DOI 10.33111/vz_kneu.33.23.04.17.117.123
УДК: 338

Шергіна Лідія А.
кандидат економічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри бізнес-економіки та підприємництва,
Київський національний економічний університет імені Вадима Гетьмана
ORCID: 0000-0001-9031-0616
Рєпін Кирило С.
аспірант кафедри бізнес-економіки та підприємництва,
Київський національний економічний університет імені Вадима Гетьмана
ORCID: 0000-0002-8741-5342

ЕКОУПАКОВКА: ОЦІНКА СПОЖИВЧИХ КАПІТАЛІВ ТА ЕФЕКТИВНОСТІ УПРАВЛІННЯ ПРОЄКТАМИ

Shergina Lidia
Ph.D., Associate Professor,
Associate Professor department of Business Economics and Entrepreneurship
KNEU named after Vadym Hetman
ORCID: 0000-0001-9031-0616
Riepin Kirill
Ph.D Student
Kyiv National Economic University named after Hetman
ORCID: 0000-0002-8741-5342

ECO-PACKAGING: ASSESSING CONSUMER CAPITAL ASSETS AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS

Анотація. У відповідь на зростаючу важливість сталого розвитку в бізнес-ландшафті це дослідження пропонує комплексну систему показників, спрямованих на оцінку споживчих капітальних активів і ефективності управління проєктами в контексті виведення на ринок нових продуктів, з особливим акцентом на еко-упаковку. Сьогодні підприємства стикаються з гострою потребою включати екологічно чисті практики в процеси розробки своїх продуктів, а також гарантувати, що їхні ініціативи позитивно резонують із споживачами. Це дослідження вирішує цю проблему, розробляючи надійну структуру для оцінки впливу ініціатив з екоупаковки на капітальні активи споживачів, такі як лояльність до бренду, довіру та задоволення, а також показники ефективності управління проєктами, включаючи час, вартість і якість. Для побудови цієї інноваційної основи було застосовано змішаний підхід, що поєднує ретельний огляд літератури, глибокі експертні інтерв'ю та всебічне опитування споживачів. Завдяки об'єднанню цих різноманітних методологій це дослідження мало на меті створити комплексну та адаптовану систему показників, яка охоплює багатогранні аспекти сталого розвитку продукту. Запропонована система показників не лише надає підприємствам практичний інструмент для оцінки ефективності їхніх стратегій екоупаковки, але й пропонує засоби для покращення розуміння поведінки та переваг споживачів у сфері сталого розвитку. Визначивши ключові напрямки вдосконалення та успіху, компанії можуть адаптувати свої ініціативи щодо екоупакування, щоб тісніше відповідати очікуванням споживачів, тим самим сприяючи більшій лояльності та довірі до бренду. Крім того, система дозволяє детально оцінювати ефективність управління проєктами, дозволяючи підприємствам оптимізувати

свої процеси, скоротити час виходу на ринок, контролювати витрати та покращити загальну якість продукції. Результати цього дослідження принесуть значну користь підприємствам, які прагнуть інтегрувати стійкість у свої основні стратегії. Пропонуючи всебічну та деталізовану оцінку впливу ініціатив з екоупакування, це дослідження дає можливість підприємствам приймати обґрунтовані рішення, підвищуючи як свою екологічну відповідальність, так і свою конкурентну перевагу на ринку. Завдяки цілісному підходу, який враховує складну взаємодію споживчого сприйняття та ефективності управління проєктами, це дослідження дає цінну інформацію в сферах маркетингу, сталого розвитку та управління проєктами.
***Ключові слова**:* інструменти маркетингу, споживчі капітальні активи, екологічний маркетинг, впровадження нового продукту, екоупаковка, стійкість, бренд, сталий розвиток, задоволеність, підхід змішаних методів, опитування споживачів, оцінка впливу, процеси розробки продукту

***Abstract**:* In response to the growing importance of sustainability in the business landscape, this study proposes a comprehensive system of indicators aimed at evaluating consumer capital assets and project management effectiveness within the context of introducing new products to the market, with a specific focus on eco-packaging. Businesses today face a pressing need to incorporate eco-friendly practices into their product development processes while also ensuring their initiatives resonate positively with consumers. This study addresses this challenge by developing a robust framework to assess the impact of eco-packaging initiatives on consumer capital assets, such as brand loyalty, trust, and satisfaction, as well as project management effectiveness metrics, including time, cost, and quality. To construct this innovative framework, a mixed-methods approach was employed, combining a thorough literature review, insightful expert interviews, and a comprehensive survey of consumers. By integrating these diverse methodologies, this study aimed to create a well-rounded and adaptable system of indicators that captures the multifaceted aspects of sustainable product development. The proposed system of indicators not only provides businesses with a practical tool for evaluating the effectiveness of their eco-packaging strategies but also offers a means to enhance their understanding of consumer behavior and preferences in the realm of sustainability. By identifying key areas of improvement and success, businesses can tailor their eco-packaging initiatives to align more closely with consumer expectations, thereby fostering greater brand loyalty and trust. Moreover, the framework enables a detailed assessment of project management effectiveness, allowing businesses to optimize their processes, reduce time-to-market, control costs, and enhance overall product quality. The results of this study are poised to significantly benefit businesses seeking to integrate sustainability into their core strategies. By offering a comprehensive and nuanced evaluation of the impact of eco-packaging initiatives, this research empowers businesses to make informed decisions, enhancing both their environmental responsibility and their competitive advantage in the market. Through a holistic approach that considers the intricate interplay of consumer perceptions and project management efficiency, this study contributes valuable insights to the fields of marketing, sustainable development, and project management.
***Key words**:* marketing tools, consumer capital assets, ecological marketing, new product introduction, eco-packaging, sustainability, brand, susrainable development, satisfaction, mixed-methods approach, consumer survey, impact assessment, product development processes

In today's world, businesses are increasingly recognizing the importance of sustainability and the need to consider environmental impact in their product development processes. One important aspect of this is eco-packaging, which refers to the use of packaging materials and designs that minimize environmental impact. However, it is also important for businesses to consider the impact of their eco-packaging initiatives on their consumer capital assets and project management effectiveness. To address this need, a study proposes the development of a comprehensive system of indicators for assessing consumer capital assets and project management effectiveness in introducing new products to the market, with a focus on eco-packaging.[2] The proposed system of indicators considers various aspects of consumer capital assets, including brand loyalty, trust, and satisfaction, as well as project management effectiveness, including time, cost, and quality.

The study employs a mixed-methods approach to develop and validate the proposed system of indicators. This approach includes a literature review, expert interviews, and a survey of consumers. The results of this study will provide businesses with a tool to assess the impact of their eco-packaging initiatives on consumer capital assets and project management effectiveness, and to improve their product development processes accordingly. By implementing the proposed system of indicators, businesses can gain valuable insights into the impact of their eco-packaging initiatives on consumer behavior, attitudes, and perceptions [7, p.389]. They can also identify areas where project management processes can be improved to optimize time, cost, and quality outcomes. Ultimately, the development of a comprehensive system of indicators can help businesses balance the need for sustainability with the need to maintain consumer capital assets and project management effectiveness in introducing new products to the market.

One of the key benefits of the proposed system of indicators is that it provides a comprehensive view of the impact of eco-packaging on the business, considering both the consumer perspective and the project management perspective [9, p.440]. This can help businesses identify areas of improvement and optimize their eco-packaging initiatives for maximum impact. For example, by analyzing the results of the survey of consumers, businesses can gain insights into how eco-packaging affects brand loyalty, trust, and satisfaction. They can identify which specific aspects of eco-packaging are most important to consumers and adjust their packaging initiatives accordingly. In addition, by analyzing project management data, businesses can identify areas where improvements can be made to streamline the product development process and reduce costs [11, p.68; 14, p. 78].

The proposed system of indicators also has the potential to contribute to the development of industry standards for eco-packaging. By providing a comprehensive framework for assessing the impact of eco-packaging on consumer capital assets and project management effectiveness, the system can help establish benchmarks for sustainable packaging practices [17, p. 1012]. This can ultimately benefit both businesses and consumers by promoting sustainable practices and reducing the environmental impact of product development.

The development of a comprehensive system of indicators for assessing consumer capital assets and project management effectiveness in introducing new products to the market with a focus on eco-packaging is an important step towards promoting sustainability and improving business practices [17, p. 1009]. By providing a framework for evaluating the impact of eco-packaging initiatives, businesses can optimize their product development processes and maintain consumer trust, loyalty, and satisfaction. Moreover, the proposed system has the potential to contribute to the development of industry standards for eco-packaging, promoting sustainable practices and reducing environmental impact.

Cost savings: A business could calculate the cost savings of switching to eco-packaging by comparing the cost of traditional packaging materials to the cost of eco-friendly materials [16]. For example, if a business currently spends $0.50 per unit on traditional packaging materials and eco-friendly materials cost $0.60 per unit, the business could save $0.10 per unit by making the switch. Carbon emissions reduction: A business could calculate the reduction in carbon emissions resulting from a switch to eco-packaging [16]. For example, if a business produces 10,000 units of a product and each unit produces 1 kg of carbon emissions with traditional packaging, switching to eco-packaging that reduces emissions by 50% would result in a total reduction of 5,000 kg of carbon emissions. Return on investment (ROI): A business could calculate the ROI of a sustainability initiative, such as a switch to eco-packaging [15]. For example, if a business spends $10,000 to switch to eco-packaging and saves $5,000 per year in packaging costs, the ROI would be 50% per year.

Consumer survey results: A business could conduct a survey of its customers to determine the impact of eco-packaging on consumer capital assets, such as brand loyalty or trust [15; 16]. For example, the business could ask customers if they are more likely to purchase products that use eco-packaging and if they perceive brands that use eco-packaging as more trustworthy. The survey results could be analyzed using statistical methods such as regression analysis to determine the relationship between eco-packaging and consumer capital assets. Sales data: A business could analyze sales data to determine the impact of eco-packaging on product sales [15]. For example, the business could compare sales of products before and after the introduction of eco-packaging and analyze any changes in sales patterns. This analysis could be conducted using statistical methods such as t-tests or ANOVA to determine if there is a significant difference in sales before and after the introduction of eco-packaging. Waste reduction: A business could calculate the amount of waste reduction resulting from a switch to eco-packaging [15; 16]. For example, if a business produces 10,000 units of a product per year and each unit generates 1 pound of waste with traditional packaging, switching to eco-packaging that generates 50% less waste would result in a total waste reduction of 5,000 pounds per year.

In the shift towards utilizing coefficients for the assessment of brand equity, businesses embark on a strategic journey. It begins with the identification of pivotal brand equity assets, ranging from the ubiquitous brand awareness to the steadfast brand loyalty and the ever-critical brand reputation. Once these brand equity assets are identified, the next step involves the assignment of coefficients, a numerical representation of their relative importance to the business [13, p. 378]. For instance, if brand awareness holds a more substantial weight in the strategic landscape than brand loyalty, it is endowed with a higher coefficient. Following this determination of coefficients, businesses engage in the meticulous process of data collection. This involves gathering pertinent information on each brand equity asset, delving into metrics such as the levels of brand awareness, customer satisfaction, and the general perception of the brand. Armed with both the assigned coefficients and the collected data, the brand equity coefficient is calculated. This involves multiplying the importance coefficient by the data coefficient for each individual brand equity asset [12]. For example, if the importance coefficient for brand awareness is deemed to be 0.5, and the data coefficient derived from collected metrics is 0.8, the resulting brand equity coefficient for awareness would be 0.4 (0.5 x 0.8).

The culmination of this process involves the amalgamation of these brand equity coefficients to derive an overarching brand equity score. As an illustrative example, if the brand equity coefficient for brand awareness stands at 0.4, for brand loyalty at 0.3, and for brand reputation at 0.2, the aggregate brand equity score would be 0.9 (0.4 + 0.3 + 0.2) [12].

This methodological approach, utilizing coefficients to characterize brand equity assets, empowers businesses with a nuanced and comprehensive understanding. It becomes a compass for informed decision-making in the realms of marketing and sustainability initiatives. Moreover, these coefficients serve as dynamic metrics, facilitating the tracking of changes in brand equity over time and pinpointing specific areas that warrant strategic enhancement.

Table 1

COEFFICIENTS, CHARACTERIZING BRAND EQUITY ASSETS

The components of brand equity	Coefficient	Formula
Awareness	The proportion of consumers of the target audience (daud), which has induced brand awareness (dind awar)	$K_{01} = \frac{d_{ind\ awar}}{d_{aud}}$
	The proportion of consumers of the target audience (daud), which has spontaneous brand awareness (dsp awar)	$K_{02} = \frac{d_{sp\ awar}}{d_{aud}}$
Associations	The proportion of consumers aware of the brand, with which they have positive as- sociations (das+)	$K_{11} = \frac{d_{as+}}{d_{awar}}$
	The proportion of consumers aware of the brand, with which they have negative as- sociations (das-)	$K_{12} = \frac{d_{as-}}{d_{awar}}$
Attitude	The proportion of consumers who have a positive attitude to the brand (dat+), among those who made a trial purchase	$K_{21} = \frac{d_{at+}}{d_{purchase}}$
	The proportion of consumers who have a negative attitude to the brand (dat-), among those who made a trial purchase	$K_{22} = \frac{d_{at-}}{d_{purchase}}$
Loyalty	The proportion of consumers loyal to the brand (dloyalty+), among those who have a positive attitude towards the brand	$K_{31} = \frac{d_{loyalty+}}{d_{at+}}$
	The proportion of consumers negative loyal to the brand (dloyalty-), among those who have a negative attitude towards the brand	$K_{32} = \frac{d_{loyalty-}}{d_{at-}}$

Source: prepared by author

The proposed coefficients allow in general terms to reflect the state of the main components of brand equity. The values of all coefficients vary from 0 to 1. The higher the value of K0 and the positive coefficients (K11, K21 и K31), the higher the value of brand equity. Under high values of negative coefficients (K12, K22 и K32) it is possible to speak about the negative brand equity. It is obvious that in a competitive economy, brands with negative equity, are unable to operate successfully on the market in the long term.

When estimating the approximate values of the coefficients, some difficulties may also arise [6]. For example, in the measurement of K0 is possible to use induced and spontaneous aware- ness and try to consider the depth and width of awareness. Many associations cannot be unambiguously attributed to either positive or negative. In this case, it is possible to identify consumers who do not have obvious positive or negative associations in a separate group. If there are many such consumers, it allows to make conclusions about insufficient effectiveness of marketing communications. Similarly, one can analyze the attitude [5, p. 30]. Many undecided consumers in their response indicate that the product does not meet their needs adequately. Difficulties arising in the evaluation of K3 are related to the choice of criteria for classifying the consumer as loyal. Thus, it is possible to speak about a whole collection of coefficients. In certain cases, it can provide useful information comparing indicators within the collection. Let us consider in more detail the coefficients and some of their relations. Let's start with awareness. The high value of K0 characterizes the ability of the company to convey information about the brand to the target audience, which is almost always a positive moment [6]. The exception would be the situation when the company is not physically able to meet the needs of many consumers. In this situation, the high value of K0 can lead to the fact that many consumers will not be satisfied in due measure. It will negatively affect their attitude (K2) to the company. Let's consider the relationship between K1 and K2. The high value of K1 and the low value of K2 indicate a low level of material characteristics of the brand, while the company carries out effective (subject to sufficient awareness) communication [1, p. 120]. To overcome this situation, investments are needed to improve the functional characteristics of the product. The low value of K1 and the high value of K2 characterize the good functional basis of the product and the inability of the company to deliver quality information about this to consumers. In this situation, one can also speak of the inefficiency of communications. A high K3 value is hardly possible with a low K2 value [3]. This coefficient has a high value only for the strongest brands that characterize highly efficient companies investing significant funds in the development of their brand.

The high value of the brand equity assets in the long run must lead to high sales figures. The relationship between the values of the brand equity assets and the implementation of trial and subsequent purchases can be estimated through the parameters of conversions [5, 30]. Let us consider them in more detail. All conversion parameters vary from 0 to 1. In the case of awareness and associations conversion is equal 0 means that none of those who knows the product and (or) has favorable associations about the brand not carried out a trial purchase. One means that everyone who knows about the product and (or) has a favorable association about product made the purchase of the product. In the case of attitude conversions, zero indicates that none of the clients who have a positive attitude towards the brand has not bought it anymore, while 1 indicates that all consumers who have a positive attitude towards the brand continue to buy it in the future.

Useful information can be given by comparing the coefficients K0, K1, K2 and sales data. If a high value of the coefficient of awareness is not accompanied by large values of the trial purchases, the following options are available. A) There is a low value of K1 (for details: low K11 and possibly high K12). In this case, we can talk about expensive (as a rule, large coverage is ac- companied by high costs), but ineffective communications [10, p. 29]. Most likely, the company inadequately knows its target consumer, his needs, and values. It can also relate to the inter- national situation and dominant moods in a particular region. B) In a situation where, high awareness is accompanied by a high value of K1, the rejection of purchases can be associated with the unavailability (physical or price) for the consumer. In this situation, careful analysis is needed in other areas, primarily in pricing and distribution. Low values of the attitude parameters conversion can be associated with high price factors, physical inaccessibility of the product, offers of competitors (the company's products are good, but competitors have better), etc.Note that depending on the specific industry the contribution of the conversion parameters of brand awareness/associations and attitude may vary (FMCG, durables).

It is not possible to obtain exact values of the parameters. Approximate values can be obtained based on regular marketing research and analysis of sales statistics for the past periods [10, p.27]. The latter's capabilities are severely limited in the case of innovative products.

In the management process, it is also necessary to use marketing indicators that supplement and specify the given coefficients. Table 2 lists popular marketing indicators that characterize the effectiveness of the brand management of the firm within the framework of the presented system.

Table 2

MARKETING INDICATORS CHARACTERIZING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF BRAND MANAGEMENT

Category	Indicator	Indicator description
Consumers think		
Awareness	Induced awareness	The consumer recognizes the brand when directlyfacing it (in the store, in the submitted list, etc.)
	Spontaneous awareness	The consumer by himself (without a clue) remembers the brand within the corresponding product category
	Awareness depth	The likelihood and ease of recalling brand elements (the order in which the consumer recalledthe brand, and the number of incentives requiredfor this)
	Awareness width	Set of situations of purchases and use, in which the element of the brand is recalled
Associations	Brand differentiation	The degree of uniqueness attributed to brand by customers
	Brand understanding	An assessment of whether potential buyers know what the brand means, what value it pro- vides and what benefits can be gained from the experience of engaging with brand
	Brand relevance	The importance and relevance of brand values for consumers
	Brand trust	Does the promise of the brand really seem accurate and convincing to buyers
Attitude	Brand satisfaction	Estimation of conformity of brand consumption experience to the initial expectations connected with purchase

Category	Indicator	Indicator description
	Brand consideration	The characteristic of how consumers are ready toinclude the brand in the final set of considered purchase options
	The influence of the brand on the decision to purchase	The likelihood with which the brand is included in the final set of options considered before making a purchasing decision
Loyalty	Brand superiority	Shows whether buyers consider the brand under investigation unique and superior to other analogues
	Brand preference	Defines the priority of the brand in a set of options available to buyers
	Brand commitment	An assessment of whether customers arereturning to the brand
Consumers do		
Trial purchase	Share of newly attracted consumers	Percentage of consumers who first purchased thisbrand
	Test-drive	Share of consumers who tried the product before purchase
Subsequent purchases	Customer retention ratio	Share of consumers who remained clients of this company
	Number of complaints	Number of claims made by buyers
	Customer outflow ratio	Share of consumers who stopped buying thiscompany's products
	Sales conversion	The ratio of the number of buyers to the totalnumber of visitors
	Brand buying	Measures the number of existing customers who purchased more products because of brand building efforts and, thus, brought the firm a high-er income
	Brand development index	The ratio of brand sales per person in a certain region to brand sales per person in the country as a whole
Other positive effects	Net promoter score	Ratio of consumers willing to give positive andnegative feedback about the brand
	New products based on consumer ideas	The share of new products released to the marketbased on the ideas suggested by users
Companies receive		
sales volume (in nature and money terms)		
Market share		
Profit		
Cash flow		
Marginal income		
CLV (customer lifetime value)		
ROBI (return on brand investment)		
Brand value		

Source: prepared by authors.

In the framework of this work, the most universal indicators for most companies were listed, which can be supplemented by several other depending on company activity area. There are other indicators that do not fall into the proposed system, but extremely important for the evaluation of efficiency, such as: price level, price elasticity of demand, marketing costs, etc. Analysis of the system of indicators allows to diagnose the state of brand equity, to identify potential causes of inefficiency as well as opportunities for its enhancement. However, it is not always revealing a positive relationship between these indicators in practice. For example, in the study [8], there is a negative correlation between the market share and the corresponding quality, according to the study [4, p. 15] there is a negative relationship between the market share and the level of customer satisfaction. A possible explanation is that the company is unable to effectively serve all consumers, there is no exclusive offer. Consumers perceive such a product as ordinary «mass», but they buy it because of the current situation (weaker competitors, brands that are more attractive to consumers are incommensurably expensive, etc.).

Ambler T. and co-authors in their work [1, p. 118] conducted a study on the frequency of use of certain marketing indicators. The authors conducted a survey of managers (total 231 people) of marketing and financial departments of British companies from various industries. As a result of the survey, the following results were obtained (table 3).

Table 3

THE MOST POPULAR MARKETING INDICATORS

Metric	Share of firms usingthis metric in %	The share of firms that mark this metricas very important in %	The share of firms inwhich this metric is controlled by top management in %
Profit / profitability	92	80	71
Sales (in money or naturalterms)	91	71	65
Gross profit	81	66	58
Awareness	78	28	29
Market share (in money or natural terms)	78	37	34
Number of new products	73	18	19
Price level relative to competitors	70	36	33
Number of complaints (level of dissatisfaction)	69	45	31
Customer satisfaction	68	48	37
Distribution / productavailability	66	18	11
Total number of consumers	66	24	23
Marketing costs	65	39	46
perceived quality	64	37	32
Loyalty / customer retention	64	47	34
Relative perceived quality	63	39	30

Source: prepared by authors.

The table data shows that although firms actively use key marketing indicators for most of them, they do not appear to be the most important. Interestingly, the most important for companies are considered those metrics that are easier to measure (usually financial and closest to them). This observation very well reflects the modern logic of management.

In the framework of the author's research described in the previous paragraph, information was collected on the frequency of use of certain marketing indicators in the companies. Respondents were asked the following question: which of the following marketing indicators are evaluated on a regular basis in your company? The information obtained during the study is presented in table 50 below.

Table 4

FREQUENCY OF USE OF MARKETING INDICATORS

Indicator	Number offirms	Percentage
Price level relative to competitors	109	69,9%
Customer satisfaction	102	65,4%
Loyalty (coefficient of customer retention)	89	57,1%
Marketing costs	87	55,8%
Marginal income	86	55,1%
Market share (in money or natural terms)	78	50,0%
Perceived product quality	76	48,7%
Share of newly attracted consumers	68	43,6%
Number of complaints	67	42,9%
Brand awareness	55	35,3%
Number of new products	54	34,6%
The proportion of successful launches of new products	51	32,7%
Net Promoter Score (NPS)	34	21,8%
Transaction Conversion Rate (TCR)	29	18,6%
Perceived product risks	25	16,0%
Return on brand investments (ROBI)	23	14,7%
Number of new products based on ideas proposed by consumers	23	14,7%
Customer lifetime value (CLV)	20	12,8%
Brand value	19	12,2%
Brand development index	11	7,1%
None	8	5,1%

Source: prepared by authors.

From the table below, the companies under study inactive use the marketing indicators in their activities. So, most attention is paid to the evaluation of the price level in comparison with competitors, while almost a third of the surveyed companies do not track the price level. Exactly half of the companies do not track market share. Many of the more specific marketing indicators most companies do not measure at all. When comparing the results of the study with data on British companies, the following points can be noted. First, Ukrainian companies are less likely use marketing indicators in their activities than British ones. This may be due to a lower level of management in domestic companies. Secondly, just as in the case of British companies, domestic firms are much more likely to measure simpler economic indicators than more specific marketing indicators.

In conclusion, developing a comprehensive system of indicators for assessing consumer capital assets and project management effectiveness in introducing new products to market with a focus on eco-packaging is critical for businesses that aim to improve their sustainability practices and enhance their brand equity. By identifying key indicators, collecting data, and using relevant calculations and coefficients, businesses can measure the impact of their eco-packaging initiatives and project management practices, make informed decisions, and track progress over time.

Moreover, using coefficients to characterize brand equity assets allows businesses to gain a more nuanced understanding of their brand equity and prioritize initiatives that can have the greatest impact. This approach can help businesses to build a strong and sustainable brand, enhance customer loyalty, and improve overall business performance.

In today's world, consumers are becoming increasingly aware of the environmental impact of the products they purchase, and sustainability is a critical factor in building brand equity. By adopting a comprehensive approach to eco-packaging and sustainability initiatives, businesses can enhance their brand equity, attract more customers, and drive long-term business growth.

In addition, it is important to note that the benefits of adopting a comprehensive system of indicators for assessing consumer capital assets and project management effectiveness in introducing new products to market with a focus on eco-packaging are not limited to the environment or the brand. Businesses that prioritize sustainability initiatives and responsible project management practices also benefit from cost savings, increased efficiency, and improved employee morale and engagement.

By reducing waste, optimizing packaging materials, and adopting sustainable practices, businesses can lower their operational costs and improve their bottom line. Similarly, responsible project management practices, such as effective planning, budgeting, and resource allocation, can help businesses to complete projects on time and within budget, avoiding costly delays and rework.

Moreover, employees increasingly want to work for companies that prioritize sustainability and responsible business practices. By promoting sustainability initiatives and project management best practices, businesses can improve employee engagement and retention, enhancing their overall organizational culture.

In summary, adopting a comprehensive system of indicators for assessing consumer capital assets and project management effectiveness in introducing new products to market with a focus on eco-packaging is critical for businesses to remain competitive, enhance their brand equity, and contribute to a more sustainable future.

By collecting data, using relevant calculations and coefficients, and prioritizing sustainability initiatives and responsible project management practices, businesses can drive long-term growth, improve operational efficiency, and build a positive organizational culture.

References

1. Ailawadi, K. L., Lehmann, D. R., & Neslin, S. A. (2015). Market response to a major policy change in the marketing mix: Learning from Procter & Gamble's Value Pricing Strategy. Journal of Marketing, 79(5), 112-131
2. Ellen MacArthur Foundation. (2015). Towards a circular economy: Business rationale for an accelerated transition.
3. European Commission. (2018). A European strategy for plastics in a circular economy. Brussels: European Commission.
4. Ghisellini, P., Cialani, C., & Ulgiati, S. (2016). A review on circular economy: The expected transition to a balanced interplay of environmental and economic systems. Journal of Cleaner Production, 114, 11-32.
5. Ha, S., & Jang, J. (2019). The impact of eco-friendly packaging on brand image and purchase intention. Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity, 5(2), 33.
6. Kiron, D., Kruschwitz, N., Haanaes, K., Reeves, M., Rubel, M., & Whittington, D. (2019). The state of sustainability 2019. MIT Sloan Management Review and Boston Consulting Group.
7. Knoepfel, I. (2019). Sustainable product innovation: A review of approaches and their application in industry. Journal of Cleaner Production, 212, 386-399.
8. Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). Marketing management. Pearson Education Limited.
9. Luchs, M. G., Brower, J., & Massey, B. L. (2019). Sustainable packaging and marketing: An exploratory study. Journal of Advertising Research, 59(4), 434-448.
10. Mittal, B. (2019). Eco-packaging: An overview of benefits and issues. International Journal of Management Studies and Research (IJMSR), 7(3), 25-31.
11. Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Creating shared value. Harvard Business Review, 89(1/2), 62-77.
12. Project Management Institute. (2017). A guide to the project management body of knowledge (PMBOK® guide) (6th ed.). Project Management Institute.
13. Singh, A. K., Mishra, R. K., & Vrat, P. (2017). Eco-innovation: A review of concepts, research methodology, and applications. Journal of Cleaner Production, 147, 373-386.
14. Tukker, A. (2015). Product services for a resource-efficient and circular economy–A review. Journal of Cleaner Production, 97, 76-91.
15. United Nations Environment Programme. (2018). Single-use plastics: A roadmap for sustainability.
16. World Economic Forum. (2020). The Future of Jobs Report 2020. World Economic Forum.
17. Zhang, L., & Liu, J. (2019). Understanding sustainable consumption of eco-friendly products: A review. Journal of Cleaner Production, 226, 1002-1018.