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In November 2017, Cam Baty sat in the sun on a veranda soaking up the European countryside. He and his wife, Karina Birch, had taken a well-deserved sabbatical from their life as co-owners of Rocky Mountain Soap Company (RMSC), based in Canmore, Alberta.

Despite being an ocean away, Baty accepted a webchat invitation and began an interview about RMSC’s path ahead. RMSC was committed to sustainability, and both he and Birch felt strongly about continuing to provide toxin-free, 100 per cent natural bath and body products. They also were intent on finding a way to make their product packaging more closely mirror their values: “At the end of the day we believe in our business. . . . Our product is 100 per cent natural and nobody can touch us on that. . . . We have tried to build sustainability in our built environment, and the next step is to build it into our packaging.”

While laudable, RMSC’s commitment to sustainability was not straightforward, especially given the intensifying competition in the personal care retail sector. As a still-growing company, how could RMSC ensure that its focus on sustainability remained central to how it did business? And, maybe more importantly, what investments would the company need to make in order to help customers support RMSC as an organization that went beyond greenwashed marketing to deliver both a product and packaging that truly aligned with a sustainability consciousness?

ROCKY MOUNTAIN SOAP COMPANY: THE ORGANIZATION

History

Tricia Pearson founded RMSC in 1995 but put the business up for sale a few years later when her husband received an overseas job transfer. In 2000, the company and its single 300-square-foot location was purchased for CA$45,000[[1]](#endnote-1) by regular customer and business graduate Birch and her then boyfriend Baty, also a business graduate. During that first year, Birch and a team of her friends could be found making the soaps on a hot plate in the back of the store and affixing printed labels with a glue stick.

Since that first humble year, however, Birch and Baty watched as annual sales rose to more than $10 million (see Exhibit 1). By 2017, RMSC had more than 700 wholesale accounts and had expanded into six major retail markets, with seven of its 11 stores located in Alberta. Also in 2017, Baty and Birch had their eyes set on a Yonge Street location in Toronto and had plans to open a storefront in Ottawa.

RMSC’s impressive growth landed the company in a market alongside much larger industry players that had deep resource pools to draw from. Baty explained:

We used to be the mom and pop [store] in Canmore, but now we’re playing against the big guys from all over the world: The Body Shop, Lush, Sage, Kiehl’s. . . . Now there’s [sic] 10 players in our category and it’s extremely competitive. . . . We really have to be good to differentiate ourselves. We’re really still an infant business with infant skills.

Feeling their way into a differentiation strategy took time, and it was not until about 2003 that Birch and Baty decided to include only 100 per cent natural ingredients in their products, a strategic decision that moved RMSC away from being a mere producer and retailer toward becoming an outward representation of a value system and informed lifestyle choice.

Natural Innovation

Birch and Baty believed that “with fewer ingredients, you obtain higher quality.” Thus, they focused on their products comprising 10 or fewer ingredients and locally sourced whenever possible. Additionally, they published two lists: a “Green List” of their 21 top natural or organic ingredients, many of which were sourced from local grocery and restaurant suppliers, and a “Red List” of 21 products that RMSC would “never put in anything they make.” Their commitment was to provide customers with therapeutic and toxin-free products that could go onto the skin and into the body without contributing to anyone’s “body burden” (which RMSC defined as the number of toxins that have been absorbed and stored in body tissues).

RMSC’s product design process, which Birch oversaw, primarily relied on customers and employees presenting a strong case for bringing a new product to market. Once a product idea was approved by Birch, she then worked with an on-staff chemist to develop product formulations and essential oil blends to ensure the safety of the product. Ensuring product safety meant that the product was tested—repeatedly—on Baty, Birch, their kids, store managers, and employees before it was ever sold to customers. For example, before a single salt scrub actually launched, RMSC insiders thoroughly tested each of its 17 different formulations.

While RMSC’s “tested on owners, not animals” approach was a protest against animal testing, it also meant more. RMSC believed that if all body care companies would use only toxin-free ingredients, then the entire industry would completely eliminate the need to test on animals. RMSC also asserted that non-toxic body care products served to protect natural habitats and aquatic life after the products went down the drain and re-entered the natural environment. The co-owners’ goal was to change the industry as a whole so that it took care of animals and their habitats. They conscientiously worked to make “100 per cent natural” an environmentally and socially conscious choice for all consumers, not just RMSC customers.

Manufacturing

To ensure high quality, RMSC formulated and manufactured its own products in its Canmore workshop, a 16,000-square-foot “green” space that welcomed visitors who could see first-hand how products were made and how RMSC’s different departments worked together to conduct business.

In planning for the facility expansion, which took place in 2015, Baty and Birch were intentional in designing a manufacturing space that aligned with their commitment to being 100 per cent natural and eco-friendly. Following through with that intention, they purchased and renovated a used building rather than constructing a new one. Whenever possible, they also reused existing furnaces, insulation, lighting, doors, bathroom fixtures, and kitchen cabinets. Reclaimed wood was chosen for all millwork and studs, and all lighting was obtained from reclaimed sources. Solar electricity was added, low-VOC (volatile organic compound) paint was used, and recycled fibre carpeting was installed. Desks were constructed from birch plywood rather than laminates, tables were made from barn fir, and marble countertops were fashioned from slabs that once dressed the outside of a Toronto office tower.

The expanded workshop allowed RMSC to keep the small-batch processing Baty and Birch believed was integral to the consistent manufacture of high-quality products while providing enough space for the operation to triple in size before they needed to consider another facility. And, while Baty admits that their expansion approach was more expensive than the other avenues they considered (most specifically, relocating manufacturing operations to his hometown of Winnipeg, where real estate and development costs were significantly lower than in the resort community of Canmore), the decision to keep operations “nestled in the heart of the snow-capped Canadian Rockies” made sense from both an ethical and branding perspective. Baty fittingly affirmed, “We are the Rocky Mountain Soap Company, after all.”

Corporate Culture

In 2012, RMSC was recognized as one of Canada’s 10 Most Admired Corporate Cultures.[[2]](#endnote-2) This prestigious award was created to celebrate and advance “best-in-class Canadian organizations for having cultures that have helped them enhance performance and sustain a competitive advantage.”[[3]](#endnote-3)

In line with the criteria for this award, RMSC identified five key values that helped drive its business practices:

* *Positivitude*—RMSC coined this word to amalgamate positivity and attitude. RMSC believed that the more positive energy that people experienced, the healthier and happier they would be.
* *Be Kind*—RMSC invited its staff to consider the impact of their actions on those around them: “In the hardest moments it’s not what you do, but how you do it.”
* *Customer Service Is an Extreme Sport*—According to RMSC, providing great service required creativity, focus, and a solid game plan, all built from sharp skills and meaningful relationships.
* *Cultivate Team Spirit*—“Never leaving anyone behind” was the summary principle. RMSC advocated open and honest communication, respect, and positivity as methods to build team trust and create unity around shared objectives.
* *Give It a Go*—This final value referred to the use of innovation, adventure, courage, curiosity, open-mindedness, flexibility, and imagination.

These values stemmed from Baty and Birch’s general leadership approach to dismantling barriers between management and employees. To demonstrate their commitment to sharing RMSC’s successes with their employees, Baty and Birch drew on WestJet’s model and implemented their own profit-sharing program.

THE SKINCARE INDUSTRY

The retail market of skincare products included products formulated for facial care, body care, hand care, make-up removal, and depilatories (hair removers). Facial care, body care, and hand care made up 96 per cent of the skincare market in 2017 (see Exhibit 2).

The Personal Products Council, a trade association for the cosmetics and personal-care products industry with more than 600 member companies, reported annual industry revenue of more than US$250 billion worldwide for 2016.[[4]](#endnote-4) Furthermore, the global market for this sector was expected to increase between 3.5 per cent and 4.5 per cent to reach a forecasted total market value of US$500 billion by 2020.[[5]](#endnote-5)

Industry Trends and Opportunities

RMSC was growing amid rapidly changing trends in the personal care product industry, including increased demand for organic and natural products, new target markets, and new distribution channels.

Increased Demand for Organic and Natural Products

Consumers had begun to draw connections between toxic chemicals and health, which led to a realignment in the personal care market.[[6]](#endnote-6) Even though natural and organic products were generally 30–50 per cent more expensive than traditional products, this segment’s consumer base was growing. In response, large manufacturers were trying to enter this growing market by buying smaller, natural brand companies like RMSC.[[7]](#endnote-7)

New Target Markets

Historically, the primary target market for personal care products had been women. However, statistics revealed that 52 per cent of global male consumers considered their looks and appearance to be either important or very important, and 29 per cent touched up their look throughout the day.[[8]](#endnote-8) Not surprisingly then, the men’s personal care market was expected to grow to US$166 billion worldwide by 2022, translating to an exceptional compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 5.4 per cent from 2016 to 2022.[[9]](#endnote-9)

New Distribution Channels

In 2016, consumers were 37 per cent more likely to buy products such as soap bars and shaving cream on Amazon.com, Inc. (Amazon) in 2016 than they were in 2015.[[10]](#endnote-10) By leveraging e-commerce distribution, smaller companies could compete with established players, particularly by posting product reviews, creating positive customer experiences, and providing community engagement forums.

The Natural and Organic Personal Care Market

Consumers’ purchase behaviours for natural and organic skin and hair care products were influenced by three main factors: health consciousness, environmental consciousness, and appearance consciousness. The term “health consciousness” referred to consumers’ desire to actively seek a healthy lifestyle, and environmental consciousness referred to consumers' preference to purchase products that had a minimal impact on the environment. Lastly, appearance consciousness referred to consumers’ perception that chemical-free products would be more likely to help them externalize an internal image of being both health conscious and environmentally conscious.[[11]](#endnote-11) Although the natural and organic personal care market was a small market segment, increasing demand from consumers and growing awareness were expected to drive the global natural and organic personal care market to an estimated value of US$22 billion by the end of 2024, based on a CAGR of 8.8 per cent. North America was expected to dominate the market with a 33.5 per cent global market share, registering a CAGR of 9.7 per cent.[[12]](#endnote-12)

Competitors

At the time that RMSC was contemplating changes to its product packaging, the natural and organic personal care market appeared to be highly fragmented and intensely competitive. Brands were working to differentiate their images and products by competing on the basis of product, cost, and even packaging. Key global players in the same market included Estée Lauder Companies Inc.; L’Oréal Group (L’Oréal); L’Occitane en Provence; The Body Shop International Limited (The Body Shop); Burt’s Bees, Inc. (Burt’s Bees); and Kiehl’s LLC (Kiehl’s).[[13]](#endnote-13) However, considering RMSC’s geographic location and primary product line, the most relevant competitors were Lush Retail Ltd. (Lush), Kiehl’s, Burt’s Bees, and The Body Shop.

Lush

Founded in 1994, Lush was a UK-based firm that focused on using fresh and natural ingredients.[[14]](#endnote-14) In 2016, the company generated US$900 million in sales, which represented an increase of 26 per cent from the previous year.[[15]](#endnote-15) By 2017, Lush had opened approximately 250 stores in North America with products being made primarily in two Canadian factories. To offer some context, workers in these factories hand-made roughly 500 fist-sized bath bombs per day.[[16]](#endnote-16)

Lush’s focuses included (1) fighting animal testing, (2) providing the freshest cosmetics online, (3) practising ethical buying, (4) providing 100 per cent vegetarian products, (5) building products by hand, and (6) using “naked packaging” as often as possible. To reduce packaging waste, 35 per cent of its products (e.g., solid shampoo bars and massage bars) were unpackaged, with the remaining product line packaged using recycled and recyclable materials.[[17]](#endnote-17)

Kiehl’s

Kiehl’s began as a New York pharmacy in 1851 and had been developing and marketing efficient, highly concentrated skin care from natural ingredients ever since. By 2017, it surpassed sales of US$1 billion.[[18]](#endnote-18)

The company focused on three pillars: quality, service, and community.[[19]](#endnote-19) Until 2015, the company had donated approximately US$3.5 million to charities related to its three core initiatives: environmental sustainability, HIV (human immunodeficiency virus) protection and education, and children’s well-being.[[20]](#endnote-20) Recently, Kiehl’s had partnered with Academy Award-winning actor Matthew McConaughey to benefit Autism Speaks, a global leader in autism advocacy. Each time someone shared Kiehl’s awareness video, Kiehl’s donated US$1, up to a maximum of US$200,000, to autism advocacy. To further support the cause, the company released a Kiehl’s x Matthew McConaughey Limited Edition Ultra Facial Cream.[[21]](#endnote-21)

In addition, Kiehl’s had a program called “Recycle and Be Rewarded” that provided customers with a complimentary product when they returned 10 empty bottles of Kiehl’s products.[[22]](#endnote-22)

Burt’s Bees

Acquired by The Clorox Company in 2007, US-based Burt’s Bees was originally founded in 1984 and was a prominent role model for this market sector. In 2008, the company collaborated with the Natural Products Association to develop the Natural Standard for Personal Care Products, and in 2011, the ImagePower Green Brands Survey identified Burt’s Bees as the number one green brand as perceived by US consumers.[[23]](#endnote-23)

A member of the Sustainable Packaging Coalition, Burt’s Bees had committed to the highest standards of package development and actively developed innovative sustainable packaging solutions including TerraSkin wraps, an environmentally friendly, treeless, and bleach-free paper alternative the company used to package its bar soaps.[[24]](#endnote-24)

The Body Shop

Established in 1976, the UK cosmetics chain was purchased by L’Oréal in 2006 and sold for US$1.1 billion in 2017. The Body Shop’s new owner, Natura, was a Brazilian cosmetics group considered to be a pioneer in nature-inspired products, personalized service, and ethical business. The acquisition provided Natura with more than 3,000 stores in 66 countries, the corporate infrastructure to test its local expertise at a global level,[[25]](#endnote-25) and sales of more than US$1 billion.[[26]](#endnote-26) The core values of the business included (1) supporting community fair trade, (2) activating self-esteem, (3) defending human rights, (4) eliminating animal testing, and (5) protecting the planet.[[27]](#endnote-27)

In 2016, The Body Shop introduced a new commitment, Enrich Not Exploit, which aimed to protect and enhance the planet and its people. The Enrich Not Exploit initiative introduced new packaging designs for all 905 full-sized products and for more than 100 trial-size and travel-size products with the goal that, by 2020, 70 per cent of product packaging would not contain plastics made from oil. To achieve this goal, The Body Shop partnered with Newlight Technology to develop packaging using AirCarbon, a thermoplastic made from pollutant gases—carbon dioxide and methane. The Body Shop claimed that it was the first within the beauty industry to commercialize the use of AirCarbon[[28]](#endnote-28) and saw the move as an outward commitment toward the principle of “keeping fossil fuels in the ground.”[[29]](#endnote-29)

SUSTAINABLE PACKAGING

One of the fastest-growing influences on consumers’ purchasing behaviour were the sustainability claims that were made by companies.[[30]](#endnote-30) In 2015, Nielsen conducted an online survey of 30,000 consumers in 60 countries to assess how sustainability influenced purchasing decisions. At that time, customers weighed environmentally friendly packaging as driving 41 per cent of their purchase behaviour, the same rank they afforded products made by companies known for their commitment to community (see Exhibit 3 for a full list of customer responses).

Perhaps in response to changing consumer behaviours that valued sustainability, companies began including environmentally responsible packaging as a part of their standard practice and sustainability goals, pushing the sustainable packaging industry toward the forecasted value of US$244 billion in 2018.[[31]](#endnote-31) Sustainable packaging referred, in general, to the use of materials and manufacturing methods that had a positive impact on the environment and on people. The Sustainable Packaging Coalition’s (SPC’s) definition for sustainable packaging focused on eight equally weighted criteria:[[32]](#endnote-32)

* is beneficial, safe, and healthy for individuals and communities throughout its life cycle,
* meets market criteria for performance and cost,
* is sourced, manufactured, transported, and recycled using renewable energy,
* optimizes the use of renewable or recycled source materials,
* is manufactured using clean production technologies and best practices,
* is made from materials healthy throughout the life cycle,
* is physically designed to optimize materials and energy, and
* is effectively recovered and utilized in biological and/or industrial closed loop cycles

Packaging for RMSC

From the beginning, Birch and Baty had embedded economic, social, and environmental logic into RMSC’s business and manufacturing operations. Waste reduction and sustainability efforts included simple measures, such as reducing and simplifying product packaging, and more complex decisions, such as abandoning traditional plastic-based shipping peanuts in favour of an edible corn starch version. In an interview with *Forbes*, Birch explained: “It just makes sense. We work hard to make sure that our product is clean, 10 ingredients or less [sic], that our stores and offices are eco-friendly. It’s only natural that we try to limit our impact in the packaging department as well.”[[33]](#endnote-33)

As Birch and Baty decided how to solve the problem of unsustainable packaging, they considered at least three possible avenues: reduce, recycle, or refill.

Reduce

Reducing package material content and eliminating unnecessary design work on packages could be both earth-friendly and cost-saving. To date, RMSC had used minimal packaging for soap and had removed extraneous elements from other personal care products. Further reductions were best thought to be done “one step at a time” where customers and staff would have the opportunity to contribute to the unfolding of new package strategies.

Recycle

Recycling was considered a way to address package waste but was generally neither convenient nor profitable. Many sources of personal care packaging were comprised of blended materials that were not easily separated, making recycling virtually impossible, especially when leftover product remained in the tube or container. Furthermore, the high costs for collection, separation, and processing made traditional disposal methods (i.e., landfill or incineration) the most economically viable options.[[34]](#endnote-34)

Nonetheless, to facilitate recycling, RMSC designed packaging from simple materials that did not require extensive disassembly prior to being recycled. The company also coloured its packaging with natural inks that would not release toxins into the environment.

Further, RMSC promoted “upcycling,” a way of recycling that used an unwanted item to create a product of higher quality or higher value than the original.[[35]](#endnote-35) For example, in 2016, RMSC worked with the SPC in the United States and a Chicago-based supplier to develop a paper-based, compostable pot that was robust enough for packaging waxy substances, such as lipsticks. RMSC used this packaging, made from the fibres of recycled materials and post-consumer waste, to launch its Lip Quench product. The RMSC website showed how, once empty, the Lip Quench package could be upcycled into a plant pot used to start seedlings.[[36]](#endnote-36) Later, this packaging would become Forest Stewardship Council-certified.[[37]](#endnote-37)

Although this innovative packaging aligned with RMSC values, developing and sourcing it had been cost and time intensive. At a cost of $2.50 per unit, the compostable packaging for Lip Quench comprised 72 per cent of the cost of goods sold (COGS) and 18 per cent of the retail price. RMSC’s average packaging costs were 36 per cent of COGS and 4 per cent of retail price. Traditional plastic packaging would have cost only $0.56 per unit (see Exhibit 4).

Refill

RMSC considered two refill strategies. The first was to create milk carton packaging that would function as a refill for liquid products such as shampoo, conditioner, body wash, and liquid soap. RMSC’s current refill bottle was made of highly recyclable plastic, but Baty and Birch believed that a cardboard solution would be better. They had approached a packager to help develop a carton but were having difficulty finding a closure that would prevent soap and essential oils from leaking out and an exterior coating that could effectively resist water. These research and development efforts were expensive, and as a small company, RMSC had limited bargaining power and no economy of scale to leverage.

For the second strategy, RMSC considered splitting the product containers into an outer component and an inner component. The outer container would be designed to house an inner insert, which would contain the product. Because RMSC used glass jars for products in its skincare line and the glass industry was energy intensive,[[38]](#endnote-38) providing customers with a cardboard or plastic insert option could effectively reduce waste and decrease the amount of energy required to transport materials (cardboard was significantly lighter than glass). Customer reactions to this approach remained unclear, as did the total cost of redesigning current packaging to accommodate an insert option.

CONCLUSION

Birch and Baty knew that decisions about how to build greater sustainability into RMSC’s packaging would be waiting for them as soon as they returned home from Europe. They recognized how important these efforts were for their company, but also saw how RMSC’s progress could motivate a new industry precedent that would benefit businesses, people, and the environment in the long term. Yet, none of these initiatives would matter if the expense of pursuing them put the company at risk: financial viability was a prerequisite for a business pursuing environmental and social stewardship.

What should Birch and Baty do? How could they use the resources available to develop a packaging solution that aligned with RMSC’s brand focus of “100 per cent natural”? Were there other options to consider? Was there someone they could bring on board to help? In general, how could they find the support they needed?

Baty knew that improved packaging would happen only if he and Birch forced it to happen, at least initially. His mind began filling with potential solutions. Baty’s eyes turned toward the patio table, landing first on a pen and some paper, and then on a tube of natural sunscreen. The choice was simple: sunscreen first, pen second.
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EXHIBIT 1: Rocky Mountain Soap Company REVENUE GROWTH, 2013–2019 (Revenue in THOUSANDS of CA$)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **FY13** | **FY14** | **FY15** | **FY16** | **FY17\*** | **FY18\*** | **FY19\*** |
| Total Revenue | 7,139 | 7,552 | 8,509 | 9,836 | 10,911 | 11,944 | 13,883 |
| LTR % | 32.3% | 31.1% | 30.5% | 33.9% | 32.8% | 36.3% | 36.5% |
| COGS % | 28.6% | 29.2% | 31.2% | 31.3% | 24.0% | 28.8% | 27.8% |
| OH % | 20.2% | 23.3% | 24.5% | 23.5% | 25.3% | 25.4% | 22.0% |
| R&D % | 3.0% | 3.0% | 2.5% | 2.3% | 2.5% | 2.9% | 2.7% |

Note: FY = fiscal year; LTR = loan to revenue (also referred to as debt to income); COGS = cost of goods sold; OH = overhead; R&D = research and development; \*FY17–FY19 are estimates.

Source: Compiled by authors based on company data.

EXHIBIT 2: 2017 GLOBAL SKINCARE PRODUCTS MARKET CATEGORY SEGMENTATION

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Value (in US$ billions)** | **%** |
| Facial Care | 97.4 | 80.5 |
| Body Care | 15.6 | 13.0 |
| Hand Care | 3.1 | 2.5 |
| Make-up Remover | 2.3 | 2.0 |
| Depilatories | 2.3 | 2.0 |
| Total | 120.7 | 100.0 |

Source: Reformatted by the authors from Marketline, “Global Skincare,” 2, MarketLine Industry Profile, 2018.

EXHIBIT 3: NIELSEN RESEARCH ON HOW SUSTAINABILITY INFLUENCES CONSUMERS’ PURCHASing INTENT

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key purchasing drivers as weighted by all survey respondents** | |
| The products are made by a brand or company that I trust | 62% |
| The product is known for its health & wellness benefits | 59% |
| The product is made from fresh, natural, or organic ingredients | 57% |
| The product is from a company known for being environmentally friendly | 45% |
| The product is from a company known for its commitment to social value | 43% |
| The product’s packaging is environmentally friendly | 41% |
| The product is from a company known for its commitment to my community | 41% |
| I saw an ad on television about the social or environmental good the product’s company is doing | 34% |

Source: Reformatted by the authors from Nielsen, *The Sustainability Imperative. New Insights on Consumer Expectations*, October 2015, accessed November 22, 2017, www.nielsen.com/content/dam/nielsenglobal/dk/docs/global-sustainability-report-oct-2015.pdf?afflt=ntrt15340001&afflt\_uid=oB7cx5Vqojc.7kTBloThxcFQfMbv5bHjKFtN7-7s9F2r&afflt\_uid\_2=AFFLT\_ID\_2.

EXHIBIT 4: Rocky Mountain Soap Company’S PACKAGING OPTIONS—TRADITIONAL VERSUS SUSTAINABLE LIPSTICK

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Conventional Lipstick with Traditional Packaging** | **Lip Quench with Sustainable Packaging** |
| Retail Price | $14.00 | $14.00 |
| Total COGS | $1.55 | $3.49 |
| COGS as a % of Retail Price | 11% | 25% |
| Packaging Cost | $0.56 | $2.50 |
| As a % of Retail Price | 4% | 18% |
| As a % of COGS | 36% | 72% |

Note: COGS = cost of goods sold

Source: Compiled by authors based on company data.
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