



# Barriers to the Implementation of Green Chemistry in the United States

## Citation

Matus, Kira J. M., William C. Clark, Paul T. Anastas, and Julie B. Zimmerman. 2012. Barriers to the Implementation of Green Chemistry in the United States. *Environmental Science & Technology*, published online, September 10, 2012.

## Published Version

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/es3021777>

## Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:9639957>

## Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA>

## Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.  
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

## Barriers to the Implementation of Green Chemistry in the United States

Kira J.M. Matus, Paul T. Anastas, William C. Clark, and Julie Beth Zimmerman

*Environ. Sci. Technol.*, **Just Accepted Manuscript** • Publication Date (Web): 10 Sep 2012

Downloaded from <http://pubs.acs.org> on September 18, 2012

### Just Accepted

“Just Accepted” manuscripts have been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication. They are posted online prior to technical editing, formatting for publication and author proofing. The American Chemical Society provides “Just Accepted” as a free service to the research community to expedite the dissemination of scientific material as soon as possible after acceptance. “Just Accepted” manuscripts appear in full in PDF format accompanied by an HTML abstract. “Just Accepted” manuscripts have been fully peer reviewed, but should not be considered the official version of record. They are accessible to all readers and citable by the Digital Object Identifier (DOI®). “Just Accepted” is an optional service offered to authors. Therefore, the “Just Accepted” Web site may not include all articles that will be published in the journal. After a manuscript is technically edited and formatted, it will be removed from the “Just Accepted” Web site and published as an ASAP article. Note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the manuscript text and/or graphics which could affect content, and all legal disclaimers and ethical guidelines that apply to the journal pertain. ACS cannot be held responsible for errors or consequences arising from the use of information contained in these “Just Accepted” manuscripts.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



63x47mm (96 x 96 DPI)

# Barriers to the Implementation of Green Chemistry in the United States

*Kira J.M. Matus<sup>\*</sup>, William C. Clark<sup>†</sup>, Paul T. Anastas<sup>‡,§</sup>, Julie B. Zimmerman<sup>\*\*</sup>,<sup>‡</sup>*

## **Abstract:**

This paper investigates the conditions under which firms are able to develop and implement innovations with sustainable development benefits. In particular, we examine “green chemistry” innovations in the United States. Via interviews with green chemistry leaders from industry, academia, NGOs and government, we identified six major categories of challenges commonly confronted by innovators. They are: (1) economic and financial, (2) regulatory, (3) technical, (4) organizational, (5) cultural and (6) definition and metrics. Further analysis of these barriers shows that in the United States,

---

<sup>\*</sup> Department of Government, London School of Economics and Political Science

<sup>†</sup> Sustainability Science Program, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University

<sup>‡</sup> School of Forestry and Environmental Science, Yale University

<sup>§</sup> Chemistry Department, Yale University

<sup>\*\*</sup> Department of Chemical and Environmental Engineering, Yale University

1  
2  
3 two elements of these that are particular to the implementation of green chemistry innovations are the  
4  
5 absence of clear definitions and metrics for use by researchers and decision makers, as well as the  
6  
7 interdisciplinary demands of these innovations on researchers and management. Finally, we conclude  
8  
9 with some of the strategies that have been successful thus far in overcoming these barriers, and the types  
10  
11 of policies which could have positive impacts moving forward.  
12  
13

## 14 15 16 ***I. Introduction*** 17

18  
19 Over the years, the cumulative number of regulations to which an American chemical firm must  
20  
21 comply has increased dramatically. (1) Within the chemical industry, there is increased recognition of the  
22  
23 need to deal with the challenges of sustainability as a strategy for moving out ahead of anticipated future  
24  
25 regulation. One strategy has been the development green chemistry. (2) Green chemistry, along with the  
26  
27 complimentary fields of green engineering, industrial ecology, and sustainability science represent  
28  
29 examples of the critical emerging disciplines necessary to realize this goal. Each of these disciplines/  
30  
31 meta-disciplines works at different scales and with different focus areas to make fundamental  
32  
33 contributions to advancing sustainability. Green chemistry, however, is one of the most fundamental of  
34  
35 these fields in that it focuses on the molecular level to design chemicals and materials to be inherently  
36  
37 non-hazardous. In theory, firms that can achieve minimally hazardous processes and products would  
38  
39 eliminate, or significantly reduce, their regulatory burden.  
40  
41  
42

43  
44 The challenge of promoting greater adoption of green chemistry innovations is substantial because  
45  
46 green chemistry is an emerging disruptive technology (3) embedded in a complex scientific, political,  
47  
48 regulatory, economic, industrial and cultural framework. Innovations in green chemistry are innovations  
49  
50 in a large system that spans borders between nations, between industries, and between scientific  
51  
52 disciplines. Thus there is a need for research into the underlying causes of the barriers to the  
53  
54 implementation of green chemistry technologies in the United States, with a view towards using its  
55  
56 findings to inform the design of future policies.  
57  
58  
59  
60

## A. Background and History of Green Chemistry

Green chemistry is described in detail in the “12 Principles of Green Chemistry.” (2) These principles are a tool for translating the goal of reducing negative impacts into an operational method for doing chemistry. These Twelve Principles have become the standard for green chemistry research and practice. They address issues of health, safety and the environment, including the efficient use of energy and materials. They encompass a multi-disciplinary, lifecycle perspective for chemists doing chemistry. They are, in many respects, a design framework at the molecular level, which, ideally would result in chemicals that are “benign by design.” Benign chemicals that reduce risk by eliminating hazard (in production and in use) would allow firms to escape from the pattern of increasing regulation, since inherently safe chemicals would not need to be regulated.

While the benefits of green chemistry have been and continue to be demonstrated across the chemical enterprise, its widespread penetration and implementation has been impeded by its fundamental and disruptive nature. Current estimates put the share of green chemistry products in the chemical sector at about 1%. (4) This is not unexpected; innovations are often difficult to implement, especially in mature, established industries like the chemical industry.

For green chemistry, there are theoretical and empirical reasons to support the idea that the challenges to implementation differ from innovation more generally. First, we would expect that the market acting alone would underprovide these particular innovations. This is because of the public, as well as private benefits that these technologies deliver. Empirically, green chemistry is also technically demanding. Development and implementation requires the use of multiple scientific and engineering disciplines, as well as an understanding of toxicology and environmental science. Green chemistry requires the ability to analyze trade-offs between different environmental and health impacts, while also maximizing technical performance and profits. The interdisciplinary knowledge and range of skills needed to make

1  
2  
3 many of these technologies commercially successful is not typical of existing organizational structures in  
4  
5 either the research or industrial sides of the chemical enterprise.  
6

7  
8 In order to identify and analyze the barriers to the implementation of green chemistry, we chose to  
9  
10 pursue a combination of in-depth qualitative interviews and a multi-stakeholder workshop, in order to  
11  
12 elicit the experiences of experts in the field. First, in 2006 we interviewed ten experts in the field of  
13  
14 green chemistry<sup>††</sup>. All of these experts had experience translating research into commercial activities and  
15  
16 knowledge of the barriers that are present for the implementation of green chemistry technologies. All of  
17  
18 the interviews were qualitative, semi-structured, and based on a common interview protocol. This kind of  
19  
20 qualitative interviewing process is conversational by nature, and as such, the focus and order of the topics  
21  
22 covered differed from interview to interview. It is based on a set of topics to be considered, as opposed to  
23  
24 a more formal set of survey questions<sup>‡‡</sup>. (5) These interviews formed the basis for an initial set of  
25  
26 barriers to adoption, which were presented to a group of approximately thirty interested and qualified  
27  
28 individuals from industry, academia, government, and non-governmental institutions<sup>i</sup> at a workshop in  
29  
30 2007. This larger, multi-stakeholder group refined the barriers based on their experiences in the field, and  
31  
32 the different perspectives that they represented. Both the interviews and the workshop were conducted  
33  
34 under an agreement of non-attribution. Geographically, all of the research was focused on green  
35  
36 chemistry occurring in the United States, as opposed to issues faced in other parts of the world. Because  
37  
38 green chemistry penetration is relatively limited in the chemical industry, we chose to focus on the subset  
39  
40 of individuals with knowledge and experience in the field, in order to be sure to capture the phenomena of  
41  
42 interest. While this set of individuals is not representative of the chemical industry, NGOs, and regulators  
43  
44 as a whole, they did span a broad set of the organizations active in this particular field.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

---

51  
52  
53 †† See Supporting Information

54  
55 ‡‡ See Supporting Information  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## II. *The Barriers to Green Chemistry Implementation*

Analysis of the impediments to Green Chemistry is an important for understanding its potential for widespread adoption. There has been other research on the nature of the barriers that typically impede the implementation of green chemistry. (6–10) Our initial hypothesis was that candidates for important barriers include key regulatory impediments, knowledge impediments, challenges with metrics and impediments that are the result of the institutions, culture and infrastructure particular to the chemical sector. While many of these candidate barriers appear to be perfectly reasonable, there was a need for a deeper investigation into the dynamics present in this particular innovation system<sup>§§</sup>. The development of a more comprehensive framework of the green chemistry innovation system (11) also provides a way to develop an analytical understanding of where, within the system, these key barriers occur, what resources they impact, and which stakeholders are involved. (12)

Through interviews and the workshop, a set of common barriers emerged. Table 1 shows the list of major barriers, and the number of the initial pool of interviewees who identified them as key challenges. Each barrier type will be presented in more detail below. Given the semi-structured nature of the interviews, the failure to mention particular barrier during the course of an interview does not necessarily indicate a divergent opinion. In fact, there was almost no overt divergence of views on these topics. Instead, the variation appears to be on which trends and issues are considered the most important by each individual interviewee. One of the major tasks of the workshop was to capture the specific elements of each barrier type, and to probe for any major divergence of opinion on inclusion of particular barriers and any that might have been missed due to composition of the initial interview set.

---



**Table 1-** Frequency of Interviewee Identification of Barriers (N=10)

<b>Barrier to Green Chemistry Adoption</b>	<b>Number of Interviewees Reporting (N=10)</b>
Economic and Financial: Costs, incentives, and markets	5
Regulatory: Uncertainty, timing, disincentives	5
Technical: Expertise, education, training scientific and engineering issues	5
Organizational: Intra-firm, and firm-academic	6
Definition and metrics: unavailable, or difficult to operationalize	6
Cultural: Awareness, educational curriculum, priorities, attitudes	9

In Section 3, we compare these green chemistry-specific barriers to similar barriers to innovation generally from the literature. This process disaggregates general barriers to innovation from those that are the result of the details of the green chemistry system. This, in turn, is a useful step in understanding and developing effective policy approaches to green chemistry innovations in particular, and innovations for sustainable development more generally.

#### **A. Framing the Barriers**

What are the barriers that slow or prevent the implementation of green chemistry? In particular, which of these barriers are the most particular to the chemical enterprise, as opposed to the more general problems associated with implementing technical innovations in well-established industries?

The research indicated that there are a complex set of intertwined issues that act as barriers to the effective implementation of green chemistry within the chemical enterprise. In the United States, they broadly fall into the categories of economic and financial, regulatory, technical, organizational, cultural,

1  
2  
3 and even definition and measurement. These categories themselves have significant interactions and  
4 overlaps between them.  
5  
6

7 The sectors of industry that fall under the chemical enterprise umbrella are both large and diverse.  
8  
9 They range from pharmaceuticals to textiles, from pesticides to paper, from petroleum products to  
10 specialty chemicals, plastics, and just about everything in-between. It is not unusual for a company that  
11 specializes in a consumer product like sporting goods to evaluate its processes and discover that it is also  
12 in the business of large-scale chemical production. The variety and ubiquity of the use and production of  
13 chemicals within industry creates an underlying challenge. Many firms that fall into the chemical  
14 umbrella may not see themselves as such, which makes the dissemination of information to these arenas  
15 much more difficult.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 Furthermore, diversity within industry extends beyond product lines, but also includes the particular  
25 kinds of barriers that different firms face when they decide to implement green chemistry. There is a huge  
26 variety of technical knowledge within the industry, much of it highly contextual. There are also very  
27 different experiences with regulations. In some sectors, this can mean the need to recertify pharmaceutical  
28 products, while in others, no action at all may be required. This is just one aspect which affects how and  
29 where green chemistry is easy (and difficult) to implement. Diversity in particular firm cultures,  
30 organizational structures, and financial situations throughout the chemical enterprise also impact  
31 implementation. This means that any particular sector, or even any particular firm, may find itself facing a  
32 unique group of barriers which complicates learning and knowledge transfer to take place between firms  
33 and across sectors.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 Many of the sectors in the industry are highly intertwined, which means that firms within the chemical  
47 enterprise occupy a variety of positions along the supply chain, from primary production (i.e.  
48 petrochemicals) all the way to consumer products. Some firms face demand from the consumer market,  
49 others are focused on industrial and business to business (B2B) markets, and some firms may deal with  
50 both. The needs of these very different markets add to the complexity of evaluating potential barriers to  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 green chemistry. Despite this diversity, there are many barriers which appear to be common across large  
4 parts of the chemical enterprise.  
5  
6

## 7 8 **B. The Barriers** 9

10  
11  
12 Each of the major barriers are elaborated below, based on information reported during the interviews  
13 and the workshop discussions.  
14  
15

### 16 17 18 1. Economic and Financial Barriers 19

20  
21  
22 Within the chemical enterprise, a new product or process based on green chemistry must meet two  
23 criteria- economic and environmental performance. The product or process must not only represent an  
24 improvement for health and the environment, but it must also be more profitable, without sacrificing  
25 efficacy or quality. In the case of an existing product, changes in the production process or formulation  
26 must represent enough of a potential cost savings to out-weigh upfront costs. Pfizer has saved millions of  
27 dollars to date from Presidential Green Chemistry Award winning changes to the process to synthesize  
28 sertraline, the active ingredient in Zoloft. The resulting revenue increase was enough to overcome the  
29 costs, which went beyond capital investment and included all of the costs associated with the time-  
30 consuming process of recertifying the drug with the FDA. (13) But a small decreases in costs of waste,  
31 marginal efficiency improvements, or implementation of less dangerous processes may not be enough to  
32 justify large investments, especially when exact savings are uncertain or hard to quantify.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 There are other financial barriers. Many chemical enterprises are highly capital intensive, and firms will  
47 be reluctant to abandon their previous investments. The costs of shuttering an old, inefficient plant can be  
48 very high, leaving firms without the resources to then re-invest in new technologies. One study a contract  
49 fine chemical producer uses large reactors, even for making small batches of pharmaceutical API's. This  
50 requires large quantities of waste solvent, among other inefficiencies. This is the kind of case where  
51 greener processes could easily be deployed, but for the fact that firms find themselves tied to the facilities  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 at hand. (14) Depending on the sector, many operations may not enjoy high-enough margins to overcome  
4  
5 the financial and economic barriers to change.  
6  
7

## 8 9 2. Regulatory Barriers

10  
11  
12 The significant growth in environmental regulations over time has had an important impact on the  
13  
14 chemical enterprise. And given the increasing globalization of the chemical enterprise, many firms must  
15  
16 cope with different regulations in each of the nations where they produce and sell their products. While  
17  
18 green chemistry is interested in reducing inherent risk through the reduction of hazard, most  
19  
20 environmental, health and safety regulations focus instead on reducing risk through reductions in  
21  
22 exposure. This means that many firms find themselves in situations where they must use their resources  
23  
24 on mandated actions and end-of-pipe technologies, instead of investing in research and development into  
25  
26 inherently safer products and processes. In 2005, chemical manufacturing spent more than any other  
27  
28 industrial sector on pollution abatement. (15) This illustrates the results of a regulatory focus on risk  
29  
30 control, rather than risk prevention, can be a serious barrier. This distribution of costs at least partly  
31  
32 reflects a regulatory focus on risk control, rather than risk prevention. Under control-oriented regulation,  
33  
34 firms have little incentive to invest in prevention, and may be forced to divert resources to control instead.  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 There are also regulatory barriers that are product sector specific. If a pharmaceutical company wishes  
40  
41 to change certain parts of its method of production for a product on the market in the United States, it  
42  
43 must undergo a time-consuming and expensive recertification process with the FDA. If a company  
44  
45 develops a pesticide that is safer, or produced in a less hazardous or more environmentally friendly  
46  
47 manner than one in current production, it must go through the process of registration with the EPA under  
48  
49 FIFRA. New chemicals that may replace harmful PBT's or carcinogens must be registered with the EPA  
50  
51 under TSCA. These regulations, while meant to protect, do not offer any incentives for greener  
52  
53 alternatives (such as a fast-track for processes that provide environmental or health benefits) and often  
54  
55 take enough time, money, or both, to create a significant barrier to the implementation of green chemistry.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Another example of regulatory barrier pertains to government preferred procurement .Even regulations  
4 meant to incentivize green innovation can become problematic. Shaw Carpet introduced its EcoWorx  
5 carpet tiles in 1999. One of the advantages of this new carpet material is that both the backing and facing  
6 are recyclable into new tiles. However, initially, the tiles are made up of new (virgin) materials. This  
7 became an issue due to the fact that government environmentally preferred procurement status is based on  
8 total *current* recycled content. So even though with EcoWorx, less waste goes to landfills, it was at a  
9 disadvantage in terms of government procurement. (16) EcoWorx is an example of the barrier to new  
10 green chemistry innovations that result from well-intentioned environmental regulations.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 Finally, there are financial regulations that can also create a barrier. Many of these involve details of the  
22 accounting systems, and how and when a company can write-off old infrastructure. There are also  
23 financial complexities that come from the regulations governing the liability of firms for the land where  
24 their facilities are cited, should any health or environmental problems that result from these facilities arise  
25 in the future. Even if companies are able to shutter old plants, they face a significant potential future  
26 financial liability (such as Superfund), that makes it much more attractive to continue with the status quo  
27 than to make investments in new infrastructure.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

### 39 3. Technical Barriers

40  
41  
42  
43

44 The science behind green chemistry is often complex and multi-disciplinary. While the underlying  
45 chemistry has made great progress, there are many reactions and processes for which greener substitutes  
46 remain unknown. Even where academic or industrial research has devised a new reaction or synthetic  
47 pathway to a given chemical, this knowledge may not be readily available to the chemists within industry.  
48 Some of it remains in the firms that develop it, protected as trade secret for competitive advantage. Some  
49 of it is buried within the vast chemical literature, and may not even be labeled anywhere as being a  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 “green” alternative. As of yet, there is no formal collection and dissemination, large-scale green chemistry  
4 database, or comprehensive reference.  
5  
6

7  
8 When tools are generated by one firm, or within one industry, they can be very difficult to implement  
9 elsewhere. S.C. Johnson, Inc. has been very successful in its implementation of its Greenlist™ program.  
10 Greenlist™ is an internal tool that rates every product by its environmental and health impacts. It helps  
11 scientists design newer, greener products, and also improve on existing ones. It also provides a  
12 quantitative metrics that can be used by management regarding performance. But the very flexibility to  
13 absorb detail and context that makes it effective also makes it very difficult to transfer to other firms. It  
14 requires a significant technical effort to adjust it for the products of other formulators, and even more  
15 fundamental adjustment would be required if it were to be transferred to other sectors, especially those  
16 that are involved in the production, as opposed to the formulation, of chemical products.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 The number of disciplines involved in green chemistry also creates a technical barrier. Organic  
28 chemists typically do not have a working knowledge of toxicology, chemical engineering, or ecology.  
29 Similarly, toxicologists are not trained as synthetic chemists, and the engineers usually do not have  
30 extensive knowledge of environmental systems. This makes it difficult for chemists to anticipate, or take  
31 into account, the potential downstream effects of a product or a synthetic pathway, unless they are  
32 provided with a tool-set to aid them in a more systematic evaluation. The lack of a broader technical  
33 background in the training of chemists, including the ability to think on a more global, systems level, has  
34 emerged as an important barrier to the integration and implementation of green chemistry within industry.  
35 In some cases, a firm’s existing expertise is insufficient. When BASF started developing bio-based  
36 polymers, they discovered that their polymer scientists did not have the required experience working with  
37 bio-based feedstocks. The solution in this case was to partner with a biotechnology startup. (17) But  
38 these kinds of expertise gaps can pose significant technical challenges.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 A final technical barrier is the result of data and information gaps. Nike has developed Nike  
54 Considered, which it uses to measure the sustainability of its products. This required chemical data from  
55 suppliers. Nike encountered two challenges. First, they found that suppliers may not have, or can be  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 unwilling to share, information about the chemicals used in production processes. Secondly, for many  
4  
5 substances, hazard characteristics remain unknown. (18) There are many of these sorts of gaps in the  
6  
7 knowledge base that create barriers to implementation.  
8  
9

#### 10 11 12 13 4. Organizational Barriers 14 15

16  
17 Within firms, the implementation of green chemistry can run into problems that are the result of the  
18 organization's structure. A division may be reluctant to change to a greener production process that may  
19 produce costs for their own bottom-line, even if the results benefit the firm as a whole, since this could  
20 negatively impact evaluations of the division's performance. The same problem can occur even more  
21 locally, when a particular facility is reluctant to implement a change which would be good for a division  
22 overall, but that would be locally costly.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 There can also be occasions where the development of a greener product in one part of a company will  
31 hurt the sales of another product, leading to conflicts and difficulty in implementation. These kinds of  
32 organizational clashes are especially likely to occur if the overall business plan and evaluation structure  
33 does not explicitly include environmental and health metrics.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 Another kind of organizational barrier can occur when the "champions" of a greener product or process  
40 are not in positions of power. If support does not exist at the very top, then implementing green chemistry  
41 becomes less of a priority, and it is difficult to secure the necessary resources for implementation. Like  
42 any other project, green chemistry can fall prey to the power struggles within any given company. Besides  
43 the importance of support at the top of the firm, it is also important for there to be buy-in from those who  
44 actually are in charge of the research and production processes. The absence of a common environmental  
45 goal across the organization can be a significant hurdle to implementation.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 One final organizational barrier occurs when firms develop their business models for green chemistry  
55 innovations. For example, BASF's bioplastics business has been based out of a relatively small R&D  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 division, and subject to changing managerial opinions on the worth of the products to the business. (17)

4  
5 As opposed to some of its competitors in the biopolymers market, specifically Dow Chemical, it has  
6  
7 chosen to concentrate on a smaller, niche market, instead of building company-wide innovation goals and  
8  
9 developing broader, and even new markets. (17)  
10  
11

## 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 5. Cultural Barriers 19

20  
21  
22 Within firms, the regulatory community, academia, and even the general public, there are barriers that  
23  
24 could best be classified as cultural. One of the most important of these is awareness. While green  
25  
26 chemistry has made significant progress, it is unknown or misunderstood by a large number of chemists.  
27  
28 It is not part of the standard curriculum in most schools, although this is beginning to change. And while  
29  
30 training is low among chemists, many managers lack even basic awareness of the concept, and its  
31  
32 business potential. People whose jobs revolve around sales, marketing, and operations have even less  
33  
34 exposure to the concepts and potential benefits of green chemistry. Some may harbor misconceptions  
35  
36 regarding the actual nature of green chemistry, and may consider it to be just greenwashing, or a part of  
37  
38 the “environmental agenda,” as opposed to a set of practices grounded in rigorous science. Or, they just  
39  
40 may have no idea that the science itself is available, and could have important benefits.  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 There are also cultural barriers that are the result of previous experiences with the environmental  
46  
47 movement. These include, from the corporate standpoint, the idea that all environmentally friendly  
48  
49 changes are expensive and not particularly worthwhile. This is a legacy of the largely command-and-  
50  
51 control policies typical of environmental regulation through the 1980’s, which often mandated costly  
52  
53 technologies. (19, 20) For the general public, there has been a variety of often less than successful  
54  
55 “green” products over the years. In interviews and the workshop, participants spoke of a lingering  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 perception among some consumers that products labeled as “green” are more expensive and less  
4  
5 effective, which lowers demand and limits the effectiveness of green as a marketing strategy.  
6

7  
8 There are also cultural barriers that arise from the separation of academia from industry. Academia is  
9  
10 concerned with providing an education that produces first-rate chemists, and the definition of what that  
11  
12 education includes have remained remarkably constant since the end of World War II. Changes in  
13  
14 chemical education have been difficult, and incorporation of green chemistry into the curriculum, while  
15  
16 gaining ground, is hardly universal. Academia is also focused on its own particular research goals, which  
17  
18 are not necessarily the same as the research agendas that would be useful to industry. The differences  
19  
20 between the research interests of academics, whose careers depend on publications in peer-reviewed  
21  
22 journals and their image in the academic community as serious researchers, can be very different from the  
23  
24 research interests of chemists within industry. These chemists are concentrated on particular problems  
25  
26 which they are attempting to solve, in an arena where speed, effectiveness and cost-efficiency are  
27  
28 important to their personal success.  
29

30  
31 Finally, there are cultural barriers within the chemical enterprise that deal with innovation more  
32  
33 broadly. Some sectors are highly innovative, constantly rework their products and processes, and place  
34  
35 great value on being as efficient and cutting-edge as possible. This is often the case with consumer  
36  
37 products firms, who face a constantly shifting market demand, and must innovate to stay competitive.  
38  
39 However, there are other sectors that are less open to innovation. The pharmaceutical industry has been  
40  
41 confronted with its resistance to change. This has also been the case with bulk chemicals, and other  
42  
43 sectors whose products are (or are very much like) commodities. The degree to which the culture of a  
44  
45 sector or firm shuns innovation in general can create a significant barrier to the implementation of green  
46  
47 chemistry.  
48  
49

50  
51  
52  
53  
54 6. Barriers from Disagreements Regarding Definitions and Metrics  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Green chemistry, unlike many other elements of sustainability, consists of a rigorous definition and  
4 design framework, which is embodied in the Twelve Principles of Green Chemistry. (2) Nonetheless, a  
5 final important barrier emerges from questions about what exactly constitutes green chemistry. The term  
6 is often used interchangeably with chemical sustainability, and can easily be grouped in with green  
7 engineering and sustainable development in general. It is unclear to some whether green chemistry is its  
8 own branch of chemistry, like organic or physical chemistry; whether it is a method for analyzing and  
9 thinking systematically about chemistry; or whether it is something else entirely. This kind of definitional  
10 fuzziness can be both positive and negative. It has allowed for a fair amount of longitude in developing  
11 the science, but it has also led to confusion and argument about whether a given reaction, product, or  
12 process really represents green chemistry.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 Part of this last problem is compounded by the absence of a metric or certification for green chemistry.  
26 Green chemistry is highly contextual, and thus open to a great deal of debate. The ability to have a  
27 process for certification, such as is found with organic food products, creates a way for firms to express to  
28 their markets that a product is more environmentally friendly by some well-defined (though possibly still  
29 contestable) measure. This could be much more difficult with green chemistry, since a careful reading of  
30 the Twelve Principles reveals that green chemistry is a process for thinking about chemistry from a  
31 systems perspective, as opposed to set of goals or standards of what makes something green.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 One of the barriers that emerges from the loose definition and current lack of metrics is that it is hard to  
41 point to a given product and declare it “green.” Because the Twelve Principles define a complex, multi-  
42 parameter system that often involves making trade-offs between its elements, it is very difficult to create  
43 bright-line standards that would make green chemistry certification and labeling effective. The closest  
44 there is to such a system is the NSF/GCI/ANSI 355: Greener Chemicals and Processes Information  
45 Standard. This standard, developed through the multi-stakeholder ANSI process, does not certify that a  
46 process or product is “green chemistry.” What it does do is set up a standardized reporting system for  
47 chemical hazard properties and process impacts. (21) This kind of reporting system is designed to help  
48 deal with many of the information and data gaps discussed in the technical barriers system.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Multiple interviewees noted that the lack of a clear way to certify something as “green chemistry,”  
4 makes harder to create support in firms, presents limits for potential marketing opportunities, and it may  
5 end up causing too much focus on debating what is “in” and what is “out,” as opposed to working on the  
6 underlying science.  
7  
8  
9  
10

### 11 12 13 14 15 **III. Discussion** 16

#### 17 18 19 20 **A. Themes** 21

22  
23 In the United States, while there are six main barriers to the implementation of green chemistry, they  
24 appear to have two common threads. Prominent to many challenges to implementation is a dearth of  
25 information that is required to develop, implement, and analyze the new technologies. Some of the  
26 information exists but is not accessible; a significant quantity, including metrics and toxicology data, still  
27 requires more research. The shortcomings in the actual knowledge base are exacerbated by a lack of  
28 general awareness about green chemistry and sustainability more broadly. People are unaware of the  
29 value of information that they possess, or of the existence of the need for more work in key areas.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 A second key theme is the challenge that emerges from the economic aspect of sustainability. Firms  
40 need markets for their products, and a way to recoup their costs if they are to stay in business. For many  
41 in the United States, regulatory requirements and significant amounts of existing physical capital increase  
42 the financial risks of developing and implementing green chemistry technologies. In some cases, a lack  
43 of understanding on the part of those in marketing, sales, and high-level decision making positions makes  
44 it easy for firms to miss out on potentially profitable opportunities. Since implementation of green  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

chemistry requires that it be as economically profitable as the non-green alternatives<sup>\*\*\*</sup>, economic barriers are just as significant as technical ones.

### B. Analysis: Barriers to Innovation vs. Barriers to Green Chemistry

Many of the economic challenges of innovation for sustainable development, including green chemistry, stems from the fact that they encompass an area in which there are significant market failures at play. For green chemistry in the United States, issues arise from externalities, information asymmetries, and even the simple absence of markets. There are also more complex problems, which result from the interactions of other policies, such as economic, energy, and even trade and accounting rules, with elements of the green chemistry system. For green chemistry, the most pertinent market failures are information asymmetries, the public good aspect of the system, and interactions from other, existing policies. This is shown visually in Table 5, which presents the barriers to the implementation of green chemistry innovations in terms of their root causes (which types of market failures and interactions).

**Table 2-** Root Causes of Barriers

	<b>Public Goods</b>	<b>Externalities</b>	<b>Natural Monopolies</b>	<b>Information Asymmetries</b>	<b>Policy Interactions</b>
Economic and Financial	X	x		x	X

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> John Warner, presentation at 3<sup>rd</sup> Indo-US Workshop on Green Chemistry, Delhi, India, 2008

Regulatory	X			x	X
Technical	X			x	
Organizational	X	X		x	X
Cultural				x	
Definition and Metrics	X			x	

Of these root causes, information asymmetries are especially pernicious. Green chemistry is an innovation platform that is highly knowledge intensive. It requires that large quantities of information be available to all of the actors in the system. Yet key pieces of information for decision-makers throughout the system may not be available to them. Industry has knowledge not available to consumers or regulators; academia may have access to information hidden to industry. Problems with the knowledge flow, which cause the information asymmetries, are one important aspect that policy could address.

Green chemistry also has a significant public goods aspect. Many of the benefits of green chemistry innovations accrue to society, not to the innovator. It is always difficult for an innovator to capture its full benefits. But environmental benefits accrue to the public, and so many of the barriers to implementing green chemistry arise from the problems with promoting the provision of public goods. This impacts research, regulatory and bureaucratic decision-making, and decisions about the investment of limited financial resources on the part of firms. While they may want to “do the right thing,” firms also have to make sound financial decisions, and societal benefits from green chemistry do not impact their bottom line in the absence of policies that create incentives for these types of actions.

Another step in analyzing the barriers to the implementation of green chemistry is acknowledging that many overlap heavily with innovation more generally. The innovation literature indicates at least six main types of barriers that are commonly found: organizational, cultural, economic and financial, market, regulatory and path-dependence. (7, 22–31) From a policy perspective, this indicates that policies to

1  
2  
3 support innovation generally, through the reduction of these barriers, are expected to have a positive  
4  
5 impact on green chemistry.  
6

7  
8 These findings also highlight some areas where the demands of green chemistry are particular to this  
9  
10 specific family of innovations. In the United States, the problems around definition and metrics are an  
11  
12 element that appears to be more specific to green chemistry than innovation broadly. These barriers are  
13  
14 part of the difficulty of establishing useful and appropriate ways of measuring indicators of sustainability,  
15  
16 and integrating them into a business decision-making context. These metrics are not well supported  
17  
18 within most academic and/or industrial organizations.  
19

20  
21 In the United States, a reading of the barriers as a group shows that green chemistry also runs into  
22  
23 particular difficulty because it is “competence destroying”. This means that it rewards a different set of  
24  
25 abilities than previous technologies. (27) Green chemistry requires new approaches, and an expanded  
26  
27 skill set on both the technical and managerial ends. For those who have built careers on the traditional  
28  
29 way of doing work in both academic and industrial chemistry, this presents a threat to their established  
30  
31 position. This issue appears to be nearly universal within green chemistry, due to the fact that most  
32  
33 training and industrial experience do not reflect the broad, multi-disciplinary demands of green chemistry.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

#### 39 ***IV. Conclusions***

40  
41  
42  
43 The barriers to the successful implementation of green chemistry are significant. Despite this, during  
44  
45 their interviews and the workshops, participants identified some common elements that had been key to  
46  
47 successful efforts. There are at least seven factors that, time and again, have been important to the  
48  
49 success of green chemistry, and had helped them to overcome many of the barriers. They are  
50

- 51 • Champions at upper and technical levels,
- 52
- 53 • Regulatory pressures,
- 54
- 55 • Availability of capital,
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

- Clear benefits,
- Green chemistry metrics integrated into goals and strategy (real performance incentives),
- Market demand, and
- Supply chain pressure.

The success of leaders in the field indicates that there are a number of potential levers in the system of green chemistry innovation where policies could help alleviate some of the barriers. One area where policy can have an impact is on the creation and dissemination of information. The timeliness of information flows and the need to continually increase the base knowledge stocks are a cornerstone to successfully developing green chemistry innovations. There are a variety of potentially effective ways to address the problems that arise from informational challenges. Policy can also help reduce many of the delays in the system that prevents basic research discoveries from moving into use in technology deployment. This finding is particularly interesting, because it indicates that the first action by government should be to facilitate knowledge creation and accessibility, and not focus entirely on specific regulatory prescriptions.

Secondly, incentives are important. Investment in basic research and information is not sufficient on its own. There needs to be more training for scientists, but even more importantly, the right kinds of incentives for firms to implement technologies. This is where policies can lower many of the economic and financial barriers. Recent OECD research has suggested that policy and regulation have an impact on the development of green technologies within the chemical industry. (32) While an OECD's study has found that traditional regulation is one driver of innovation, other policies with a potential for large impact include tax incentives, access to inexpensive capital, and technical assistance for implementation. Special focus should be placed on small businesses, which face higher barriers than larger firms. Many of these smaller businesses may not have the funds or personnel to implement these technologies on their own, or even recognize themselves as part of the chemical sector, but have potential for significant health

1  
2  
3 and local environmental benefits (i.e. auto painting, textile and paper, dry cleaners, nail salons, etc.).

4  
5 Policies should not prescribe particular technologies, and also should improve the access to data  
6  
7 (including testing), to avoid costly replication of work. Attention also needs to be paid to acceptable  
8  
9 levels of risk tolerance and a more thorough discussion of the societal acceptability of hazard.

10  
11 It is important to stress that the actions of one set of stakeholders (for example, those involved with the  
12  
13 regulatory and policy processes) can have a significant impact on barriers for all those involved. Changes  
14  
15 to the chemistry curriculum to produce graduates with the prerequisite knowledge and skills to develop  
16  
17 and implement green chemistry would have a significant positive impact on the technical challenges faced  
18  
19 by industries. Policies to advance green chemistry need to be part of a larger, integrated approach.

20  
21 Approaching the problem piecemeal is not likely to be effective.

22  
23 Furthermore, policy in this case can be thought of as being broader in scope than just traditional public  
24  
25 policy, to include the strategic decisions and actors of players from other sectors, who can identify areas  
26  
27 in which they are able to have an impact, and proceed accordingly. Work with a multi-stakeholder group  
28  
29 of green chemistry experts demonstrated the types of useful, action-oriented approaches that can emerge  
30  
31 from this framing. (33) Finally, and most importantly, the research supports the idea that policies to  
32  
33 support innovation for sustainable development are needed in a variety of places throughout the  
34  
35 innovation system. For this reason, policy makers need to diagnose the system before they start  
36  
37 prescribing remedies. They need to understand what types of actions, with which groups of stakeholders  
38  
39 will be effective at combating key barriers in different points in system. And it is these sorts of well-  
40  
41 thought out, collaborative actions that will be needed to move the implementation of green chemistry  
42  
43 forward, beyond the many barriers in its path.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 AUTHOR INFORMATION4  
5 **Corresponding Author**

6  
7 \*Department of Government, London School of Economics and Political Science, Houghton St.,  
8  
9  
10 London WC2A 2AE, UK. [k.matus@lse.ac.uk](mailto:k.matus@lse.ac.uk). +44 (0)20 7107 5335

11  
12  
13 **Author Contributions**

14  
15 The manuscript was written through contributions of all authors. All authors have given  
16  
17 approval to the final version of the manuscript.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 **Acknowledgments**

24  
25  
26 This research has been made possible due to the generous support of:

27  
28 ACS Petroleum Research Fund

29  
30 ACS Green Chemistry Institute

31  
32 The Belfer Center for Science in International Affairs (Harvard University)

33  
34 The Roy Fellowship

35  
36 The Vicki Norberg-Bohm Fellowship

37  
38 And support from Kai Itameri-Kinter, Nancy Dickson, Mary Anne Baumgartner and Nora O'Neil.  
39  
40  
41  
42

43  
44 This publication was developed under STAR Fellowship Assistance Agreement No. FP916883  
45  
46 awarded by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). It has not been formally reviewed by EPA.

47  
48 The views expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors, and EPA does not endorse any  
49  
50 products or commercial services mentioned in this publication.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**References:**

- (1) Cusumano, J. A. New technology and the environment. *CHEMTECH* **1992**, *22*, 482–489.
- (2) Anastas, P. T.; Warner, J. C. *Green chemistry*: theory and practice; Oxford University Press: Oxford England; New York, 1998.
- (3) Christensen, C. M. *The innovator's dilemma*: when new technologies cause great firms to fail; Harvard Business School Press: Boston, Mass., 1997.
- (4) Goodman, S. "Green chemistry" movement sprouts in colleges, companies. *The New York Times* **2009**.
- (5) Babbie, E. R. *The practice of social research*; Wadsworth Pub Co, 2007.
- (6) Poliakoff, M.; Licence, P. Sustainable technology: Green chemistry. *Nature* **2007**, *450*, 810–812.
- (7) Poliakoff, M.; Fitzpatrick, J. M.; Farren, T. R.; Anastas, P. T. Green chemistry: Science and politics of change. *Science* **2002**, *297*, 807–810.
- (8) Satterfield, M. B.; Kolb, C. E.; Peoples, R.; Adams, G. L.; Schuster, D. S.; Ramsey, H. C.; Stechel, E.; Wood-Black, F.; Garant, R. J.; Abraham\*, M. A. Overcoming Nontechnical Barriers to the Implementation of Sustainable Solutions in Industry. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2009**, *43*, 4221–4226.
- (9) Wilson, M. P.; Schwarzman, M. R. Toward a new US chemicals policy: rebuilding the foundation to advance new science, green chemistry, and environmental health. *Environmental health perspectives* **2009**, *117*, 1202.
- (10) Matus, K. J. M.; Xiao, X.; Zimmerman, J. B. Green chemistry and green engineering in China: drivers, policies and barriers to innovation. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **2012**, *32*, 193–203.

- 1  
2  
3 (11) Matus, K. J. *Green Chemistry: A Study of Innovation for Sustainable Development*,  
4 Harvard University, 2009.  
5  
6  
7  
8 (12) Matus, K. J. M.; Hutchison, J. E.; Tanguay, R. L.; Rung, S.; Peoples, R. *Green*  
9  
10 *Nanotechnology Challenges and Opportunities*; American Chemical Society, 2011.  
11  
12 (13) Manley, J. B.; Anastas, P. T.; Cue Jr., B. W. Frontiers in Green Chemistry: meeting the  
13 grand challenges for sustainability in R&D and manufacturing. *Journal of Cleaner*  
14 *Production* **2008**, *16*, 743–750.  
15  
16  
17 (14) Scott, A. *Chemical Week*. March 8, 2010, p. 21.  
18  
19 (15) U.S. Census Bureau *Pollution Abatement Costs and Expenditures: 2005*; MA200; 05; U.S.  
20 Government Printing Office, Washington, DC., 2008; pp. 9–10.  
21  
22 (16) Segars, J. W.; Bradfield, S. L.; Wright, J. J.; Realff, M. J. EcoWorx, green engineering  
23 principles in practice. *Environmental science & technology* **2003**, *37*, 5269–5277.  
24  
25 (17) Iles, A.; Martin, A. N. Expanding bioplastics production: sustainable business innovation  
26 in the chemical industry. *Journal of Cleaner Production*.  
27  
28 (18) Green Chemistry and Commerce Council *Considered Chemistry at Nike: Creating Safer*  
29 *Products through the Evaluation and Restriction of Hazardous Chemicals Case Study for*  
30 *the Green Chemistry and Commerce Council (GC3)*; Lowell Center for Sustainable  
31 Production at the University of Massachusetts Lowell: Lowell, MA, 2009.  
32  
33 (19) Esteghamat, K. Structure and Performance of the Chemical Industry Under Regulation. In  
34 *Chemicals and Long-Term Economic Growth*; John Wiley and Sons: New York, 1998.  
35  
36 (20) Hoffman, A. J. *From heresy to dogma: an institutional history of corporate*  
37 *environmentalism*; Stanford University Press: Stanford, Calif., 2001; Vol. Expand.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- (21) NSF International NSF International □: Sustainability □: NSF/GCI/ANSI 355: Greener Chemicals and Processes Information.  
[http://www.nsf.org/business/sustainability/product\\_greener\\_chemicals.asp?program=Sustainability](http://www.nsf.org/business/sustainability/product_greener_chemicals.asp?program=Sustainability) (accessed August 14, 2012).
- (22) Dahlman, C. J.; Ross-Larson, B.; Westphal, L. E. Managing Technological Development: Lessons from Newly Industrialized Countries. *World Development* **1987**, *15*, 759–775.
- (23) March, J. G.; Simon, H. A. *Organizations*; Wiley: New York, 1958.
- (24) Lall, S.; Pietrobelli, C. *Failing to Compete*; Edward Elgar Publishing, Ltd.: UK, 2002.
- (25) Archibugi, D.; Pietrobelli, C. The globalization of technology and its implications for developing countries: Windows of opportunity or further burden? *Technological Forecasting & Social Change* **2003**, *70*, 861–883.
- (26) Ruttan, V. W. *Technology, growth, and development □: an induced innovation perspective*; Oxford University Press: New York, 2001.
- (27) Tushman, M.; Smith, W. Innovation Streams, Organization Designs, and Organizational Evolution. In *Managing Strategic Innovation and Change*; Oxford University Press: New York, 2004; Vol. 2, p. 2.
- (28) Gatignon, H.; Tushman, M. L.; Smith, W.; Anderson, P. A structural approach to assessing innovation: Construct development of innovation locus, type, and characteristics. *Management Science* **2002**, *48*, 1103–1122.
- (29) Tushman, M. L.; Anderson, P. Technological Discontinuities and Organizational Environments. *Administrative Science Quarterly* **1986**, *31*, 439–465.
- (30) Gavetti, G.; Levinthal, D. Looking forward and looking backward: Cognitive and experiential search. *Administrative science quarterly* **2000**, *45*, 113–137.

- 1  
2  
3 (31) Anderson, P.; Tushman, M. L. Technological Discontinuities and Dominant Designs: A  
4  
5 Cyclical Model of Technological Change. *Adm.Sci.Q.* **1990**, *35*, 604–633.  
6  
7  
8 (32) OECD Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals  
9  
10 *Sustainable Chemistry: Evidence on Innovation from Patent Data*; OECD Environment,  
11  
12 Health and Safety Publications Series on Risk Management; 25; OECD: Paris, 2011.  
13  
14  
15 (33) Matus, K. J. Policy Incentives for a Cleaner Supply Chain: The Case of Green Chemistry.  
16  
17 *Journal of International Affairs* **2010**, *64*, 121–136.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
-