GSC Advanced Research and Reviews
eISSN: 2582-4597 CODEN (USA): GARRC2
Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/gscarr
Journal homepage: https://gsconlinepress.com/journals/gscarr/

(REVIEW ARTICLE)

Check for updates

Sustainability reporting in corporations: A comparative review of practices in the USA and Europe

Oluwatobi Timothy Soyombo [1], Olusegun Gbenga Odunaiya [1], Chinelo Emilia Okoli [2], Gloria Siwe Usiagu [2,*] and Ifeanyi Onyedika Ekemezie [2]

[1] *Havenhill Synergy Limited, Nigeria.*
[2] *Shell Nigeria Plc, Nigeria.*

GSC Advanced Research and Reviews, 2024, 18(02), 204–214

Publication history: Received on 31 December 2023; revised on 08 February 2024; accepted on 10 February 2024

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/gscarr.2024.18.2.061

Abstract

As global awareness of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) issues intensifies, corporations are increasingly recognizing the importance of sustainability reporting in demonstrating their commitment to responsible business practices. This Review provides a comparative review of sustainability reporting practices in corporations, focusing on the distinctions between the USA and Europe. The USA and Europe, as major economic regions, exhibit distinct approaches to sustainability reporting, reflecting diverse regulatory frameworks, cultural considerations, and stakeholder expectations. This review delves into the key elements characterizing sustainability reporting in both regions, highlighting the convergences and divergences that shape corporate disclosure practices. In the USA, sustainability reporting is predominantly driven by voluntary initiatives and market forces. Companies often engage in ESG reporting to meet the expectations of investors, consumers, and other stakeholders who increasingly prioritize sustainable business practices. The absence of a standardized regulatory framework has led to a heterogeneous landscape of reporting methodologies, with some corporations adhering to global standards like the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) or adopting industry-specific frameworks. In contrast, Europe has witnessed a more structured and regulatory-driven approach to sustainability reporting. The European Union (EU) has been at the forefront of shaping sustainable finance policies, introducing frameworks such as the Non-Financial Reporting Directive (NFRD) that mandate certain companies to disclose non-financial information. European corporations, therefore, navigate a more standardized reporting landscape, aligning with established frameworks like the EU Taxonomy Regulation and the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) recommendations. This comparative analysis explores the motivations behind sustainability reporting, the disclosure frameworks commonly employed, and the impact of regional regulatory contexts on corporate practices. By shedding light on the unique dynamics in the USA and Europe, this review contributes to a nuanced understanding of how corporations navigate the evolving landscape of sustainability reporting, ultimately fostering transparency, accountability, and responsible corporate citizenship.

Keywords: Sustainability; Corporations; Practices; Reporting; Comparative

1. Introduction

In the wake of heightened awareness surrounding environmental, social, and governance (ESG) considerations, corporations worldwide are increasingly acknowledging the pivotal role of sustainability reporting in conveying their commitment to responsible business practices (Rupani *et al*., 2023). Sustainability reporting involves the disclosure of non-financial information, providing stakeholders with a comprehensive view of a company's impact on the environment, society, and governance structures. This transparent communication has become a crucial component in building trust, fostering accountability, and aligning corporate strategies with global sustainability goals (Chukwu *et al*.,

* Corresponding author: Glory Siwe Usiagu

2023). The global landscape of sustainability reporting is marked by regional nuances, shaped by diverse regulatory frameworks, cultural values, and stakeholder expectations. A particularly compelling dichotomy exists between the United States and Europe, two major economic regions with distinct approaches to corporate sustainability disclosure (Ervits, 2021). Understanding the unique practices and drivers within these regions is essential for stakeholders, investors, and policymakers seeking insights into the evolving dynamics of sustainable business practices (Hofstetter *et al*., 2021).

The purpose of this comparative review is to delve into the intricacies of sustainability reporting in corporations, with a specific focus on contrasting practices in the USA and Europe. By exploring the motivations, reporting frameworks, and regulatory landscapes that guide sustainability disclosure in these regions, we aim to provide a comprehensive understanding of how corporations navigate the complexities of ESG reporting. This analysis not only sheds light on the convergences and divergences but also serves as a valuable resource for businesses, investors, and policymakers seeking to enhance their grasp of sustainability reporting practices on both sides of the Atlantic.

As sustainability continues to be a driving force in shaping the future of corporate governance, this comparative review contributes to the ongoing dialogue surrounding responsible business practices. By elucidating the distinct approaches taken by corporations in the USA and Europe, we aim to facilitate informed decision-making, foster transparency, and stimulate further discussions on the global trajectory of sustainability reporting in corporations.

2. Motivations and Drivers for Sustainability Reporting

Sustainability reporting has become a central tenet of corporate governance, reflecting a commitment to environmental, social, and governance (ESG) principles (Alsayegh *et al*., 2020). Corporations across the globe, particularly in the USA and Europe, are compelled to engage in sustainability reporting due to a combination of market forces, regulatory frameworks, and evolving stakeholder expectations. In the United States, sustainability reporting is predominantly driven by market forces and voluntary initiatives. Corporations recognize the influence of consumer preferences, investor demands, and competitive dynamics in shaping their commitment to ESG practices. As consumers increasingly prioritize sustainable and socially responsible products and services, businesses are motivated to align their strategies with these market expectations.

Voluntary initiatives, such as participation in sustainability reporting frameworks like the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) or the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB), play a crucial role (Elkins and Entwistle, 2023). Companies opting to voluntarily disclose their ESG performance aim to differentiate themselves in the marketplace, attract ethical investors, and enhance their overall brand reputation. Stakeholder expectations, including those of investors, customers, and employees, are powerful drivers for sustainability reporting in the USA. Institutional investors, in particular, are integrating ESG considerations into their investment decisions, and corporations recognize the need to provide comprehensive and transparent non-financial information. Shareholders increasingly view sustainability reporting as a means to assess a company's long-term viability and resilience in the face of global challenges. As such, corporations respond to stakeholder expectations by voluntarily disclosing ESG metrics, demonstrating their commitment to responsible business practices, and fostering trust among diverse stakeholders (Wong *et al*., 2021).

In Europe, sustainability reporting is significantly influenced by regulatory frameworks, notably the Non-Financial Reporting Directive (NFRD). The NFRD mandates certain European companies to disclose non-financial information, including their policies, risks, and outcomes regarding environmental matters, social and employee aspects, respect for human rights, anti-corruption, and diversity (Falkenberg *et al*., 2023). The regulatory landscape in Europe, characterized by standardized reporting requirements, underscores a more structured approach compared to the USA. The.

Europe experiences significant market and stakeholder pressures that drive sustainability reporting. European consumers exhibit a heightened awareness of sustainability issues, influencing their purchasing decisions and placing pressure on companies to demonstrate commitment to ESG values. Additionally, institutional investors and asset managers in Europe are increasingly integrating ESG criteria into their investment strategies. The pressure from these financial entities creates an impetus for companies to disclose comprehensive sustainability information, aligning with the expectations of the investment community.

In summary, while the motivations for sustainability reporting share common threads globally, the drivers differ between the USA and Europe. In the USA, market forces and voluntary initiatives propel sustainability reporting, driven by the desire to stay competitive and meet evolving stakeholder expectations (Sulkowski and Jebe, 2022). On the other hand, Europe relies heavily on regulatory frameworks like the NFRD, coupled with market and stakeholder pressures, to ensure standardized and comprehensive sustainability reporting. This comparative analysis highlights the nuanced approaches taken by corporations in response to regional dynamics, ultimately contributing to the broader discourse on responsible corporate practices.

3. Key Elements of Sustainability Reporting

Sustainability reporting has evolved into a vital tool for corporations to communicate their environmental, social, and governance (ESG) performance. While there are global commonalities, the approach to sustainability reporting varies between the United States and Europe. This comparative analysis explores key elements of sustainability reporting, focusing on shared reporting frameworks and distinctive approaches in the USA and Europe. The GRI is a widely recognized framework for sustainability reporting adopted by companies worldwide. Its guidelines provide a comprehensive structure for reporting on economic, environmental, and social aspects (Orazalin and Mahmood, 2020). Both the USA and Europe often utilize the GRI framework as a foundation for disclosing non-financial information.

In the USA, the GRI framework is embraced by companies aiming for global best practices in sustainability reporting. Its principles allow for flexibility in reporting, aligning with the voluntary nature of sustainability reporting in the country. Many US corporations choose the GRI as a guide due to its adaptability to diverse industry sectors. In Europe, the GRI framework serves as a foundational tool for sustainability reporting, complementing the regulatory requirements set by directives like the Non-Financial Reporting Directive (NFRD). European companies, especially those operating internationally, find alignment with the GRI essential for presenting a holistic view of their sustainability performance (Khatri and Kjærland, 2023). The TCFD provides recommendations for disclosing climate-related financial risks and opportunities. This framework aims to enhance transparency in corporate reporting, enabling stakeholders to assess a company's resilience in the face of climate-related challenges.

The TCFD framework has gained prominence in the USA, particularly as climate-related risks become central to sustainability considerations. Companies in the USA, driven by market forces and investor demands, are increasingly incorporating TCFD recommendations into their disclosures to communicate climate-related financial information. Europe, with its strong emphasis on regulatory compliance, has integrated TCFD recommendations into its reporting landscape. The European Union's Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR) aligns with TCFD principles, reinforcing the importance of climate-related financial disclosures for European corporations.

In the USA, sustainability reporting is characterized by a flexible and diverse landscape. Companies have the autonomy to choose from various reporting standards and frameworks based on their industry, goals, and stakeholder expectations. This flexibility allows for creativity and innovation in reporting, fostering a market-driven approach. US companies often leverage multiple reporting standards, including industry-specific frameworks like the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB), to address sector-specific ESG concerns (Dye *et al*., 2021). This approach aligns with the voluntary nature of sustainability reporting in the USA, where companies tailor their disclosures to meet the needs of their stakeholders. In Europe, sustainability reporting is more standardized due to the influence of regulatory frameworks. The NFRD, as a key directive, mandates certain companies to disclose specific non-financial information. This standardized approach ensures a consistent format for reporting, making it easier for stakeholders to compare and evaluate companies. European corporations are obliged to adhere to specific reporting requirements outlined in the NFRD. This regulatory framework shapes the content and structure of sustainability reports, ensuring a level of uniformity across reporting entities. The emphasis on regulatory compliance reflects Europe's commitment to creating a standardized and transparent reporting environment.

In summary, while both the USA and Europe share common reporting frameworks such as the GRI, their distinctive approaches emerge in the emphasis on flexibility and varied standards in the USA, contrasted with Europe's adherence to standardized regulatory frameworks. This comparative analysis underscores the nuanced dynamics shaping sustainability reporting practices in different regions, reflecting a balance between market-driven flexibility and regulatory-driven standardization. Corporations navigating these diverse landscapes must strategically align their reporting approaches with regional expectations to effectively communicate their sustainability performance to stakeholders (Al Amosh *et al*., 2024).

4. Impact of Regulatory Context

Sustainability reporting in corporations is significantly influenced by the regulatory context in which they operate (Dissanayake *et al*., 2019). This comparative analysis examines the impact of regulatory frameworks on sustainability reporting practices in the United States (USA) and Europe, delving into the unique dynamics shaped by regional regulatory environments. In the USA, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) plays a pivotal role in shaping the regulatory landscape for corporate reporting. While the SEC traditionally focused on financial disclosures, there has been an increasing recognition of the importance of non-financial information, including ESG factors.

The SEC requires companies to disclose material information that could affect their financial performance in their annual reports (Form 10-K). While sustainability reporting is not mandated, the SEC encourages companies to provide insight into how they integrate ESG factors into their business strategies. The influence of SEC regulations prompts US corporations to assess the materiality of ESG issues, considering their impact on financial performance. This approach aligns with the principles of materiality, emphasizing the disclosure of information that could influence investor decisions. Beyond federal regulations, sustainability reporting in the USA is influenced by state-level initiatives and market-driven dynamics. Several states have introduced or considered legislation to mandate or incentivize sustainability reporting, creating a patchwork of regulatory requirements. States such as California, New York, and Illinois have taken steps to establish ESG reporting requirements. The variations in state-level regulations contribute to a diverse landscape, with some companies adhering to specific state mandates while others navigate a more voluntary reporting environment. The absence of a comprehensive federal mandate has led to market-driven initiatives. Investors, rating agencies, and industry groups play a crucial role in encouraging sustainability reporting as companies respond to the demands of various stakeholders (Petrescu *et al*., 2020).

Europe adopts a more structured approach to sustainability reporting, primarily driven by regulatory directives. The Non-Financial Reporting Directive (NFRD) stands out as a key regulatory instrument, mandating certain companies to disclose non-financial information. The NFRD requires large public-interest entities to report on their policies, risks, and outcomes related to environmental matters, social and employee aspects, respect for human rights, anti-corruption, and diversity. This standardized approach ensures a consistent framework for reporting. Europe further reinforces its commitment to sustainability reporting through the SFDR, which compels financial market participants and financial advisers to disclose information on the integration of sustainability risks and the consideration of adverse sustainability impacts.

While Europe exhibits a more centralized regulatory approach, there are still variances at the national level. National governments may introduce additional reporting requirements or nuances, contributing to a complex regulatory landscape (Kayode-Ajala, 2023). The European Union (EU) is actively working toward harmonizing sustainability reporting practices across member states. Ongoing efforts aim to streamline reporting requirements, ensuring consistency while accommodating the diverse economic and cultural contexts within the EU. Despite harmonization efforts, national regulatory variances persist. Differences in reporting requirements, especially for non-public companies, may exist between EU member states, contributing to the need for companies to navigate both EU-wide and national frameworks (Polzer and Reichard, 2020.).

In summary, the impact of regulatory context on sustainability reporting diverges between the USA and Europe. The USA's regulatory environment is characterized by SEC influence, materiality considerations, and a patchwork of state-level initiatives. In contrast, Europe exhibits a more centralized regulatory approach, with directives like the NFRD driving standardized reporting across member states. Understanding these regulatory dynamics is crucial for corporations as they navigate the evolving landscape of sustainability reporting, balancing compliance with the unique expectations and challenges posed by their respective regions (Lai and Stacchezzini, 2021).

5. Industry-Specific Reporting Trends

Sustainability reporting has evolved beyond a generic practice, with companies increasingly tailoring their disclosures to industry-specific nuances (Cerbone and Maroun, 2020). This comparative analysis explores industry-specific reporting trends in the USA and Europe, shedding light on how corporations in various sectors navigate the dynamic landscape of sustainability reporting. Sustainability reporting in the USA reflects a diverse and industry-driven landscape. Companies across sectors adopt industry-specific frameworks to address unique environmental, social, and governance (ESG) challenges. Key trends in industry-specific reporting practices in the USA include:

Technology companies in the USA often prioritize materiality assessments to identify ESG issues relevant to their industry. This approach ensures that disclosures align with the concerns most impactful to stakeholders and the business. The technology sector frequently emphasizes metrics related to innovation, research and development (R&D) investments, and contributions to sustainable technologies. Companies highlight efforts to reduce environmental impact through innovative solutions and energy-efficient practices. Given the heightened awareness of climate-related risks, energy and extractives companies in the USA increasingly focus on disclosing climate-related information

(Herbohn *et al*., 2022). This includes detailing strategies for transitioning to renewable energy sources, reducing carbon emissions, and managing climate-related risks.

Sustainability reports in this sector often feature metrics related to responsible resource extraction, water management, and biodiversity conservation. Companies highlight their commitment to sustainable resource utilization and environmental stewardship. Companies in the consumer goods and retail sector prioritize supply chain transparency in their sustainability reporting. Disclosures often detail efforts to address ethical sourcing, fair labor practices, and responsible production methods. Sustainability reports in this sector frequently include product lifecycle assessments, demonstrating a commitment to reducing the environmental impact of products from manufacturing to disposal (The *et al*., 2020). Metrics related to circular economy initiatives and waste reduction are common.

Europe exhibits a similar trend in industry-specific sustainability reporting, emphasizing sector-specific challenges and opportunities. Key industry-specific reporting practices in Europe include: European automotive companies prioritize disclosing their efforts to reduce carbon emissions. Sustainability reports often feature targets for transitioning to electric vehicles, improving fuel efficiency, and contributing to the broader decarbonization of the transportation sector (Njemanze *et al*., 2008; Akagha and Epie, 2022). Sustainability reports highlight circular economy initiatives, with a focus on recycling, sustainable materials, and end-of-life vehicle management. Companies emphasize commitments to responsible resource use and waste reduction. Financial institutions in Europe increasingly incorporate environmental, social, and governance factors into their investment strategies. Sustainability reports detail how ESG considerations influence investment decisions and portfolio management (Oprean-Stan *et al*., 2020). European financial services companies often include metrics related to financial inclusion and responsible lending practices. Sustainability reports may highlight initiatives aimed at addressing social inequalities and promoting financial well-being. Sustainability reporting in the European food and beverage industry frequently emphasizes sustainable agriculture practices. Companies disclose efforts to promote responsible sourcing, reduce agricultural impact on ecosystems, and support local farmers. European companies in this sector increasingly include metrics related to promoting healthy nutrition and addressing obesity concerns. Sustainability reports may outline strategies for providing nutritious products and reducing the environmental impact of food production (Uzougbo *et al*., 2023).

In summary, industry-specific reporting trends in the USA and Europe demonstrate a shared commitment to addressing sector-specific challenges. While the USA showcases diversity in industry-driven reporting, Europe exhibits a similar trend with a stronger regulatory influence. Both regions emphasize materiality assessments, climate-related disclosures, and metrics aligned with their respective industry focuses. Understanding these trends is crucial for corporations seeking to align their sustainability reporting with industry expectations and demonstrate a holistic commitment to responsible business practices (Babawurun *et al*., 2023).

6. Case Studies and Examples

Sustainability reporting has become a cornerstone of corporate transparency, with companies worldwide increasingly sharing their environmental, social, and governance (ESG) performance (Osemene *et al*., 2021). This comparative analysis delves into illustrative case studies from both the USA and Europe, showcasing how corporations in each region approach sustainability reporting and demonstrate their commitment to sustainable practices. Microsoft has committed to becoming carbon negative by 2030, meaning it aims to remove more carbon from the atmosphere than it emits. The company's sustainability reports emphasize its comprehensive approach to addressing carbon emissions, including investments in renewable energy, carbon capture technologies, and sustainable practices across its supply chain.

Microsoft's sustainability efforts extend to promoting a circular economy. The company is committed to designing products that are easier to repair, reuse, and recycle. Through initiatives like the Microsoft Circular Centers, the company aims to extend the lifespan of its devices and reduce electronic waste. P&G has set ambitious climate goals, aiming to achieve a 50% reduction in its greenhouse gas emissions by 2030. The company's sustainability reports outline its progress toward these targets, detailing initiatives such as increasing energy efficiency, sourcing renewable energy, and investing in sustainable packaging (Cheng *et al*., 2023). P&G prioritizes water conservation in its sustainability agenda. The company's reports highlight efforts to reduce water consumption in manufacturing processes, implement water recycling systems, and promote water stewardship across its operations. Tesla is renowned for its commitment to sustainable transportation. The company's sustainability reports provide detailed insights into its efforts to reduce emissions through electric vehicle production and advancements in battery technology. Tesla's focus on transparency allows stakeholders to track its progress in reducing the carbon footprint of transportation. Tesla's sustainability narrative extends to energy solutions beyond electric vehicles (Krishnan and Butt, 2022). The company's reports showcase innovations in energy storage, such as the Powerwall and Powerpack, contributing to a more sustainable and decentralized energy ecosystem.

Unilever's sustainability reporting is anchored in its Sustainable Living Plan. The company outlines its commitment to enhancing the well-being of people, reducing environmental impact, and sourcing sustainably. Unilever's reports provide a comprehensive overview of progress in areas such as greenhouse gas reduction, water use, and sustainable sourcing of raw materials. Unilever places a strong emphasis on its social impact. The company's sustainability narrative includes initiatives to improve hygiene and sanitation globally, enhance livelihoods for smallholder farmers, and promote diversity and inclusion (Wangu, 2021). Siemens prioritizes decarbonization in its sustainability efforts. The company's reports detail its commitment to achieving a carbon-neutral footprint by 2030 and strategies for reducing emissions from its operations and supply chain. Siemens showcases advancements in energy-efficient technologies and renewable energy solutions.

Siemens' sustainability narrative extends to sustainable infrastructure development. The company's reports highlight projects focused on smart cities, energy-efficient transportation, and the digitization of industrial processes to contribute to sustainable urbanization. Nestlé places a strong emphasis on sustainable sourcing and agriculture in its sustainability reporting. The company's reports outline commitments to responsible sourcing of raw materials, efforts to combat deforestation, and initiatives to enhance the livelihoods of farmers in its supply chain (Bager and Lambin, 2022). Nestlé's sustainability narrative encompasses initiatives to address global health challenges. The company's reports detail commitments to improve the nutritional profile of its products, combatting issues such as obesity, and promoting healthy lifestyles.

In summary, the case studies from USA and European corporations underscore diverse approaches to sustainability reporting. USA corporations often highlight ambitious climate goals, circular economy initiatives, and transparency in emissions reduction. European corporations, on the other hand, showcase commitments to holistic sustainability plans, social impact initiatives, and innovative solutions for decarbonization (Seroka-Stolka, 2023). These case studies demonstrate the multifaceted nature of sustainability reporting and how companies in both regions align their practices with their unique sustainability priorities.

7. Challenges and Opportunities

Sustainability reporting has become integral to corporate governance, providing transparency and accountability in environmental, social, and governance (ESG) practices (Neri, 2021). However, corporations face a myriad of challenges in navigating the complex landscape of sustainability reporting, with regional variations influencing their experiences. This comparative analysis delves into the challenges faced by corporations in the USA and Europe while also exploring the opportunities arising from robust sustainability reporting practices. Corporations in the USA encounter challenges due to the absence of a unified federal regulatory framework for sustainability reporting. The fragmented regulatory environment, coupled with variations at the state level, results in a lack of consistency in reporting requirements and standards. Companies may find it challenging to align their reporting practices with varying state-level regulations, leading to additional compliance burdens and potential inconsistencies in disclosures.

Sustainability reporting in the USA is often voluntary, with companies having the discretion to choose the extent and depth of their disclosures (Nishitani *et al*., 2021). This voluntariness can lead to uneven reporting practices across industries, hindering comparability and transparency. Stakeholders may face difficulties in assessing the true sustainability performance of companies, as there is no standardized framework mandating comprehensive disclosures. Corporations in the USA may face pressure from investors who are often focused on short-term financial gains rather than long-term sustainability goals. Balancing the need to meet immediate financial expectations with long-term sustainability strategies poses a challenge. Companies may struggle to allocate resources to sustainable practices that might not yield immediate financial returns, risking a misalignment between short-term investor expectations and long-term sustainability objectives (Chowdhury and Shumon, 2020).

While Europe benefits from a more structured regulatory approach, the complex landscape of directives, such as the Non-Financial Reporting Directive (NFRD) and Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR), can be challenging for corporations. Navigating diverse reporting requirements across member states poses complexity. Companies operating in multiple European countries may face compliance challenges, requiring them to tailor their sustainability reporting to align with both EU-wide directives and national regulatory specifics (Fiechter *et al*., 2022). European corporations are subject to more stringent reporting requirements, especially those falling within the scope of the NFRD. These requirements necessitate comprehensive disclosures on environmental, social, and governance aspects, increasing reporting burdens. Companies may incur additional costs and dedicate more resources to meet the extensive reporting requirements, potentially diverting attention from direct sustainability initiatives. Shifting from traditional business models to more sustainable practices is a significant challenge for European corporations. The transition requires substantial investments, changes in operational processes, and adaptation to evolving sustainability standards.

Companies may face resistance to change, especially if sustainability measures disrupt established business practices. Balancing the imperative for sustainable practices with the need for profitability can be a delicate task (Ajayi *et al*., 2024).

Effective sustainability reporting presents an opportunity for corporations to enhance their corporate reputation. Transparent and positive disclosures can build trust among stakeholders, including consumers, investors, and the wider community. Companies that successfully communicate their commitment to sustainable practices can differentiate themselves in the market, potentially attracting environmentally and socially conscious consumers and investors. Robust sustainability reporting can open doors to a broader range of capital and investment opportunities. Investors increasingly consider ESG factors in their decision-making, and companies with strong sustainability performance may be more attractive to socially responsible investors. Access to sustainable finance and inclusion in ESG-focused investment portfolios can provide corporations with additional avenues for funding and growth (Abhayawansa and Mooneeapen, 2022). Sustainability reporting encourages companies to innovate and adopt more efficient operational practices (Khan *et al*., 2021). A focus on sustainable supply chain management, energy efficiency, and waste reduction can lead to operational improvements and cost savings. Companies that prioritize sustainability in their operations may experience long-term benefits through improved efficiency, reduced environmental impact, and a positive contribution to their bottom line. Sustainability reporting fosters stakeholder engagement by providing a platform for corporations to communicate with diverse stakeholders, including customers, employees, and communities (Millar and Searcy, 2020). Engaging with stakeholders can lead to valuable insights and collaborative efforts. Building strong relationships with stakeholders creates a supportive network that can contribute to the success of sustainability initiatives, helping companies address challenges and seize opportunities.

Europe face unique challenges in the realm of sustainability reporting, driven by regulatory landscapes, investor expectations, and the evolving nature of sustainable business practices. While challenges exist, both regions also present opportunities for companies to enhance their reputation, access capital, drive innovation, and engage meaningfully with stakeholders. Effectively navigating these challenges and capitalizing on opportunities requires a strategic and adaptive approach to sustainability reporting (Haque, 2023).

8. Future Trends and Emerging Standards

Sustainability reporting has evolved significantly over the years, driven by changing stakeholder expectations, regulatory developments, and a growing recognition of the interconnectedness between corporate performance and broader environmental and social challenges (Lai and Stacchezzini, 2021). As corporations in the USA and Europe continue to embrace sustainability reporting, a glimpse into future trends and emerging standards reveals a dynamic landscape shaped by advancements in reporting frameworks, increased emphasis on materiality, and a push towards global harmonization.

The Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) has played a pivotal role in shaping sustainability reporting globally. Over time, GRI has released updated versions of its Sustainability Reporting Standards, incorporating feedback from stakeholders and aligning with international best practices. GRI is expected to continue refining its standards to address emerging sustainability challenges. Anticipated changes include enhanced guidance on climate-related disclosures, social impact measurement, and a focus on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The TCFD has gained prominence for its focus on climate-related financial disclosures. Initially concentrated on climate risk reporting, TCFD has expanded its recommendations to cover a broader range of environmental and social factors (David and Giordano-Spring, 2022). TCFD is likely to refine its recommendations further, aligning with global efforts to combat climate change. Increased integration of climate-related metrics into mainstream financial reporting is expected, reflecting the growing recognition of climate risks as financial risks. SASB provides industry-specific sustainability accounting standards, helping companies disclose financially material ESG information (Schiehll and Kolahgar, 2021). The framework has evolved to address industry nuances and capture the most relevant sustainability metrics. SASB is anticipated to continue collaborating with stakeholders to refine and expand its standards. This may involve incorporating additional industry sectors, updating metrics to reflect emerging ESG trends, and aligning more closely with other reporting frameworks.

Integrated reporting seeks to provide a comprehensive view of a company's value creation by integrating financial and non-financial information. The International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC) has been a driving force behind this approach (La Torre *et al*., 2020). The evolution of integrated reporting is expected to continue, with a focus on harmonizing different reporting frameworks. There may be increased emphasis on demonstrating how environmental, social, and governance factors contribute to long-term value creation. Materiality assessments have become a crucial aspect of sustainability reporting, guiding companies in identifying and prioritizing the most relevant ESG issues

(Sepúlveda-Alzate *et al*., 2022). Materiality assessments ensure that disclosures are aligned with stakeholder concerns and business impacts. Future trends may involve refining materiality assessments to capture emerging risks and opportunities. Companies may increasingly adopt technology-driven solutions to gather and analyze stakeholder input for more dynamic materiality assessments (Bernards *et al*., 2020).

Technology has played a growing role in sustainability reporting, facilitating data collection, analysis, and visualization. Digital platforms and software solutions have improved the efficiency and accuracy of reporting processes. The future is likely to witness further integration of technology in sustainability reporting. Artificial intelligence (AI), blockchain, and advanced analytics may be employed to enhance data accuracy, automate reporting tasks, and provide real-time insights (Tyagi *et al*., 2020). There has been a push towards global harmonization of sustainability reporting standards to reduce complexity, enhance comparability, and facilitate cross-border analysis. Organizations like the International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) Foundation have explored the establishment of a global sustainability standards board. The future may witness increased collaboration among standard-setting organizations to develop a globally accepted set of sustainability reporting standards. Efforts to align different frameworks and achieve convergence could gain momentum. Governments and regulatory bodies globally have been actively engaging with sustainability reporting. The European Union's Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR) and the SEC's increased focus on climate-related disclosures are examples of evolving regulatory landscapes (Steuer and Tröger, 2022). Regulatory frameworks may evolve further, potentially converging towards common reporting requirements. Increased regulatory scrutiny and standardization could shape reporting practices, encouraging a more consistent and transparent approach.

In conclusion, the future of sustainability reporting in corporations in the USA and Europe is poised for continued evolution. Emerging standards are likely to reflect a greater emphasis on global harmonization, integrated reporting, and the use of technology to enhance data accuracy and stakeholder engagement. Anticipated changes in reporting practices underline a shift towards more dynamic and comprehensive approaches, acknowledging the interplay between financial and non-financial factors in driving long-term value creation (Asogwa *et al*., 2021). As sustainability reporting continues to mature, corporations that embrace these future trends are well-positioned to navigate the evolving landscape and meet the expectations of stakeholders in a rapidly changing world.

9. Conclusion

The comparative analysis of sustainability reporting practices in the USA and Europe has provided valuable insights into the evolving landscape of corporate transparency and responsibility. Both regions showcase distinctive approaches, shaped by their regulatory frameworks, market dynamics, and stakeholder expectations. This comprehensive review has explored motivations, key elements, regulatory contexts, industry-specific trends, case studies, challenges, opportunities, and future trends, shedding light on the complex interplay of factors influencing sustainability reporting. Emphasizes voluntariness, leading to varied reporting practices across industries and states. Features a more structured approach with stringent directives like the Non-Financial Reporting Directive, fostering comprehensive disclosures. Driven by market forces, voluntary initiatives, and stakeholder expectations. Influenced by regulatory frameworks, market pressures, and the imperative to align with global sustainability goals.

Exhibits flexibility with diverse standards, allowing companies to tailor their approach. Adheres to standardized regulatory frameworks, ensuring consistency but potentially increasing reporting burdens. Faces challenges related to fragmented regulations, short-term investor focus, and a voluntary reporting landscape. Opportunities lie in enhancing corporate reputation and accessing diverse capital sources. Grapples with complex regulatory environments, stringent reporting requirements, and transitioning to sustainable business models. Opportunities include innovation, stakeholder engagement, and improved operational efficiencies. Witnessing advancements in reporting standards, increased focus on materiality, and a push towards global harmonization. Expectations for continued evolution with integrated

Recognizing the need for harmonization, corporations globally may benefit from efforts to align reporting standards. This could enhance consistency, comparability, and the effectiveness of sustainability reporting. Striking a balance between voluntary reporting and regulatory oversight is crucial. A pragmatic approach that encourages transparency without stifling innovation can contribute to a more robust global sustainability framework. Leveraging technology for sustainability reporting is a global imperative. Incorporating artificial intelligence, blockchain, and advanced analytics can streamline processes, enhance accuracy, and facilitate real-time insights. Recognizing the importance of stakeholder engagement, global corporations should prioritize a stakeholder-centric approach to reporting. Dynamic materiality assessments and interactive reporting formats can foster meaningful engagement. Global corporations must cultivate adaptability to navigate evolving standards and best practices. A proactive approach to anticipating and incorporating changes in reporting requirements can enhance resilience.

In conclusion, the comparative review of sustainability reporting practices in the USA and Europe highlights the nuanced dynamics shaping corporate disclosures. The key takeaways underscore the importance of context-specific approaches, adaptability, and a forward-looking mindset for corporations globally. As sustainability reporting continues to evolve, corporations that integrate lessons from diverse regulatory environments and embrace emerging trends will play a pivotal role in advancing corporate sustainability practices on a global scale. This journey towards transparency, accountability, and responsible business practices is not only a regional imperative but a collective responsibility for the global business community.

Compliance with ethical standards

Disclosure of conflict of interest

The author has no conflict of interest in this research.

References

[1] Abhayawansa, S. and Mooneeapen, O., 2022. Directions for future research to steer environmental, social and governance (ESG) investing to support sustainability: a systematic literature review. *Handbook of accounting and sustainability*, pp.318-341.

[2] Ajayi, S.A., Olaniyi, O.O., Oladoyinbo, T.O., Ajayi, N.D. and Olaniyi, F.G., 2024. Sustainable sourcing of organic skincare ingredients: A critical analysis of ethical concerns and environmental implications. *Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports*, *18*(1), pp.65-91.

[3] Akagha, O. and Epie, C., 2022. Responsible People Management and Fairness During COVID-19 (Law and Ethics–The Case of Pan-Atlantic University). In *Responsible Management of Shifts in Work Modes–Values for a Post Pandemic Future, Volume 1* (pp. 95-111). Emerald Publishing Limited.

[4] Akagha, O.V., Coker, J.O., Uzougbo, N.S. and Bakare, S.S., 2023. Company Secretarial And Administrative Services In Modern Irish Corporations: A Review Of The Strategies And Best Practices Adopted In Company Secretarial And Administrative Services. *International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research*, *5*(10), pp.793-813.

[5] Al Amosh, H., Khatib, S.F. and Ananzeh, H., 2024. Terrorist attacks and environmental social and governance performance: Evidence from cross-country panel data. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *31*(1), pp.210-223.

[6] Alsayegh, M.F., Abdul Rahman, R. and Homayoun, S., 2020. Corporate economic, environmental, and social sustainability performance transformation through ESG disclosure. *Sustainability*, *12*(9), p.3910.

[7] Asogwa, I.E., Varua, M.E., Humphreys, P. and Datt, R., 2021. Understanding sustainability reporting in non-governmental organisations: a systematic review of reporting practices, drivers, barriers and paths for future research. *Sustainability*, *13*(18), p.10184.

[8] Babawurun, T., Ewim, D.R.E., Scott, T.O. and Neye-Akogo, C., 2023. A Comprehensive Review of Wind Turbine Modeling for Addressing Energy Challenges in Nigeria and South Africa in the 4IR Context. *The Journal of Engineering and Exact Sciences*, *9*(2), pp.15479-01e.

[9] Bager, S.L. and Lambin, E.F., 2022. How do companies implement their zero-deforestation commitments. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *375*, p.134056.

[10] Bernards, N., Campbell-Verduyn, M., Rodima-Taylor, D., Duberry, J., DuPont, Q., Dimmelmeier, A., Huetten, M., Mahrenbach, L.C., Porter, T. and Reinsberg, B., 2020. Interrogating technology-led experiments in sustainability governance. *Global Policy*, *11*(4), pp.523-531.

[11] Cerbone, D. and Maroun, W., 2020. Materiality in an integrated reporting setting: Insights using an institutional logics framework. *The British Accounting Review*, *52*(3), p.100876.

[12] Cheng, X., Chen, K. and Su, Y., 2023. Green innovation in oil and gas exploration and production for meeting the sustainability goals. *Resources Policy*, *87*, p.104315.

[13] Chowdhury, P. and Shumon, R., 2020. Minimizing the gap between expectation and ability: Strategies for smes to implement social sustainability practices. *Sustainability*, *12*(16), p.6408.

[14] Chukwu, E., Adu-Baah, A., Niaz, M., Nwagwu, U. and Chukwu, M.U., 2023. Navigating ethical supply chains: the intersection of diplomatic management and theological ethics. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences and Arts*, *2*(1), pp.127-139.

[15] David, B. and Giordano-Spring, S., 2022. Climate reporting related to the TCFD framework: An exploration of the air transport sector. *Social and Environmental Accountability Journal*, *42*(1-2), pp.18-37.

[16] Dissanayake, D., Tilt, C. and Qian, W., 2019. Factors influencing sustainability reporting by Sri Lankan companies. *Pacific Accounting Review*, *31*(1), pp.84-109.

[17] Dye, J., McKinnon, M. and Van der Byl, C., 2021. Green gaps: Firm ESG disclosure and financial institutions' reporting Requirements. *Journal of Sustainability Research*, *3*(1).

[18] Elkins, H. and Entwistle, G., 2023. A Canadian Response to the Pursuit of Global Sustainability Reporting Standards. *Accounting Perspectives*, *22*(1), pp.7-54.

[19] Ervits, I., 2021. CSR reporting by Chinese and Western MNEs: Patterns combining formal homogenization and substantive differences. *International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility*, *6*(1), pp.1-24.

[20] Falkenberg, C., Schneeberger, C. and Pöchtrager, S., 2023. Is Sustainability Reporting Promoting a Circular Economy? Analysis of Companies' Sustainability Reports in the Agri-Food Sector in the Scope of Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive and EU Taxonomy Regulation. *Sustainability*, *15*(9), p.7498.

[21] Fiechter, P., Hitz, J.M. and Lehmann, N., 2022. Real effects of a widespread CSR reporting mandate: Evidence from the European Union's CSR Directive. *Journal of Accounting Research*, *60*(4), pp.1499-1549.

[22] Haque, S.M.S., 2023. The impact of remote work on hr practices: navigating challenges, embracing opportunities. *European Journal of Human Resource Management Studies*, *7*(1).

[23] Herbohn, K., Clarkson, P. and Wallis, M., 2022. 19. The state of climate change-related risk disclosures and the way forward. *Handbook of Accounting and Sustainability*, p.343.

[24] Hofstetter, J.S., De Marchi, V., Sarkis, J., Govindan, K., Klassen, R., Ometto, A.R., Spraul, K.S., Bocken, N., Ashton, W.S., Sharma, S. and Jaeger-Erben, M., 2021. From sustainable global value chains to circular economy—different silos, different perspectives, but many opportunities to build bridges. *Circular Economy and Sustainability*, *1*(1), pp.21-47.

[25] Kayode-Ajala, O., 2023. Establishing cyber resilience in developing countries: an exploratory investigation into institutional, legal, financial, and social challenges. *International Journal of Sustainable Infrastructure for Cities and Societies*, *8*(9), pp.1-10.

[26] Khan, P.A., Johl, S.K. and Johl, S.K., 2021. Does adoption of ISO 56002‐2019 and green innovation reporting enhance the firm sustainable development goal performance? An emerging paradigm. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *30*(7), pp.2922-2936.

[27] Khatri, I. and Kjærland, F., 2023. Sustainability reporting practices and environmental performance amongst nordic listed firms. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *418*, p.138172.

[28] Krishnan, R. and Butt, B., 2022. "The gasoline of the future:" points of continuity, energy materiality, and corporate marketing of electric vehicles among automakers and utilities. *Energy Research & Social Science*, *83*, p.102349.

[29] La Torre, M., Dumay, J., Rea, M.A. and Abhayawansa, S., 2020. A journey towards a safe harbour: The rhetorical process of the International Integrated Reporting Council. *The British Accounting Review*, *52*(2), p.100836.

[30] Lai, A. and Stacchezzini, R., 2021. Organisational and professional challenges amid the evolution of sustainability reporting: a theoretical framework and an agenda for future research. *Meditari Accountancy Research*, *29*(3), pp.405-429.

[31] Millar, E. and Searcy, C., 2020. The presence of citizen science in sustainability reporting. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, *11*(1), pp.31-64.

[32] Neri, S., 2021. Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) and Integrated Reporting. *Global Challenges to CSR and Sustainable Development: Root Causes and Evidence from Case Studies*, pp.293-302.

[33] Nishitani, K., Unerman, J. and Kokubu, K., 2021. Motivations for voluntary corporate adoption of integrated reporting: A novel context for comparing voluntary disclosure and legitimacy theory. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *322*, p.129027.

[34] Njemanze, P.C., Njemanze, J., Skelton, A., Akudo, A., Akagha, O., Chukwu, A.A., Peters, C. and Maduka, O., 2008. High-frequency ultrasound imaging of the duodenum and colon in patients with symptomatic giardiasis in comparison to amebiasis and healthy subjects. *Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology*, *23*(7pt2), pp.e34-e42.

[35] Oprean-Stan, C., Oncioiu, I., Iuga, I.C. and Stan, S., 2020. Impact of sustainability reporting and inadequate management of ESG factors on corporate performance and sustainable growth. *Sustainability*, *12*(20), p.8536.

[36] Orazalin, N. and Mahmood, M., 2020. Determinants of GRI-based sustainability reporting: evidence from an emerging economy. *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies*, *10*(1), pp.140-164.

[37] Osemene, O.F., Adinnu, P., Fagbemi, T.O. and Olowookere, J.K., 2021. Corporate governance and environmental accounting reporting in selected quoted African companies. *Global Business Review*, p.09721509211010989.

[38] Petrescu, A.G., Bilcan, F.R., Petrescu, M., Holban Oncioiu, I., Türkeş, M.C. and Căpuşneanu, S., 2020. Assessing the benefits of the sustainability reporting practices in the top Romanian companies. *Sustainability*, *12*(8), p.3470.

[39] Polzer, T. and Reichard, C., 2020. IPSAS for European Union member states as starting points for EPSAS: Analysis of the discourses among countries and stakeholders. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, *33*(2/3), pp.247-264.

[40] Rupani, J., Muralidhar, L.B. and Nethravathi, K., 2023. A Study on Recent Trends in Environmental, Social and Governance Goals of Global Corporates. *TWIST*, *18*(4), pp.68-75.

[41] Schiehll, E. and Kolahgar, S., 2021. Financial materiality in the informativeness of sustainability reporting. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *30*(2), pp.840-855.

[42] Sepúlveda-Alzate, Y.M., García-Benau, M.A. and Gómez-Villegas, M., 2022. Materiality assessment: The case of Latin American listed companies. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, *13*(1), pp.88-113.

[43] Seroka-Stolka, O., 2023. Enhancing Environmental Sustainability: Stakeholder Pressure and Corporate CO2-Related Performance—An Examination of the Mediating and Moderating Effects of Corporate Decarbonization Strategies. *Sustainability*, *15*(19), p.14257.

[44] Steuer, S. and Tröger, T.H., 2022. The role of disclosure in green finance. *Journal of Financial Regulation*, *8*(1), pp.1-50.

[45] Sulkowski, A. and Jebe, R., 2022. Evolving ESG Reporting Governance, Regime Theory, and Proactive Law: Predictions and Strategies. *American Business Law Journal*, *59*(3), pp.449-503.

[46] Teh, D., Khan, T., Corbitt, B. and Ong, C.E., 2020. Sustainability strategy and blockchain-enabled life cycle assessment: a focus on materials industry. *Environment Systems and Decisions*, *40*, pp.605-622.

[47] Tyagi, A.K., Aswathy, S.U. and Abraham, A., 2020. Integrating blockchain technology and artificial intelligence: Synergies perspectives challenges and research directions. *Journal of Information Assurance and Security*, *15*(5), p.1554.

[48] Uzougbo, N.S., Akagha, O.V., Coker, J.O., Bakare, S.S. and Ijiga, A.C., 2023. Effective strategies for resolving labour disputes in the corporate sector: Lessons from Nigeria and the United States.

[49] Wangu, J., 2021. The need for a food systems approach in smallholder food and nutrition security initiatives: Lessons from inclusive agribusiness in smallholder communities. *Foods*, *10*(8), p.1785.

[50] Wong, C.W., Wong, C.Y., Boon-Itt, S. and Tang, A.K., 2021. Strategies for building environmental transparency and accountability. *Sustainability*, *13*(16), p.9116