Volume: 9 Issues: 57 Issue Special Issue [October, 2024] pp.30 - 42
International Journal of Accounting, Finance and Business (IJAFB)
eISSN: 0128-1844
Journal website: www.ijafb.com
DOI: 10.55573/IJAFB.095703

UNVEILING GREENWASHING: RISKS IN SUSTAINABILITY AND ESG REPORTING

Nurul Nazlia Jamil[1*]
Ersa Tri Wahyuni [2],

[1] Senior Lecturer: Faculty of Economics and Muamalat, Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia, Nilai,71800,Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia (E-mail: nurulnazlia@usim.edu.my)
[2] Associate Professor: Faculty of Economic and Business, Universitas Padjajaran, Bandung,Jawa Barat,Indonesia (E-mail: ersa@unpad.ac.id)
*Corresponding author: nurulnazlia@usim.edu.my

Article history
Received date : 10-8-2024
Revised date : 11-8-2024
Accepted date : 7-9-2024
Published date : 18-10-2024

To cite this document:
Jamil, N. N., & Wahyuni, E. T. (2024). Unveiling greenwashing: Risks in sustainability and ESG reporting. *International Journal of Accounting, Finance and Business (IJAFB),* 9 (57), 30 - 42.

Abstract*: In recent years, the corporate world has witnessed a surge in sustainability reporting, reflecting a growing awareness of environmental and social responsibility. However, amidst this trend lies a significant risk of greenwashing. Greenwashing refers to the deceptive practice of conveying a false impression or providing misleading information about a company's environmental efforts. This paper explores the phenomenon of greenwashing and its ramifications in sustainable reporting. Companies often resort to superficial gestures or cosmetic changes to portray themselves as environmentally conscious, while their core operations remain unchanged. The paper also examines the implications of greenwashing on stakeholders and the environment. Misleading sustainability reporting can erode trust among consumers, investors, and communities, leading to reputational damage and financial losses. The study is employing an inductive approach which analysing literature to develop coherent narratives and theoretical insights regarding the phenomenon of greenwashing and its implications for sustainability reporting. The study makes attempts to highlight the challenges in detecting and combating greenwashing. With the lack of standardized metrics and regulatory oversight, distinguishing between authentic sustainability practices and deceptive claims becomes increasingly difficult. This opacity poses risks not only to stakeholders but also to the credibility of sustainability reporting as a whole. The paper concludes the need for increasing integration of ESG metrics into business practices, the innovative approaches in ESG practices and the shift towards risk management can minimize the greenwashing activities. In conclusion, this paper underscores the importance of addressing greenwashing to foster genuine progress towards sustainability. By embracing these changes and viewing ESG as an integral part of their strategy, companies can not only fulfil their ethical obligations but also unlock new opportunities for growth and resilience.*

Keywords*: Greenwashing, Sustainability Reporting, Environmental, Social and Governance*

Volume: 9 Issues: 57 Issue Special Issue [October, 2024] pp.30 - 42
International Journal of Accounting, Finance and Business (IJAFB)
eISSN: 0128-1844
Journal website: www.ijafb.com
DOI: 10.55573/IJAFB.095703

Introduction

In an era where environmental, social, and governance (ESG) considerations are increasingly becoming integral to business strategies, the concepts of greenwashing and sustainability reporting have emerged as focal points in corporate discourse. ESG factors encompass a broad spectrum of criteria that measure a company's performance and impact on the environment, society, and governance practices. As companies strive to align with sustainability goals and cater to the growing demands of socially responsible investors and consumers, the significance of accurate and transparent sustainability reporting cannot be overstated.

However, amidst the surge in sustainability reporting, concerns regarding greenwashing have intensified. According to Free et al. (2024), greenwashing a term coined to describe the deceptive practice of overstating or misrepresenting a company's environmental efforts, poses a significant risk to the integrity of ESG initiatives. Companies may resort to superficial measures or token gestures to portray themselves as environmentally conscious, while their actual practices remain unsustainable or even detrimental to the planet. This phenomenon not only erodes trust among stakeholders but also undermines genuine sustainability efforts, diverting attention and resources away from meaningful initiatives.

Against this backdrop, sustainability reporting plays a crucial role in providing stakeholders with insights into a company's ESG performance and commitments. Transparency and accountability are paramount in ensuring the credibility of such reports. However, the lack of standardized metrics and regulatory oversight poses challenges in discerning between authentic sustainability practices and greenwashing. This is consistent with study by Yu et al. (2020) shown the investors, consumers, and other stakeholders often face difficulty in making informed decisions and holding companies accountable for their ESG claims.

This introduction sets the stage for a deeper exploration of ESG considerations, greenwashing, and sustainability reporting. By examining the motivations behind greenwashing, the implications for stakeholders and the environment, and the challenges in detecting and combating deceptive practices, we aim to shed light on the complexities of navigating the evolving landscape of corporate sustainability. Moreover, we underscore the importance of transparency, accountability, and robust verification mechanisms in fostering genuine progress towards a more sustainable future.

Literature Review

In recent years, the intertwined concepts of greenwashing, environmental, social, and governance (ESG) criteria, and sustainability reporting have garnered significant attention in both academic and corporate circles. This literature review aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the existing research, theories, and insights regarding these interconnected themes. Greenwashing, as a deceptive practice aimed at creating a false impression of environmental responsibility, has been extensively studied in the literature. Scholars have explored various facets of greenwashing, including its motivations, manifestations, and consequences. For instance, Schaefer et al. (2019), identified a range of motives driving greenwashing behavior, such as gaining competitive advantage, mitigating regulatory risks, and enhancing corporate image. Similarly, Delmas and Burbano (2011) conducted empirical research to demonstrate how firms engage in greenwashing to exploit consumer preferences for environmentally friendly products, thereby influencing purchasing decisions.

Volume: 9 Issues: 57 Issue Special Issue [October, 2024] pp.30 - 42
International Journal of Accounting, Finance and Business (IJAFB)
eISSN: 0128-1844
Journal website: www.ijafb.com
DOI: 10.55573/IJAFB.095703

The rise of ESG criteria as a framework for assessing corporate sustainability performance has reshaped the landscape of business practices and reporting standards. Researchers have investigated the integration of ESG factors into investment strategies, corporate decision-making processes, and stakeholder engagement initiatives. Eccles et al. (2011) proposed the concept of "integrated reporting," which emphasizes the holistic portrayal of a company's financial and non-financial performance, including ESG metrics. This approach aligns with the growing recognition that sustainable value creation requires a comprehensive understanding of both financial and extra-financial factors.

Sustainability reporting serves as a vital mechanism for communicating a company's ESG commitments, initiatives, and outcomes to stakeholders. Scholars have examined the evolution of sustainability reporting frameworks, the effectiveness of disclosure practices, and the challenges associated with ensuring transparency and credibility. Adams (2008) highlighted the importance of standardized reporting guidelines and assurance processes in enhancing the reliability of sustainability disclosures. Moreover, Schaltegger (2018) emphasized the role of narrative reporting in complementing quantitative metrics by providing context and insights into a company's sustainability journey.

The intersection of greenwashing, ESG, and sustainability reporting has become a focal point of inquiry, reflecting the need to address ethical, regulatory, and practical considerations. Researchers have explored the implications of greenwashing for sustainability reporting credibility, investor decision-making processes, and regulatory enforcement efforts. For instance, Marquis and Toffel (2011) investigated the impact of media scrutiny on firms accused of greenwashing, finding that negative publicity can lead to reputational damage and financial penalties.

In conclusion, the literature on greenwashing, ESG, and sustainability reporting underscores the complexity and importance of navigating corporate sustainability challenges. Moving forward, interdisciplinary research efforts are needed to develop robust methodologies, frameworks, and policies that promote transparency, accountability, and genuine progress towards a more sustainable and responsible business environment.

Research Methodology

This paper is to conduct literature review on the greenwashing and the risk to ESG and sustainability reporting concepts as they are applied in the contemporary business practice. This involves a systematic examination on academic literature to understand the definition of greenwashing and the impacts on the ESG and sustainability reporting. Building from this foundation, the study then evaluates and critically examine the sustainability reporting and ESG framework and provide future suggestion for the issues highlighted.

Greenwashing

Greenwashing takes many forms, ranging from vague or misleading advertising claims to token gestures and superficial sustainability initiatives. Researchers have documented various greenwashing strategies employed by companies across different industries and contexts. For example, Parguel et al. (2011) categorized greenwashing tactics into different types, such as vague or irrelevant claims, false or misleading information, and hidden trade-offs. Moreover, Lyon and Montgomery (2015) examined the prevalence of greenwashing in the energy sector, highlighting the use of deceptive advertising and lobbying tactics to promote fossil fuel interests under the guise of environmental stewardship.

ACADEMIC INSPIRED NETWORK
Volume: 9 Issues: 57 Issue Special Issue [October, 2024] pp.30 - 42
International Journal of Accounting, Finance and Business (IJAFB)
eISSN: 0128-1844
Journal website: www.ijafb.com
DOI: 10.55573/IJAFB.095703

Greenwashing can have profound consequences for companies, consumers, investors, and society at large. Scholars have investigated the impact of greenwashing on consumer trust, brand reputation, and purchasing behavior. For instance, Lin-Hi and Müller (2013) explored the relationship between corporate environmental performance and consumer trust, finding that greenwashing undermines trust and credibility in companies' environmental claims. Moreover, Marquis and Toffel (2011) examined the reputational risks associated with greenwashing, highlighting how negative publicity and media scrutiny can damage corporate reputation and shareholder value.

Efforts to combat greenwashing have focused on enhancing transparency, accountability, and regulatory oversight. Researchers have proposed various solutions and best practices for promoting genuine sustainability efforts and deterring deceptive practices. For example, Lyon and Maxwell (2011) advocated for greater transparency and disclosure requirements, coupled with independent verification and certification mechanisms. Similarly, Chen and Chu (2024) emphasized the importance of regulatory enforcement and legal remedies in holding companies accountable for greenwashing behavior.

In conclusion, greenwashing represents a complex and multifaceted phenomenon with far-reaching implications for businesses, consumers, and society. By understanding the motivations, manifestations, and consequences of greenwashing, policymakers, practitioners, and researchers can develop effective strategies and interventions to promote transparency, integrity, and sustainability in corporate practices.

The Reporting Framework

Governance has been around for a while, most companies report on their share structure, ownership and most investors actually do want to know if managers are being paid too much and if the Board is qualified. Although G doesn’t necessarily have a dollar figure attached to it, it is important, and investors know that. Around the time of the 2005 UNEP report, when the term was first coined, environment was also considered very important. The S or social issues only taking on more relevance latterly, especially with the 2008 financial crisis and the renewed debate about ESG and fiduciary duty. There is plenty of evidence that the ESG factors impact the financial well-being of a business and that without due consideration of the E and S businesses not only increase their risk, they also miss opportunities.

As the ESG ‘’industry’’ has expanded, the term has become erroneously intertwined with sustainability. However, it is essential to emphasise that sustainability is not a subset of ESG but rather the encompassing concept to which all ESG efforts contribute. Sustainability embodies the principles and values of living in harmony with the planet while achieving peace and equality through our activities and institutions. In contrast, ESG efforts, simply put, are how organisations measure, monitor and manage their performance to be more sustainable.

If an organisation is merely focussing on philanthropical and volunteering programmes, that is CSR or Corporate Social Responsibility efforts (and not ESG or Sustainability). Yes, CSR was effective in driving the responsibility agenda but it became too broad, and philosophical for businesses. Whereas ESG has gained traction as it gave quantitative measures to which business leaders and investors could relate more directly to their business, and therefore could more readily adopt the related frameworks. This is a serious issue for stakeholders for several reasons. Despite its admirable objectives, ESG initiatives have predominantly cultivated a culture focused on meeting regulatory requirements rather than fostering the transformative innovation

ACADEMIC INSPIRED NETWORK
Volume: 9 Issues: 57 Issue Special Issue [October, 2024] pp.30 - 42
International Journal of Accounting, Finance and Business (IJAFB)
eISSN: 0128-1844
Journal website: www.ijafb.com
DOI: 10.55573/IJAFB.095703

necessary to address environmental challenges. Instead of inspiring genuine commitment to sustainability, the ESG framework, with its emphasis on regulatory compliance, accessible funding, and attractive incentives, has unintentionally encouraged superficial practices. This has led to the proliferation of greenwashing tactics, where companies prioritize appearances over substantive environmental action, thus undermining the original intent of ESG initiatives.

True champions of environmental and societal sustainability see themselves as caretakers of the planet and its inhabitants, actively leading the way in developing creative solutions to current challenges in ways that are profitable. Instead of being motivated by external rewards or regulatory demands, authentic steward leaders are internally compelled by a sincere dedication to leave behind a beneficial legacy.

The world of ESG has taken off and is catching on in Asia. Everyone is talking about how important adopting ESG initiatives is and how investors are taking notice of risk mitigation through ESG performance. The term has become one of those acronyms that many people recognize, yet not everyone understands. Without getting too pedantic, definitions are important to ensure alignment, prevent misallocation of valuable resources and guard against accidental greenwashing.

Understanding where it came from, its purpose and objectives, gives us insights as to how the term ESG has been used, misused and perhaps abused. It's not in anyone's interest, let alone a company's self-interest, to reduce ESG to mere marketing or differentiation strategies or view it solely as a risk management exercise. Whilst important to look back and establish clarity on definitions, I now find myself looking to the future. As we move forward, I begin to wonder where in ESG does humanity and well-being fit? How might we evolve this tool from doing less bad i.e., mitigation, to positive or regenerative investments i.e., the real impact of ESG capital?

As the importance of Environmental, Social, and Governance factors in investment decision-making continues to grow, there is a need for a uniform and global reporting framework for ESG. This framework would provide consistent guidelines and standards for companies to report their ESG performance, allowing investors to easily compare and evaluate different companies. Furthermore, a uniform and global reporting framework would enhance transparency and credibility of ESG information, addressing concerns about greenwashing and providing investors with reliable data.

The current frameworks available across many countries are:

1. Global Reporting Initiative: This is one of the most widely used frameworks for ESG reporting. It provides guidance and indicators for reporting on a wide range of sustainability issues.
2. Sustainability Accounting Standards Board: This framework focuses on industry-specific metrics and disclosures, providing investors with more relevant and comparable ESG information.
3. Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures: This framework, established by the Financial Stability Board, focuses specifically on climate-related risks and opportunities.
4. Carbon Disclosure Project: This is a widely recognized framework that helps companies disclose their carbon emissions and climate change strategies.

5. Integrated Reporting Framework: This framework encourages companies to provide a holistic view of their performance, including financial, environmental, social, and governance aspects.
6. CDP Water Security: This framework focuses on water-related risks and management strategies. Water security frameworks are particularly relevant for industries that heavily rely on water resources, such as agriculture, manufacturing, and energy production. These are specialized frameworks for water management.

In order to effectively assess and compare ESG performance across companies and industries, there is a need for a uniform and global reporting framework. The lack of a uniform and global reporting framework for ESG makes it difficult for investors to compare the sustainability performance of different companies. Additionally, without a uniform and global reporting framework, companies may have varying interpretations of what constitutes ESG reporting and may be able to manipulate or withhold relevant information.

ESG Reporting

ESG reporting has evolved from a niche practice to a mainstream corporate activity, driven by a growing recognition of the interconnectedness between business operations and broader societal and environmental issues. Researchers have traced the historical development of ESG reporting frameworks, from early corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives to the emergence of standardized reporting guidelines and frameworks. For instance, Hoang (2018) identified the evolution of ESG reporting from voluntary, non-standardized disclosures to more structured and comprehensive reporting practices, influenced by factors such as regulatory pressures, stakeholder demands, and market expectations. Reporting plays a vital role by not only communicating positive stories but also by acknowledging and addressing key material issues that could impact the business continuity in the short and long term. This dual focus ensures a well-rounded and transparent representation of the business's ESG performance and challenges.

ESG should not be treated as a mere tick-box exercise. Instead, it should be viewed as a strategic imperative seamlessly integrated across business operations, ensuring comprehensive and effective addressing of all ESG issues in the short and long term. Furthermore, having a uniform and global reporting framework for ESG, it would establish consistent guidelines and metrics for ESG reporting, ensuring that companies report relevant and comparable information. This would make it easier for investors to analyze and compare ESG performance across different companies and industries.

Moreover, a uniform framework would provide a comprehensive and interconnected view of a company's overall performance, allowing stakeholders to gain a deeper understanding of how ESG factors are integrated into the core business strategy. This holistic view would enable investors to make informed decisions that align with their ethical and sustainable investment objectives, contributing to the overall advancement of sustainable practices across industries.
Additionally, a global reporting framework could facilitate collaboration and knowledge sharing among companies, investors, and other stakeholders. This exchange of information and best practices could lead to the development of innovative solutions and initiatives to address global sustainability challenges, fostering a more cohesive and proactive approach towards achieving environmental and social goals on a global scale.

Volume: 9 Issues: 57 Issue Special Issue [October, 2024] pp.30 - 42
International Journal of Accounting, Finance and Business (IJAFB)
eISSN: 0128-1844
Journal website: www.ijafb.com
DOI: 10.55573/IJAFB.095703

Ultimately, it will contribute to the advancement of a more sustainable and responsible global economy by promoting greater awareness of environmental impact issues within corporate structures. Given the growing significance of Environmental, Social, and Governance factors in investment decision-making, the need for a uniform and global reporting framework becomes even more apparent. The existing frameworks, while valuable, lack the consistency and standardization necessary for effective comparison and evaluation. Furthermore, without a uniform and global reporting framework, there is a risk of misleading or incomplete information being reported.

A uniform and global reporting framework for ESG would not only standardize reporting and improve transparency but also promote a deeper understanding of how ESG factors are integrated into a company's core business strategy. This comprehensive view would empower stakeholders to make informed decisions aligning with their ethical and sustainable investment objectives, thereby contributing to the broader advancement of sustainable practices across industries.

This is consistent with Mahmud et al. (2017) mentioned that the implementation of a global reporting framework could facilitate collaboration and knowledge sharing among companies, investors, and other stakeholders. This exchange of information and best practices could lead to the development of innovative solutions and initiatives to address global sustainability challenges, ultimately fostering a more cohesive and proactive approach towards achieving environmental and social goals on a global scale.
In conclusion, the implementation of a uniform and global reporting framework for ESG is crucial. It will harmonize ESG disclosures, enhance transparency, foster accountability, and drive continuous improvement in sustainable business practices. By providing clear and consistent guidelines, this framework will enable investors to make informed decisions and comparisons across companies and industries.

A Model for ESG Reporting

In the realm of corporate governance and business strategy, the integration of ESG criteria stands out as a transformative global trend, redefining traditional paradigms of success and sustainability. This shift is particularly pronounced in the Asia-Pacific region, which has emerged as a forerunner in embedding ESG metrics into corporate frameworks and executive incentives.

Recent studies and reports paint a clear picture of this evolution. In 2023, an impressive 77% of employers in the Asia-Pacific region incorporated ESG measures into their executive incentive plans, marking a significant leap from 63% in the previous year (Isik et al., 2024). This uptick is not just a statistic but a testament to the growing recognition of ESG's critical role in fostering long-term, sustainable corporate growth.

However, the landscape of ESG integration is as diverse as it is dynamic. Countries such as Singapore, Australia, and Japan are leading the charge, with adoption rates soaring high – 93% in Singapore, 86% in Australia, and 72% in Japan (Isik et al.,2024). These figures mirror, if not surpass, the trends observed in more traditionally ESG-focused regions like Europe and North America. This leadership emphasises a broader regional commitment to sustainable and responsible business practices, driven by both internal corporate governance values and external investor pressures.

Volume: 9 Issues: 57 Issue Special Issue [October, 2024] pp.30 - 42
International Journal of Accounting, Finance and Business (IJAFB)
eISSN: 0128-1844
Journal website: www.ijafb.com
DOI: 10.55573/IJAFB.095703

However, according to Mohd Daud et al. (2024), in other parts of Asia-Pacific, such as China, Hong Kong, India, and Malaysia, the adoption of ESG metrics exhibits a more gradual trajectory. In these markets, inconsistencies in disclosure practices and varying regulatory frameworks contribute to a more staggered integration of ESG principles. Yet, the direction is clear an increasing number of leading companies in these countries are aligning their business practices with ESG priorities, indicating a region-wide shift towards more sustainable business models.

According to Baratta et al. (2023), the industry-specific variations in ESG adoption further illustrate the complexity of this trend. Sectors like consumer staples, energy, financials, and utilities are more proactive in embracing ESG metrics, reflecting their direct impact on environmental and social aspects. Meanwhile, the rise in ESG metric adoption in sectors such as real estate and communications services highlights a growing awareness across diverse business landscapes.

As the study observe these global trends, it becomes evident that ESG integration is not a passing fad but a fundamental shift in how businesses operate and define success. The Asia-Pacific region's leadership in this domain sets a compelling example for the rest of the world, showcasing the potential of ESG to drive not just ethical and sustainable practices, but also robust and resilient business growth.

Challenges in ESG Reporting and Ratings

While the integration of ESG principles marks a progressive stride in corporate responsibility, it is not without its complexities and challenges. Central to these challenges is the issue of ESG reporting and ratings areas that have been subject to increasing scrutiny for their opacity and inconsistency.

The ESG rating system, a critical tool for investors to assess a company's sustainability and ethical impact, has faced criticism for its lack of transparency and standardization (Wang et al.2023). Major rating agencies like MSCI, S&P Global, and Morningstar's Sustainalytics each use different methodologies, leading to significant variances in scores. For instance, studies show only about a 60% correlation in ESG ratings among providers, compared to up to 99% in credit ratings. This disparity can leave investors navigating a maze of conflicting information, challenging the reliability of these ratings as tools for informed decision-making.Beyond the ratings themselves, the process of ESG reporting is filled with difficulties. The data, often scraped from diverse sources of varying quality, is fed into models to produce composite scores. However, the combination of disparate metrics can render these scores arbitrary, raising questions about their real-world relevance and accuracy.

A study conducted by Galletta et al. (2023) shows European banks present a case in point, struggling with the intricacies of new ESG requirements, particularly the Green Asset Ratio (GAR). Introduced by the European Banking Authority (EBA), the GAR is a measure intended to reflect the extent to which a bank's asset portfolio aligns with sustainable activities. However, early assessments indicate that the banking industry is substantially behind the curve, with estimates suggesting a figure lower than 7%. This shortfall highlights the challenges institutions face in aligning their operations with evolving ESG standards.

Moreover, the EBA's requirement has spurred debates among banks and investors about the efficacy and impact of such metrics. European banks are advocating for a more nuanced

Volume: 9 Issues: 57 Issue Special Issue [October, 2024] pp.30 - 42
International Journal of Accounting, Finance and Business (IJAFB)
eISSN: 0128-1844
Journal website: www.ijafb.com
DOI: 10.55573/IJAFB.095703

approach, suggesting that investors should consider a broader range of ESG metrics rather than focusing solely on GAR. This viewpoint emphasises a broader issue in the ESG domain the need for metrics that are not only comprehensive and transparent but also adaptable to the complexities of different industries and markets.

The challenges in ESG reporting and ratings lie in achieving a balance between comprehensive assessment and practical applicability. As we push forward in this ESG-driven era, these challenges highlight the need for continued refinement and harmonisation of reporting standards and methodologies, ensuring that ESG remains a robust and reliable compass for sustainable and ethical business practices.

Innovations in ESG Practices

As ESG practices increasingly become a cornerstone in modern business strategy, innovative approaches to ESG reporting are emerging, reshaping the landscape of corporate responsibility and transparency.

A notable example of this innovation is the adoption of the Simplified ESG Disclosure Guide (SEDG) by ESGpedia in Malaysia (Chung et al.2024). This initiative marks a significant step in simplifying the ESG reporting process for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), a sector that often grapples with the complexities of comprehensive ESG reporting. The SEDG, launched by Capital Markets Malaysia, is a pioneering effort providing SMEs with a streamlined and standardised set of guidelines tailored for ESG disclosures. This move not only facilitates easier compliance for SMEs but also ensures their competitive edge in the global market, where ESG adherence is increasingly becoming a benchmark.

Further advancing the ESG reporting landscape are digital tools and platforms, exemplified by STACS's ESGpedia. ESGpedia, a platform developed by Hashstacs Pte Ltd (STACS), is revolutionising the ESG space by digitalising the reporting process. This platform integrates tools such as a digital assessment and a carbon calculator aligned with GHG Protocol and ISO14064 methodologies, providing SMEs with automated calculations and deeper insights into their greenhouse gas emissions. The digitalisation of these tools democratises access to ESG reporting, allowing a broader range of companies to participate in sustainable practices effectively.

Furthermore, ESGpedia's influence is not limited to Malaysia. As a prominent ESG data and technology firm in Asia, STACS's platform plays a crucial role in numerous endeavors, such as the ESCAP Sustainable Business Network's Asia-Pacific Green Deal digital platform and the Monetary Authority of Singapore's Greenprint ESG Registry. According to Ho (2023) with over 5 million data points on sustainability, ESGpedia acts as a central hub for corporations, SMEs, and the financial sector, aiding not only in meeting ESG regulations but also in advancing their wider ESG objectives.

These innovations in ESG practices are a demonstration to the evolving nature of corporate sustainability efforts. By leveraging technology and simplifying reporting processes, these tools and platforms are ensuring that ESG compliance is no longer a daunting task but an accessible and integral aspect of business operations. As we continue to witness these advancements, it is clear that the path to sustainable and responsible business practices is becoming more navigable and inclusive, paving the way for a greener and more ethical corporate world.

Volume: 9 Issues: 57 Issue Special Issue [October, 2024] pp.30 - 42
International Journal of Accounting, Finance and Business (IJAFB)
eISSN: 0128-1844
Journal website: www.ijafb.com
DOI: 10.55573/IJAFB.095703

The Shift Towards Risk Management

In the ever-evolving landscape of corporate governance, a significant trend is emerging: the framing of ESG and Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) strategies within the broader, more traditional concept of Risk Management. This has been mentioned in the study by Hubel and Scholz (2020), this paradigm shift reflects a strategic realignment, as businesses seek to navigate the complex interplay of social responsibility and operational risk.

At the heart of this trend is the recognition that ESG and DEI issues are not just ethical imperatives but also crucial risk factors that can impact a company's long-term viability. Factors such as climate change, social justice, and workforce diversity are increasingly viewed through the lens of risk assessment and mitigation (Kandpal et al.2024). This perspective allows companies to address these concerns proactively, framing them as integral parts of their risk management strategies rather than standalone initiatives.

Concurrently, we are witnessing the emergence of terms like Corporate Citizenship, Wellness, and Belonging as less controversial and more universally palatable alternatives to ESG and DEI. Corporate Citizenship, for instance, encompasses a broad range of socially responsible activities and emphasises a company's commitment to ethical behaviour and community involvement. This term is gaining traction as it encapsulates the essence of social responsibility without the political overtones that sometimes accompany ESG discussions.

Wellness and Belonging are similarly becoming focal points, especially in the context of employee engagement and workplace culture. These terms signify a shift from a narrow focus on diversity metrics to a broader emphasis on creating inclusive environments where all employees feel valued and supported. This approach not only enhances employee satisfaction and productivity but also mitigates the risks associated with workplace discontent and turnover. Examples of this shift are evident in various industry sectors. Financial institutions, traditionally at the forefront of risk management, are integrating ESG considerations into their investment and lending decisions, recognising the financial risks associated with environmental and social issues (Hubel and Scholz, 2020). Similarly, technology companies are increasingly focusing on wellness and belonging initiatives, acknowledging the risks to innovation and growth posed by non-inclusive cultures.

This realignment towards risk management, with a focus on Corporate Citizenship, Wellness, and Belonging, represents a pragmatic approach to navigating the complex and often politically charged landscape of ESG and DEI. By incorporating these elements into their broader risk management frameworks, companies can ensure that their strategies are not only socially responsible but also aligned with their core business objectives and risk profiles.

Conclusion

The rise of ESG initiatives following the Paris Agreement demonstrated a commitment by businesses and investors to contributing to a more sustainable future. However, the commercial interests infiltrating the ESG landscape have undermined the movement's transformative potential. The current trend toward market-driven solutions has led to an ESG consultancy model that often prioritizes client satisfaction over genuine environmental progress. This has resulted in weakened standards, greenwashing, and a loss of public trust.

A significant shift is needed to achieve the true potential of ESG or a framework that replaces it. To make meaningful environmental and social progress, we must break down the illusions

Volume: 9 Issues: 57 Issue Special Issue [October, 2024] pp.30 - 42
International Journal of Accounting, Finance and Business (IJAFB)
eISSN: 0128-1844
Journal website: www.ijafb.com
DOI: 10.55573/IJAFB.095703

and prioritize independent, transparent verification of sustainability claims. Companies must be held legally accountable for misleading practices, and consultancies should assist businesses in achieving established targets, not shaping targets to appease clients.

The urgency of the climate crisis and widespread environmental degradation demands immediate action. If left unchecked, the current ESG model will further erode public support for environmental solutions. We must move beyond the flawed foundations and build a new system focused on integrity, scientific rigour, and verifiable outcomes.

As we look towards the horizon of ESG practices, it is evident that the field is poised for continued evolution and innovation. The future of ESG is likely to be shaped by an increasingly sophisticated regulatory landscape and a growing emphasis on investor expectations for transparency and accountability.

Regulatory bodies worldwide are expected to play a pivotal role in shaping the future of ESG practices. We anticipate a trend towards more standardised and stringent ESG reporting requirements, which will likely include comprehensive disclosure mandates and more defined metrics for sustainability and social impact. This regulatory push will drive companies to not only comply but to also integrate ESG principles more deeply into their core business strategies.

Investor expectations are also set to evolve. As shareholders and stakeholders become more ESG-savvy, their demands for ethical practices, environmental stewardship, and social responsibility will increase. This shift will likely lead to a more dynamic and interactive dialogue between companies and their investors, with a greater focus on long-term value creation and impact.

Technological advancements will also play a crucial role in the future of ESG. Digital tools and platforms will become more prevalent, offering enhanced capabilities for data collection, analysis, and reporting. This digitalisation will make ESG reporting more accessible and efficient, enabling a wider range of companies to engage in sustainable practices.

In conclusion, our exploration of the evolving landscape of ESG has highlighted several key points: the increasing integration of ESG metrics into business practices, the challenges of ESG reporting and ratings, innovative approaches in ESG practices, the shift towards risk management, and the leadership of the APAC region in ESG integration. These facets feature the dynamic and multifaceted nature of ESG, reflecting its growing importance in the global business and investment landscape.

Staying informed and adaptable is crucial in this rapidly evolving field. As regulatory frameworks evolve, investor expectations change, and new technologies emerge, businesses must remain agile and proactive in their approach to ESG. As we navigate this complex and ever-changing terrain, the importance of ESG in shaping a sustainable, ethical, and profitable future has never been clearer.

Acknowledgements
We would like to thank Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia and Universitas Padjajaran, Bandung, Indonesia for their helpful feedback and support.

Volume: 9 Issues: 57 Issue Special Issue [October, 2024] pp.30 - 42
International Journal of Accounting, Finance and Business (IJAFB)
eISSN: 0128-1844
Journal website: www.ijafb.com
DOI: 10.55573/IJAFB.095703

References

Adams, B. (2008). Green development: Environment and sustainability in a developing world. *Routledge.*

Baratta, A., Cimino, A., Longo, F., Solina, V., & Verteramo, S. (2023). The impact of ESG practices in industry with a focus on carbon emissions: Insights and future perspectives. *Sustainability*, 15(8), 6685.

Chen, P., & Chu, Z. (2024). Mere facade? Is greenwashing behaviour lower in low-carbon corporates?. *Business Strategy and the Environment*.

Chung, R., Bayne, L., & Birt, J. (2024). Stakeholder responses to mandating environmental, social and governance reporting in Hong Kong. *China Journal of Accounting Research*, 100353.

Delmas, M. A., & Burbano, V. C. (2011). The drivers of greenwashing. *California management review*, *54*(1), 64-87.

Eccles, R. G., Serafeim, G., & Krzus, M. P. (2011). Market interest in nonfinancial information. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, *23*(4), 113-127.

Free, C., Jones, S., & Tremblay, M. S. (2024). Greenwashing and sustainability assurance: A review and call for future research. *Journal of Accounting Literature.*

Galletta, S., Goodell, J. W., Mazzù, S., & Paltrinieri, A. (2023). Bank reputation and operational risk: The impact of ESG. *Finance Research Letters*, 51, 103494.

Ho, J. (2023). 11 Banking, Blockchain, and ESG. The Role of Distributed Ledger Technology in Banking: *From Theory to Practice*, 235.

Hoang, T. (2018). The role of the integrated reporting in raising awareness of environmental, social and corporate governance (ESG) performance. In *Stakeholders, governance and responsibility* (pp. 47-69). Emerald Publishing Limited.

Hübel, B., & Scholz, H. (2020). Integrating sustainability risks in asset management: the role of ESG exposures and ESG ratings. *Journal of Asset Management*, 21(1), 52-69.

Işık, C., Ongan, S., Islam, H., Jabeen, G., & Pinzon, S. (2024). Is economic growth in East Asia pacific and South Asia ESG factors based and aligned growth?. *Sustainable Development.*

Kandpal, V., Jaswal, A., Santibanez Gonzalez, E. D., & Agarwal, N. (2024). Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and ESG Reporting: Redefining Business in the Twenty-First Century. In Sustainable Energy Transition: Circular Economy and Sustainable Financing for Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) Practices (pp. 239-272). *Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.*

Lyon, T. P., & Montgomery, A. W. (2015). The means and end of greenwash. *Organization & Environment*, *28*(2), 223-249.

Mohd Daud, S. N., Ghazali, N. S., & Mohammad Ismail, N. H. (2024). ESG, innovation, and economic growth: an empirical evidence. *Studies in Economics and Finance.*

Parguel, B., Benoît-Moreau, F., & Larceneux, F. (2011). How sustainability ratings might deter 'greenwashing': A closer look at ethical corporate communication. *Journal of business ethics*, *102*, 15-28.

Lin-Hi, N., & Müller, K. (2013). The CSR bottom line: Preventing corporate social irresponsibility. *Journal of Business Research*, *66*(10), 1928-1936.

Mahmud, S., Biswas, T., & Islam, N. (2017). Sustainability reporting practices and implications of banking sector of Bangladesh according to global reporting initiative (GRI) reporting framework: An empirical evaluation. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, 6(3), 01-14.

Marquis, C., & Toffel, M. W. (2011). *The globalization of corporate environmental disclosure: accountability or greenwashing?*. Boston: Harvard Business School.

Volume: 9 Issues: 57 Issue Special Issue [October, 2024] pp.30 - 42
International Journal of Accounting, Finance and Business (IJAFB)
eISSN: 0128-1844
Journal website: www.ijafb.com
DOI: 10.55573/IJAFB.095703

Schaltegger, S. (2018). Linking environmental management accounting: A reflection on (missing) links to sustainability and planetary boundaries. *Social and Environmental Accountability Journal*, *38*(1), 19-29.

Schaefer, S. D., Terlutter, R., & Diehl, S. (2019). Is my company really doing good? Factors influencing employees' evaluation of the authenticity of their company's corporate social responsibility engagement. *Journal of business research*, *101*, 128-143.

Wang, J., Ma, M., Dong, T., & Zhang, Z. (2023). Do ESG ratings promote corporate green innovation? A quasi-natural experiment based on SynTao Green Finance's ESG ratings. *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 87, 102623.

Yu, E. P. Y., Van Luu, B., & Chen, C. H. (2020). Greenwashing in environmental, social and governance disclosures. *Research in International Business and Finance*, *52*, 101192.