Results of the quantitative part of the case interviews

22 companies have been interviewed about different aspects of their work with green business models. The companies have been grouped as follows:

ESCOs	DBFO	CMS	Sharing	other PSS
• *Magnus Enell (expert)* • Schneider Electrics (Sweden) • Danfoss (Denmark) • Dalkia (Sweden) • Enespa (Finland) • Thyssen Krupp (Denmark)	• *Markku Antonnen (expert)* • Allfarveg E39 (Norway) • Kaivomestira (Finland) • Watrec (Finland) • AFA JCDecaux (Denmark)	• *Ole Helby (expert)* • Kemira (Finland) • Argentum (Sweden) • AGA Gas (Sweden)	• *Oksana Mont (expert)* • Bilkollektivet (Denmark) • Move About (Norway) • Kuinoma (Finland) • GreenQloud (Iceland)	• *Matthias Lindahl (expert)* • Volvo Aero (Sweden) • Better Place (Denmark) • Malvik Everk (Norway) • PSS Energy (Denmark) • Preseco (Finland) • ICEconsult (Iceland)

Each of the companies has been asked the same line of questions about their green business model covering the topics of economic benefits, environmental benefits, barriers, drivers, potential and recommendations.

Below the companies' responses to each of the questions will be summed up, in order to give an overview of the companies' work with the green business models. The reader should bear in mind that the conclusions in this document are based only on this small number of companies, and will therefore not be able to give a fulfilling picture of the work with green business models in the Nordic region. Especially when comparing responses from companies working with different kinds of green business models, generalizations will be made on a narrow basis, since only few companies might have responded in each category. However, these responses will give an idea of what possibilities and restrictions companies meet, when working with different kinds of green business models.

Economic benefits

Turnover, earnings and employees wit respect to the business model:

Table 1: The table shows the number of businesses stating their annual growth within the 4 different intervals

	Turnover				Earnings				Employees			
	0-5	6-19	20-49	>50	0-5	6-19	20-49	>50	0-5	6-19	20-49	>50
Annual growth within latest 3 years (%)	2	1	3	3	5	0	2	0	4	2	1	0
Expected annual growth within next 3 years (%)	2	0	6	1	3	1	2	0	5	1	3	1

Innovation:

Table 2: The table shows number of companies giving each response. 20 out of 22 companies replied.

The extend to which companies believe the green business model to be more innovative than traditional business models	**Very low extent**	**Low extent**	**Same**	**High extent**	**Very high extent**
ESCO companies	0	0	0	3	1
CMS companies	0	0	0	1	1
DBFO companies	0	0	1	2	0
Sharing companies	0	0	1	2	1
Other PSS companies	0	0	0	2	5
All companies	0	0	2	10	8

Environmental benefits

Environmental benefits affiliated with the project:

Table 3: The table shows number of companies giving each response. 21 out of 22 companies replied.

The extend to which the companies believe their business model to bring about environmental benefits compared to more traditional business models	Very low extent	Low extent	Same	High extent	Very high extent
ESCO companies	0	0	0	3	2
CMS companies	0	0	0	1	1
DBFO companies	0	0	1,5	1,5	0
Sharing companies	0	0	0	0	4
Other PSS companies	0	0	0	3	4
All companies	0	0	1,5	8,5	11

Note: half scores are given when a company was divided between two boxes.

The extent of environmental benefits that the project has brought about:

Table 4: The estimated environmental benefits the projects have brought about. The table shows the number of businesses stating reductions of the following categories within the 4 different intervals.

Energy use (please indicate energy source)				Green house gas emissions				Material use (please indicate type of material)				Waste				Polluting or hazardous substances, chemicals etc.			
Interval (pct.)				Interval (pct.)				Interval (pct.)				Interval (pct.)				Interval (pct.)			
0-5	6-19	20-49	>50	0- 5	6-19	20-49	>50	0-5	6-19	20-49	>50	0-5	6-19	20-49	>50	0-5	6-19	20-49	>50
No. of businesses				No. of businesses				No. of businesses				No. of businesses				No. of businesses			
1	1	3	1	2	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	0	1	0

Barriers

Rating of the perceived barriers of the business model:

Table 5: The table shows the average of the ratings given by the companies. 19 out of 22 companies replied.

The company's rating of barriers for the business model (1: least important barrier, 10: most important barrier)	ESCO-companies	CMS-companies	DBFO-companies	Sharing companies	Other PSS companies	All companies
Regulation	4,1	1,8**	3,5*	4,3*	5,0	3,7
Lacking will	3,0	3,0*	4,0*	1,0*	2,0	2,6
Lacking abilities	3,3	2,0*	4,0*	1,0**	1,4	2,3
Lacking knowledge	3,8	1,5*	4,0*	1,0**	1,8	2,4
Lacking finance	3,8	4,0*	2,5*	8,0*	3,4	4,3
Unclear economic benefits	2,8	5,0*	8,0*	3,5*	2,6	4,6
Unclear environmental benefits	1,4	1,5*	4,0**	1,0**	1,4	2,4
Other uncertain advantages	3,5*		4,0*		1,0*	2,8
Other barriers?	6,0*		1,0**		6,5*	4,5

Note: *= only 2-3 respondents, ** = only 1 respondent

Table 6: The table shows the average of the ratings given by the companies. 19 out of 22 companies replied.

The company's perception of the costumers rating of barriers for the business model (1: least important barrier, 10: most important barrier)	ESCO-companies	CMS-companies	DBFO-companies	Sharing companies	Other PSS companies	All companies
Regulation	2,4	1,0**	5,5*	4,7*	4,2	3,6
Lacking will	5,2	3,5*	5,0*	5,3*	4,6	4,7
Lacking abilities	4,6	2,5*	5,0*	1,0**	2,5	3,1
Lacking knowledge	5,0	4,0*	5,0*	2,5*	7,3	4,8
Lacking finance	7,0	4,5*	2,0*	1,0**	4,7	3,8
Unclear economic benefits	3,2	6,0*	5,0*	1,5*	2,8	4,3
Unclear environmental benefits	1,8	1,5*	4,0**	1,0**	1,8	2,1
Other uncertain advantages	4,5*		4,0*			4,2
Other barriers?	4,3*		1,0**	4,0**	3,5*	3,2

Note: *= only 2-3 respondents, ** = only 1 respondent

4.2 The nature of the barriers:

Table 7: The table shows number of companies giving each response. 20 out of 22 companies replied

The extend to which companies believe that there are barriers for the dissemination of the model	To a very low extent	To a low extent	To a high extent	To a very high extent	I do not know
ESCO companies	1	0	3	1	0
CMS companies	2	1	0	0	0
DBFO companies	0	0	1	0	0
Sharing companies	1	5	1	0	0
Other PSS companies	1	5	1	0	0
All companies	4	7	8	1	0

Drivers

5.1 Rating of the perceived drivers for the business model:

Table 8: The table shows the average of the ratings given by the companies. 21 of the 22 companies replied.

Average perceived importance of barriers from the company's point of view (1: least important barrier, 10: most important barrier)	ESCO-companies	CMS-companies	DBFO-companies	Sharing companies	Other PSS companies	All companies
Branding/reputation	5,8	7,7*	8,3	5,7*	4,8	6,5
Earnings	7,2	6,2*	9,0*	5,3*	8,5	7,2
Savings	4,0**	10,0**	3,5*	1,0**	5,0**	4,7
Positive environmental effects	5,8	6,8*	6,0*	9,5*	6,6	7,0
Financial support from government	4,2	1,5*	1,0*	4,0*	5,3*	3,2
Regulation	4,2*	7,5*	1,5*	8,5*	5,4	5,4
Other framework conditions	10,0*		4,5*		4,0*	6,2
Other drivers?						

Note: *= only 2-3 respondents, ** = only 1 respondent

Table 9: The table shows the average of the ratings given by the companies. 21 of the 22 companies replied.

Average perceived importance of barriers from the customers point of view - the company's perception (1: least important barrier, 10: most important barrier)	ESCO-companies	CMS-companies	DBFO-companies	Sharing companies	Other PSS companies	All companies
Branding/reputation	6,6	7,5*	8,5*	9,0*	5,8	7,5
Earnings	6,5*	2,0**	9,5*	2,0*	10,0**	6,0
Savings	7,0	8,0*	5,5*	7,0*	9,3	7,4
Positive environmental effects	7,1	6,7*	6,0*	6,8*	6,2	6,6
Financial support from government	4,4	1,5*	8,0**	4,0*	6,0*	4,8
Regulation	3,4*	8,5*	3,5*	10,0**	7,6	6,6
Other framework conditions	10,0*		4,5*		4,0*	6,2
Other drivers?	8,0**				10,0**	9,0*

Note: *= only 2-3 respondents, ** = only 1 respondent

Potential

Potential for more and similar projects/cases:

Table 10: The table shows the number of companies giving each response. 21 out of 22 companies replied.

The extend to which the companies believe that there is a potential for more similar projects/cases in their own country	Very low extent	Low extent	High extent	Very high extent	I do not know
ESCO companies	0	0	1	4	0
CMS companies	0	0	2	0	0
DBFO companies	0	1	0,5	1,5	0
Sharing companies	0	0	2	2	0
Other PSS companies	0	0	3	4	0
All companies	0	1	8,5	11,5	0

Note: half scores are given when a company was thorn between two boxes.

Table 11: The table shows the number of companies giving each response. 20 out of 22 companies replied.

The extend to which the companies believe that there is a potential for more similar projects/cases in other Nordic countries	Very low extent	Low extent	High extent	Very high extent	I do not know
ESCO companies	0	0	1	3	1
CMS companies	0	0	2	0	0
DBFO companies	0	1	0,5	1,5	0
Sharing companies	1	0	1	1	0
Other PSS companies	0	1	1	5	0
All companies	1	2	5,5	10,5	1

Note: half scores are given when a company was thorn between two boxes.

6.4 Positive environmental potential affiliated with the business model:

Table 12: the table shows number of companies giving each response. 19 out of 22 companies replied.

The extend to which companies believe that there is a positive environmental potential affiliated with their respective model	Very low potential	Low potential	High potential	Very high potential	I do not know
ESCO business model companies	0	0	2,5	2,5	0
CMS business model companies	0	0	0	2	0
DBFO business model companies	0	0	1	1	0
Sharing business model companies	0	0	1	2	0
Other PSS business model companies	0	0	4	3	0
All companies	0	0	8,5	10,5	0

Note: half scores are given when a company was thorn between two boxes.