<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

An ecosystem service-dominant logic? - integrating the ecosystem service approach and the service-dominant logic

Matthies, Brent D.

2016-06-15

Matthies , B D , D'Amato , D , Berghäll , S , Ekholm , T , Hoen , H F , Holopainen , J , Korhonen , J E , Lähtinen , K , Mattila , O , Toppinen , A , Valsta , L , Wang , L & Yousefpour , R 2016 , ' An ecosystem service-dominant logic? - integrating the ecosystem service approach and the service-dominant logic ' , Journal of Cleaner Production , vol. 124 , pp. 51-64 . <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.02.109>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/173349>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.02.109>

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

1 **Title:** An Ecosystem Service-Dominant Logic? – Integrating the ecosystem service approach and
2 the service-dominant logic.

3

4 **Corresponding Author:**

5

6 Brent D. Matthies
7 University of Helsinki
8 P. O. Box 27
9 Helsinki, Finland
10 FI-00014
11 Email: brent.matthies@helsinki.fi

12

13 **Co-Authors:**

14

15 Dalia D'Amato
16 University of Helsinki
17 Email: dalia.damato@helsinki.fi

18

19 Dr. Sami Berghäll
20 University of Helsinki
21 Email: sami.berghall@helsinki.fi

22

23 Dr. Tommi Ekholm
24 VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland
25 P.O. Box 1000
26 VTT, Finland
27 FI-02044
28 Email: tommi.ekholm@vtt.fi

29

30 Dr. Hans Fredrik Hoen
31 Norwegian University of Life Sciences
32 Universitetstunet 3
33 1430 Ås, Norway
34 Email: hans.hoen@nmbu.no

35

36 Jani Holopainen
37 University of Helsinki
38 Email: jani.m.holopainen@helsinki.fi

39

40 Jaana E. Korhonen
41 University of Helsinki
42 Email: jaana.e.korhonen@helsinki.fi

43

44 Dr. Katja Lähtinen
45 University of Helsinki
46 Email: katja.lahtinen@helsinki.fi

47

48 Dr. Osmo Mattila
49 University of Helsinki
50 Email: osmo.mattila@helsinki.fi

51
52 Dr. Anne Toppinen
53 University of Helsinki
54 Email: anne.toppinen@helsinki.fi
55

56 Dr. Lauri Valsta
57 University of Helsinki
58 Email: lauri.valsta@helsinki.fi
59

60 Dr. Lei Wang
61 Zhejiang Agriculture and Forestry University
62 Email: waleland@foxmail.com
63

64 Dr. Rasoul Yousefpour
65 University of Freiburg
66 Tennenbacher Str. 4 (2. OG)
67 Freiburg, Germany
68 D-79106
69 Email: rasoul.yousefpour@ife.uni-freiburg.de
70

71 **Abstract:**

72
73 Natural and business ecosystems are complex and dynamic service systems that interact through the
74 utilization of ecosystem service offerings for human well-being. Currently, natural and business
75 sciences have not developed a shared and common set of service-based terms or concepts for
76 discussing ecosystem service offerings in the process of value co-creation. In this study, the
77 ecosystem service approach was compared with marketing science's service-dominant logic. The
78 terminology and concepts were harmonized, and the two approaches were then integrated into a
79 service-dominant value creation (SVC) framework. The incorporation of natural ecosystems
80 includes accounting for the flow of positive and negative impacts through associated value
81 networks. Therefore, the term *value-in-impact* was proposed to describe these value flows. A case
82 study of the global forest-based sector was then presented, demonstrating how to discuss current
83 research challenges using the proposed framework. In conclusion, a shared service-dominant
84 approach provides an opportunity for deeper inter-disciplinary discussion between natural and
85 business sciences. This study represents a contribution towards the development of a holistic service
86 science that includes consideration for natural ecosystems. The SVC framework also addresses
87 many of the multidimensional challenges noted by previous sustainability frameworks.
88

89 **Keywords**

90
91 Service-dominant; Ecosystem service; Service science; Value creation; Ecosystem; Ecosystem
92 service cascade

93 **1. Introduction**

94 Numerous acute global change pressures are currently being exerted on natural ecosystems
95 (Rockström et al., 2009). These pressures originate from and are driven by the economic activities
96 of human societies, and threaten the value co-creation processes between firms and their beneficiaries

97 (i.e., customers) (Carpenter et al., 2009). Within natural sciences, the Ecosystem Service (ES)
98 approach has emerged to describe the benefits that humans obtain from natural and, in some cases,
99 semi-natural ecosystems¹ for human well-being (de Groot et al., 2002; Fisher et al. 2009). According
100 to this concept, natural ecosystems perform several functions that are useful to humans (e.g.,
101 provisioning of food, biomass, regulating water flows, global and local climate, and contributing to
102 cultural values).

103 Notwithstanding the use of the term ‘ecosystem services,’ the ES approach has still largely failed
104 to develop into a truly service-based on the concept. The ES literature defines ‘service’ as “an
105 ecological function or process that is considered useful to human beings” (Haines-Young and
106 Potschin, 2010). In service and marketing sciences, the definition of ‘service’ is “the process of doing
107 something beneficial for and in conjunction with some entity” (Vargo and Lusch, 2008a). Both of
108 these definitions are highly complementary, and suggest that the ES approach is potentially an
109 extension of service sciences. Berghäll et al. (2014) and Lusch and Vargo (2014) have previously
110 identified this connection by noting the similarities between the ES approach and marketing sciences’
111 service-dominant (SD) logic.

112 The SD logic reinterprets the process of value creation and co-creation, by shifting away from a
113 goods-dominant (GD) (i.e., neo-classical, production-oriented) view to one based on service value
114 creation (Vargo and Lusch, 2004). The GD logic view on value creation focuses on a firm embedding
115 “value in ‘goods’ or ‘services,’ [and] value is ‘added’ by enhancing or increasing attributes” to the
116 ‘good’ or ‘services’ (Vargo and Lusch, 2008a). In the GD view, value is measured in terms of nominal
117 value exchanged (i.e., price for the ‘services’ or value-in-exchange). By contrast, the SD logic argues
118 that value is co-created between all human actors (i.e., firms, individuals) through the value of using
119 a ‘service’ (i.e., utilization or value-in-use) and determined individually through experience of the
120 beneficiary (i.e., phenomenologically determined).

121 The ES approach has also sought to recognize a broader definition of value beyond only the
122 monetary valuation of ‘goods and services’ (e.g., Polasky and Segerson, 2009; Spangenburg et al.,
123 2014). Thus, the SD logic and ES approaches appear highly complementary; the main difference
124 being the differing focus on service value flows. Within the ES approach, the focus is placed on flows
125 between natural ecosystems and socio-economic networks, while the SD logic focuses largely on
126 flows within socio-economic networks. Despite the similarities between the two approaches, the ES

¹ This distinction has been made given that this study also incorporates business literature where it has become common to use the terms “ecosystem” to refer to a ‘service ecosystem’ or a ‘business ecosystem’.

127 literature often adopts a GD logic view on value creation to address service provisioning challenges.
128 For example, ES offerings are frequently referred to as ecosystem ‘goods and services’ (e.g., Wilson
129 and Hoehn, 2006; Müller and Burkhard, 2012). Alternatively, the lack of an ES contribution to the
130 ongoing discourse in service sciences means that the complex socio-ecological relationship tends to
131 become oversimplified within the SD logic (e.g., Lusch and Vargo, 2006; 2011).

132 Bridging these two bodies of literature is timely and important. A common set of terminology and
133 concepts could facilitate a shared approach to addressing the impacts of companies on ES offerings,
134 and improve their value co-creation processes (Whiteman et al., 2013; Waage and Kester, 2014;
135 D’Amato et al., 2014). A shared lexicon would also facilitate the discussion about ES trade-offs and
136 multi-level governance challenges that firms and ecosystem managers both face (Heuer, 2011;
137 Whiteman et al., 2013).

138 The purpose of this study, therefore, is to establish a service-based understanding of value creation
139 with respect to ES offerings. To start, a review of the SD logic and ES approaches is given in Section
140 2, and conflicts and gaps in terminology and concepts are resolved. The two approaches are then
141 integrated into a conceptual framework for service value flows between the economy, society, and
142 the environment in Section 3. The proposed service-dominant value creation (SVC) framework acts
143 as a guide for future inter-disciplinary discourse on the ES value creation processes. The
144 multidimensional (i.e., temporal and spatial) nature of the SVC framework made it difficult to ignore
145 the obvious connection to sustainability science (i.e., sustainable development) (e.g., Lozano, 2008).
146 Therefore, the implications that a SD approach has for that field of study are also discussed. Also, in
147 Section 3 the term *value-in-impact* is proposed for discussing the positive and negative ES
148 provisioning impacts throughout business ecosystems and value networks. Finally, a case application
149 of the SVC framework is provided for the global forest-based sector in Section 4. A perspective from
150 this sector is highly applicable, as it offers cases of environmental self-regulation and a history of
151 continuous engagement and integration of stakeholder groups (Aaltonen and Kujala, 2010; Prakash
152 and Potoski, 2012; Toppinen et al., 2014).

153 **2. Harmonizing the Ecosystem Service and Service-Dominant Approaches**

154 By harmonizing the language used in business and natural sciences, there is an increased
155 opportunity for collaboration and communication between those fields of study. To facilitate this
156 process for readers unfamiliar with one or both of those approaches, a brief overview of the
157 differences between the GD and SD logics and the ES cascade framework are provided. It is not

possible, however, to extensively summarize each of the approaches here. A more in-depth overview of the SD logic is provided by Lusch and Vargo (2014). Moreover, Fisher et al. (2009) and Haines-Young and Potschin (2010; 2011) both provide important discussions on the definition and classification of ES. For ease of reference, all acronyms and terms that were used throughout this article have been compiled in Tables 1 and 2 respectively.

Table 1. A list of acronyms used in this article.

Acronym	Term
CSR/CR/CS	Corporate Social Responsibility/Corporate Responsibility/Corporate Sustainability
CSV	Creating Shared Value
DPSIR	Drivers, Pressures, State, Impact, Response
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Ecosystem service
GD	Goods-Dominant
GISCAME	Geographic Information System, Cellular Automation, Multi Criteria Evaluation
PES	Payments for Ecosystem Services
SD	Service-Dominant

Table 2. A list of key terminology and definitions from the Ecosystem Service and Service-Dominant approaches.

Term	Definition	Source
Service	<i>From ES approach:</i> An ecological function or process that is considered useful to human beings. <i>From SD approach:</i> The application of specialized competences by one entity through deeds, processes, and performances to create benefit for the entity itself or another entity. The singular term ‘service’ is used to reflect “the process of doing something beneficial for and in conjunction with some entity”. This contrasts with the plural form ‘services’ (see next definition).	Haines-Young and Potschin, 2010; Vargo and Lusch, 2008a
Services	The “intangible output of the firm” or “intangible goods”. Commonly used in the GD logic.	Vargo and Lusch, 2008a
Service System	Dynamic and self-reconfiguring system, interacting over various different temporal and spatial scales, loosely arranged using either hard and/or soft contracts, and entailing both value co-creation and -integration by different actors and their natural environment.	Vargo and Lusch, 2011
Sustainability	“Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”. Depending on the classification and definition, it consists of three or four dimensions: economic, environmental, social, and cultural.	WCED, 1987
Creation of Shared Value (CSV)	“Generating economic value in a way that also produces value for society by addressing its challenges... by reconceiving products and markets, redefining productivity in the value chain, and building supportive industry clusters at the company’s locations.”	Porter and Kramer, 2011
Ecosystem Service Approach		
Natural ecosystem	“A dynamic complex of plant, animal and microorganism communities and their nonliving environment interacting as a functional unit.”	MA, 2003
Natural capital	“The stock that yields the flow of natural resources.” We augment this definition in Section 3 to be: the stock of potential value held by natural ecosystems for human utilization.	Daly, 1994
Biological diversity (i.e., biodiversity)	The “variability among living organisms from all sources including, <i>inter alia</i> , terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are part: this includes diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems.”	Convention on Biological Diversity, 1992

Ecosystem service(s)	Benefit(s) obtained by people from natural or semi-natural ecosystems that contribute to human well-being.	Fisher et al., 2009; Haines-Young and Potschin, 2010
Ecosphere	The “sum total of life on earth together with the global environment and the earth’s total resources” or “that part of our sphere in which there is life together with the living organisms it contains.”	Cole, 1958; Gillard, 1969
Service-Dominant Approach		
Business ecosystem	A complex network of relationships based on service flows and organizational evolution (i.e., a whole ecosystem influencing/interacting with the actors – extension to the Service System definition).	Moore, 1996; Iansiti and Levien, 2004
Operand resource	Those resources that are acted upon – e.g., wood.	Vargo and Lusch, 2004
Operant resource	Those resources that act upon other resources – e.g., knowledge and skills.	Vargo and Lusch, 2004
Resource Integration	Application of operant resources or competencies to operand resources via four resource categories: people, technology, value propositions connecting internal and external service systems, and shared information (e.g. language, laws, measures, and methods).	Vargo and Lusch, 2004; Spohrer et al., 2007
Service ecosystem	A “relatively self-contained, self-adjusting system of resource-integrating actors that are connected by shared institutional, logical, and mutual value creation through service exchange.”	Lusch and Vargo, 2014
Value network	Any purposeful group of people or organizations creating social and economic good through complex dynamic exchanges of value. Also referred to as a value constellation.	Normann and Ramirez, 1993; Allee, 2009
Value-in-exchange	“Is required for value creation” and acts to mediate and monitor value-in-use. It provides a “way of measuring relative value within a context of surrounding systems.”	Vargo et al., 2008
Value-in-use	“Value is always uniquely and phenomenologically determined by the beneficiary” leading to a more holistic recognition, collection and definition of value originating from the interaction of different service systems.	Vargo and Lusch, 2006
<i>Value-in-impact</i>	A spatially and temporally dynamic component embedded in value-in-use and exchange, which represents the co-creation and co-destruction of potential value (positive and negative impact) attributed by actors to how ES are managed, facilitated, and utilized by human-based service systems in the value network.	Presented in this study.

The four axioms and six additional foundational premises of the SD logic (Vargo and Lusch, 2004, 2008b; Lusch and Vargo, 2014) state that:

1. “Service is the fundamental basis of exchange”
 - a. “Indirect exchange masks the fundamental basis of exchange”
 - b. Goods are a vehicle or “distribution mechanism for service provision”
 - c. “Operant resources are the fundamental source of competitive advantage”
 - d. “All economies are service economies”
2. “The customer is always a co-creator of value”
 - a. “The enterprise can only make value propositions”
 - b. “A service-centered view is customer oriented and relational”
3. “All economic and social actors are resource integrators”
4. “Value is always uniquely and phenomenologically determined by the beneficiary”

These axioms contrast with the GD logic, where value-in-exchange is the basis for estimating the value of ‘goods’ or ‘services’ and value is produced by firms and brought to a market through the

181 exchange of other goods or money (Table 3) (Vargo et al., 2008). The GD logic identifies ‘final’
 182 customers as the receivers of value, and interactions in the market occur mainly between ‘producers’
 183 and ‘consumers’ (Lusch and Vargo, 2014). Value is embedded in a produced good, and the focus is
 184 on the supply and demand of goods via price (Vargo and Lusch, 2011). Therefore, value is created
 185 by firms (i.e., production) and destroyed (i.e., consumed) by the ‘consumer’ (Plé and Chumpitaz
 186 Cáceres, 2010).

187 **Table 3. A comparison of value creation concepts from the Goods-Dominant logic and the**
 188 **Service-Dominant logic (Adapted from Vargo et al. (2008)).**

	GD Logic	SD Logic
Value driver	Value-in-exchange	Value-in-use or value-in-context
Creator of value	Firm, often with input from firms in a supply chain	Firm, network partners, and beneficiaries*
Process of value creation	Firms embed value in “goods” or “services”, value is “added” by enhancing or increasing attributes	Firms propose value through market offerings, beneficiaries* continue value-creation process through use
Purpose of value	Increase wealth for the firm	Increase adaptability, survivability, and system well-being through service (applied knowledge and skills) of others
Measurement of value	The amount of nominal value, price received in exchange	The adaptability and survivability of the beneficiary system
Resources used	Primarily operand resources	Primarily operant resources, sometimes transferred by embedding them in operand resources (i.e., goods)
Role of firm	Produce and distribute value	Propose and co-create value, provide service
Role of goods	Units of output, operand resources are embedded with value	Vehicle for operant resources, enables access to benefits of firm competences
Role of customers	To ‘use up’ or ‘destroy’ value created by the firm	Co-create value through the integration of firm-provided resources with other private and public resources

*Vargo et al. (2008) use ‘customers’ here, but we have changed this to beneficiaries.

189 The process of value creation and purpose of that value, in the context of the SD logic, is described
 190 as created jointly, or co-created, by service systems either for or with beneficiary systems (Table 3)
 191 (Vargo et al., 2008). This is done through a network constituting of interactive sets of experiences
 192 and activities (i.e., interactions and resource integration between different individuals and firms) to
 193 improve the beneficiaries’ well-being (Maglio and Spohrer, 2008; Spohrer et al., 2008; Grönroos,
 194 2008). The interactions are based on voluntary mutual exchange between different service systems
 195 (Payne et al., 2008).

196 Co-creation of potential value is accomplished via four resource categories: people, technology,
 197 value propositions connecting internal and external service systems, and shared information (e.g.,
 198 language, laws, measures, and methods) (Spohrer et al., 2007). Resource integration involves
 199 applying operant resources or competencies to operand resources (Vargo and Lusch, 2004). This
 200 network of value co-creators can be referred to as a ‘value network’ of ‘service systems’ (i.e.,

201 individuals, firms, actors) (Table 2). In the value network, there are only actor-to-actor interactions
202 where human actors can form their own service system or contribute towards a larger multi-individual
203 service system (i.e., employees in a firm) (Ramirez, 1999; Peppard and Ryland, 2006).

204 Furthermore, value is perceived by the beneficiary based on the processes that contribute towards
205 the potential value of a given service. If a firm tries to maximize “the lifetime value” of its
206 beneficiaries, then superior value propositions must be provisioned to maximize the total potential
207 value that is co-created with them (Payne and Frow, 2005; Payne et al., 2008). Lifetime value is
208 derivative of superior knowledge of the beneficiaries’ value creation process, which requires
209 understanding of the structure of those processes.

210 Total potential value of a service is comprised of two components: value-in-exchange and value-
211 in-use. These components represent value that is actualized by facilitating the service offering to the
212 beneficiary and their subsequent utilization of it (Gummesson, 2007; Grönroos and Voima, 2013).
213 Transfers of value are formalized in the market through value-in-exchange (i.e., exchange of money),
214 which can exist as “multiple singular entities” throughout the value creation process (Grönroos and
215 Voima, 2013). These exchanges mediate and monitor the value creation process that evolves within
216 value-in-use (Grönroos, 2008). Value-in-use “is always uniquely and phenomenologically
217 determined by the beneficiary;” making value idiosyncratically created and evaluated by the
218 beneficiary (Vargo and Lusch, 2006; Lusch and Vargo, 2014).

219 Value-in-use is based on the collective or individual value of a beneficiary’s utilization
220 preferences (Vargo and Lusch, 2008b). Given that human experiences can be realized over multiple
221 temporal and spatial dimensions; the inclusion of value-in-use is an important part of determining the
222 lifetime value of a beneficiary. Full value-in-use may only be actualized long after the value-in-
223 exchange is fully realized or occur far away from the physical point of exchange (Payne et al., 2008;
224 Bocken et al., 2015). Moreover, value creation is a non-linear interactive and dynamic process (Payne
225 et al., 2008). Experiences can lead to value-in-use that is positive or negative (i.e., greater or lesser
226 well-being) (Grönroos and Voima, 2013). Thus, value creation by one service system results in
227 potential value that can be utilized, missed or destroyed by various other actors, processes, and
228 resources that are part of a service system’s value network (Maglio and Spohrer, 2008; Bocken et al.,
229 2015).

230 In the SD view, value co-destruction occurs through “interactional process between service
231 systems that results in a decline in at least one of the systems’ well-being” (Plé and Chumpitaz
232 Cáceres, 2010). Therefore, value destruction is a consequence of misuse of operant or operand

resources and not what is ‘expected’ or ‘appropriate’ according to another service system (e.g., the beneficiary system). Misuse can be accidental or intentional, and lead to adverse outcomes for some or all service systems in the value network (Plé and Chumpitaz Cáceres, 2010).

Many of the foundational concepts of the SD logic are found implicitly within the ES approach. Gómez-Baggethun et al., (2010) note that the terms value-in-use and value-in-exchange have a long history as part of the debate about the societal value of natural ecosystem functions. Ricardo (1871) discussed that natural ecosystem functions as ‘serviceable’ to human service-systems through value-in-use. Similar views on ecosystems’ value were also forwarded by Marx (1891), who stated that both labor and nature were the source of use value, though neither economist suggested that nature contributed to exchange value (Gómez-Baggethun et al., 2010). In the early 20th century, the discussion shifted to one focused on the value-in-exchange due through the emergence of the neo-classical economic paradigm. Pigou (1920) noted that “the range of our inquiry becomes restricted to that part of social welfare that can be put directly or indirectly into relation with the measuring rod of money.” This shift in the view on ES value creation severely restricted subsequent analyses to only those service offerings that had a monetary value (i.e., price) and excluded non-market service offerings (e.g., regulating ES).

More recently, there has been a shift in economics towards a more holistic recognition of ES offerings using monetary valuation methods (e.g., willingness-to-pay) (Gómez-Baggethun et al., 2010). The aim of monetization is to price non-market ES offerings and account for them through various schemes (e.g., payments for ecosystem services (PES)). Still, the use of these policies only expresses priced service offerings through the exchange value of the service. The recognition of ES offerings’ value only through market prices often excludes value-in-use. This restricts both the maximum value potential that is recognized by firms and other resource integrators value co-creation opportunities.

The holistic recognition of both value-in-use and exchange for ES offerings has important implications for the decisions by human-based service systems to utilize, miss, or destroy value throughout the network. These missed opportunities can be extended to the creation and destruction of value from natural ecosystems (i.e., trade-offs between ES offerings resulting from natural ecosystem utilization and management). By extending the SD approach to ES offerings, then ES are service offerings that form part of the value creation processes of value networks and are impacted by resource integration processes over the network. Fully understanding the impacts of resource integration on the value potential of ES offerings is important. To start, ES offerings should be

265 classified in a manner that facilitates accurate measurement and accounting of their role in value
266 creation.

267 The ES cascade was developed (see, Haines Young and Potschin 2010, 2011) for accounting and
268 classifying ES (Fig. 1). The cascade describes the integration of resources required to produce service
269 offerings by a given natural ecosystem (i.e., natural ecosystem functions and processes). It references
270 value creation through both value-in-exchange (e.g., “willingness-to-pay”) and value-in-use (e.g.,
271 “what values...social, moral, or aesthetic”) between natural ecosystems and beneficiaries. In the
272 cascade framework, the maximum potential value of ES offerings that is available to humans from
273 natural ecosystems is constrained based on the sum of pressures on the system. For these reasons, the
274 cascade has become an integrated component for various ES and environmental impact modeling
275 frameworks that guide natural ecosystem management decisions. These models range from spatial
276 impact assessment models (e.g., GISCAM – see Table 1) to the *DPSIR* (*Drivers, Pressures, State, Impact, Response*)
277 conceptual model for ecosystem management and communication (Müller and
278 Burkhard, 2012; Kelble et al., 2013). The exact nature of the aforementioned models is not important
279 for this study, but the integration of the ES cascade into planning models does indicate its operational
280 potential and adaptability.

281
282 **Fig. 1. The Ecosystem Service cascade framework adopted from Haines-Young and Potschin**
283 **(2010).**

285 Within the cascade, ‘function’ refers to the “capacity or capability of the ecosystem to do
286 something that is potentially useful to people,” indicating the role of the natural ecosystem as a service

287 system providing offerings with potential value (de Groot, 1992; de Groot et al., 2002). In this study,
288 the term ‘function’ is used to refer to those natural ecosystem processes that lead to service offerings
289 and well-being for human-beings². Fisher et al. (2008; 2009) regard biophysical structures and
290 ecological processes or functions (i.e., biocentric part of the cascade starting on the left side) to be
291 moving from ‘intermediate services’ into ‘final services’ and their associated benefits (i.e.,
292 anthropocentric part of the cascade starting on the right side). That progression is generally viewed
293 as a continuum within Fig. 1. Final service offerings directly contribute to an individuals’ well-being,
294 and ‘intermediate’ service offerings (e.g., primary productivity) enhance well-being indirectly
295 through a ‘final’ service offering (e.g., constant stream flow) (Johnston and Russell, 2011). The
296 cascade framework aims to remove the risk of double-counting in ES analysis by only accounting for
297 service offerings when they are utilized by another service system (Fisher et al., 2009).

298 Having summarized the main concepts and terms, it is important to note that there are still gaps
299 and conflicts between the SD logic and ES approaches. To address these gaps and conflicts some of
300 the current terminology and concepts in both approaches need to be re-evaluated. Four necessary
301 shifts were identified that are foundational to harmonizing the ES and SD logic approaches.

302 First, the SD logic makes a clear distinction between the use of the singular term ‘service’ and
303 GD logic-based ‘services’ (Table 2). Vargo and Lusch (2008a) provide an in-depth discussion of the
304 similarity of usage between these two terms. They define service offerings as the outcome of applying
305 “specialized competences” or operant resources “through deeds, processes, and performances for the
306 benefit of another entity or the entity itself” (Table 2). We believe that this is the intended definition
307 of ecosystem ‘services’ given by Fisher et al. (2009) and applied in the various ES classification
308 schemes. In the current ES literature, the plural of ‘service’ or ‘services’ is used interchangeably with
309 the GD ‘services,’ but these two terms have very different meanings within the discussion on value
310 creation. They are not interchangeable, but rather the same term for two definitions. Therefore, we
311 adopt the singular form ‘service,’ and the plural form ‘service offerings,’ throughout the remainder
312 of this text to avoid confusion and draw the distinction with the GD ‘services’. However, we
313 acknowledge that the use of ‘services’ is well-established within the ES literature. Clarification of the
314 meaning of ‘services,’ though challenging, is important and will require further efforts and discussion.

315 Second, based on the definition of service system given in Table 2 the natural environment is a
316 contextual part of, or even a basis of, the definition of service systems (i.e., the term ‘entity’ refers to

² Fisher et al. (2009) note that there is an important distinction between ecosystem ‘function’ (anthropocentrically derived) and ‘functioning’ (biocentrically derived). Value creation is an anthropocentric concept, which justifies our used of ‘function’ over ‘functioning’.

all organisms involved in the value creation process). Despite some supportive discussion, the integration of natural ecosystems as a macro service system within the value network is not a widely accepted view within the SD logic. The economy, in the hierarchy of embedded service systems, has previously been identified as the largest service system by Maglio and Spohrer (2008). We propose instead that the ecosphere is the largest service system and an actor in the value creation process that human-based service systems interact with and act upon. It would be impossible for any of the other service systems to integrate resources or co-create value without this system, and human societies and economies would not exist without the environment that they have evolved within and from. The ecosphere integrates resources based on competencies that exist through complex ecosystem functions, which lead to value propositions (i.e., ES offerings) that other service systems utilize and value.

Third, the use of ‘natural resources’ is currently and persistently used to refer to natural ecosystems’ service offerings in the service literature (e.g., Porter and Kramer, 2011; Grönroos and Voima, 2013). This term is largely obsolete within the ES literature. The term ‘operand resources’ is used within the SD logic to describe those ‘natural resources’ that “require some action to be performed on them to have value;” further potential value and value-in-use are created by human-based service systems integrating these operand resources (Lusch and Vargo, 2011). The reliance on further processing of the ‘natural resource’ base, with the intention to utilize potential value, is in opposition with the ecosphere being the largest macro service system. Rather than being described as ‘natural resources,’ we propose that ES offerings’ contributions to human well-being mean that they have potential value regardless of further processing (i.e., by firms or individuals). Then natural ecosystems can be viewed as actors within the value network rather than commodity repositories. Value potential that is created by natural ecosystems can then be attributed to them rather than attributed to firms and individuals who are only facilitating or utilizing those ES offerings.

Finally, there needs to be a clear amendment to how service offerings from natural ecosystems are described and discussed in the ES literature. The terminology ‘goods and services’ is frequently used despite the widespread use of a ‘service’ approach (e.g., Polasky and Segerson, 2009; Johnston and Russell, 2011). The lack of a clear SD approach in the discussion of ES, despite the large amount of service science literature available, impedes debate between natural and business sciences. It also inhibits the development of a holistic discourse with the ES literature regarding the service value of ES offerings. As a result, emphasis is often placed only on the exchange value of ES; even though many authors note the limitations of this approach when discussing the opportunity costs of ES provisioning (e.g., Wilson and Hoehn, 2006; Spangenberg et al., 2014). Natural ecosystems only

350 provision service offerings and not ‘goods and services,’ which act as the basis of exchange with
351 other human-based service systems. This means that the focus in the ES literature should shift towards
352 a holistic view on ES value creation. This viewpoint is not expressly new. The desire for a more
353 balanced approach to estimating and describing the potential value of ES offerings has been called
354 for and demonstrated by others (e.g., de Groot et al., 2010; Potschin and Haines-Young, 2011).

355 **3. Towards an integrated Service-Dominant Value Creation Framework**

356 Harmonization of the ES and SD logic terminology and concepts provides the basis for creating
357 the SVC framework for discussing service value creation. The two approaches together consider
358 value creation across all three macro service systems or dimensions of sustainability (i.e., economy,
359 society, and environment). The purpose of their harmonization is, ultimately, to address the global
360 change pressures being exerted on natural ecosystems, and the associated negative value creation
361 (i.e., value destruction of ES through adverse trade-offs). Therefore, it is sensible to also note the
362 main overlaps between the SVC framework and other frameworks proposed within sustainability
363 science.

364 The ES literature describes the socio-ecological system as functioning through a complex and
365 dynamic set of ‘demand-supply’ relationships based on non-linearities, thresholds, and the influence
366 of external pressures (Anderies et al., 2004; Folke, 2007). Fig. 2 moves away from that ‘demand-
367 supply’ relationship found in the ES cascade framework, towards one based on value creation within
368 a set of dynamic and complex value networks. For example, all aspects of value creation are
369 emphasized (i.e., use and exchange) rather than only those related to the exchange value (i.e., price)
370 of ES offerings³. Delimiting value assessments into stated monetary preferences (e.g., willingness-
371 to-pay) that represent total value of the services (i.e., GD logic of value) are not sufficient to
372 comprehensively communicate about ES value-in-use. As a distinction to Haines-Young and
373 Potschin’s (2010; 2011) ES cascade framework, a greater emphasis is placed on the value-in-use and
374 phenomenological determination of value by beneficiaries. The SVC framework better accounts for
375 value creation by addressing the complex value creation interactions within business ecosystems,
376 between society and the economy, and between human-based service systems and natural ecosystems.

³ We base this assessment on the discussion by Vargo and Lusch (2008a), who provide a detailed comparison of the terms ‘value-in-use’ and ‘utility’ from economic sciences. Those authors state that in the shift from Adam Smith’s economic philosophy (where he presented the term ‘value-in-use’) to the concept of economic science (based on embedded ‘utility’), means that “value-in-use has been dwarfed and ‘utility’ has morphed into value-in-exchange.” We do not take on this debate in this study, and instead accept Vargo and Lusch’s (2008a) assessment of the difference of these two terms in presenting our integrated approach.

378

379 **Fig. 2. A service-dominant value creation (SVC) framework for ecosystem service offerings in**
380 **value co-creation within the socio-ecological system.**

381 An embedded non-concentric circles approach is applied in Fig. 2 to demonstrate the dependent
382 relationship between the macro service systems. By placing the macro service systems of society and
383 economy within the environment, the reliance of human well-being and societal development are
384 intrinsically linked to natural ecosystems (Carter and Moir, 2012; Costanza et al., 2014). In Fig. 2,
385 interactions between service systems occur in a bi-directional and non-circular manner. The
386 overlapping ‘process’ boxes represent the flow of potential ES value through the macro service
387 systems (i.e., economy, society, and the environment).

388 Each of the three dimensions is interlinked through a constellation of dynamic and co-current
389 value networks. In each network, economic and social service systems fluidly co-create value with
390 each other through voluntary exchanges. Temporally (e.g., intergenerational, over time) and spatially
391 (e.g., between service systems, over geographical distance) dynamic interactions are accounted for

392 through the facilitation (i.e., exchange) and utilization of phenomenologically determined potential
393 value. This flow of service offerings between the three dimensions overcomes the previous critiques
394 of the embedded circles approach: lack of multidimensionality (i.e., temporal – intergenerational) and
395 interconnectedness (i.e., spatial – connections between the three dimensions) (Lozano, 2008).
396 Therefore, we consider an integrated and intergenerational perspective between the dimensions
397 through the process of value creation.

398 An individual can be both a social and economic service system during the same value creation
399 processes, and the economy is naturally embedded in the society. Human-based service systems rely
400 on the exploitation of natural capital for continued value creation. The ES cascade overlaps with
401 human-based macro service systems (i.e., economy and society), and the determination of
402 ‘intermediate’ and ‘final’ ES offerings is dependent on the level of connectivity to other service
403 systems and utilization by the beneficiary (Turner and Daily, 2008; Fisher et al., 2009). Moving
404 clockwise, resource integration processes are applied by other service systems to those ES; aiming to
405 maximize value co-creation. This means that value is co-created by utilizing and managing potential
406 value of ES offerings, and by integrating resources to create further value propositions. Therefore,
407 human-based service systems are co-creators and co-destroyers of potential ES value through
408 exchanges and interventions with natural ecosystems. Consequently, natural capital represents the
409 stock of potential value held by natural ecosystems. By integrating natural ecosystems in this way,
410 positive and negative impacts on ES value creation are accounted for the over an entire value network.

411 Service offerings then directly or indirectly benefit individuals, and a feedback of impacts on
412 natural ecosystems occurs. These impacts can affect natural ecosystem resilience, which is an
413 indication of their ability to continue providing further potential value (i.e., co-destruction by human-
414 based service systems with natural ecosystems). All natural ecosystem management by human-based
415 service systems constrains the provisioning of some ES over others; potentially resulting in adverse
416 trade-offs (Polasky and Segerson, 2009).

417 Trade-offs have a pivotal role in value creation for both individual and total service system well-
418 being (Carpenter et al., 2009; Howe et al., 2014). A change in the level of provisioning for one service
419 may negatively affect the level of provisioning of another, which often occurs when human-based
420 service systems are competing for value co-creation opportunities with natural ecosystems
421 (Rodriguez et al., 2006; McShane et al., 2011). Trade-offs, and the associated ecological impacts, are
422 particularly important for the management of natural ecosystems, which provision multiple ES
423 simultaneously (Polasky and Segerson, 2009). Given that both exchange and use values are intrinsic

424 to the concept of ES, all changes to ES provisioning levels are implicitly value-laden (Brauman et al.,
425 2007, Diaz et al., 2011).

426 Currently there are no commonly accepted terms or concepts in service science related to the
427 identification and discussion of co-creation or co-destruction of natural ecosystem's service offerings.
428 Consequently, the new concept of *value-in-impact* is introduced to account for and discuss their role
429 in value creation. *Value-in-impact* is a spatially and temporally dynamic component of value-in-use
430 and value-in-exchange, which represents the co-creation and co-destruction of potential value (i.e.,
431 positive and negative impact) attributed by actors to how ES are managed, facilitated, and utilized by
432 human-based service systems (Fig. 3). It represents the value potential available to and
433 phenomenologically determined by the beneficiaries of ES offerings over the value network. Total
434 potential value is constrained based on scarcity of ES provisioning in the socio-ecological system.
435 One approach to addressing thresholds in the socio-ecological system is evaluating essentiality and
436 environmental impact of a firm's offering through a sustainable development orientation
437 (Heikkurinen and Bonnedahl, 2013; Nunes et al., 2015).

438

Fig. 3. A graphical conceptualization of the *value-in-impact* concept represented as a portion of the value-in-use and value-in-exchange of a service offering. *Value-in-impact* is both spatially and temporally dynamic, and can be either part of the positive or negative impacts on maximum potential value over the value network. A two-dimensional reflection of the value space is shown below to demonstrate the interdependency between the three components of value.

In Fig. 3, the net value potential, spatial, and temporal dimensions represent the total potential and phenomenologically-determined value for a beneficiary. Knowing that total potential value is the sum of value-in-use and value-in-exchange, *value-in-impact* is a part of both use and exchange value and does not constitute the entire potential of either. Actions across the value network constrain value potential by carrying out value destruction; thereby, limiting the net potential value that is available over spatial and temporal dimensions. Value-in-use is a requirement for an exchange of value to occur, which is the basis for representing value-in-exchange non-linearly within value-in-use. The maximum and minimum of all value dimensions are undefined (i.e., they are phenomenologically determined by the beneficiary and constrained over the value network).

By placing *value-in-impact* in the context of ES trade-offs within the SVC framework, actions by other service systems can result in trade-offs that create or destroy value potential associated with natural capital. For example, negative value or the destruction of potential value for beneficiaries can emerge as a result of a firm's impacts on natural ecosystems. Some trade-offs, occurring over spatially and temporally diverse dimensions, may be irreversible leading directly or indirectly to adverse impacts on value flows (Howe et al., 2014). The resulting impacts could be an aggregated loss in value for some beneficiaries or an entire set of beneficiary service systems. The amount of net potential value still available from utilizing ES offerings represents the impact on value co-creation by a service system's resource integration processes. These impacts can affect both the lifetime value of and potential value for a firm's beneficiaries. This provides a more inclusive approach to studying the relationship between the damage, replacement and avoidance costs noted by Spangenberg et al. (2014), and their impact on human well-being.

Value-in-impact can facilitate understanding of how to maximize the potential societal value, associated with the facilitation and utilization of ES, over the value network (i.e., the economy is considered to be one aspect of societal organization). Discussing and identifying the maximum potential societal value associated with *value-in-impact* requires knowledge of ES indicators, impacts of processing, and trade-offs of ES offerings throughout the value network. There are already various different decision-making methods that can be used to account for these impacts with differing outcomes (e.g., Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)). The purpose of *value-in-impact* is not to create another method or replace existing methods. Rather, it provides service sciences with a

474 contextually appropriate term to discuss ES trade-offs and utilization impacts linked to beneficiaries'
475 value creation processes.

476 A considerable amount of research on how beneficiaries' value structures are related to their
477 views on ecological impacts has already been conducted (Stern et al., 1993; Schwartz, 1994; Stern
478 and Dietz, 1994). The manner in which impacts on ES service provisioning are perceived by
479 individuals, either more or less positively or negatively, is connected to the value orientations of their
480 environmental concern: biocentrism, humanism altruism⁴, and egoism. This is a reflection of how
481 adverse impacts on natural ecosystems, resulting from choices by other service systems within the
482 value network, ultimately affect those individuals both directly and indirectly (Dietz et al., 2009). The
483 three dimensional aspect of environmental concern differs between beneficiaries. That difference
484 ultimately results in diversity in the desirable end states of or behaviors towards value creation
485 (preferences) and service provisioning. In-order to prevent value destruction, firms need to better
486 understand how individual beneficiaries' value creation processes are structured.

487 As noted earlier, *value-in-impact* is a temporally dynamic part of value and value structures are
488 not fixed. Managing the change in lifetime value that emerges due to changes in an individual's
489 preferences is a value creation risk for firms. Increased awareness of ES impacts for a given service
490 offering means that *value-in-impact* could form an increasing share of the value creation opportunities
491 between a beneficiary and other service systems (Dietz et al., 2005). As a result, the shifting value
492 orientations of beneficiaries are important and should be recognized; something that is increasingly
493 acknowledged by many firms (The Economist, 2015).

494 Within Fig. 2, trade-offs between different ES and impacts are considered by the connection of
495 service systems at multiple levels of governance. Multi-level governance interventions aim to address
496 value destruction and alleviate pressures from managing the provisioning ES offerings. The
497 governance element is a key component of the ES cascade and earlier ES frameworks (e.g., Turner
498 and Daily, 2008; Polasky and Segerson, 2009). Policies regarding environmental programs and
499 regulations, voluntary or mandatory, should act to dictate a safe minimum level of service
500 provisioning required throughout the value network (Segerson, 2013). Carbon emission controls via
501 taxes or cap-and-trade, obligatory resource management laws, and corporate sustainability reporting
502 are a few examples of possible instruments (Gray, 2010; Prakash and Potoski, 2012; Segerson, 2013).
503 Policies reflect use (e.g., corporate sustainability disclosure based on GRI standards) or exchange

⁴ Altruism is defined by Dietz et al. (2009) as the value of others, including humans and other ecosystems/species. Human altruism can also be referred to as social altruism and environmental altruism can also be referred to as biocentrism (Dietz et al., 2009).

(e.g., PES) values attributed to ES (Matthies et al., 2016). Policy makers must evaluate the minimum service provisioning levels required to maximize value over all of the individual value chains that constitute the value network (Balmford et al., 2011). A holistic integration of the SD logic in the ES approach provides for the inclusion of all social and ecological actors to be considered as endogenous components of the value creation process (Vargo et al., 2008).

4. Applications of the SVC framework to the global forest-based sector

We now provide a case application of the SVC framework, and associated shifts in terminology, for the global forest-based sector. Although we highlight forestry, the concepts presented in this study are likely to be applicable across a wide range of sectors reliant on interactions with the natural environment.

The global forest-based sector (e.g., forestry producing biomass – e.g., round wood – and industries processing harvested biomass – e.g., into pulp and paper or dimension lumber) faces numerous obstacles in accounting for impacts on forested ecosystems. The service systems or actors involved in value co-creation are both direct (e.g., foragers, recreationalists) and indirect beneficiaries (e.g., multinational corporations processing pulp and paper for individual utilization). Many strategic shifts are currently occurring due to societal (e.g., urbanization, technology) and policy changes (e.g., sustainable forest management certification) that have had important implications on the types and volume of ES available from forested ecosystems (Fisher et al, 2008). These factors, along with the wide range of developmental and sociological contexts that the sector operates in, makes the associated value networks dynamic, complex and increasingly service oriented (Toppinen et al., 2013).

Arnold (2015) notes that by evaluating all of the stakeholders in the value network, co-creation processes can be integrated throughout the entire value chain to “minimize negative social and ecological impacts” or *value-in-impact*. Fig. 4 gives a graphical example of a forest-based value network map. It includes actors spanning the environment, society, and the economy, which interact over time and space to co-create value. Below the figure the interactions are discussed using the previously discussed terms and concepts.

Starting at the forested landscape level, ecosystem management with competing objectives can lead to adverse trade-offs between ES offerings. Depending upon the value structure of the beneficiaries and their understanding of the resulting trade-offs, the potential value available to them may also be affected. For those individuals who manage or use the forest directly (e.g., private forest

535 owners), their highly variable ownership objectives, values, and attitudes can have a significant
 536 impact on the provisioning of different ES and associated value creation opportunities (e.g., Wiersum
 537 et al., 2005; Häyrynen et al. 2014).

- (a) An ecosystem manager's objectives act to support or constrain the provisioning of ES offerings from the natural ecosystem. Managers can both co-create value with the ecosystem directly or utilize the ES offerings to co-create value within the value network with other service systems. Therefore, they can be both a beneficiary and a resource integrator.
- (b) Exchanges between the ecosystem manager and the firm. Value is co-created and potential value of ES offerings is facilitated to the firm. Firms apply operant resources to the operand resources with the aim to maximize the lifetime value of the beneficiary. Firm's resource integration processes affect the positive and negative impacts on natural ecosystems, and the potential for value destruction results from those actions.
- (c) Exchange between the firm and beneficiaries is a value co-creation opportunity. The beneficiary system utilizes the potential value of the service offering. This includes both the aspects of the potential value associated with ES and those associated with the application of operant resources by the firm. The aspects associated with the value of ES can be viewed as the value-in-impact component. The destruction of potential value by the firm, through their impact on natural ecosystems, is transferred to the beneficiary.
- (d) Policy makers are one service system that can determine if governance changes are needed to limit value destruction with the macro service system (i.e., economy). Some aims of improved governance are the reduction in trade-offs from natural ecosystem management decisions and the communication of impacts to beneficiaries.
- (e) Interactions between beneficiaries and natural ecosystems can result in direct exchanges of ES between the two service systems.
- (f) The beneficiary and the natural ecosystem manager can be the same actor and service system, which demonstrates the non-linear and dynamic nature of the value network.

538 **Fig. 4. An example of a value network map for the global forest-based sector explained using**
 539 **service-based terminology and concepts.**

540 For example, emphasis on economic management objectives can have a negative impact on the
 541 provisioning of ES related to biodiversity or climate change mitigation (Bonan, 2008; Yousefpour
 542 and Hanewinkel, 2009). This can reduce the value potential available for recreational use of forests

543 or culturally important landscapes, of which the same managers may also be beneficiaries (Pröbstl et
544 al., 2010; Lähtinen and Myllyviita, 2015). Impacts and trade-offs are then transferred further
545 throughout the value network. As a consequence, the increasing societal demands for greater
546 accountability and protection of forest ES offerings are a fundamental challenge (Lähtinen et al.,
547 2014).

548 Managing the positive and negative impacts of land-use is increasingly complex for all human-
549 based service systems (e.g., individuals, firms). The value-in-use of provisioning of climatic benefits
550 might be experienced by beneficiaries well into the future, providing a large lifetime value for the
551 firm, but only providing a minimal value-in-exchange currently. Also, the purchase of ES offerings
552 in one country can lead to negative value realization for local communities due to losses in livelihood
553 opportunities. Nevertheless, it may also lead to value creation opportunities when those service
554 offerings are utilized and exchanged with beneficiaries in another country. Consequently, spatial and
555 temporal aspects are important considerations. The breadth of these challenges demonstrates the
556 importance of a comprehensive view on value creation to allow the firm to better manage
557 opportunities in their value network.

558 In Fig. 5, one portion of the value network was isolated in a highly simplified example of a
559 wooden table. The natural ecosystem (forest) provides intermediate ES offerings of climate regulation
560 through the (a) sequestration and storage of carbon away from the atmosphere. This service is based
561 on the functions and processes of the natural ecosystem, which are (b) utilized by firms, individuals,
562 and humanity to improve well-being and allow for the continuation of other service systems (i.e., the
563 economy, society). When biomass is removed from the natural ecosystem, the (c) regulating service
564 (e.g., stored carbon) is embedded within the operand resource (i.e., timber)⁵. The timber acts as a
565 vehicle (i.e., distribution mechanism), but has no value alone without a use by a beneficiary. The firm
566 or resource integrator applies knowledge and skills to (d) embed further value potential in the ‘good’
567 (table) for the beneficiary. The firm also acts as a value co-creator (e) by facilitating the use of wood
568 through: the exchange of the table and customer interactions (i.e., value-in-exchange), interactions
569 with the beneficiary through table assembly support, climate regulation service offerings (e.g., carbon
570 storage, substitution effects), and all current and future use value of the table for the family (e.g., for
571 eating, design, as a gathering point for meals).

⁵ We acknowledge that this is a gross simplification of carbon accounting in forest management. However, for the sake of the example we exclude further climatic and accounting interactions.

Fig. 5. A simplified diagram of a harmonized service-dominant approach to ecosystem service offerings.

The firm affects the total potential value that can be co-created by managing the environmental impacts of their processes (i.e., *value-in-impact*). The type of material that is processed (e.g., wood versus steel), its associated ecosystem management (e.g., sustainable management of the forest), and the firm's greenhouse gas emissions are all a part of the impact on net potential value. The flow of and trade-offs between ES offerings can then be addressed (f) by beneficiaries making alternative value propositions (e.g., shifting to value networks where sustainably managed ecosystems are ensured through certification).

The challenge in accounting for and communicating these impacts highlights the importance of multi-level governance. Its role is to provide a means of communicating the impacts to beneficiaries who phenomenologically determine the net positive or negative potential value that they perceive for a given service offering. Beneficiaries then provide feedback through exchanges with other service systems, and support efforts to enforce changes in the governance of interactions between natural ecosystems and other service systems.

One effort to communicate and regulate impacts, and address the resulting trade-offs is through forest management certification (e.g., Forest Stewardship Council and Programme for Endorsement of Forest Certification). Certification is an example of market-based private governance that aims to reduce value destruction by ensuring the same ecological management standards across globalized value networks (Humphreys, 2006; Cashore et al., 2007). Evidence suggests that some beneficiaries are willing to pay 'premium profits' or price premiums for the assurances of certification (Russo and

594 Fouts, 1997; Pitelis, 2009). Premiums are realized through value-in-exchange and -use, and can be
595 an important component in building a competitive advantage (York, 2009; Cai and Aguilar, 2013).
596 Thus, value creation extends beyond the ‘price effect’ to include use value. This value-in-use is
597 realized by choosing a service with a relatively higher net *value-in-impact* than alternatives offer
598 (Toppinen et al., 2014).

599 Accounting and disclosure of the environmental impacts by firms is another means of providing
600 beneficiaries with knowledge, which can affect their perception value creation opportunities. This
601 phenomenological determination of value includes the total net potential value associated with the
602 *value-in-impact*. Most of the current tools used to account for and report impacts require some form
603 of qualitative and quantitative indicators of economic or social and environmental performance (EC,
604 2013). Voluntary guidelines for stakeholder communication and sustainability disclosure exist (e.g.,
605 Account Ability, 2011; GRI, 2015, ISO 26000), which can be important tools to monitor the
606 sustainability of the business processes. Strategic benefits of reporting include: enhancing business
607 opportunities, acquiring responsibility-driven customers and financiers, managing risks with a social
608 license to operate, and improving a firm’s reputation (Li and Toppinen, 2011; Lozano and Huisingh,
609 2011).

610 These strategic actions aim to build up a firms’ sustainable competitive advantage and are based
611 on the value co-creation organizational competencies (i.e., “organizational capabilities necessary to
612 execute S-D logic in practice”) noted by Karpen et al. (2011). Better consideration for communication
613 about ES offerings and value co-creation with a firm’s stakeholders and beneficiaries has been
614 suggested to contribute towards increased overall stakeholder value and to build a basis for a
615 sustainable competitive advantage (Borck and Coglianese, 2009; Porter and Kramer, 2011; Karpen
616 et al., 2011). Firms that shift towards a holistic (non-linear) SD approach could benefit from the
617 complementarity of holistic service thinking and sustainability. Skålén and Edvardsson (2015) and
618 Pinho et al. (2014) provide two examples of research related to switching from a GD to SD logic
619 within a firm and within a complex value network respectively.

620 **5. Discussion**

621 Both the ES and SD logic approaches aim to enhance the general understanding of what a service
622 is and how service value is created. These complimentary approaches have been partially harmonized
623 in this study to address oversimplification of natural ecosystems in service sciences and encourage
624 interdisciplinary discussion on ES value creation. A harmonized approach should better facilitate

interdisciplinary research between natural and business sciences. It should also clarify the service orientation of the ES approach. Many of the large gaps between the ES and SD logic approaches have now been addressed, but there is still a need for further research.

For example, harmonization of existing ES classification(s) (e.g., the Common International Classification of Ecosystem Services (CICES)) with the SD logic would be an important starting point. Other areas include the service science definitions of ‘service’ or the role of resource integrators (e.g., Vargo and Lusch, 2008a; Edvardsson et al., 2014). Changing all terms in ES and SD research was deemed beyond the scope of this study. However, small semantic changes can be made by other authors in an effort to achieve an appropriate lexicon for discussing ES (Matthies et al., 2015).

Shifts in terminology will be challenging and require input from both business and natural sciences. This is due to the complexity of natural ecosystems, and their differences when compared other service systems. For example, the term ‘offering’ still represents the proposition of value based on intent. This is suitable if service offerings from natural ecosystems are regarded as ‘natural resources’ or they are otherwise ignored. However, the ecosphere, as the largest service system, does not intend to provide other service systems with value propositions. Also, the ecosphere is not bound by the same institutional constraints (i.e., normative, regulative, cognitive) as human-based service systems. It is rather humans managing and utilizing the potential value provided by natural ecosystems that drive the value co-creation processes with natural ecosystems. This brief example suggests that not all service systems are governed by the same logics of service value co-creation, and a more environmentally inclusive conceptualization may be necessary.

In order to achieve balanced input from many disciplines, it will also be necessary to address the connections between this research and other existing approaches. The SD approach to value creation shares many similarities with the concept of Creating Shared Value (CSV), Corporate Sustainability (CS), and other similar fields of study (Porter and Kramer, 2011; Amini and Bienstock, 2014). In accounting for ES trade-offs and the integration of the firm-wide impacts of their utilization, some of the limitations of the CSV approach noted by Crane et al. (2014) have been addressed in this study. By not specifically integrating and discussing those concepts, this article did not mean to challenge or ignore them. Rather the aim of this study was to specifically harmonize the ES and SD approaches.

6. Conclusions

In summary, the authors of this article call for the current SD logic to consider the interrelated system of reciprocal service provisioning between natural ecosystems and human-based service

656 systems. The article also reveals that there are individuals within the ES community who both
 657 understand the evolving SD logic and aim to join the discourse. Table 4 synthetizes the changes that
 658 were identified in this article for achieving a harmonized service-dominant approach.

659 **Table 4. A summary of the suggested terminological and conceptual adjustments to create a**
 660 **harmonized service-dominant approach.**

Adjustment of...	Current approach	Proposed Integrated approach
Ecosystem Service	‘Ecosystem goods and services are the basis of exchange’	Ecosystem service offerings are the basis of exchange, where firms/individuals co-create value with natural ecosystems.
	‘Value for ecosystem service offerings is determined through value-in-exchange’	Value for ecosystem service offerings is the total potential value, exchange, use, and impact value, perceived and realized by each service system through voluntary exchanges.
Natural Capital	‘The stock that yields the flow of natural resources.’	‘The stock of potential value held by natural ecosystems for human utilization.’
Service-Dominant Logic	‘The largest service system is the global economy’	The ecosphere is the largest service system and an actor in the value creation process that human service systems interact with and act upon
	‘Natural resources are operand resources to be integrated by service systems’	Natural ecosystems provide service offerings with potential value that are utilized or facilitated by other human-based service systems.
	‘Service systems integrate natural resources’	Service systems realize and utilize, create further value from, and/or destroy the potential value that is created by natural ecosystems.
Value Network	‘Any purposeful group of people or organizations creating social and economic good through complex dynamic exchanges of value.’	‘Any purposeful group of people, organizations, or natural ecosystems that create benefit for human well-being through complex dynamic exchanges of value.’
Both approaches	N/A	<i>Value-in-impact</i> as a conceptual tool for discussing the positive and negative ES provisioning impacts throughout the value creation process

661

662 There are numerous benefits of developing a multidisciplinary set of terms and concepts to
 663 address ES value creation. The most obvious are the inter-disciplinary applications within the two
 664 respective fields of study. The interaction between natural and business ecosystems is indissoluble,
 665 and should be a vital component of any theory regarding the facilitation, utilization, and provisioning
 666 of value through service offerings.

667 Acknowledgements

668 Funding from the Academy of Finland (Grants no. 260595 and 265593) and the EUMIXFOR Short
 669 Term Scientific Mission (FP1206) (Grant reference no. 170515-059236) are gratefully
 670 acknowledged. We also acknowledge the helpful comments and feedback from the three
 671 anonymous reviewers and the editor.

672 **References**

- 673 Aaltonen, K., and Kujala, J. (2010) A project lifecycle perspective on stakeholder influence
674 strategies in global projects. *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 26, 381-397.
675 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2010.09.001>
- 676 Account Ability (2011) AccountAbility1000 Stakeholder Engagement Standard 2011. Last accessed
677 on June 15th, 2015. Available from:
678 <http://www.accountability.org/images/content/5/4/542/AA1000SES%202010%20PRInt.pdf>
- 679 Allee, V. (2009) Value-creating networks: organizational issues and challenges. *The Learning*
680 *Organization* 16 (6), 427 – 442. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09696470910993918>
- 681 Anderies, J. M., Janssen, M. A., and Ostrom, E. (2004) Framework to Analyze the Robustness of
682 Social-ecological Systems from an Institutional Perspective. *Ecology and Society* 9, 8. [online]
683 URL: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol9/iss1/art18>
- 684 Amini, M., and Bienstock, C. C. (2014) Corporate sustainability: an integrative definition and
685 framework to evaluate corporate practice and guide academic research. *Journal of Cleaner*
686 *Production* 76, 12-19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.02.016>
- 687 Arnold, M. (2015). Fostering sustainability by linking co-creation and relationship management
688 concepts. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.03.059>
- 689 Auld, G., Gulbrandsen, L. H., and McDermott, C. L. (2008) Certification schemes and the impacts
690 on forests and forestry. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 33, 187–211.
691 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.envIRON.33.013007.103754>
- 692 Balmford, A., Fisher, B., Green, R. E., Naidoo, R., Strassburg, B., Turner, R. K., and Rodrigues, A.
693 S. L. (2011) Bringing Ecosystem Services into the Real World: An Operational Framework for
694 Assessing the Economic Consequences of Losing Wild Nature. *Environmental Resource*
695 *Economics* 48, 161-175. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10640-010-9413-2>
- 696 Berghäll, S., Mattila, O., Kuusisto, J., Häyrynen, L., and Toppinen, A. (2014) Are the Social Layers
697 of Ecosystem Services Understandable Through the Service Dominant Logic: The Business
698 Potential of Forest as an Experience. In *Proceedings of the 5th AHFE Conference: Advances in the*
699 *human side of service engineering, Krakow, Poland, July 19-23*. Freund, L., and Cellary, W. (eds.),
700 pp. 637-645.
- 701 Bliss, J. C., and Martin, A. J. (1989). Identifying small-scale forest management motivations with
702 qualitative methods. *Forest Science* 35 (2), 601–622.
- 703 Bocken, N. M. P., Rana, P., and Short, S. W. (2015). Value mapping for sustainable business
704 thinking. *Journal for Industrial and Production Engineering* 32 (1), 67-81.
705 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/21681015.2014.1000399>
- 706 Bonan, G. B. (2008). Forests and Climate Change: Forcings, Feedbacks, and the Climate Benefits
707 of Forests. *Science* 320, 1444-1449. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1155121>
- 708 Borck, J. C., and Coglianese, C. (2009). Voluntary Environmental Programs: Assessing Their
709 Effectiveness. *Annual Review of Environmental Resources* 34, 305-324.
710 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.envIRON.032908.091450>

711 Boyd, J., and Krupnick, A. (2009). The definition and choice of environmental commodities for
712 nonmarket valuation. *Resources for the Future*, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
713 <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1479820>

714 Brauman, K. A., Daily, G. C., Duarte, T. K., and Mooney, H. A. (2007). The nature and value of
715 ecosystem services: an overview highlighting hydrologic services. *Annual Review of*
716 *Environmental Resources* 32, 67–98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.energy.32.031306.102758>

717 Cai, Z., and Aguilar, F. X. (2013) Meta-analysis of consumer’s willingness-to-pay premiums for
718 certified wood products. *Journal of Forest Economics* 19 (1), 15-31.
719 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jfe.2012.06.007>

720 Carpenter, S.R., Mooney, H. A., Agard, J., Capistrano, D., DeFries, R. S., Díaz, S., Dietz, T.,
721 Duraipappah, A. K., Oteng-Yeboah, A., Pereira, H. M., Perrings, C., Reid, W. V., Sarukhan, J.,
722 Scholes, R. J., and Whyte, A. (2009). Science for managing ecosystem services: Beyond the
723 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. *PNAS* 106 (5), 1305-1312.
724 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0808772106>

725 Carter, K., and Moir, S. (2012). Diagrammatic Representations of Sustainability – a Review and
726 Synthesis. In *Proceedings 28th Annual ARCOM (Association of Researchers in Construction*
727 *Management) Conference, Edinburgh, UK. September 3-5.* (ed.) S. D. Smith, pp. 1479–1489.

728 Cashore, B, Auld, G., Bernstein, S., and McDermott, C. (2007). Can non-state governance “ratchet-
729 up global environmental standards? Lessons from the forest sector. *RECIEL* 16(2): 158-172.
730 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9388.2007.00560.x>

731 Cole, L. C. (1958). The ecosphere. *Scientific American* 198 (4), 83-92.
732 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0458-83>

733 Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) (1992). “Article 2. Use of Terms”. The United Nations,
734 New York, U.S.A.

735 Costanza, R., de Groot, R., Sutton, P., van der Ploeg, S., Anderson, S., Kubiszewski, I., Farber, S.,
736 and Turner, R. K. (2014) Changes in the global value of ecosystem services. *Global Environmental*
737 *Change* 26, 152–158. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.04.002>

738 Crane, A., Palazzo, G., Spence, L. J., and Matten, D. (2014) Contesting the Value of “Creating
739 Shared Value”. *California Management Review* 56 (2), 130-153.
740 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2014.56.2.130>

741 Daly, H. (1994) Operationalizing Sustainable Development by Investing in Natural Capital. Island
742 Press, Washington, D.C., U.S.A., pp. 22-37.

743 D’Amato, D., Li, N., Rekola, M., Toppinen, A., and Lu, F-F. (2014) Linking forest ecosystem
744 services to corporate sustainability disclosure: A conceptual analysis. *Ecosystem Services* 14, 170-
745 178. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2014.11.017>

746 de Groot, R. S. (1992) Functions of nature: evaluation of nature in environmental planning,
747 management and decision making. Wolters-Noordhoff BV, the Netherlands.

748 de Groot, R. S., Wilson, M. A., and Boumans, R. M. J. (2002) A typology for the classification,
749 description, and valuation of ecosystem functions, goods and services. *Ecological Economics* 41
750 (3), 393-408. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0921-8009\(02\)00089-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0921-8009(02)00089-7)

751 de Groot, R. S., Alkemade, R., Braat, L., Hein, L., and Willemsen, L. (2010) Challenges in
752 integrating the concept of ecosystem services and values in landscape planning, management and
753 decision making. *Ecological Complexity* 7 (3), 260–272.
754 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecocom.2009.10.006>

755 Diaz, S., Quetier, F., Caceres, D. M., Trainor, S. F., Perez-Harguindeguy, N., Bret-Harte, M. S.,
756 Finegan, B., Pena-Claros, M., and Poorter, L. (2011) Linking functional diversity and social actor
757 strategies in a framework for interdisciplinary analysis of nature's benefits to society. *PNAS* 108,
758 895–902. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1017993108>

759 Dickinson, J. L., Crain, R., Yalowitz, S., and Cherry, T. M. (2014) How Framing Climate Change
760 Influences Citizen Scientists' Intentions to Do Something About It. *The Journal of Environmental*
761 *Education* 44 (3), 145-158. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00958964.2012.742032>

762 Dietz, T., Fitzgerald, A., and Shwom, R. (2005) Environmental Values. *Annual Review of*
763 *Environmental Resources* 30, 335-372. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.energy.30.050504.144444>

764 The Economist. "Climate change: Walking the walk." June 6th-12th, 2015.

765 Echeverri, P., and Skålen, P. (2011) Co-creation and co-destruction – a practice theory based study
766 of interactive value formation. *Marketing Theory* 11 (3), 351-373.
767 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1470593111408181>

768 Edvardsson, B., Kleinaltenkamp, M., Tronvoll, B., McHugh, P., and Windahl, C. (2014)
769 Institutional logics matter when coordinating resource integration. *Marketing Theory*, 14 (3), 291-
770 309. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1470593114534343>

771 EC - European Commission (2013) Corporate Social Responsibility: Accountable, Transparent and
772 Responsible Business Behaviour and Sustainable Growth. Brussels, Belgium.

773 Kauppi, A. (2015) Ecosystem services increase the value of pulp. The Finnish Forest Association.
774 Last accessed on December 15th, 2015. Available from: [http://www.smy.fi/en/artikkeli/ecosystem-](http://www.smy.fi/en/artikkeli/ecosystem-services-increase-the-value-of-pulp/)
775 [services-increase-the-value-of-pulp/](http://www.smy.fi/en/artikkeli/ecosystem-services-increase-the-value-of-pulp/)

776 Fisher, B., Turner, R. K., Zylstra, M., Brouwer, R., de Groot, R., Farber, S., Ferraro, P., Green, R.,
777 Hadley, D., Harlow, J., Jefferiss, P., Kirkby, C., Morling, P., Mowatt, S., Naidoo, R., Paavola, J.,
778 Strassburg, B., Yu, D., and Balmford, A. (2008) Ecosystem services and economic theory:
779 integration for policy relevant research. *Ecological Applications* 18 (8), 2050-2067.
780 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1890/07-1537.1>

781 Fisher, B., Turner, R. K., and Morling, P. (2009) Defining and classifying ecosystem services for
782 decision making. *Ecological Economics* 68 (3), 643-653.
783 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2008.09.014>

784 Folke, C., Pritchard, L., Berkes, F., Colding, J., and Svedin, U. (2007) The problem of fit between
785 ecosystems and institutions: ten years later. *Ecology and Society* 12 (1): 30. [online] URL:
786 <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol12/iss1/art30/>

787 Gillard, A. (1969). On the terminology of biosphere and ecosphere. *Nature* 223, 500 – 501.
788 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/223500a0>

789 Gómez-Baggethun, E., de Groot, R., Lomas, P. L., and Montes, C. (2010) The history of ecosystem
790 services in economic theory and practice: from early notions to markets and payment schemes.
791 *Ecological Economics* 69 (6), 1209-1218. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2009.11.007>

- 792 Gummesson, E. (2007) Exit services marketing – enter service marketing. *Journal of Customer*
793 *Behaviour* 6 (2), 113-141. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1362/147539207X223357>
- 794 Gray, R. (2010) Is accounting for sustainability actually accounting for sustainability...and how
795 would we know? An exploration of narratives of organisation and the planet. *Accounting,*
796 *Organizations, and Society* 35, 47–62. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2009.04.006>
- 797 GRI – Global Reporting Initiative (2015) Reporting Principles and Standard Disclosures. Last
798 accessed on June 15th, 2015. Available from:
799 [https://www.globalreporting.org/resource/library/GRIG4-Part1-Reporting-Principles-and-Standard-](https://www.globalreporting.org/resource/library/GRIG4-Part1-Reporting-Principles-and-Standard-Disclosures.pdf)
800 [Disclosures.pdf](https://www.globalreporting.org/resource/library/GRIG4-Part1-Reporting-Principles-and-Standard-Disclosures.pdf)
- 801 Grönroos, C. (2008) Service logic revisited: who creates value? And who co-creates? *European*
802 *Business Review* 20 (4), 298-314. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09555340810886585>
- 803 Grönroos, C., and Voima, P. (2013) Critical service logic: making sense of value creation and co-
804 creation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 41, 113-150.
805 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11747-012-0308-3>
- 806 Harrington, R., Anton, C., Dawson, T. P., de Bello, F., Feld, C. K., Haslett, J. R., Kluvánková-
807 Oravská, T., Kontogianni, A., Lavorel, S., Luck, G. W., Rounsevell, M. D. A., Samways, M. J.,
808 Settele, J., Skourtos, M., Spangenberg, J. A., Vandewalle, M., Zobel, M., and Harrison, P. A.
809 (2010) Ecosystem services and biodiversity conservation: concepts and a glossary. *Biodiversity and*
810 *Conservation* 19 (10), 2773-2790. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10531-010-9834-9>
- 811 Haines-Young, R. and Potschin, M. (2010) The links between biodiversity, ecosystem services and
812 human well-being. In *Ecosystem Ecology: A New Synthesis*. Raffaelli, D., and Frid, C. (eds.), pp.
813 110-139. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K.
- 814 Haines-Young, R., and Potschin, M. (2011) Common International Classification of Ecosystem
815 Services (CICES): 2011 update. In *Expert Meeting on Ecosystem Accounts*. (eds.) CICES. United
816 Nations Statistics Division, the European Environment Agency and the World Bank, London, U.K.
- 817 Heikkurinen, P., and Bonnedahl, K. J. (2013). Corporate responsibility for sustainable development:
818 a review and conceptual comparison of market-and stakeholder-oriented strategies. *Journal of*
819 *Cleaner Production* 43, 191-198. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.12.021>
- 820 Heuer, M. (2011) Ecosystem Cross-Sector Collaboration: Conceptualizing an Adaptive Approach to
821 Sustainability Governance. *Business Strategy and the Environment* 20, 211-221.
822 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/bse.673>
- 823 Howe, C., Suich, H., Vira, B., and Mace, G. M. (2014) Creating win-wins from trade-offs?
824 Ecosystem services for human well-being: A meta-analysis of ecosystem services trade-offs and
825 synergies in the real world. *Global Environmental Change* 28, 263-275.
826 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.07.005>
- 827 Humphreys, D. (2006). Chapter 6: The certification wars. In *LogJam: Deforestation and the Crisis*
828 *of Global Governance*. p. 116-141. Earthscan, London, U.K.
- 829 Häyriinen, L., Mattila, O., Berghäll, S., and Toppinen, A. (2014). Forest Owners' Socio-
830 demographic Characteristics as Predictors of Customer Value: Evidence from Finland. *Small-scale*
831 *Forestry* 14 (1), 19-37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11842-014-9271-9>

832 Iansiti, M., and Levien, R. (2004) *Keystones and Dominators: Framing Operating and Technology*
833 *Strategy in a Business Ecosystem*. Harvard Business School, Boston, U.S.A

834 Johnston, R. J., and Russell, M. (2011) An operational structure for clarity in ecosystem service
835 values. *Ecological Economics* 70, 2243-2249. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2011.07.003>

836 Karpen, I. O., Bove, L. L., and Lukas, B. A. (2011) Linking service-dominant logic and strategic
837 business practice: a conceptual model of a service-dominant orientation. *Journal of Service*
838 *Research*, 1094670511425697.

839 Kelble, C. R., Loomis, D. K., Lovelace, S., Nuttle, W. K., Ortner, P. B., Fletcher, P., Cook, G. S.,
840 Lorenz, J. J., and Boyer, J. N. (2013) The EBM-DPSER conceptual model: integrating ecosystem
841 services into the DPSIR framework. *PLoS ONE* 8(8): e70766.
842 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0070766>

843 Li, N., and Toppinen, A. (2011) Corporate responsibility and sustainable competitive advantage in
844 forest-based industry: Complementary or conflicting goals? *Forest Policy and Economics* 13 (2),
845 113–123. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2010.06.002>

846 Lozano, R. (2008) Envisioning sustainability three-dimensionally. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 16
847 (17), 1838-1846. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2008.02.008>

848 Lozano, R., and Huisinigh, D. (2011) Inter-linking issues and dimensions in sustainability reporting.
849 *Journal of Cleaner Production* 19, 99–107. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2010.01.004>

850 Lusch, R. F., and Vargo, S. L. (2006) Service-dominant logic as a foundation for a general theory.
851 In *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate, and Directions*, Lusch, R. F., and
852 Vargo, S. L. (eds.), pp. 406-420. Sharpe Inc., Armonk.

853 Lusch, R. F., and Vargo, S. L. (2014) *Service-dominant logic: Premises, Perspectives, Possibilities*.
854 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K.

855 Lähtinen, K., Myllyviita, T., Leskinen, P., and Pitkänen, S. (2014) A Systematic literature review
856 on indicators to assess local sustainability of forest energy production. *Renewable & Sustainable*
857 *Energy Reviews* 40: 1202–1216. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2014.07.060>

858 Lähtinen, K., and Myllyviita, T. (2015) Cultural sustainability in reference to the Global Reporting
859 Initiative (GRI) guidelines – Case forest bioenergy production. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*
860 *Management and Sustainable Development* 5, 290–318. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JCHMSD-06-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JCHMSD-06-2013-0025)
861 [2013-0025](http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JCHMSD-06-2013-0025)

862 Matthies, B. D., Kalliokoski, T., Ekholm, T., Hoen, H. F., and Valsta, L. T. (2015) Risk, reward,
863 and payments for ecosystem services: A portfolio approach to ecosystem services and forestland
864 investment. *Ecosystem Services* 16, 1-12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2015.08.006>

865 Maglio, P. P., and Spohrer, J. (2008) Fundamentals of service science. *Journal of the Academy of*
866 *Marketing Science* 36 (1), 18-20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11747-007-0058-9>

867 Marx, K. (1970) Critique of the Gotha program. Progress Publishers, Moscow, U.S.S.R. (Originally
868 published in 1891 in *Die Neue Zeit*, Bd. 1, No. 18, 1890-91).

869 McShane, T. O., Hirsch, P. D., Tran Chi, T., Songorwa, A. N., Kinzig, A., Monteferri, B.,
870 Mutekanga, D., Hoang Van, T., Dammert, J. L., Pulgar-Vidal, M., Welch-Devine, M., Brosius, J.

871 P., Coppolillo, P., and O'Connor, S. (2011) Hard choices: making tradeoffs between biodiversity
872 conservation and human well-being. *Biological Conservation* 144, 966–972.

873 Merriam-Webster.com. (2011) "vehicle." Accessed on: December 15th, 2015. Accessed from:
874 <http://www.merriam-webster.com>.

875 Moore, J. F. (2006) Business ecosystems and the view from the firm. *The Antitrust Bulletin* 51 (1),
876 31-75. [online] URL:
877 http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/antibull51&g_sent=1&id=37

878 Mönkkönen, M., Juutinen, A., Mazziotta, A., Miettinen, K., Podkopaev, D., Reunanen, P.,
879 Salminen, H., and Tikkanen, O-P. (2014) Spatially dynamic forest management to sustain
880 biodiversity and economic returns. *Journal of Environmental Management* 134, 80-89.
881 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2013.12.021>

882 Müller, F., and Burkhard, B. (2012) The indicator side of ecosystem services. *Ecosystem Services* 1
883 (1), 26-30. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2012.06.001>

884 Normann, R., and Ramirez, R. (1993) From value chain to value constellation: Designing
885 interactive strategy. *Harvard Business Review* 71, 65-77.

886 Nunes, B., Alaminio, R. C., Shaw, D., and Bennett, D. (2015). Modelling sustainability performance
887 to achieve absolute reductions in socio-ecological systems. *Journal of Cleaner Production*.
888 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.08.037>

889 Payne, A. F., and Frow, P. (2005) A strategic framework for customer relationship management.
890 *Journal of Marketing* 69, 167-176. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.2005.69.4.167>

891 Payne, A. F., Storbacka, K., and Frow, P. (2008) Managing the co-creation of value. *Journal of the*
892 *Academy of Marketing Science* 36, 83-96. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11747-007-0070-0>

893 Peppard, J., and Rylander, A. (2006) From value chain to value network: Insights for mobile
894 operators. *European Management Journal* 24 (2) 1-22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2006.03.003>

895 Pinho, N., Beirão, G., Patrício, L., and Fisk, R. P. (2014) Understanding value co-creation in
896 complex services with many actors. *Journal of Service Management* 25 (4), 470 – 493.
897 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JOSM-02-2014-0055>

898 Pitelis, C. N. (2009) The Co-Evolution of Organizational Value Capture, Value Creation and
899 Sustainable Advantage. *Organizational Studies* 30 (10), 1115-1139.
900 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0170840609346977>

901 Plé, L., and Chumpitaz Cáceres, R. (2010). Not always co-creation: introducing interactional co-
902 destruction of value in service- dominant logic. *Journal of Services Marketing* 24 (6), 430 – 437.
903 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/08876041011072546>

904 Polasky, S., and Segerson, K. (2009) Integrating Ecology and Economics in the Study of Ecosystem
905 Services: Some Lessons Learned. *Annual Review of Resource Economics* 1, 409–34.
906 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.resource.050708.144110>

907 Porter, M. E., and Kramer, M. R. (2011) Creating Shared Value. *Harvard Business Review* 89, 62-
908 77.

- 909 Potschin, M. B., and Haines-Young, R. H. (2011) Ecosystem services: Exploring a geographical
910 perspective. *Progress in Physical Geography* 35 (5), 575-594.
911 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0309133311423172>
- 912 Prakash, A., and Potoski, M. (2012) Voluntary Environmental Programs: A Comparative
913 Perspective. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 31 (1), 123-138.
914 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pam.20617>
- 915 Pröbstl, U., Wirth, V., Elands, B. H. M., and Bell, S. (2010) "Introduction. In *Management of*
916 *Recreation and Nature Based Tourism in European Forests*. Pröbstl, U., Wirth, V., Elands, B. H.
917 M., and Bell, S. (eds.), Springer, Berlin Heidelberg. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-03145-8_1
- 918 Ramirez, R. (1999) Value co-production: intellectual origins and implications for practice and
919 research. *Strategic Management Journal* 20, 49-65.
- 920 Ricardo, D. (2004) *On the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*. Dover Publications, New
921 York, U.S.A. (Originally published in 1817).
- 922 Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin III, F. S., Lambin, E., Lenton, T. M.,
923 Scheffer, M., Folke, C., Schellnhuber, H., Nykvist, B., De Wit, C. A., Hughes, T., van der Leeuw,
924 S., Rodhe, H., Sörlin, S., Snyder, P. K., Costanza, R., Svedin, U., Falkenmark, M., Karlberg, L.,
925 Corell, R. W., Fabry, V. J., Hansen, J., Walker, B., Liverman, D., Richardson, K., Crutzen, P., and
926 Foley, J. (2009) A safe operating space for humanity. *Nature* 461, 472-475.
927 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/461472a>
- 928 Rodriguez, J. P., Beard, T. D., Bennett, E. M., Cumming, G. S., Cork, S. J., Agard, J., Dobson, A.
929 P., and Peterson, G. D. (2006) Trade-Offs Across Space, Time, and Ecosystem Services. *Ecology*
930 *and Society* 11, 28. [online] URL: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol11/iss1/art28/>
- 931 Russo, M. V., and Fouts, P. A. (1997) A resource-based perspective on corporate environmental
932 performance and profitability. *Academy of Management Journal* 40 (3), 534-559.
933 <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/257052>
- 934 Schwartz, S. H. (1994) Are There Universal Aspects in the Structure and Contents of Human
935 Values? *Journal of Social Issues* 50 (4), 19-45. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1994.tb01196.x)
936 [4560.1994.tb01196.x](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1994.tb01196.x)
- 937 Segerson, K. (2013) Voluntary Approaches to Environmental Protection and Resource
938 Management. *Annual Review of Resource Economics* 5, 161-180.
939 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-resource-091912-151945>
- 940 Skålén, P., and Edvardsson, B. (2015) Transforming from the goods to the service-dominant logic.
941 *Marketing Theory*, 1-21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1470593115596061>
- 942 Spangenberg, J. H., von Haaren, C., and Settele, J. (2014) The ecosystem service cascade: Further
943 developing the metaphor. Integrating societal processes to accommodate social processes and
944 planning, and the case of bioenergy. *Ecological Economics* 104, 22-32.
945 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2014.04.025>
- 946 Spohrer, J., Maglio, P. P., Bailey, J., and Gruhl, D. (2007) Steps toward a science of service
947 systems. *Computer* 40, 71-77. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/MC.2007.33>

948 Spohrer, J., Vargo, S. L., Caswell, N., and Maglio, P. P. (2008) The service system is the basic
 949 abstraction of service science. In *Proceedings of the 41st Annual Hawaii International Conference*
 950 *on System Science, Hawaii, U.S.A., January*, p. 104.

951 Stern, P. C., Dietz, T., and Kalof, L. (1993) Value orientations, gender and environmental concern.
 952 *Environmental Behavior* 25, 322-348. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013916593255002>

953 Stern, P. C., and Dietz, T. (1994) The value basis of environmental concern. *Journal of Social*
 954 *Issues* 50, 65-84. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1994.tb02420.x>

955 Storbacka, K., and Lehtinen, J. R. (2001) Customer relationship management: Creating competitive
 956 advantage through win-win relationship strategies. McGraw Hill, Singapore.

957 Toppinen, A., Cubbage, F., and Moore, S. (2014) Economics of forest certification and Corporate
 958 social responsibility. In *Handbook of Forest Resource Economics*. Kant, S., and Alavapati, J. (eds.),
 959 pp. 444-458. Routledge, London, U.K. ISBN-13: 978-0415623247

960 Toppinen, A., Wan, M., and Lhtinen, K. (2013). Strategic orientations in global forest industry.
 961 Book Chapter 17 in Hansen, E. et al. (Ed.): *Global Forest Industry: Trends, Management and*
 962 *Sustainability*. Taylor & Francis Ltd. Baton Rouge, FL. ISBN 978-1-4398-7927-6.

963 Troy, A., and Wilson, M. A. (2006) Mapping ecosystem services: Practical challenges and
 964 opportunities in linking GIS and value transfer. *Ecological Economics* 60, 435-449.
 965 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2006.04.007>

966 Turner, R. K., and Daily, G. C. (2008) The ecosystem services framework and natural capital
 967 conservation. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 39 (1), 25-35.
 968 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10640-007-9176-6>

969 Pigou, A. C. (2006) *The Economics of Welfare*. Cossimo Classics, New York, U.S.A. (Originally
 970 published in 1920).

971 Vargo, S. L., and Lusch, R. F. (2004) Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *Journal of*
 972 *Marketing* 68, 1-17. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.68.1.1.24036>

973 Vargo, S. L., and Lusch, R. F. (2006) Service-dominant logic: What it is, what it is not, what it
 974 might be. In *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate and Directions*. (eds.) R. F.
 975 Lusch and S. L. Vargo, pp. 43-56. M. E. Sharpe Inc., Armonk, New York, U.S.A.

976 Vargo, S. L., Maglio, P. P., and Akaka, M. A. (2008) On value and value co-creation: A service
 977 systems and service logic perspective. *European Management Journal* 26, 145-152.
 978 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2008.04.003>

979 Vargo, S. L., and Lusch, R. F. (2008a) Why “service”? *Journal of the Academy of Marketing*
 980 *Science* 36, 25-38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11747-007-0068-7>

981 Vargo, S. L., and Lusch, R. F. (2008b) Service-dominant logic: continuing the evolution. *Journal of*
 982 *the Academy of Marketing Science* 36 (1), 1-10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11747-007-0069-6>

983 Vargo, S. L. (2009) Toward a transcending conceptualization of relationship: A service-dominant
 984 perspective. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing* 24 (5/6), 373-379.
 985 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/08858620910966255>

986 Vargo, S. L., and Lusch, R. F. (2011) It's all B2B...and beyond: Toward a systems perspective of
 987 the market. *Industrial Marketing Management* 40 (2), 181–187.
 988 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2010.06.026>

989 Waage, S., and Kester, C. (2014) Private Sector Engagement with Ecosystem Services. *Business for*
 990 *Social Responsibility*. Accessed on: April 15th, 2015. Accessed from:
 991 http://www.bsr.org/reports/BSR_Private_Engagement_With_Ecosystem_Services_2014.pdf

992 WCED - World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) *Our common future*.
 993 Oxford University Press, Oxford, U.K.

994 Whiteman, G., Walker, B., and Perego, P. (2013) Planetary Boundaries: Ecological Foundations for
 995 Corporate Sustainability. *Journal of Management Studies* 50 (2), 307-336.
 996 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2012.01073.x>

997 Wiersum, K., Elands, B., and Hoogstra, M., (2005). Small-scale forest ownership across Europe:
 998 characteristics and future potential. *Small-scale Forest Economics, Management, and Policy* 4 (1),
 999 1–19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11842-005-0001-1>

1000 Wilson, M. A., and Hoehn, J. P. (2006) Valuing environmental goods and services using benefit
 1001 transfer: The state-of-the art and science. *Ecological Economics* 60, 335-342.
 1002 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2006.08.015>

1003 York, J. G. (2009) Pragmatic Sustainability: Translating Environmental Ethics into Competitive
 1004 Advantage. *Journal of Business Ethics* 85, 97-109. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9950-6>

1005 Yousefpour, R., and Hanewinkel, M. (2009) Modelling of Forest Conversion Planning with an
 1006 Adaptive Simulation-Optimization Approach and Simultaneous Consideration of the Values of
 1007 Timber, Carbon and Biodiversity. *Ecological Economics* 68: 1711-1722.
 1008 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2008.12.009>