From Theory to Practice: ESG Integration in Corporate Governance and Financial Decision-Making

Prof. Bhaskar M G
Industrial and Engineering Management
R. V. College of Engineering
Bengaluru, Karnataka, India
bhaskarmg@rvce.edu.in

Gagana M V
Computer Science and Engineering
R. V. College of Engineering
Bengaluru, Karnataka, India
gaganamv.cs22@rvce.edu.in

Goutami Sooda
Computer Science and Engineering
R. V. College of Engineering
Bengaluru, Karnataka, India
goutamisooda.cs22@rvce.edu.in

Mitesh Murthy
Computer Science and Engineering
R. V. College of Engineering Bengaluru, Karnataka, India
miteshmurthy.cs22@rvce.edu.in

Ganesh N Naik
Computer Science and Engineering
R. V. College of Engineering Bengaluru, Karnataka, India
ganeshnnaik.cs22@rvce.edu.in

***Abstract*—The rising prominence of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) factors in corporate strategy and financial decision-making reflects evolving stakeholder expectations and regulatory demands, both globally and within India. This paper explores the theoretical foundations underpinning ESG integration—drawing on stakeholder theory, agency theory, and complementary frameworks—and their relevance to corporate governance and financial management. ESG considerations are increasingly influencing capital allocation, investment appraisal, and risk management practices, offering both a performance-enhancing and risk-mitigating lens for long-term value creation. The paper also examines ESG reporting standards, governance mechanisms, and the evolving Indian regulatory landscape, including the Business Responsibility and Sustainability Report (BRSR) mandate. Despite challenges such as standardization gaps and greenwashing risks, ESG remains central to sustainable financial performance. The study concludes by highlighting key implementation issues, critiques, and future research directions, particularly the need for improved measurement and deeper analysis within emerging market contexts like India.**

Keywords: ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance), Corporate Governance, Stakeholder Theory, Agency Theory, Sustainable Finance, Investment Decision-making, Risk Management, ESG Reporting Frameworks, Indian Corporate Regulation, Financial Management, Business Responsibility and Sustainability Report (BRSR), Greenwashing, Long-term Value Creation, Cost of Capital, Emerging Markets.

I. Introduction

In recent years, environmental, social, and corporate governance (ESG) considerations have assumed growing importance in both global and Indian corporate spheres. This heightened focus is largely driven by mounting pressure from stakeholders—including investors, regulators, customers, and civil society—who increasingly expect companies to pursue long-term value creation that aligns with broader environmental and social imperatives. The urgency of climate change, rising social inequality, and recurring governance failures have demonstrated that financial performance alone is insufficient to secure a firm's sustainability and resilience in the modern economy.

Institutional investors such as BlackRock and Norges Bank have publicly affirmed that ESG factors are not peripheral concerns but central to risk-adjusted returns, emphasizing that "climate risk is investment risk." Reflecting this global momentum, Indian regulators have also taken significant strides. The Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI), for instance, now requires the top 1,000 listed companies to file Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reports (BRSR), signaling a regulatory shift toward sustainable and accountable business conduct.

ESG, as a concept, encompasses a set of non-financial but materially significant factors that influence a firm's operations, reputation, and long-term viability. The environmental dimension includes issues such as climate change, pollution, and resource management; the social aspect spans employee welfare, human rights, diversity, and community relations; and governance pertains to board effectiveness, transparency, executive compensation, and shareholder rights. Together, these pillars guide firms in managing risks and opportunities that do not always appear in traditional financial statements but have substantial implications for future cash flows and strategic direction.

Closely tied to ESG is the concept of corporate governance—the system of rules, processes, and controls through which organizations are directed and managed. Good governance ensures that a company balances the interests of diverse stakeholders including shareholders, employees, creditors, and society at large. It also plays a vital role in embedding ESG into decision-making structures and corporate behavior, ensuring long-term accountability and trust.

This paper examines the theoretical foundations that explain the integration of ESG principles into corporate governance systems and highlights their growing relevance to financial management. Drawing from stakeholder theory, agency theory, legitimacy theory, and the resource-based view, it explores how ESG aligns with or challenges traditional financial and governance paradigms. Additionally, the paper analyzes how ESG factors are reshaping key financial management activities such as investment decisions, capital allocation, risk assessment, and value creation. While anchored in theoretical perspectives, the discussion also contextualizes these developments within both global and Indian regulatory landscapes, offering insights into how ESG is redefining corporate responsibility and financial decision-making in the 21st century.

II. Theoretical Foundations

A. Stakeholder Theory

The Stakeholder Theory, introduced by R. Edward Freeman in 1984, posits that a company's responsibility extends beyond its shareholders to include all stakeholders who affect or are affected by the firm's activities. These stakeholders include employees, customers, suppliers, communities, and the environment. Unlike the shareholder primacy model, stakeholder theory argues that long-term success stems from managing and balancing the interests of these diverse groups.

In the ESG context, stakeholder theory provides a strong normative foundation. It inherently incorporates ethical, social, and moral responsibilities, emphasizing that firms should operate in a way that benefits society while minimizing harm. ESG initiatives—such as reducing environmental harm, improving labor practices, or promoting board diversity—align closely with this view.

Empirical studies support the argument that firms adopting strong ESG practices often enjoy increased stakeholder trust and legitimacy, which in turn contribute to better firm performance. For example, firms with robust ESG programs attract and retain talent, avoid regulatory sanctions, and benefit from consumer loyalty—translating into competitive advantage.

B. Agency Theory

Agency Theory, developed by Jensen and Meckling (1976), focuses on the relationship between principals (shareholders) and agents (managers), and the conflicts that arise when the interests of these two parties diverge. The core concern of agency theory is to align managerial actions with shareholder interests, typically through governance mechanisms such as performance-based incentives and monitoring systems.

Although ESG may initially appear misaligned with agency theory's focus on shareholder value maximization, recent scholarship suggests otherwise. ESG can serve as a mechanism for reducing agency costs. For instance, governance enhancements (e.g. board independence, ESG-linked compensation) help curb managerial opportunism. Similarly, environmental and social initiatives, when material to the business, can reduce long-term risks and create sustainable value.

A growing body of empirical literature uses agency theory to explain how ESG initiatives support long-term financial performance. By addressing reputational, regulatory, and operational risks, ESG integration enhances investor confidence and reduces capital costs. Thus, from a financial management perspective, ESG is increasingly viewed not as a trade-off, but as an instrument of shareholder value preservation.

C. Other Theoretical Perspectives

Beyond stakeholder and agency theories, several other frameworks enrich the understanding of ESG's role in corporate governance:

- **Institutional Theory and Legitimacy Theory** suggest that firms adopt ESG practices in response to external pressures—such as regulatory mandates, industry norms, and societal expectations—to gain legitimacy and secure their social license to operate.
- **The Resource-Based View (RBV)** treats ESG initiatives as strategic assets. Intangible resources like corporate reputation, employee satisfaction, or sustainable supply chains can become sources of sustained competitive advantage.
- **Stewardship Theory** counters agency theory by assuming that managers are motivated to act as stewards of organizational success, aligning naturally with ESG goals.
- **Critiques of Shareholder Primacy** have also gained traction, arguing that maximizing short-term profits often comes at the cost of long-term sustainability. ESG integration is increasingly seen as a way to resolve this tension by aligning business strategy with broader societal goals.

It is important to note that ESG research does not rely on a single theoretical framework. In fact, studies often draw from multiple theories to capture the complexity of ESG-related decision-making. According to OECD findings, stakeholder theory informs nearly 48 percent of ESG literature, followed closely by agency theory at 45 percent, reflecting the dominant but complementary nature of these perspectives. As ESG continues to evolve, so too does the theoretical basis supporting its integration into corporate governance and financial management.

III. ESG Structures and Reporting

As ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) considerations become increasingly integrated into corporate strategy and financial analysis, the way companies' structure and report ESG data is critical. Effective ESG structures and transparent reporting mechanisms help firms communicate their sustainability performance, manage risks, and attract responsible investors. However, the landscape remains complex due to the evolving nature of ESG expectations, varied reporting standards, and differences in corporate governance practices. This section explores the core components of ESG, the key frameworks used for reporting, and how corporate governance mechanisms are adapting to support ESG integration.

A. ESG Components and Metrics

Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) has emerged as a crucial framework for assessing a company's commitment to sustainable and responsible business practices. It goes beyond traditional corporate social responsibility (CSR) by offering measurable indicators that directly impact long-term value and financial performance. The ESG framework is built around three main pillars. The Environmental component focuses on a firm's ecological footprint, including climate change mitigation, carbon emissions, resource use, pollution, and energy efficiency. The Social aspect evaluates how companies manage relationships with employees, communities, suppliers, and customers. It includes issues such as labor rights, diversity and inclusion, workplace safety, and community engagement. Finally, the Governance pillar assesses internal controls, leadership structure, board composition, executive compensation, and transparency.

Unlike CSR, which was often considered optional and reputational, ESG is increasingly viewed as an essential metric for long-term business sustainability and risk management. Investors, regulators, and rating agencies are now actively integrating ESG criteria into assessments of corporate performance, making ESG a central element of corporate strategy and financial reporting.

B. Reporting Frameworks

One of the main challenges in ESG reporting is the absence of a universally accepted standard. This fragmentation has resulted in inconsistent and often incomparable ESG data across firms and sectors. However, several globally recognized frameworks have emerged to guide companies in their ESG disclosures:

- **Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) -** Emphasizes stakeholder inclusivity and comprehensive sustainability disclosures.
- **Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB) –** Focuses on financial materiality, offering sector-specific standards relevant to investors.
- **Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) –** Provides recommendations for disclosing climate-related financial risks and opportunities.
- **IFRS S1 and S2 (via the ISSB) –** These standards aim to unify ESG reporting. IFRS S1 addresses general sustainability-related disclosures, while IFRS S2 focuses on climate-related information specifically.

The increasing endorsement of these standards by international regulatory bodies, including the OECD and the Financial Stability Board (FSB), signals growing alignment on the importance of standardized, investor-focused ESG reporting. Efforts to harmonize reporting frameworks—such as the collaboration between the ISSB and GRI—are underway to enhance comparability, reduce reporting burdens, and improve data reliability for stakeholders.

C. Board and Governance Mechanisms

Corporate governance structures play a critical role in embedding ESG principles into business operations and strategic decision-making. Boards of directors are increasingly held accountable for overseeing ESG risks and ensuring their integration into company strategy. Many companies have established dedicated sustainability or ESG committees within their governance structures to focus on these issues. Additionally, a growing number of firms are tying executive compensation to ESG-related targets, such as carbon reduction, workforce diversity, or safety performance, to align managerial incentives with long-term sustainability goals.

The composition of boards also influences ESG effectiveness. Independent directors bring objectivity and are often more focused on long-term value creation, while diverse boards—by gender, background, and expertise—have been shown to improve oversight and responsiveness to ESG issues. Institutional investors are becoming more active in pushing for ESG accountability through proxy voting and shareholder engagement. Audit and risk committees within the board also play a key role by overseeing ESG disclosures and ensuring that sustainability risks are addressed in internal controls and enterprise risk management systems.

IV. ESG and Financial Management Decisions

The integration of ESG factors into financial management has transformed how firms evaluate investments, manage risks, and allocate resources. Traditionally, financial decisions were based solely on profitability, risk-return analysis, and market efficiency. However, in today's business environment, ESG performance is increasingly viewed as a determinant of financial health and long-term value creation. Companies that embed ESG into their financial decision-making frameworks often outperform peers in terms of risk management, capital access, and sustainability-driven innovation.

This section examines how ESG considerations influence core financial management areas such as investment appraisal, cost of capital, risk management, and value creation for both shareholders and stakeholders. The goal is to show that ESG is not just an ethical or reputational concern, but a financially material set of factors with measurable impact on a firm's performance and resilience.

A. Investment and Capital Allocation

ESG has significantly reshaped how companies make investment decisions and allocate capital. Financial managers are now incorporating environmental and social risks, as well as governance standards, into capital budgeting tools such as Net Present Value (NPV) and Internal Rate of Return (IRR). For instance, projects with high carbon emissions may face future regulatory costs, or may be deemed socially unacceptable by stakeholders, which would affect expected cash flows or raise the required rate of return.

ESG-conscious firms tend to evaluate investments not only for financial returns but also for long-term sustainability. This has led to the concept of "capital allocation efficiency"—the idea that firms that allocate resources to ESG-aligned projects are more resilient and better equipped to handle future uncertainties. Empirical studies support this, showing that high ESG-performing firms often have better project screening processes, avoid stranded assets, and generate more stable cash flows, enhancing shareholder value over time.

B. Cost of Capital and Funding

A company's ESG profile increasingly influences its cost of capital. Investors and lenders view strong ESG performance as an indicator of lower operational and reputational risk, which reduces the risk premium they demand. As a result, companies with high ESG ratings generally enjoy a lower cost of equity and debt, leading to a reduced Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC).

Additionally, new financing instruments such as green bonds and sustainability-linked loans (SLLs) are tying access to capital directly to ESG metrics. For example, a firm may secure a lower interest rate on a loan if it achieves specific sustainability targets, such as reducing emissions or improving workplace diversity. These developments demonstrate that capital markets are rewarding firms that integrate ESG into their financial strategy, not only with reputational benefits but also with tangible financial incentives.

C. Risk Management

ESG risks have become integral to modern enterprise risk management (ERM). Environmental risks include natural disasters, resource scarcity, and carbon regulation; social risks involve labor disputes, supply chain disruptions, and community backlash; governance risks may arise from weak oversight, unethical practices, or board inefficiencies. All of these can directly impact a firm's operations, compliance costs, and reputation.

Integrating ESG into ERM allows companies to anticipate and mitigate such risks more effectively. Leading disclosure frameworks, such as TCFD and IFRS S2, require firms to assess and report on climate-related and broader sustainability risks using scenario analysis. Companies with mature ESG risk management systems have been shown to experience fewer operational shocks—such as environmental fines, product recalls, or protests—which translates into greater market stability and investor confidence. Ignoring ESG risks, on the other hand, can expose companies to significant financial and legal liabilities.

D. Shareholder and Stakeholder Value

There is growing recognition that ESG performance is closely linked to long-term shareholder and stakeholder value. While critics argue that ESG may distract from maximizing shareholder returns, many studies suggest that firms that address material ESG issues tend to deliver stronger performance over time. This is because ESG factors help firms attract better talent, build customer loyalty, manage regulatory risks, and foster innovation—all of which contribute to sustainable growth.

Institutional investors are increasingly pushing for ESG integration, not only for ethical reasons but also as part of their fiduciary duty to manage long-term risk and return. Research from academic institutions such as Stanford supports the idea that failing to consider material ESG risks could constitute negligence in fiduciary oversight. Empirical reviews generally show a positive or neutral relationship between ESG performance and financial returns, suggesting that sustainable business practices can coexist with, and even enhance, shareholder wealth.

Furthermore, companies that engage stakeholders—employees, customers, communities—through ESG initiatives often enjoy enhanced trust and long-term brand equity. This stakeholder alignment can drive innovation, reduce conflict, and secure a more stable operating environment, reinforcing financial value in the long run.

V. ESG in the Indian Corporate Context

A quiet but profound revolution is reshaping corporate India. What was once a topic for niche forums has moved firmly into the boardroom, driven by a powerful combination of regulatory foresight, investor pressure, and a new understanding of what it means to build a business that lasts.

A. The Dawn of a New Regulatory Era

The Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) has drawn a clear line in the sand, signaling that ESG is no longer optional. The mandate for the country's top 1,000 listed companies to produce a Business Responsibility and Sustainability Report (BRSR) is more than just a paperwork exercise; it's a call for radical transparency. It asks companies to look in the mirror and report not just on their profits, but on their impact on the planet and its people.

This journey is only beginning. By 2026, the top 250 of these companies will face an even higher bar: they must secure formal assurance for their ESG claims and extend this scrutiny deep into their supply chains. This means a company's responsibility will no longer end at its factory gates. It will need to understand the environmental and social footprint of its suppliers, whether it's the farm growing the cotton for a t-shirt or the small workshop assembling a component. This is a monumental shift, moving the focus from self-declaration to verifiable proof.

This evolving framework builds on India's unique Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) law, which requires companies to invest a portion of their profits back into society. But where CSR was often seen as philanthropy—a separate act of giving—the new ESG focus embeds these values into the very core of business strategy. For Indian companies wanting to attract global investment, this alignment is crucial. It's like learning the universal language of sustainable finance, allowing them to communicate their long-term value to a world of investors who are increasingly voting with their wallets.

B. Navigating India's Unique Governance Landscape

The architecture of corporate India presents its own unique set of challenges and opportunities. Many of the nation's most prominent companies are either family-run businesses, built across generations, or large state-owned enterprises. This concentration of ownership creates a delicate balancing act. While it can foster long-term vision, it can also lead to governance challenges, such as boards that lack true independence or business decisions that prioritize family legacy over the interests of minority shareholders and the wider community.

Strengthening the ”G” in ESG is therefore a critical priority. It means transforming boards from being passive observers into active stewards of the company’s ethical compass. Encouragingly, institutions are stepping up. The creation of ESG-specific indices by the Bombay Stock Exchange (BSE) and the National Stock Exchange (NSE) has sparked a healthy competition, creating a ”race to the top” as companies now vie for a coveted spot on these lists. Pioneers like the Tata Group have long demonstrated that strong governance and sustainability are not just compatible with success, but essential ingredients for it, setting a powerful example for others to follow.

C. The Financial Case Becomes Undeniable

Ultimately, the conversation always comes back to the bottom line, and here, the evidence is compelling. The river of global capital is changing its course, flowing decisively towards companies that can prove their sustainability credentials. For Indian firms, strong ESG performance is becoming a non-negotiable ticket to entry for attracting this foreign investment.

Beyond just attracting capital, ESG is proving to be a powerful tool for building resilience. Corporate resilience is the ability to weather storms—be it a supply chain disruption, a regulatory crackdown, or a global pandemic. Research suggests that for India’s dynamic private sector, strong ESG practices are a key driver of this resilience. A company that manages its water resources efficiently (E) is less vulnerable to drought. A company that treats its employees fairly (S) fosters a more motivated and innovative workforce. And a company with transparent and accountable leadership (G) is better equipped to avoid costly scandals and maintain the trust of its customers and investors. It’s a powerful testament that doing good is, in fact, very good for business.

VI. The Hurdles and the Critics: A Reality Check

For all its promise, the world of ESG is not without its growing pains and vocal critics. Navigating this landscape requires a clear-eyed view of the challenges that lie ahead, from the confusing maze of metrics to the fundamental questions about its ultimate purpose.

A. Lost in Translation: The Challenge of Standardization

One of the most immediate frustrations for anyone involved in ESG is the ”alphabet soup” of competing standards. With frameworks like GRI, SASB, and TCFD all offering different methodologies, comparing one company’s performance to another’s can feel like trying to compare athletes competing in different sports with entirely different rulebooks. This lack of a universal language leads to a perplexing problem: a company can be awarded a stellar ESG rating by one agency and a mediocre one by another.

This isn’t just an academic inconvenience. It has real-world consequences. It means well-intentioned investors can be misled, and it allows companies with genuinely poor practices to hide within the confusion. For ESG to fulfill its potential, creating a credible, consistent, and comparable system of measurement is one of the most urgent tasks at hand.

B. The Shadow of Greenwashing

Where there is money and good intention, the risk of ”greenwashing” is never far behind. This is the corporate equivalent of putting a fresh, green coat of paint on a rusty, polluting factory. It involves using slick marketing and cherry-picked data to create a misleadingly positive image of a company’s environmental and social performance. Greenwashing does more than just deceive investors; it erodes the very foundation of trust upon which the entire ESG movement is built. It penalizes the companies that are making genuine, costly efforts to improve and creates a deep cynicism that can stall progress on critical global issues. This is why the call for independent, third-party assurance is growing louder. It’s a demand for a neutral referee to check the play and ensure the game is being played fairly.

C. The Timeless Tension: Short-Term Profits vs. Long-Term Value

At its core, the ESG debate resurrects an age-old tension in capitalism: the clash between ”profit now” and ”planet later.” Critics, echoing the arguments of economist Milton Friedman, question whether a company’s focus on broad stakeholder interests distracts from its primary fiduciary duty to maximize shareholder returns.

This isn’t just a theoretical debate; it’s a daily dilemma played out in boardrooms everywhere. Imagine a CFO who knows that investing in a state-of-the-art water recycling plant will save millions in the long run but will hurt the company’s next quarterly earnings report—the very report they will be judged on. These are not easy choices. The challenge is to shift corporate culture from short-term obsession to long-term stewardship, and to convince markets that investments in sustainability are not costs, but essential down payments on future profitability.

D. The Boots-on-the-Ground Reality of Implementation

Finally, there are the practical, boots-on-the-ground hurdles of implementation. For a multinational corporation with a dedicated sustainability department, ESG reporting is a challenge. For a medium-sized manufacturing company in an emerging market, it can feel like a daunting, almost impossible task. The costs of hiring consultants, investing in data-tracking technology, and training staff can be prohibitive. Furthermore, gathering reliable data from hundreds of small suppliers down the value chain can feel like an exercise in herding cats.

Regulators like SEBI are keenly aware of this risk. Their warning against ”paper and false disclosures” is a stark reminder of what's at stake. If ESG becomes a mere box-ticking exercise, filled with inaccurate or incomplete data, it will fail. The integrity of the entire system rests on the ability of companies, big and small, to overcome these constraints and provide a true and fair view of their impact on the world.

VII. Conclusion and Future Directions

This paper has examined the integration of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) factors into corporate governance and financial management through multiple theoretical lenses. Stakeholder theory, agency theory, and complementary perspectives such as institutional theory and the resource-based view collectively underscore the growing recognition of ESG as a material driver of long-term corporate value and risk mitigation. These frameworks highlight how ESG considerations are not just ethical imperatives but strategic elements with direct implications for investment decisions, capital allocation, risk management, and overall financial performance.

Empirical research increasingly demonstrates a positive or neutral relationship between ESG performance and firm value, particularly in terms of risk-adjusted returns, capital efficiency, and resilience to external shocks. At the same time, effective ESG integration requires robust governance mechanisms — including board oversight, sustainability committees, and transparent disclosure practices — to ensure that ESG commitments translate into actionable outcomes. Global trends, such as the adoption of IFRS S1/S2 and TCFD-aligned disclosures, reflect the shift toward standardized, investor-focused ESG reporting, while India's regulatory developments (e.g., BRSR mandate by SEBI) signal growing domestic alignment with international ESG norms.

Despite this progress, significant challenges remain. The lack of standardized metrics, the risk of greenwashing, and the implementation costs—especially in emerging markets—limit the effectiveness of ESG integration. Moreover, short-term financial pressures and capacity gaps in ESG reporting continue to constrain adoption.

Looking ahead, the integration of ESG into financial management and corporate governance is expected to deepen, driven by regulatory convergence, investor demand, and the strategic imperative of sustainability. Future research should focus on quantifying ESG's direct impact on cost of capital, exploring ESG's role in firm valuation in emerging markets, and assessing the effectiveness of board-level ESG expertise. As the global financial ecosystem evolves, ESG will become increasingly central to value creation, enterprise resilience, and responsible capitalism.

Acknowledgment

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to our Principal, Prof. Bhaskar M G, our mentor, for their constant support, encouragement, and constructive feedback, which played a crucial role in the successful completion of this work. Their contributions were instrumental in shaping this research.

References

[1] Buchetti, B., Arduino, F. R., & Perdichizzi, S. (2025). A literature review on corporate governance and ESG research: Emerging trends and future directions. *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 97, 103759.
[2] Gherghina, Ș. C. (2024). Corporate finance and environmental, social, and governance (ESG) practices. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 17(7), 308.
[3] Wang, K., Yu, S., Mei, M., Yang, X., Peng, G., & Lv, B. (2023). ESG performance and corporate resilience: An empirical analysis based on the capital allocation efficiency perspective. *Sustainability*, 15(23), 16145. https://doi.org/10.3390/su152316145
[4] Rohara, S. (2025). The relationship between ESG performance and cost of capital in listed companies (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. 5261740). Available at https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=5261740.
[5] Wang, C. (2024). The relationship between ESG performance and corporate performance – Based on stakeholder theory. In *Proceedings of the 2024 International Conference on Economic Development and Social Science (EDSS 2024)* (Vol. 190, p. 03022). SHS Web of Conferences. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202419003022
[6] Starr, M. (2015). ESG's relationship to fiduciary duty – From counter to crucial. *Stanford Law School Corporate Governance Research Initiative* (Research Note).
[7] MacCormac, S. H., Silva, A. B. D., & Onabanjo, O. (2023, August 22). Inside the IFRS S1 and S2 sustainability disclosure standards. *Harvard Law School Forum on Corporate Governance*.
[8] Chen, J. (2024, September 12). Corporate governance: Definition, principles, models, and examples. *Investopedia*.
[9] OECD. (2020). *ESG investing: Practices, progress and challenges*. OECD Publishing.
[10] Fu, T., & Li, J. (2023). An empirical analysis of the impact of ESG on financial performance: The moderating role of digital transformation. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, 11, 1256052. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2023.1256052
[11] Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2014). The impact of corporate sustainability on organizational processes and performance. *Management Science*, 60(11), 2835–2857.
[12] Friede, G., Busch, T., & Bassen, A. (2015). ESG and financial performance: Aggregated evidence from more than 2000 empirical studies. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, 5(4), 210–233.
[13] Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.
[14] Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(4), 305–360.
[15] IFRS Foundation. (2023). *IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards S1 and S2*.
[16] Principles for Responsible Investment. (2017). *The PRI way: Practical guidance on responsible investment*.
[17] United Nations Sustainable Stock Exchanges Initiative. (2015). *Mobilizing capital for the SDGs: A snapshot of what stock exchanges and investors are doing around the world*.
[18] Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures. (2017). *Final report: Recommendations of the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures*.
[19] Global Reporting Initiative. (2021). *GRI sustainability reporting standards: Consolidated set of standards*.
[20] KPMG International. (2024). *Global CEO Outlook 2024: Building resilience amidst uncertainty*.
[21] Canada Energy Regulator. (2022). *The Canada Energy Regulator and ESG – Overview of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG)*. https://www.cer-rec.gc.ca/en/about/publications-reports/canada-energy-regulator-esg/canada-energy-regulator-esgoverview.html