Extended-Enterprise Lifecycle Liability: the *KILT* Model and the TYPUS Metrics

Rinaldo C. Michelini[1], Roberto P. Razzoli[2]

DIME, University of Genova
Via Opera Pia 15/a – 16145, Genova, Italy
[1]michelini@dimec.unige.it; [2]razzoli@dimec.unige.it

***Abstract*- At the millennium turnover, the ecology globalisation shows the impeding threats of over-depletion/pollution: the sustainable growth requires supply-chain visibility, resource bookkeeping and renovation planning. The changeover is planned to be enabled enforcing the enterprise responsibility of the extended artefacts, having lifecycle liability, i.e., from ideation and manufacturing, to operation, disposal and recovery of the delivered products-services. In the lifecycle specification/analysis, the basic design (global plan, detailed design, assembly, etc.) is followed by manufacturing, assembly, testing, diagnostics and operation, advertising, maintenance, etc.; then, disassembly and disposal are scheduled, requiring reclamation and recovery, by re-cycling (material reprocessing) or re-using (part refurbishing). The present paper provides pilot clues for understanding the product-process agendas, using the TYPUS metrics and the *KILT* model, developed by the authors, in previous works.**

Keywords- Lifecycle Management; Economy Globalisation; Ecology Globalisation; Sustainable Growth

I. INTRODUCTION

The aim of the paper is to value the lifecycle-management (LCM) of any deliveries (parts, machines, services, facilities, consumables, etc.) on the entire lifecycle. Lifecycle starts when the idea of a product (service, etc.) sprouts, and lasts till the disposal (or reuse, recycling) of the given item. In the first phase, there are the requirements gathering, analyses, planning (global plans, detailed plans, assembly plans, etc.), then it comes the parts manufacturing (including assembly), testing, diagnostics and servicing. Control, advertising, sales and service (maintenance and repair, etc.) are parts of the LCM. Finally when the product is worn out or becomes useless, there is the destruction (disposal) or reuse (e.g. disassembly of used, but useful parts) or recycling (e.g. melting again). These processes need to be modelled at the design stage, depending on the complexity of the delivery [1, 2, 3, 4, 5].

The lifecycle-management shall appraise the ecological footprint (environmental effects, energy/material-consumption, CO_2 emission, etc.) of manufacturing and operation of different products and services. A known balance states: *a cup of coffee needs the consumption of 600 litres of water, if everything is taken into account* (all included, from watering plants, to dish washing). The goal is clearly defined; nonetheless, the solving proposals are quite poor. The ***KILT*** model and **TYPUS** metrics are purposely specified, to make the analyses consistent [6, 7, 8, 9, 10]. The main goal is to model and quantify the complete delivery (products, by-products, trash and their effects) of a firm, and to enumerate all the relevant steps of the LCM.

The transformation of the world socio-economic layouts requires unique changes, aiming at sustainable development by the well assessed new extended enterprises, having the lifecycle responsibility of the supply chain, under suitable accreditation and certification schemes. In connection, some notions and their relationships are worthy, from the LCM point of view [11, 12, 13, 14, 15]:

- to use products-services, specified on the extended enterprise's operation spheres;
- to discern between the abilities provided by a facility and the tangible supply chains;
- to distinguish amongst the tangible and intangible value-added provided by a delivery.

The future results will help to examine the on-duty enterprises (defined as products). Moreover, the enterprises policy can be evaluated, taking into account several environmental, ecological, human and other issues of sustainable development and, notably, their eco-consistency.

II. RENEWABLE AND NON-RENEWABLE STOCKS

The *ecology*, with the tied restriction on *spontaneous* changes, which, in addition, do not alter the existing equilibriums, is quite recent entry in the society scientific background, based on the otherwise impending threats of the over-pollution and over-consumption. The uncontaminated nature, as perfect model of virtue is recurrent image, rich of charm. The concept is, unhappily, rather entangled, having links with extraordinary numbers of facts affecting the humanity history. The intricacy of those notions depends on the *nature-culture* opposition, assuming that wilderness is primary state, and civilization is artificial modification. Such *nurture* conflict assumes that the bringing up (or fostering care from the nursery) modifies the inborn idyllic attributes. Men have the civilisation mission, if we trust the anthropic principles, in strong or weak form [16, 17, 18, 19, 20].

The ecologic fundamentalism clashes against the anthropic principle, in its *weak* form, too. Actually, the man aspires to transcend the contingent nature, in view to justify the intrusion, through explicit acts and instances, to improve the surroundings. The hope might apply to the transcendent God; otherwise the dream relates to the evolution, and the struggle for life is expected leading to the best-fit winners. These pictures are recurrent vision, instituting the *progress* is fundamentalism of the human capital champions. It is, however, factual acknowledgement that the life quality is wholly *artificial* option.

Today, the *ecologism* encounters the damages of the industrial activity, founded on the manufacture transformation efficiency, making withdrawals from finite earth stocks, and piling up garbage and pollutant amounts, exceeding the natural recovery potentials. Hence, *natural* opposes to *artificial*, in view to limit dumping and contamination, moving back the growth rate at pre-industry figures. In the anthropic vision, the *nature* never opposes to the *man*, being, in reality, only helpful complement of the progress. Besides, the term natural capital is a recent designation, proposed by the ecology movements.

The designation is, nonetheless, notably effective, when the bookkeeping schemes are requested. The production of everything necessitates material, which compulsorily has to be taken from somewhere. The balances split up the renewable and the non-renewable resources. The latter shall classify in terms of (direct, instrument, etc.) usefulness, (express, ensuing, etc.) toxicity, (local, global, etc.) rarity, and so on, assuming the unidirectional flow from provisioning, to useful ends. The *point-of-sale* denotes the manufacturer's interest, leaving the entire responsibility of the use, misuse and disposal to the purchasers. These irresponsible supply chains are made legal by the current bylaws, to be, in reality, better classified as superficiality or swindle. The description relies on an *economic* productivity, defined on manufacturing and exploiting the instant supply/demand balance in the material's provision, with no worry for the context. The tax system follows similar logics: e.g., the VAT moves along the supply chain, charging the increments, utterly neglecting the correlated spoil amounts and effluence levels. As said, the method is faulty: the earth stocks will run out; the environment will turn lethal; only the today consumers (producers and buyers) profit.

The outlined remarks require revising the current attitude about the supply chains. The distinction between the tangible and intangible aspects of a delivery requires aiming at transformations maximising the value-added conferred by the latter one; the following points deserve notice [21, 22, 23, 24, 25]:

- the intangibles, chiefly, relate to wily treatments of the financial and technical capitals;
- the tangibles involve the natural capital by instrument/constituent role of the human one;
- the business stability needs a model for the explicit evaluation of all the (four) capital assets;
- the lawfulness requires an (example) metrics for the tangibles' appraisal, by legal metrology.

The above four points stress again concepts widely examined: the need to give autonomy to the natural capital, in view that the visibility might motivate enhanced eco-consciousness; the manufacturers' responsibility on the product lifecycle, leaving aside the misleading restriction on the consumers. Both concepts are, perhaps, obvious, but are late in the awareness of many current operators, which prefer naive (actually, *egoistic*) simplifying assumptions, not to give visibility to the ecology cycle. On these points, more virtuous supply chains are deemed to establish, aiming at better balancing the available resources, not to permit the hoardings and lootings of confident profiteers.

A. Financial Capital Prospects

The money is ancient invention, providing the market efficiency, to replace the barter. The earliest settings addressed an impractical unit, a pecus say a *goat* (from which *pecuniary* means), suitably replaced by metal coins. The money is the substitute of goods, having *worth* standardised according to covenants and sanctioned by the ruling authority. It is not, by itself, *wealth*, but instance of *wealth*, readily becoming currency, for trade setups. The instrument role of the financial flows is identified by bank and banking transactions, with twin executions [26, 27, 28, 29, 30]:

- credit management, creating venture companies, looking at profit through risk investments;
- debt management, offering loans at interest, originating asset-backed security engagements.

The current economic globalisation sees the finance market encumbered by offers of *sovereign* debt, with governments exceeding the GDP and needing current loans for the current expenditures. The situation tempts speculative bubbles, in which the *structured* finance exploits creating *virtual* wealth, making profit from the indebtedness of the weaker actors. The *virtual* wealth manoeuvres deserve due deepening, but are out of the present interests.

B. Technical Capital Prospects

The man controlled industrial cycles are recent conquest. The *industrial* revolution is considered to be typical outcome of the *capitalism*, especially promoted by venture companies backed by nation-state, which are entitled to pursue public and private profits. Widespread exploitation of *artificial energy* is primary technological innovation; the stream power is original enabler. The *industrial* revolution, being recent achievement, has throughout descriptions. The industry defines as the business establishment, which nicely exploits structured work-organisation and the facility-integration.

Its meaning is: branch of trade or manufacture, assuring productive efficiency; or diligence and habitual employment in

useful activities (*industrious* is equal to *diligent*). The industrial *revolution* has turned the old (third) meaning, in the other two. The process is somehow mirror of the one pursued by the word culture, from the land cultivation, to the people instruction. All rounds, the technical capital is, till today, the prime instrument driving the progress.

In its original form, the industry has been based on the *scientific* work-organisation and the *economy of scale* through the mass-production. The robot technologies have brought out the *intelligent* work-organisation and the *economy-of-scope*, by one-of-a-kind manufacture. The *industry* patterns undergo changes; *the variations amplify the opportunities, as it was the* case, with the *agricultural* revolution, compelled to move at *natural* life pace.

The industrialism has promoted the affluent society and consumerism. The drawbacks are well assessed; they open impending threats to the earth progress. The manufacture process concerns *non-renewable* resources. The irreversible transformations deteriorate the surroundings, with damages to the bio-sphere. The changes towards the *intelligent* work-organisation depend on integrating computer engineering tools. These are recognised as key help to dematerialise, and relevant support for the natural capital bookkeeping.

Once made clear the negative aspects of the industrialism, the search for remedies shall start. The total suppression of the material goods is non-sense. The burning up of inanimate stuffs is standard process to carry on the vital cycles. The resort to *artificial* energy highly (and selectively) speeds up the consumption rates, but again, the simple suppression of the option is gibberish, not to wipe out the current quality of life. The doable remedies are, quite sadly, only partial and temporary [31, 32, 33, 34, 35]:

- to augment the tangibles' productivity, obtaining larger output, while lowering the native exploited input (by process effectiveness and recovery/reclamation closure);
- to discover suited to re-materialise cycles, renewing the amount of useful earth stocks, at artificial rates (robot age technology transformations).

The success of remedies will not aim at the unlimited progress, rather at *bounded-growth*, linked to *weak* anthropic bio-sphere's duration forecasts. The current engineering concerns aim at how to improve the resource effectiveness. They include a mix of opportunities, such as the following:

- to reinvent the manufacture cycles, under resource-manager liability;
- to avoid waste, planning closed-flows, chaining outputs into inputs;
- to deliver functions, replacing goods, under unified overseeing;
- to invent domotics, optimising the energy controlled delivery;
- to supply lifecycle-service, doing maintenance and refurbishing;
- to perform reverse-logistics, up to mandatory recovery targets.

The example list shows already well understood businesses, which are deemed to expand in the near future. The to re-materialise remedy is longer term issue, involving, most likely, the agricultural ideas, to deal with animated resources, and to exploit suitable bio-mimicry transformations, which enable the related self-reproduction capacities. It is now not possible to abolish the industrial products; the remedies aim at finding out conservative tracks and replacement means, according to suitably planned restoring/remediation criteria.

The doable remedies have the extra imperative trait of urgency. The climate changes hurry up the need of lowering the contamination, starting by the CO_2 emission. This comes from the oxidization processes, including the ones of animal life. The earth atmosphere is highly oxidising, having the 21% of oxygen. Some 4.5 billion years ago, the atmosphere was reducing. The actions of photo-synthesis moved to today's balance; without it, the CO_2 would become dominant. The current composition is only marginally stable: at higher O_2 concentration, self-combustion establishes (24% of O_2). Besides, the living beings need energy, and mainly exploit the $2H_2 + O_2 => 2H_2O$, fairly exothermic reaction, which allows keeping life-suited temperature.

The today atmosphere has the 0.05% CO_2 (78% nitrogen, 1% argon). Bigger CO_2 emissions will rise side fallouts (greenhouse effect, etc.), altering the biosphere equilibrium. The real dynamics depends on multiple factors. Several models are in use, to simulate potential scenarios. The control of the CO_2 emission is critical request, to preserve the rather peculiar earth habitat, having negligible CO_2, in spite of a too oxidizing atmosphere. The environment-industry will become tomorrow's key business, which adds to the entrepreneurial developments. The innovation is a technical capital challenge.

III. SHOP-FLOOR MODELLING: INDUSTRIAL APPROACH

The manufacture activity cannot be suppressed, even if the transformation of raw materials based on *artificial* energy is paradigmatic example of consumerism and natural capital decay. When planning for remedies, we need to look at apt models, in keeping two fundamental demands [36, 37, 38, 39, 40]:

- to recognise that the natural capital use requests refunding of all the withdrawals;
- to assess and to bill the materials costs, with resort to fair legal metrology schemes.

The former is outlined in the following; the latter is considered in the fourth paragraph.

A. The KILT Model

The refunding needs synthetic models, defining the manufacture process. The portray links the delivered quantities, ***Q***, to the four capital assets: technical ***K***, financial ***I***, human ***L*** and natural ***T***; earlier models limit to financial ***I*** and human ***L*** capitals. Simple relations are in use to link the instant ***Q*** or the incremental $\Delta\boldsymbol{Q}$ values:

- $\boldsymbol{Q}^{\circ} = \alpha_o \boldsymbol{IL}$ $\quad\quad$ $\boldsymbol{Q}^{*} = \gamma_o \boldsymbol{KILT}$
- $\Delta\boldsymbol{Q}^{\circ} = \beta_o \boldsymbol{IL} - \beta_{\boldsymbol{I}}\boldsymbol{I} - \beta_{\boldsymbol{L}}\boldsymbol{L}$ $\quad\quad$ $\Delta\boldsymbol{Q}^{*} = \delta_o \boldsymbol{KILT} - \delta_{\boldsymbol{K}}\boldsymbol{K} - \delta_{\boldsymbol{I}}\boldsymbol{I} - \delta_{\boldsymbol{L}}\boldsymbol{L} - \delta_{\boldsymbol{T}}\boldsymbol{T}$

The know-how ***K*** innovation and the tangibles ***T*** bookkeeping have non negligible effects. All the contributed technical ***K***, financial ***I***, human ***L*** and natural ***T*** capitals are included, to supply evident account of tangibles and intangible effects. The tetra-linear dependence assumes to operate nearby equilibrated assets. With optimised choices, the negative extras of the incremental balances accomplish the sensitivity analyses, separately giving the individual asset contributions.

In the ***KILT*** model, lacking one contribution, the balance is lame, and the reckoned productivity figures become untruthful or meaningless. The analyses investigate the piling up invariance against the resort to non-proprietary technologies, or to off-the-market loans, or to work out-sourcing or productive break-up.

The tetra-linear dependence means the equivalence of assets alone, and their synergic cumulated action. The company return is optimal, when the (scaled) factors are balanced; the current scaling expresses in money the four capitals (the output ***Q*** has proper value, with the four inputs homogeneity). The return vanishes or becomes loss, if one contribution disappears. The loss represents the imbalance between the constituent flows (know-how, money, work out-sourcing, bought semi-finished parts, etc.).

In the bi-linear model, the tangibles ***T*** (utilities or commodities) are attainable without limits. They do not affect the manufacture business; the affordable growth trend is undefined. The changes in technology, knowledge or know-how simply rescale the productivity of tangibles, processed along the material flow. The *new* model presumes the direct concern of the sustainability bounds for energy saving, pollution avoidance, natural goods preservation, and the like. These bounds require introducing the figure of the resource *efficiency*. The replacement of material goods is a cost for the society, with non-negligible environmental impacts, which shall be paid by the holders of benefits (and not poured out on third people and future community).

The earlier dependence on the financial ***I*** and human ***L*** capitals is perhaps the result of the dialectic opposition between plant owners and labour. Yet, the neglect of the tangibles ***T*** factor is surprising, as the manufacture duty has no output, without materials and energy. The addition of the intangibles ***K*** is characteristics of the knowledge paradigms, and an earlier entry could have been devised from the new economy. With the manufacturer's lifecycle responsibility, the explicit role of ***K*** and ***T*** needs to emerge, since the companies' profitability will become critically dependent on how these factors are balanced. The ***T*** *vs*. ***K*** dialectic opposition is tomorrow's challenge.

The scaled ***T*** factor measures the natural capital use/misuse, with annexed allegations. The technology ***K*** concern has fallouts at the design, production and sale phases, and in the manufacture business, is dealt with, for *trade fairness*, by quality engineering rules. The *quality* standard, conformance to specifications, binds design (technical specifications files), to delivery approval testing. Anyway, the technology ***K*** comes as primary transformation factor, affecting the manufacture process throughput.

The productivity bookkeeping is merged into global ***Q*** assessments, to provide synthetic pictures, with visibility of the four capital assets, as the enterprise's function/facility champions. The manufacture shop-floors generate value chains, providing ***Q*** guesses based on the market requests, including the welfarism charges (***L*** factor), according to the enacted rules, and, from now on, the ecologic fees (***T*** factor), following, e.g., the in-progress EU directives. With the ***KILT*** model, the four manufacture assets easily apply, without modifying many assessed traditional habits.

B. Tangibles Productivity

The environment protection is man's right at universal range, with the aim to safeguard the future generations, today not well represented by efficient political parties or governmental agencies. The democratic consensus or international agreements are deprived of justifications, whether limited to care the interests of the today's citizens. The *fair* socio-political approach, put forward by the knowledge paradigms, compels protecting the (without voice) generations to come, by compensation ways, such as [41, 42, 43, 44, 45]:

- to create a tax system, which consolidates the wealth corresponding to the accomplished withdrawal from the natural capital, following deposit/refund-like arrangements;
- to forbid natural capital withdrawals that exceed quotas, roughly equal to the reverse logistics recovery, or (hopefully) to the bio-mimicry stimulated generation, in view to keep the original natural capital level, by neutral yield.

The first way is formal, since, transforming different capitals, the equivalence criteria are, at least, ambiguous. The second, if coherently applied, faces decay limitations, and today runs into the life quality decrease, towards the thrifty society. It is, moreover, possible to merge the two ways, using the *deposit-refund* choice as first instance, thereafter keenly researching innovative technologies, out of reverse logistics, which perform active *replacing* resources and full eco-remediation, to achieve neutral yield of the *inherited* natural capital.

Many unanswered questions exist (e.g., in terms of comprehensiveness). The EU environmental policy looks aiming at united way. The bookkeeping of the tangibles' decrease and pollutants' increase becomes primary demand, with, as side request, the assessment of the restoring onerousness. So, closed-cycle economic/ecologic processes are prerequisite of the manufacture markets to come. The analyses need to be quantitative, to make meaningful comparisons, fulfilling the assessments by recognized standards. The consistent closed-cycle appraisal brings to concepts such as the below new metrics (or similar equivalent standards).

IV. ECO-WATCHING AND APPRAISAL

The use of clever to de-materialise schemes is relevant opportunity, allowing the creation of riches, little entailing the entropy decay, going together with all the material manipulations. More at the point, in the ***KILT*** model, this means addressing the ***K*** and ***I*** factors, while minimising the ***T*** involvement. The ***L*** factor has a more tangled role: it belongs to the tangible inputs and, as such, it contributes to the entropy decay, along with the related metabolic processes and, to a particular extent, with the intentional manipulation of the surroundings, notably, entailing *artificial* energy and *synthetic* transformations. In truth, the analyses built taking into account the anthropic values imagine that the civilisation occurs, because the cosmos' inner order foretells such an outcome, so that the life and intelligence singularities are the mark of the human progress *stability*, at least, within given allocated spans.

If this reading is defendable, the human capital role has entangled aftermaths, being the essential inventor and driver of the civilisation, with constituent functions. In the present paper, the focus is limited on the modelling of productive activity, for assessing its eco-sustainability. Thus, these more general justifying projections are omitted. Limited clues are hereafter outlined, with topics more closely related to the ***KILT*** model.

A. Human Capital Prospects

The ***L*** factor of the ***KILT*** model relegates to workforce domains: the ***I*** and ***L*** dialectic is known fact of the industrial ages. In the value-added creation, nonetheless, the human capital plays much more relevant roles. The man centred anthropic construal is rooted in analysing the life and intelligence singularities: the former supplies *agentive* talent, directly engaged in the workforce rating; the latter brings in *rational* aptitude, allowing decision-keeping for selecting assessed utility goals. Many rationality achievements remain at implied range, when prised through market-poised ways; this is the case of most socio-political arrangements, notably, leading to the extant collective orders that give effectiveness to the countries and related governments.

The ecology globalisation, today, says that the over-depletion/contamination of the industry paradigms requires a new revolution, in which the life and intelligence singularities will be directly involved, through robot age implements, in view of the cognitive revolution [46, 47, 48, 49, 50]. The human and technical capitals prospects will combine together in cognizance-like processes, having to de-materialise and to re-materialise ends, making it feasible to reach the necessary reclamation and restoring targets of the eco-sustainability.

B. Natural Capital Prospects

The ***T*** factor, in any case, is essential figure to be monitored, using appropriate standards: the **TYPUS**, *tangibles yield per unit service* is example metrics. The measurement plot covers the whole materials supply chain, from procurement to recovery, so that every enjoyed *product-service* has associated eco-figures, assembling the resources consumption and the induced fallouts, requiring remediation. The results are expressed in money, resorting to arbitrariness in establishing stock-replacing prospects. The point is left open, but, it needs to be detailed, to provide quantitative (legal metrology driven) assessment of the "*deposit-refund*" balance.

The metrics is self-sufficient standard, aiming at the natural capital intensive exploitation. The supply chain lifecycle visibility needs monitoring and recording the joint economic/ecologic issues, giving quantitative assessment of all the input/output materials and energy flows. The new tax system has to operate on these data, establishing consumption rates at the input, and pollution rates at the output, to obtain the "wealth equivalent" of the overall impact (as for the first mentioned way) [47, 37, 38, 8, 9].

When a metrics, such as **TYPUS**, is adopted, conservative behaviours are soon fostered. The ecologic bent of the taxing systems becomes enabling spur, to turn the knowledge paradigms towards environmental friendly goals. The objective is to look after capital conservative arrangements, notably, as for the *natural* assets. In different words, the objective is to save the wealth (the *capital*), and to tax the consumption (the *imbalance* of the natural resources).

Today, the eco-fee evaluation is quite obscure, due to political biases. It leads to taxing schemas, which are drawn from the whole capital, more than in proportion to the *actual impact* (net depletion combined to pollution). The eco-protection, switched into the individual consumers' business, is starting point, to look for higher efficiency, over the whole supply chain, from provisioning to recovery, using *all-comprehensive* effectiveness criteria, singly dealing with each capital asset (tangibles' productivity included).

Tomorrow, the natural capital bookkeeping will be standard routine of the knowledge society. Today, the *economic* accounting to detect unlawful habits (crime, repression, etc.) is obvious practice, affecting personal liability. Similarly, the thought-out *ecological* accounting needs to develop into steady rehearsal, in view of charging the actual consumers (to the advantage of third people and future generations). With the knowledge paradigms, the tax regulation restructuring is required, because the socio-political aspects management becomes relevant contribution to effectiveness. The bigger question is how to distinguish the community's from the individual's duties.

The solution offered by the (western world style) capitalism is noteworthy issue. The personal liability is consequence of the independent freedom to organise the exclusive fortune. In place of shared figures, the individual accountability offers rewards through competition. The averaged taxation of input/output materials and energy flows is simple, being linked to nominal parameters, limiting the control to out-of-all quantities (provisioning and land-filling). This is local communities business, with visible fees refund, depending on the efficiency of the average balances. The *ecological* accounting through the **TYPUS** metrics is more tangled affair, needing to address each single supply chain, with pace wise check. The competition shifts at that level, and the lifecycle manufacturers' responsibility is viable bookkeeping charge (under registered overseeing). At least, this is fair practice, deserving attention.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The goal of this work is the technical, ecological, environmental and social examination of the lifecycle (LC) of any product (consumable, service, production) using the **TYPUS** metrics and the ***KILT*** model. The lifecycle starts when the idea of a product is born and lasts until complete disposal, through realisation and operation. Our real goal is to give some means and tools to calculate different values which correspond to different phases of the product lifecycle. We specially emphasise re-use and re-cycling as important LC phases, due to approaching water, energy and raw material shortages. As for product we mean anything which is used by simple users (a car, a cup, a bike, or a part of them, etc.), or which is used by dedicated users to produce or manage other products (a machine tool, a robot, a house, a test environment, etc.), or which is used to manage everything else (a firm, a factory, a ministry, etc.). We differentiate between simple products and extended products and between tangible and intangible parts (aspects) and take into account service as it was a product, too.

The **TYPUS** metrics and the ***KILT*** model tell that the delivery of a firm can be computed through a seemingly simple joint modulation of four main factors, as Knowledge (innovation), Investment, Labour (human capital) and Tangibles (materials), scaled by appropriate coefficients and additional adjustments. Delivery includes goal-products, side effects (water consumption, CO_2 disclosure, etc.). Based on these relationships, actual data can be given on effects, side effects and further tunings of products and productions, whether the **TYPUS** metrics is taken into account. The ***KILT*** model allows appraising further cognitive revolution deployments, when the human and technical capitals will modify, to include their explicit *constituent* contributions, in addition to the *instrument* ones. We are not allowed to omit ***T***; the ***K*** and ***L*** factors are ostensibly added chances; the ***I*** help requires suited warnings.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Goti, Ed., *Discrete event simulation*, Rijeka, Croatia: SCIYO Pub., 2010.

[2] H. H. Moffat and E. Shuckburg, Eds., *Environmental hazards: fluid-dynamics and geophysics of extreme events*, London: Imperial College Press, 2011.

[3] F. Popov and F. D. DeSimone, *Eco-efficiency: the business link to sustainable development*, Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1997.

[4] F. Teuteberg and J. M. Gomez, Eds., *Corporate environmental management information systems*, Hershey, PA: IGI, Business Science Reference, 2010.

[5] V. Viana, *Sustainable development in practice: lessons learned from Amazonas*, New York: Intl. Inst. for Environment & Development, 2010.

[6] G. Cascini, Ed., *Computer aided innovation*, Boston: Springer, 2008.

[7] R. C. Michelini and R. P. Razzoli, *Affidabilità e sicurezza del prodotto industriale: progettazione integrata per lo sviluppo sostenibile*, Milano: Tecniche Nuove, 2000.

[8] R. C. Michelini and G. L. Kovács, *Integrated design for sustainability: intelligence for eco-consistent products and services*, Tallin: EBS REVIEW Innovation, Knowledge, Marketing and Ethics, 2002.

[9] G. D. Putnik and M. M. Cunha, Eds., *Virtual enterprise integration*, Hershey, PA: IDEA Group, 2005.

[10] G. D. Putnik and M. M. Cunha, Eds., *Knowledge and technology management in virtual organisations*, Hershey, PA: IDEA Group, 2007.

[11] E. Abele, R. Anderl, and H. Birkofer, *Environment-friendly product development: methods and tools*, London: Springer. 2005.

[12] M. M. Cruz Cunha, C. Pascoa, G. D. Putnik, and A. Trigo, Eds., *Sociotechnical enterprise: information systems design and integration*, Hershey, PA: IGI Business Sci. Ref., 2013.

[13] E. Kahraman and A. Baig, Eds., *Environmentalism: environmental strategies and environment sustainability*, New York: Nova Sci. Pub., 2009.

[14] H. T. Odum, *Environment, power and society*, New York: Wiley InterScience, 1971.

[15] B. Wills, *Green intensions: creating a green value stream to compete and win*, Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, 2009

[16] J. Barrow, *Theories of everything: the quest of ultimate explanations*, Oxford: Oxford Uni. Press, 1991.

[17] T. Campbell, *My big ToE: the theory of everything*, New York: Lightning Strike Books, 2007.

[18] F. Close, *The infinity puzzle: quantum field theory and the hunt for an orderly universe*, New York: Basic Book, 2012.

[19] G. Strawson, *Consciousness and its place in nature*, New York: Oxford Uni. Press, 2006.

[20] A. F. Zobaa and R. C. Bansal, Eds., *Handbook of renewable energy technology*, London: Imperial College Press, 2011.

[21] P. Ashegiran, Ed., *The multinational corporation: environments and operations*, New York: Nova Sci. Pub., 2001.

[22] M. Freedman and B. Jaggi, Eds., *Advances in environmental accounting*, Bingley, UK: Emerald Book, 2006.

[23] S. I. Muñoz, Ed., *Ecology research progress*, New York: Nova Sci. Pub., 2009.

[24] R. Sroufe and J. Sarkis, *Strategic sustainability: the state of the art in corporate environmental management systems*, Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf, 2007.

[25] U. Tischner and M. Charter, *Sustainable solutions: developing products-services for the future*, Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf, 2001.

[26] O. Sudoh, , *Digital economy and social design*, London: Springer, 2005.

[27] J. Tepper and J. Mauldin, *Endgame: end of the debt supercycle and how it changes everything*, Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley, 2011.

[28] A. Wiggin and W. Bonner, *The new empire of debt*, Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley, 2009.

[29] M. Wolf, *Fixing global finance*, Baltimore: John Hopkins Uni. Press, 2008.

[30] J. Zweig, *Your money and your brain*, New York: Simon & Shuster, 2007.

[31] J. Chen and C. Guo, Eds., *Ecosystem ecology research trends*, New York: Nova Sci. Pub., 2009.

[32] D. Helm, *The carbon crunch: how we're getting climate change wrong, and how to fix it*, London: Yale Uni. Press, 2012.

[33] R. A. Pastorok, S. M. Bartel, S. Ferson, and L. R. Ginzburg, Eds., *Ecologic modelling in risk assessment: chemical effects on populations and eco-systems*, Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, 2001.

[34] N. Steher and H. vonStorch, *Climate & society: climate as resource, climate as risk*, London: Imperial College Press, 2009.

[35] G. Walker and D. King, *The hot topic: what we can do about global warming*, New York: Harcourt, 2008.

[36] M. M. Cruz Cunha, Ed., *Social, managerial and organisational dimension of enterprise information systems*, Hershey, PA: IGI Global Business Sci. Ref., 2009.

[37] R. C. Michelini, *Knowledge society engineering: a sustainable growth pledge*, New York: Nova Sci., 2010.

[38] R. C. Michelini, *Society progress evolution: sustainability and responsiveness*, New York: Nova Sci., 2012.

[39] G. H. Pardue and T. K. Olvera, Eds., *Ecological restoration*, New York: Nova Sci., 2009.

[40] J. E. Quintela Varajao, M. M. Cruz-Cunha, G. D. Putnik, and A. Trigo, Eds., *Enterprise information systems*, Berlin: Springer, 2010.

[41] M. P. Glazer, Ed., *New frontiers in environmental research*, New York: Nova Sci. Pub., 2009.

[42] M. Morino, *Leap of reason: managing to outcomes in an era of scarcity*, New York: Venture Philanthropy Partners, 2011.

[43] J. O'Neill, *Ecology, policy and politics*, London: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2001.

[44] A. Troccoli, Ed., *Management of weather and climate risk in the energy industry*, London: Springer, 2009.

[45] S. G. Tzafestas, Ed., *Computer-assisted management and control of manufacturing systems*, Berlin: Springer, 1997.

[46] S. Johnson, *Future perfect: the case for progress in a networked age*, London: Allen Lane, 2013.

[47] R. C. Michelini, *Knowledge entrepreneurship and sustainable growth*, New York: Nova Sci., 2008.

[48] R. C. Michelini, *Robot age knowledge changeover*, New York: Nova Sci., 2009.

[49] L. Rosner, *The technological fix: how people use technology to create and solve problems*, New York: Rutledge, 2004.

[50] D. F. Wallace, *Date, time and language: an essay on free will*, New York: Columbia Uni. Press, 2010.

Rinaldo C. Michelini di San Martino. Retired professor, School of Engineering of the University of Genova, Italy, formerly leader of the Industrial Robot Design Research Group, PMAR Lab.

Main expertise was achieved in expert automation and lifecycle design, with developments in virtual and extended entrepreneurships, to deal with the eco-sustainability targets. Recent research areas cover: - sustainable growth - cognitive processes - intelligent manufacturing, - robot technologies and instrumental robotics, - industrial diagnostics, - integrated eco-design, - reverse logistics, - and similar topics, exploring the concurrence of information and materials flows for the effective design, development, exploitation and disposal of products-services.

Prof. Michelini is a Member of IFIP W.G. 5.3 and 5.5. Founder Member of SIRI (It. Soc. of Robotics) and AIIA (It. Soc. of Artificial Intelligence), ASME Fellow, SCS (Soc. of Computer Simulation) Senior Member, Russian Academy of Engineering Member, etc. He is the author of more than 500 publications.

Roberto P. Razzoli. Graduated in Mechanical Engineering at the University of Genova, since 1993 he is a researcher in the area of mechanical design.

His main research interests covered the areas of integrated design, industrial automation, industrial diagnostics, quality engineering, design for "X" methodologies, design for environment, eco-sustainable development, lifecycle products design, reverse logistics, structured database management systems, flexible manufacturing, expert object-oriented shopfloor governors, reliability and safety of mechanical equipment, CAD/CAM, predictive and monitoring maintenance, automated assembly systems with cooperative arms, minimally invasive surgical robotics, demining systems, walking and climbing robots, modular robots, etc.

Prof. Razzoli teaches reliability and safety of machines, machine design, aircraft structural design, CAD and computer graphics. He is author or co-author of some one hundred scientific papers, twelve chapters in edited books and two books.