive, but Apple have been accused of greenwashing and may be attempting to distract from failures by highlighting a few successes (planetearthandbeyond.co). The carbon neutral products they laud may be a bogus claim as it is only achieved by carbon-offsetting through carbon credits which are often unverifiable and largely unmeasurable.

Q6: Explain the concept of 'greenwashing' and give an example to support your answer. (3.1) Greenwashing is a technique used by a business or organisation to imply that they care more and do more to protect and preserve the environment than they actually do. It can be considered a form of propaganda to create a better impression of a company among the stakeholders, including shareholders, employees, partner companies and customers. By doing so the business hopes to gain a financial advantage, to use it as a marketing tactic with customers who increasingly look for products and organisations that have a limited negative impact on the environment. Some companies, particularly large transnational corporations, have been very effective at greenwashing, but are increasingly being exposed by environmental organisations and pressure groups, government and non governmental organisations and more environmentally aware customers.
There are 7 accepted patterns of greenwashing, sometimes called the 7 deadly sins of greenwashing, some more subtle and effective than others, but all meant to mislead and give the company a commercial advantage. (research.library.fordham.edu/greenwashing)
1. Hidden trade-off
This involves making claims that are only partially true, when a so called solution hits only one particular target. For instance, advertising a reduction in one form of waste when the overall waste produced by the company is very high and unsustainable, or claiming that packaging is produced from recycled materials, when carbon emissions and overuse of resources is causing environmental and sustainability problems.
2. No proof of environmental claim
When a company claims to be sustainable, carbon neutral or reaching other environmental targets which are presented without proof in an unsubstantiated way. Companies must offer verification by expert bodies such as Energy Star.
3. Vagueness of claim or claims
This is a lack of specificity about any claims that are made using typical greenwashing terms such as green, natural, environmentally friendly and sustainable without backing this up with facts and data on how much carbon is being saved, what toxic waste is no longer produced or what the deadline is for reaching a specific target.
4. Irrelevance
This is when a company advertises and promotes an environmental feature that involves such a minor action, function or product that it really doesn't matter or affect the bigger picture. The claim being made may indeed be true, but is far less significant than the major negative environmental impacts the company is making
5. Lesser of two evils
This involves making a claim about success in the sustainability field when the overall impact of the business is extremely negative. Exxon a major gas and oil supplier with major investments in fossil fuels does this when it stresses how it is working towards new, clean fuels when the vast majority of its activities cause massive carbon emissions.
6. Fibbing/lying
Simply making claims or issuing statements that are untrue. In other words it doesn't do what it says on the tin, opening the company up to litigation and fines. Car firm VW did this when they 'doctored' diesel cars to show lower emissions readings when tested while lauding the eco-friendly, low emissions nature of its vehicles. This 'dieselgate' scandal cost the company over $30 billion in fines, compensation and legal costs, and the effect on its reputation is as yet unknown.
7. Worshipping false labels
This is where a company praises its sustainability while neglecting to mention other very bad environmental impacts caused by the company. The claims may not even be legitimate or backed by regulatory bodies such as Energy Star, Green Seal and Green Business Bureau, or a company may award itself an 'eco-friendly' certificate that means nothing.

ExxonMobil
ExxonMobil is a transnational energy corporation with its main headquarters in the USA. Heavily involved in oil and gas exploration and exploitation it is part of the BigOil corporate 'gang' among which greenwashing is common and it has probably been involved in all the accepted forms of greenwashing.
Being involved in fossil fuels Exxon necessarily has a massive world impact in the release of greenhouse gases and potentially causing ecosystem damaging spills during exploitation or transport, as with the Exxon Valdez in Alaska in 1989. While it is thought that small firms collectively have a larger impact on the environment than the big corporations, this is not the case in energy, where the top 100 companies have been responsible for 71% of greenhouse gas emissions since 1988 (www.theguardian.com).
Exxon make many claims about their green credentials (corporate.exxonmobil.com). Their vision statement is full of typical greenwashing terms and phrases such as sustainability, responsibility (to meet society's energy needs), improving the quality of the environment, managing environmental performance and appears to stress low carbon solutions. It is, however, short on timelines, deadlines and firm policies, and the 'forward looking statement' is actually preceded by a warning basically saying that these are our aims but they are subject to outside forces, so don't blame us if we don't achieve them.
What they actually achieve is quite different (research.library.fordham.edu); in this article 'The ins and outs of corporate greenwashing,' actions by corporations such as Exxon are called 'deception by public relations'. Since the Exxon Valdez public relations disaster of 1989 the corporation has made strenuous efforts to stress the 'green' credentials of a company that is anything but green.

Exxon often set up or support environmental campaigns that are either not backed up by adequate funding or are a front for devious attempts to make fossil fuels more acceptable to politicians and the public. As part of the Global Climate Coalition it led an anti global warming campaign casting doubt on scientific research and well held scientific opinions. Along with the other BigOil corporations it attempted to foster the view that either global warming was a myth, or it was a natural process that has nothing to do with human activities. When not doing this its publicity attempted to put the blame on the public and their energy needs, all Exxon was doing was satisfying demand. By doing this it attempted to keep the discussion about consumers and their use of energy rather than the energy producing companies.
Exxon has vigorously promoted the exploitation of natural gas as a supposedly clean form of fossil fuel instead of leading the way towards renewables. While natural gas is cleaner than coal and oil there is no way it can be considered clean (forest.research.gov.uk). Compared to coal, oil produces around 70% of the greenhouse gases whereas natural gas is approximately 55%, biomass is much cleaner with an average figure of around 15%. So natural gas is still a significant contributor to atmospheric carbon emissions. This is more apparent if we consider some of this could be methane (CH_4) during drilling for natural gas and that methane is 28 times more powerful a greenhouse gas compared to carbon dioxide, Exxon is less than truthful in extolling the virtues of gas as a future energy source when they actually see it as a competitor for renewables.
Exxon make many unsubstantiated claims (clientearth.org), for instance that the algae research they are involved in will produce biofuels that might help create a revolution in clean transport of the future, when in reality they don't even have a company wide net zero target for 2050, and in the period 2010-2018 spent only 0.2% of their total expenditure on low carbon energy sources. Carbon capture has been highlighted by the company, but investment is very limited and the technology has not really progressed in the last 20 years (theguardian.com/uk). Links to university research departments to find new energy solutions for the future are stressed by the company, in reality the funding supplied is so small compared to company profits that it is hard to see this as anything other than a greenwashing publicity stunt.
The company has also been at the vanguard of attempts to influence the direction of policies implemented by the US government. By lying about climate change and spreading doubt about its scientific credibility it has helped shape government attitudes to the extent that environmental laws were been blocked as late as 2005. The Energy Policy Act also in 2005 allotted $7 billion in subsidies to oil as gas companies after pressure from BigOil.
In the USA Exxon and the BigOil companies seem to be more able to sway opinion on the political right than on the left. Democrats have usually paid less attention to the propaganda of large energy companies and have led the move to ban exploration and exploitation of oil and gas, particularly in fragile ecosystems like the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska and pushed for more renewables.
By fear mongering in a subtle way about energy security and energy imports Exxon and BigOil have managed to persuade the public and the incoming Republican government led by Trump to 'drill, baby, drill' and he has nominated a fracking executive to lead the energy department. The new US energy policy aims to boost oil drilling, gas exploitation and fracking, so it may be that greenwashing by Exxon and similar companies has been both a success and beneficial to them.

Q7: Describe the potential impacts of greenwashing on society. (3.2) If the greenwashing by a corporation or company is successful people may be supporting unsustainable activities by unethical organisations. This will mean consumers have been, and perhaps still are, supporting environmental
damage through excessive emissions, excessive waste, perhaps toxic, plastic or micro-plastics, and resources depletion. BigOil corporations, including Exxon, continue to do this today, undermining generally accepted science on climate change and persuading people and governments that fossil fuels should still be exploited and used as a major energy source.
People, therefore, are unknowingly contributing to a downward spiral of environmental issues such as global warming and climate change that can have a marked detrimental impact on social and economic issues and on society. In California, for instance, carbon induced climate change has increased the incidence and intensity of droughts, storms and floods which bring increasingly severe problems to society. Wildfire can destroy residential areas, water supply problems affect urban centres and food supplies, and energy deficiencies due to lack of water to power Hydro station leads to power cuts.
Climate change brings an increase in sea surface temperatures which extends the hurricane/cyclone season, increases their frequency and intensity, bringing devastation to affected areas and societies (www.ipc.ch). Tropical cyclone Nargis in 2008 hit the country of Myanmar causing a storm surge of 7.6 metres, killing 140,000 people and destroying 450,000 homes, 1700 schools and leaving 2-3 million people homeless. It also hit the rice harvest badly that year causing a humanitarian crisis.
Another major environmental impact of climate change is desertification and this has profound impacts on the societies involved. Desertification is the spread of deserts and this is seen particularly to the south of the Sahara in northern Africa, where the southward spread of the desert into the semi-arid Sahel has been exacerbated by human induced climate change. This has led to the overpopulation of countries like Sudan where the land is now unable to support the population leading to overuse of the soil, soil degradation, malnutrition and starvation, causing large numbers to migrate out of the area for economic, social and environmental reasons. The increased pressure on a land unable to support its population has been a contributory factor in the conflicts and civil wars that are continuing, and the destructive societal impacts they bring.
Increasing awareness of environmental issues and problems has both stimulated greenwashing by companies to increase their standing and led to the fact that in recent times it is more likely to be exposed. If greenwashing is not successful and exposed by regulatory agencies or environmental groups there a separate set of impacts on society.
Customers and society in general will have far less trust in corporations and this may spread beyond the guilty companies to the whole corporate world, and perhaps even authorities and organisations not involved in greenwashing. People may feel unable to make ethical choices having been misled which could lead to a more cynical and apathetic approach to the whole sustainability issue (skicho.teemill.com). Since the social driver is essential in moving towards a sustainable economy this may

have longer term negative impacts on the move to a more sustainable world, particularly if the public becomes increasingly skeptical about scientific statements. The need to check and confirm claims made by organisations caused by the growing demand for 'green' products may in fact divert attention from important sustainability issues and the whole sustainability movement may stagnate.
Greenwashing over a sustained period of time that masks unsustainable processes, practices and products could lead to resource depletion that would have longer term implications for society and its ability to prosper. Organisations that are exposed may decline or go out of business, causing unemployment and its attendant problems to the area where the company was based. This may spread throughout the whole chain of companies, suppliers, transport firms, retailers and partnerships causing widespread social and economic hardship.

Q8: Outline the implications of greenwashing on organisations. (3.3) Although people are becoming more aware of what greenwashing is and how it can shape their opinions and direct their actions, there is still a sizeable section of society who can be taken in by greenwashing claims. Greenwashing propaganda may be believed by stakeholders, including shareholders who may flock to invest in a company and customers who may boost sales. This may bring about a cycle of success, increasing sales and profits, good returns for investors and shareholders, reinvestment and continued progress.
Exxon the US transnational energy company have undoubtedly benefitted to some extent from their greenwashing efforts. Despite some very poor publicity and several high profile court cases they seem to have convinced a majority of the US population and the Republican Party, including incoming president Trump, that energy security is more important than the possible 'myth' and 'certainly unsubstantiated' climate change. Trump wants US energy dominance by streamlining and speeding up applications for drilling licences for fossil fuels on federal land, and Exxon will be at the forefront of the rush to 'drill, baby, drill.'
Recent research (researchgate.net)(businessdasher.com) has shown that the general public is becoming much more aware of environmental issues. In 2024 in a survey, 72% said they now buy more environmentally friendly products than they did 5 years ago, 55% will pay more for environmentally friendly products, and as much as 92% are more likely to trust a brand that is environmentally and socially aware. This increased environmental awareness of consumers, however, is a double edged sword. Being more environmentally aware they are more likely to be influenced by environmental claims, even if they involve greenwashing, bringing improvements in brand awareness, public image and customer loyalty. However, being more environmentally aware customers are more likely to see through bogus claims, particularly if they are helped by environmental groups concerned with sustainability. In this case it may lead customers to lose trust in the company, buy less or even boycott the products. This would obviously have a severe negative impact on business, however, some doubt has been cast on whether knowledge of greenwashing affects purchasing behaviour as much as expected.
Some organisations now feel that they do not want to advertise about environmental issues as it is too easy for them to be accused of greenwashing as the impact of companies on the environment is such a complex issue, and they fear the reputational damage an accusation will make. The negative impacts of being exposed as an 'ethically' weak company that engages in greenwashing is extensive. They include loss of trust, loss of reputation, lower sales, an economic downturn of the business and even government fines.
The VW emissions scandal illustrates this well. Having been shown to have deliberately lied to licensing agencies and the public they paid a total of over $30 billion in fines and compensation, and they were even sued by shareholders concerned about their personal losses. VW saw a 46% drop in its share price in the two months after they were exposed, sales dropped and the scandal also hit suppliers, dealerships and, most surprisingly, competitors as trust was lost in the whole motor vehicle industry.
Governments are becoming more aware of the need to regulate company claims about environmental issues. In 2013 the UK Government set up the Competition and Marketing Authority (CMA) to investigate eco-friendly claims made by companies, this means that those who engage in greenwashing are more likely to be exposed and consumers are protected from unfair practices. The CMA aims to uphold the law, hold companies to account, look for evidence concerning claims made, conduct research and educate consumers, making greenwashing something companies now try hard to avoid.
