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Introduction and Background
The year 2010 is noticeable compared to other years. The worldwide financial crisis in 2008/09 caused a rethinking and shift of priorities in the companies.
FM and CSR, both cover a wide range of issues such as environment, services for employees. Buildings contribute as 40% of total global greenhouse gas emissions and the building sector has the biggest potential for delivering significant and cost-effective greenhouse gas emission reduction in western economies. According to several studies FM-services can influence the employee’s well being and the productivity, improve the image of the occupier organization and decrease costs at the same time. The hypothesis of the study is therefore that FM-activities can help to reach CSR-goals and CSR is increasing the importance of FM.

To verify or falsify the hypothesis the goals and planned actions of CSR-reports and their coherences and interactions with the activities of Facility Management (FM) were analysed. The scientific questions of this paper are: How is the interaction between CSR and FM? Do FM-activities help to achieve CSR-goals?
Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Literature Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards, Laws, Guidelines, Theories CSR/FM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of CSR goals &amp; FM tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of CSR goals &amp; standardised annotation of FM tasks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Method steps

The first step of the survey was a literature research. The literature research gives an overview of the prevalent theories, laws and standards of CSR and the actual state of CSR research in combination to FM and the development of CSR-reports in the German speaking countries (Austria, Switzerland and Germany).

In a next step the different international FM standards and the list of FM tasks within these standards were analysed to define a standardised annotation of the FM tasks.

Based on the results of the literature research, in the desktop research the following steps were carried out:

1. Analysis of 150 CSR-reports to identify the main CSR-goals and measurements of companies
2. Analysis of the coherences and interactions between CSR-goals and FM-activities according to the standardised annotation
3. Falsification or verification of hypothesis

CSR

In consequence of the economic crisis companies worldwide realize that only organizations which act in an economically, ecologically and socially responsible manner will be successful on the market in the long term. For CSR there are many definitions on the basis of international guidelines, e. g. OECD-guiding principles, CSR-guideline of the European Commission, International Standard ISO 26000 and the Green paper (COM 2001, 366) from the European Commission. The national initiative “Companies: partner to the youth” defines CSR as responsible business management and the social, ecological and economic responsibility of companies in all their business activities. This includes the Economic Value Added and also the exchange relationship between employees, suppliers, customers and the commonwealth. This definition assumes that CSR could be classified into four action fields: at the workplace, at the market, at the commonwealth and towards the environment (cf. Blanke & Dresewski, 2007, p.5). According to the European Commission, CSR is defined as a strategic initiative that should support companies to consider ecological aspects in their decisions and the way they interact with stakeholders (cf. European Commission, 2001, p.7). In the year 2011, CSR is defined by the European Commission as "the responsibility of enterprises for their impacts on society" (European Commission, 2011, p.6).

Based on these broader definitions of CSR there are three main actions fields, which could be divided into the so called “Triple-Bottom-Line-Approach” and into the social, ecological and economic dimensions. So not only the financial performance of a company is relevant, also the sustainability and the environment protection is essential.
CSR reporting
The terms Corporate Social Responsibility and sustainability are very closely interlinked, so overlaps in corporate reports are unavoidable. Ernst & Young are editors of an annual analysis on the topic reporting of Austria’s top-companies and they define integrated reports as a combination of financial and non-financial information in one report. This definition of CSR-reports/integrated report is based on a guideline of the IIRC (International Integrated Reporting Committee) (cf. International Integrated Reporting Committee, 2015). Because CSR and sustainability are core elements of company reports it seems that in many cases CSR-reports are integrated reports.

An integrated report could support companies to make sustainable decisions and to make the performance of a company more understandable for other stakeholders (cf. Madl, K., Rogl, G., Simacek, E. 2012, p.9).

There are many guidelines how corporate reporting should look like, but there exists no generally valid definition for CSR-reports or the form of such a report. The Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) is an internationally acting institution and they work together with partner platforms. The goal of the GRI is to establish framework conditions for a voluntary reporting. “With thousands of reporters in over 90 countries, GRI provides the world’s most widely used standards on sustainability reporting and disclosure” (Globalreporting, 2015). According to GRI “A sustainability report is a report published by a company or organization about the economic, environmental and social impacts caused by its everyday activities. A sustainability report also presents the organization’s values and governance model, and demonstrates the link between its strategy and its commitment to a sustainable global economy” (Globalreporting, 2015).

At the moment none of these guidelines and principles is obligatory for companies. They decide voluntarily to contribute to a better society and a cleaner environment. But stakeholders urge to implement CSR, because they want that companies act socially responsible and ecologically and economically sustainable because this is important so that the company is successful for a long term and not only for a short period. Starting from 2017 CSR-reports will also be obligatory for large scale enterprises in Europe. The consequence is that large scale companies are more and more confronted to do the reporting and in a next step to implement the measures.
As an example the total number of CSR-reports in Austria, Germany and Switzerland, that are provided at the BSD-Consulting Switzerland Platform has raised from each year to the next (Figure 2). Worldwide the number of reports rises continuously. The implementation of CSR-strategies and measures is a big challenge for the companies. CSR-reports include strategic goals of a company, which often are combined with aspects of sustainability.

**FM and FM-activities**

FM is defined as an integrated management of the workplace to enhance the performance of the organisation (cf. Choptipanich, S., 2004, p.364-372). The main issue of FM is the support function. The support function of FM for example is the coordination of physical resources, the workplace and the support of services to the user and the different types of work processes to support the core business of a company (cf. Jensen, P. A., van der Voordt, T., Coenen, C., 2012). For Europe the most common definition of Facility Management could be found in the European Norm EN 15221. It says that FM is the management of a company’s infrastructure and services. Therefore the company has to define the demand, decide if the required services should be outsourced or done internally and control the delivery. Facility managers are strategic managers of the company they represent (cf. BS EN 15221-1, 2006).

For a consistent and validated comparison of FM-activities and CSR-goals and measurements, which are defined in the CSR-reports, a standardised annotation of the FM tasks is needed. A standardised annotation is provided by several FM standards. In Europe the following are most commonly used:

- EN 15221-4 (ct. (DIN EN 15221-4, 2007)
- GEFMA 100-2 (ct. GEFMA 100-2, 2004, 2007)

The list of the FM-activities from the GEFMA 100-2 exist for the longest time and is the most common standard in Europe, as all other standards were established later. The EN 15221-4 is
the only pan European standardised annotation of FM activities but it is not translated and applied in all European countries at the moment.

So the annotation of the FM-guideline GEFMA (German Facility Management Association) 100-2 was used. The GEFMA 100-2 provides a standardised annotation of all FM tasks over the whole lifecycle of a building. This survey concentrates on the tasks that are carried out in the utilization phase of a building. The FM tasks of the utilization phase include for example the management of technical and infrastructural services, waste management, security and cleaning of an object/building and the provision of the workplace (cf. GEFMA 100-2, 2007, p.B2). This classification was used for the definition of the indicators.

Due to the selection of the GEFMA as standardised annotation of FM activities CSR-reports from German-speaking countries have been chosen as the companies from these countries issue their reports in German and are most familiar with this annotation. Therefore the mapping of CSR-goals and measurements to this annotation is easier to be validated. The study concentrates only on a few countries to guarantee significant evaluation relevance.

Survey results: CSR and FM

The main emphasis of this survey is the empirical analysis of a representative number of free accessible CSR-reports from German speaking countries. 60 CSR- and Sustainability-reports from 2014 and 90 reports from 2011 were analysed and compared with the standardised annotation of FM-activities to show the coherences and interactions between CSR and FM.

The reports were taken from the international CSR-platform Global Reporting Initiative (GRI). The selection of the reports happened at random. There was no distinction between CSR-reports, Sustainability-reports or Annual-reports with integrated CSR. The selected reports were taken from the year 2011, because in that year the European Commission published a new guideline for CSR. It was updated in 2014 as in this year the European commission announced the obligation to issue reports from 2017 on. These reports also represent the current situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Eval. in</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Eval. in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Number of selected CSR-reports from GRI 2014/2011

For 2014 compared to the total number of CSRs (CSR-reports) the sample has an evaluation relevance of 39.0% (30 from 77) for Austria (AUT) and of 22.4% (30 from 134) for Germany (GER). This means that the coverage is in both cases high but the analysis for Austria is more convincing (Table 1). From 2014 for Switzerland (CH) there are no analysed reports.

To answer the question if there are coherences between CSR- and FM-activities and which FM-activities are important and relevant for CSR, indicators for these coherences and interactions have to be defined so that in a next step these indicators could be searched in the reports. Table 2 shows the indicator of these coherences and interactions by mapping the standardised annotation of GEFMA 100-2 with goals and measurements found in the CSR-reports.
Table 2. FM-activities from GEFMA 100-2 and goals of CSR-reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FM-activities based on GEFMA 100-2</th>
<th>Goals/Measurements of CSR-reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(6150) Quality management (within FM)</td>
<td>Green Building, Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6160) Environment protection (within FM)</td>
<td>Recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6210) Floor-Space Management</td>
<td>Reduction of CO2-Emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6420) Energy Management</td>
<td>Environment Management, Climate Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6440) Waste Management</td>
<td>Energy Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6500) foster and cleaning of buildings</td>
<td>Renewable Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6870) Transport</td>
<td>Energy Efficiency, Reduction, Saving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6880) Carry out procurement</td>
<td>Energy Consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6880) Carry out procurement</td>
<td>Waste Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6880) Carry out procurement</td>
<td>Cleaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6880) Carry out procurement</td>
<td>E-Mobility, Car Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6880) Carry out procurement</td>
<td>Transport logistics, Business Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6880) Carry out procurement</td>
<td>Water and Paper Consumption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fuke, F., 2012, p.28

So whenever a goal/measurement of the CSR report was found according to table 2 the FM-activity was interrelated/mapped.

Results

The analysis of 60 CSR-reports from 2014 and 90 from 2011 shows that the word FM or the organisational unit FM is hardly mentioned in the reports. In Austria for example from the total number of 60 CSR-reports in 2014 and 2011, Facility Management is mentioned in 12 reports. But FM-activities from GEFMA 100-2 are mentioned in nearly all of the 150 reports (Table 3). The reason why FM in general is hardly mentioned in the reports is the fact that companies do not realise at the first sight that specific CSR-goals/measurements have interactions with FM-activities, which are defined in the GEFMA 100-2.

Table 3. FM- included or not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of analysed CSR-reports</th>
<th>AUT 2014</th>
<th>AUT 2011</th>
<th>GER 2014</th>
<th>GER 2011</th>
<th>Total 2014</th>
<th>Total 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUT 2014</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM included</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM-activities included (GEFMA 100-2)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The line “FM included” shows if the term FM or the organisational unit Facility Management in general is mentioned. This means that the terms FM, Facility or facility services could be found in the reports. The last line gives information about the FM-activities. The percentage represents if any of the CSR goal/measurements from Table 2 was mentioned. The difference
between the table “FM included” and “FM-activities included (GEFMA 100-2)” is that reports which include FM-activities from the GEFMA 100-2 have clearly mentioned terms defined in table 2. The table above shows that there are no differences between Austria and Germany, or between the years.

Figure 4 shows the same criteria like in Table 3, but divided in various sectors.

![Figure 3. FM included, per sector](image)

The cross-sectoral comparison shows the same results as Table 3. FM is hardly mentioned in the reports but we can find that FM-activities are included in nearly every report. The real estate and financial sector show most of the reports, which mention FM. Companies of the construction-, transport- and food- sector never mention FM in their CSR-reports.

### Table 4. FM-activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEFMA 100-2</th>
<th>FM Activities in Analyzed CSRs</th>
<th>AUT 2014</th>
<th>in %</th>
<th>AUT 2011</th>
<th>in %</th>
<th>GER 2014</th>
<th>in %</th>
<th>GER 2011</th>
<th>in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6160)</td>
<td>Environment, CO2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6420)</td>
<td>Energy Efficiency</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6440)</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6870)</td>
<td>Travel, Carpool</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6880)</td>
<td>Water, Paper</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6150)</td>
<td>Green Building</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6500)</td>
<td>Cleaning</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6210)</td>
<td>Space Efficiency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows the FM-activities according to the GEFMA 100-2. The line “FM-Activities in Analyzed CSR-reports” shows if any FM-activities of GEFMA 100-2 are also goals of the CSR-reports. In Austria for the year 2014, 96.7% of the analysed CSR-reports mention FM-activities.
as goals, 100% of the German CSR-reports from 2011 and 2014 included FM-activities of the GEMFA 100-2. The highest number of nominations as CSR goal has reached the FM activity “(6160 | Environment, CO2)”, closely followed by the FM-activity “(6420 | Energy Efficiency)” and “(6440 | Waste)”. These two topics are also core tasks of FM according to the European standard EN 15221-4 or GEFMA 100. The reduction of water and paper consumption is a main goal of CSR and FM either.

The FM-activities “(6210 | Space Efficiency)” and “(6150 | Green Building)” have the lowest number of occurrence. This shows that the reports are not drafted by Facility Managers as this activity has a direct impact on CO2 emission and energy consumption. Every square meter that is not needed reduces CO2 emission and energy demand. The ranking of the FM-activities are congruent in the year 2014 and 2011.

The results of Table 4 validate the hypothesis that FM can help to realise the CSR-goals to a large extent.

Conclusion
Because of the increasing scarcity of resources and the climate change, topics like CSR and sustainability are gaining importance. The boom of CSR-reports shows that companies, especially large scale enterprises, are anxious for implementing CSR-concepts. The results of the analysis of 150 CSR-reports from the period 2011 to 2014, from Germany, Switzerland and Austria show a very high coherence and interaction between CSR- and FM-goals. The most mentioned CSR-goals related to Facility Management are CO2 reduction, resource saving, energy reduction and the reduction of commodities (paper, water). All these variables are mentioned in the analysed CSR-reports. Many CSR-topics are not considered as FM-topics at first glance, but a more detailed analysis shows that FM-activities are included in many CSR-reports. Nearly every CSR-report from the survey contains FM-related activities. The reason why FM in general is not directly mentioned in the reports is for sure that companies do not associate the included CSR-goals with FM-activities. Both management strategies pursue the objective of sustainable and corporate governance. To achieve these goals, an intensive cooperation between CSR and FM is necessary.

Fact is that at the moment the C-suite interrelate FM mainly with maintenance and cost reduction. Facility Managers have to change this perception. An actual survey from the IFM (Department IFM - Real Estate and Facility Management) of the Vienna University of Technology shows that a change is happening – during the last years cost reduction in the FM-sector was paramount (cf. Redlein & Zobl, 2014, p.26). Today the goals of FM-departments are – in addition to cost transparency and cost reduction – sustainability, quality assurance and environmental protection. FM could influence CSR directly by measures like the reduction of greenhouse gas emission, refuse management and the sustainable use of resources. The function of facility managers is to ensure the performance of a building. The facility manager is responsible for the interior of the property. This includes the usage and implementation of CO2 neutral technologies. A further task of facility managers is to find out how and if different services influence the success of the sustainability balance, core processes and the products of a company. Facility Management caused real estate-related cost-savings of 30 to 50% and a reduction of energy costs up to 80%. The possibility that FM has an influence on CSR-strategies and measurements of a company for example by the optimisation of the usage or by saving space is very important but not recognised in the CSR strategies. FM-activities have a high significance for CSR and sustainability. With these tasks FM achieves a high sustainability effect and could help to bring forward social responsibility. Facility Managers
have to analyse the CSR-reports of their companies and offer the board projects that help to reach these goals. Facility Managers should take the chance to act actively in this field as a strategic partner. So FM can also add value to society, in terms of sustainability, environmental protection and CSR. Then FM will also be mentioned directly in the CSR-reports. Otherwise they are only vicarious agents or data providers.

The current survey shows the coherences between FM-activities and CSR for German-speaking countries. The survey focused on these countries where the GEFMA 100-2 is the most used standardised annotation of FM tasks and therefore the mapping of CSR-goals and measurements to this annotation is easier to be validated. The reason why the study concentrates only on a few countries (Germany, Austria, and Switzerland) is to guarantee significant evaluation relevance.

At the moment it seems that very high coherences and interactions between CSR-goals and FM-activities are not only a phenomenon in the European countries. To validate this hypothesis, CSR-reports worldwide, from different countries should be analysed and compared.
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