# Design and Empirical Evaluation of a Sustainability KPI Framework for Corporate R&D Laboratories

Yiqun Ma [a]* and Qiang Sun [b]

State Grid Energy Research Institute CO., LTD (SGERI.), No. 18, Binhe Road, Beiqijia Town, Changping, Beijing, China

E-mail: [a]*31394342@qq.com; [b]mathive@163.com

**Abstract.** Corporate R&D laboratories are under increasing pressure to comply with ESG standards, yet often lack structured tools for assessing sustainability performance. This study develops a multidimensional KPI framework addressing resource efficiency, environmental impact, compliance, and organizational engagement. Twelve indicators were identified through literature review and expert consultation. A hybrid weighting approach, integrating Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) and entropy methods, was employed to ensure balanced evaluation. Applied in a corporate laboratory, the framework demonstrated operational feasibility, strategic relevance, and diagnostic value. While technical metrics performed well, cultural indicators lagged, highlighting the need for behavioural incentives. Stakeholder feedback supported the dashboard's utility for management and communication purposes.

**Keywords:** Sustainability; R&D Laboratory; KPI System; Environmental Performance; AHP; Entropy Method; Green Management; Corporate ESG

## 1 Introduction

Amid global carbon neutrality goals and the broader green transition, enterprises are shifting from resource-intensive operations toward low-carbon, high-efficiency development. Corporate R&D laboratories, as vital innovation hubs for product design and process validation, are also major consumers of energy and hazardous materials. Balancing innovation performance with environmental accountability has emerged as a core challenge for sustainable enterprise development.

Although environmental and energy management systems (e.g., ISO 14001, ISO 50001) are adopted in production, laboratories often lack tailored sustainability strategies. Existing green initiatives in these settings remain fragmented and are rarely supported by standardized, measurable Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), particularly in high-risk sectors such as pharmaceuticals and advanced materials.

KPIs enable data-driven decision-making and progress tracking but are seldom customized for laboratory contexts. Most current frameworks focus on manufacturing or building-level energy metrics, neglecting the complexity of R&D environments.

© The Author(s) 2025

B. Siuta-Tokarska et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2025 3rd International Academic Conference on Management Innovation and Economic Development (MIED 2025)*, Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research 348,
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-835-6_79

This study addresses this gap by developing a multidimensional sustainability KPI framework for corporate laboratories. The goals are to: (1) define key sustainability performance dimensions through literature and industry review; (2) construct a weighted KPI system using AHP and TOPSIS methods; and (3) validate the framework through a real-world enterprise case study.

The outcomes aim to guide enterprises in implementing sustainable laboratory practices while contributing to the broader discourse on performance evaluation and digital environmental management.

## 2 Theoretical Foundation and Literature Review

### 2.1 Theoretical Basis

**Sustainable Development Theory.** Rooted in the Brundtland Report (1987), sustainable development advocates meeting present needs without compromising future generations. In corporate practice, this is reflected in the "triple bottom line" — environmental, social, and economic dimensions. In laboratories, this necessitates a balance between operational efficiency and environmental stewardship.

**Key Performance Indicator (KPI) Theory.** Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are essential tools for monitoring, aligning, and improving organizational objectives. In sustainability contexts, KPIs support the evaluation of energy efficiency, emissions, waste reduction, and regulatory compliance, consistent with the SMART principle.

**Balanced Scorecard (BSC) and Multi-Criteria Decision-Making (MCDM).** The Balanced Scorecard (BSC) expands performance measurement beyond finance to include process, learning, and environmental dimensions. Multi-criteria decision-making (MCDM) tools such as AHP, TOPSIS, and entropy methods are widely used to manage complex evaluation systems.

### 2.2 Literature Review

**Green Laboratory Practices. S**tudies on lab sustainability primarily focus on academic institutions, addressing waste, ventilation, and chemical use. Although programs like LEED for Labs and My Green Lab offer best practices, corporate laboratories—being commercially driven and technically intensive—receive limited tailored guidance.

**Sustainability KPIs.** Existing enterprise-level KPI frameworks rarely address the specific needs of R&D labs [1]. Most focus on physical outputs (e.g., energy or waste) and overlook behavioral and procedural factors vital to laboratory sustainability. Sustainability performance measurement requires a review of current methodologies [2]. Studies on sustainable laboratory operations often draw from academic best practices [3]

**MCDM Applications.** Although AHP and TOPSIS have been applied in green buildings and university labs [4]., their use in enterprise laboratory sustainability assessment remains limited. There is a clear need for a customized, quantitative KPI system aligned with R&D operations.

### 2.3 Summary of Research Gaps

Three key gaps emerge:

(i) absence of lab-specific sustainability KPI frameworks;

(ii) lack of empirical validation in corporate R&D settings;

(iii) insufficient integration of digital tools for real-time KPI tracking. This study aims to address these challenges through a practical and evidence-based framework. This study seeks to fill these gaps by designing a sustainability-oriented KPI system specifically for corporate laboratories and validating its feasibility and managerial effectiveness through empirical analysis.

## 3 Research Methodology

### 3.1 Research Design Overview

This study employs a design–application–evaluation approach to develop and validate a sustainability KPI system for corporate R&D laboratories. The process includes:

(i) Indicator Development based on literature, expert insights [5], and standards;

(ii) System Construction using multi-criteria decision-making (MCDM) methods;

(iii) Empirical Validation through application in a corporate lab and stakeholder feedback analysis.

The methodology emphasizes theoretical soundness and practical applicability.

### 3.2 Research Scope and Target

This study targets corporate R&D laboratories in high-impact sectors such as pharmaceuticals, chemicals, and advanced materials. Sustainability dimensions include resource efficiency, operational compliance, and organizational engagement. Intended users comprise lab managers, EHS officers, and sustainability teams

### 3.3 Indicator Development

Indicators were derived from academic and industry literature, international standards (ISO 14001, 50001, LEED, GRI), and expert interviews (n = 10). Over 30 preliminary indicators were identified across four dimensions:

**Resource Utilization:** Energy use, water reuse, reagent optimization

**Environmental Impact:** GHG emissions, waste treatment

**Compliance:** Audit frequency, non-compliance rate

**Organizational Culture:** Training, green procurement, staff participation

### 3.4 Indicator Weighting and System Construction

Hybrid methods combining AHP and entropy improve green innovation evaluation [6]. A hybrid MCDM approach integrates AHP and entropy methods. AHP provided expert-driven structural weights [7], while entropy adjusted these using empirical variability. The KPI score was calculated as:

$$S = \sum (Wi \times Xi)$$

Where:

$Wi$ is the adjusted weight of the i-th indicator, and $Xi$ is the normalized performance value for the i-th indicator.

### 3.5 Empirical Application and Validation

A medium-sized R&D lab in East China was selected, featuring LIMS, EMS, and BMS systems. Data from digital platforms and stakeholder surveys (n = 35) supported KPI scoring and evaluation.

Historical and real-time data were collected from EMS (energy), LIMS (chemical usage), and manual records. Surveys and interviews with stakeholders (n = 35) were conducted to assess perceived usefulness and ease of use of the KPI system.

### 3.6 Methodological Rigor

Triangulation of expert and system data ensured robustness. Pilot testing and sensitivity analysis were conducted to confirm consistency and reliability of the framework.

## 4 Construction of the Sustainability KPI System and Empirical Analysis

### 4.1 Framework of the KPI System

**Table 1.** Structure of the Sustainability KPI System

| Dimension | Secondary Indicator | Code | Unit |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Resource Efficiency | Energy consumption per experiment | RE1 | kWh/experiment |
| | Water reuse rate | RE2 | % |
| | Chemical usage optimization index | RE3 | kg/output unit |
| 2. Environmental Impact | GHG emissions per project | EI1 | kg $CO_2$-eq/project |
| | Hazardous waste treatment compliance rate | EI2 | % |
| | Laboratory waste recycling rate | EI3 | % |
| 3. Compliance & Risk | Number of non-compliance events | CR1 | cases/year |
| | Environmental inspection pass rate | CR2 | % |
| 4. Organizational Engagement | Green training coverage | OE1 | % (of total staff) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Staff participation in sustainability programs | OE2 | % |
| Green procurement ratio | OE3 | % |
| Sustainable innovation suggestions submitted | OE4 | proposals/FTE/year |

Based on expert consultation, literature review, and enterprise needs, a sustainability KPI system was developed encompassing four dimensions and twelve indicators (Table 1).

Each indicator is weighted using a hybrid AHP–entropy method, reflecting both expert judgment and data variability. The total score represents the lab's sustainability performance.

### 4.2 Weighting Results and System Calibration

Final weights were: Resource Efficiency (30%), Environmental Impact (35%), Compliance & Risk (15%), and Organizational Engagement (20%). Sensitivity analysis confirmed score robustness under moderate performance fluctuations.

The weighting calibration was tested via sensitivity analysis. Moderate changes in individual indicator performance (±10%) produced proportionally stable total scores, confirming robustness.

### 4.3 Case Study: Application in a Corporate R&D Laboratory

medium-sized R&D lab in East China (~150 staff) served as the pilot site. Data from EMS, LIMS, surveys, and audits were normalized and scored (Table 2).

Scoring Formula:

$$KPI\ Score=\sum i=1\ to\ 12wi\cdot xi\backslash text\{KPI\ Score\}\ =\ \backslash sum_\{i=1\}\hat{}\{12\}\ w_i\ \backslash cdot\ x_iKPI\ Score=i=1\sum 12wi\cdot xi$$

Where *wi* is the weight of indicator i, and *xi* is the normalized score.

**Performance Results**

**Table 2.** Performance Results.

| Dimension | Average Score (0–100) | Key Observations |
|---|---|---|
| Resource Efficiency | 72.4 | High electricity usage during standby identified. |
| Environmental Impact | 64.3 | Room to improve waste segregation and recycling. |
| Compliance & Risk | 85.7 | Strong internal auditing mechanism in place. |
| Organizational Engagement | 59.2 | Low staff participation in green campaigns. |
| **Total KPI Score** | **69.5** | Moderate performance; indicates clear improvement areas. |

### 4.4 Stakeholder Feedback and System Evaluation

Among 35 stakeholders, 85% found the system valuable for visibility, and 71% confirmed ease of use. Suggestions included real-time dashboards and gamified engagement tools.

### 4.5 Summary of Empirical Insights

The pilot confirmed that a KPI-based approach enables measurable, data-driven lab sustainability. However, improving cultural participation remains a key managerial challenge.

## 5 Discussion and Managerial Implications

### 5.1 Key Findings

The application of the KPI framework produced several key insights:

**(i) Multidimensional Tracking:** Integrating technical, compliance, and behavioral indicators allows for a holistic view of lab sustainability beyond traditional audits.

**(ii) Performance Gap:** Technical indicators (e.g., energy use, emissions) outperformed behavioral ones, highlighting the need for cultural engagement strategies.

**(iii) Digital Infrastructure as Enabler:** The use of LIMS, EMS, and surveys facilitated accurate, timely data collection and supported responsive management.

**(iv) Strategic Communication Tool:** The KPI dashboard enhanced internal transparency and helped institutionalize sustainability in lab governance and planning.

### 5.2 Managerial Implications

Based on case results and feedback, several recommendations are offered:

**Integrate with ESG Strategy:** ESG performance can enhance firm value in emerging markets [8]. Position lab KPIs within broader ESG and CSR frameworks to support compliance and carbon neutrality goals.

**Institutionalize KPIs:** Embed sustainability KPIs into managerial targets and OKRs, linking them to budgeting, incentives, and resource planning. Sustainable business models should integrate real-world applications for impact [9].

**Strengthen Digital Monitoring:** Leverage IoT and smart tools to enhance real-time tracking; integrate dashboards with lab software platforms (e.g., LIMS, ELN).

**Support Cultural Change:** Use gamification, recognition, and team-based initiatives to encourage participation; reward green innovation proposals.

### 5.3 Theoretical Contributions

This study contributes to sustainability literature by introducing a KPI model tailored to corporate R&D labs, combining expert-driven and data-based methods, and validating it in a real-world context. It bridges academic theory with industrial application.5.4 Limitations and Future Research

### 5.4 Limitations and Future Research

Limitations include focus on a single lab, limited observation period, and reliance on internal data. Future research should explore broader sectoral applications, AI-enhanced KPI systems, and long-term impacts on innovation and ESG performance.

## 6 Conclusion and Outlook

### 6.1 Conclusion

This study developed and empirically validated a sustainability-oriented KPI framework tailored to the needs of corporate R&D laboratories. By integrating literature review, expert consultation, MCDM techniques, and real-world application, the research achieved four key outcomes:

(1) A comprehensive KPI system was created, covering technical, environmental, compliance, and behavioral indicators.

(2) A hybrid weighting method (AHP + entropy) balanced expert insight with objective data variation.

(3) Field application confirmed the framework's operational feasibility and strategic value in supporting sustainability goals.

(4) Stakeholder feedback emphasized the framework's role not only in monitoring performance but also in fostering a green organizational culture.

Overall, the KPI system serves as a practical mechanism for translating sustainability goals into actionable lab practices, supporting both decision-making and employee engagement.

### 6.2 Outlook

As sustainability becomes integral to R&D strategy, structured KPI systems will play an increasingly vital role. Future research and practice should focus on:

(1) AI and Digital Twin Integration – Advanced technologies such as predictive analytics and real-time anomaly detection can enhance responsiveness and efficiency in sustainability monitoring.

(2) Standardization and Benchmarking – Cross-organizational comparability demands industry-wide consensus on sustainability metrics, potentially guided by consortia and regulatory bodies.

(3) Innovation Linkages –System dynamics approaches facilitate sustainability KPI integration into R&D management [10] Further studies should explore how sustainability KPI improvements influence innovation outputs, including product development, patents, and R&D efficiency.

By aligning sustainability measurement with digital infrastructure and innovation performance, KPI systems can evolve from compliance tools to enablers of strategic value in corporate R&D settings.

## Acknowledgments

This project is supported by the State Grid Corporation of China (SGCC) project 'Research on the Management of Corporate Science and Technology Innovation System and National Major Scientific Research Tasks'

## References

1. Labuschagne, C., Brent, A. C., & van Erck, R. P. G. (2005). Assessing the sustainability performances of industries. Journal of Cleaner Production, 13(4), 373–385. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2003.10.007
2. Sarkis, J., Zhu, Q., & Lai, K.-H. (2021). Sustainability performance measurement: A review and future directions. International Journal of Production Economics, 231, 107891. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2020.107891
3. Vaneeckhaute, C., & Vanrolleghem, P. A. (2019). Green lab: Towards sustainable laboratory operations. Sustainable Production and Consumption, 19, 245–256. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2019.04.001
4. Abdel-Basset, M., Mohamed, R., & Smarandache, F. (2021). *An extension of neutrosophic AHP–Entropy–TOPSIS for green supplier selection.* Environmental Impact Assessment Review, 89, 106581. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2021.106581.
5. Zemlickienė, V., & Turskis, Z. (2022). Performance Measurement in R&D Projects: Relevance of Indicators Based on US and German Experts. Sustainability, 14(18), 11737. https://doi.org/10.3390/su141811737
6. Wu, H., Chen, J., & Huang, X. (2021). A novel hybrid method for green innovation capability evaluation using AHP and entropy. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 168, 120748. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.120748
7. Saaty, T. L. (1980). The Analytic Hierarchy Process. New York: McGraw-Hill.
8. Li, X., Li, Z., & Shi, Y. (2022). *Does ESG performance enhance firm value? Evidence from emerging markets.* Journal of Cleaner Production, 355, 131778. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.131778
9. Bocken, N. M. P., Short, S. W., Rana, P., & Evans, S. (2022). *Designing sustainable business models: Exploring real-world applications and impact*. Journal of Cleaner Production, 362, 132382. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.132382
10. Zhang, H., Wang, H., & Wu, Y. (2023). Integrating sustainability KPIs into R&D management: A system dynamics approach. Sustainability, 15(1), 302. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15010302

**Open Access** This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.