UKR Journal of Economics, Business and Management (UKRJEBM)

Homepage: https://ukrpublisher.com/ukrjebm/
Email: submit.ukrpublisher@gmail.com

Volume 2, Issue 8, 2026 ISSN: 3049-429X (Online)

Corporate Governance Frameworks and Their Role in Achieving the SDGs

Amb. Nnordee Bariagara King David, Ph.D[1] & Dr. Charity Oluwafemi Sadibo[2]

[1]Registrar General. Awedu Institute of Business Management and Leadership.
[2]Human Resources Management, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education Port Harcourt.

***Corresponding Author**: Amb. Nnordee Bariagara King David, Ph.D
DOI: *https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22067396*

Article History

Original Research Article

Received: 20-06-2026

Accepted: 26-07-2026

Published: 23-08-2026

Citation: Amb. Nnordee Bariagara King David, Ph.D, & Dr. Charity Oluwafemi Sadibo. (2026). Corporate governance frameworks and their role in achieving the SDGs. UKR Journal of Economics, Business and Management, 2(8), 211-217.

Abstract

The 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development are an ambitious global compact that requires private sector investment, innovation, and operational capacity to achieve transformative change. Despite corporate commitments to the SDG agenda, aspirational rhetoric and measurable action remain far apart due to the lack of governance architectures that can translate sustainability pledges into accountable, strategically integrated organisational behaviour. This article argues that strong corporate governance frameworks are necessary to turn SDG promises into measurable results. Based on a comprehensive review of corporate governance, sustainability reporting, stakeholder theory, and strategic management literature, the article examines three interconnected governance principles board-level accountability, transparency and disclosure, and risk and opportunity mapping that provide the institutional infrastructure for credible SDG integration. The data also shows how effective governance takes firms beyond compliance-oriented "do no harm" to proactive value creation through materiality assessments, integrated reporting, and long-term investor trust. Data restrictions prevent accurate impact measurement, standardisation inadequacies cause greenwashing concerns, and financial sector structural short-termism penalises long-term sustainability investments. The article suggests mandatory board-level sustainability education, integrated financial and sustainability reporting, proactive engagement with long-term investors, intermediate performance milestones, and multi-stakeholder partnerships for capacity and data sharing. The article concludes that governance reform is a strategic imperative that helps businesses align their operations with the long-term flourishing of people and planet, turning the SDG agenda into an internal organisational reality. By integrating sustainability into fiduciary duties, executive compensation, risk management frameworks, and reporting systems, corporations can bridge the gap between declaration and delivery, meaningfully contributing to the 2030 Agenda while increasing long-term enterprise value and societal resilience.

Keywords: *Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), Corporate Governance, Sustainability Integration, Sustainability Reporting, Board-Level Accountability, Stakeholder Engagement.*

Introduction

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development represents the most ambitious international agreement yet established to tackle issues of poverty, inequality, climate change, and environmental deterioration. It comprises seventeen Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Nevertheless, a dismal truth has emerged as the 2030 deadline approaches: the fiscal shortfall for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in developing nations is projected to reach trillions of dollars annually. This amount significantly exceeds the fiscal capabilities of national administrations. Nhamo and Mjimba (2020) propose a fundamental reevaluation of implementation strategies, shifting from a solely state-centric model to one that actively involves non-state actors, particularly the private sector. This is due to the extensive nature of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) agenda. Certainly, the interrelated characteristics of these goals render them more urgent than they may otherwise appear. For example, climate initiatives aligned with the Paris Agreement have immediate effects on both the volume and quality of water, leading to intricate trade-offs that necessitate collaborative solutions across several sectors (Cullen et al., 2025). Governments are hindered by financial constraints and political cycles, preventing them from autonomously using the technical advancements, management expertise, and capital investment required to achieve these interconnected objectives.

To meet this commitment, an increasing number of companies have publicly committed to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), integrating sustainability language into their mission statements, annual reports, and marketing strategies. Conversely, a notable gap persists between the stated objectives and the realised outcomes. Although numerous organisations want to foster a more sustainable society, many lack the requisite internal governance frameworks to actualise their ambitions. Martínez-Ferrero and García-Meca (2020) assert that inadequate oversight processes, decentralised decision-making, and a lack of accountability mechanisms linking sustainability performance to executive actions contribute to the superficial engagement of businesses in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) agenda. This inconsistency stems not merely from inadequate implementation; instead, it reflects a core deficiency in the organization's integration of sustainability into the essential strategy and fiduciary responsibilities of the board and executive leadership. The comprehensive analysis of business and management literature conducted by Mahajan et al. (2024) substantiates this claim. The analysis indicates that despite a notable rise in academic engagement with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the application of this knowledge in corporate practices remains inconsistent. This arises from the reality that governance frameworks have failed to evolve alongside the terminology linked to sustainability.

The objective of this essay is to contend that strong corporate governance practices are the paramount tool for converting corporate SDG commitments from mere public relations statements into actionable and measurable initiatives. Without intentional governance reform encompassing board oversight, risk management, transparency, and alignment of incentives, corporate engagement with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) will remain largely superficial rather than genuinely transformative. Through governance, sustainability may be implemented, observed, and enforced. Governance constitutes the foundational framework essential for sustainability. Governance serves as the conduit between policy pronouncements and their practical execution.

The Traditional Governance vs. The SDG Agenda

Throughout a significant portion of the contemporary corporate period, governance has been perceived through a quite limited perspective. The conventional framework, firmly established in agency theory, asserts that directors' foremost fiduciary responsibility is to enhance shareholder value, with business performance primarily evaluated by quarterly profits, stock price growth, and profit margins. Risk management in this framework is predominantly introspective, focused on safeguarding the organization against operational, financial, and reputational hazards that may diminish investor returns. Mrabure and Abhulimhen-Iyoha (2020) express this traditional viewpoint, highlighting that corporate governance has traditionally emphasised safeguarding shareholders' interests, frequently marginalising wider societal issues in strategy discussions. Within this paradigm, environmental and social expenditures are perceived not as value-generating investments but as expenses to be curtailed, resulting in an intrinsic conflict with the comprehensive and long-term focus of sustainable development.

The emergence of the SDGs has fundamentally questioned this conventional wisdom, necessitating a reassessment of the corporation's objectives and obligations. The intricate nature and interrelation of worldwide issues ranging from climate-driven migration to entrenched inequality necessitate that enterprises embrace a stakeholder-focused strategy that considers the rightful concerns of workers, local populations, supply chain collaborators, and the ecosystem. Mhlanga (2022) asserts that the Fourth Industrial Revolution provides technological remedies for sustainability issues, yet it also intensifies social upheavals, rendering stakeholder capitalism not just an ethical choice but a strategic imperative for enduring corporate robustness. This transition is further elaborated by Ruggie, Rees, and Davis (2020), who contend that operationalising stakeholder capitalism necessitates the integration of human rights due diligence and social impact evaluation into corporate governance frameworks, thus advancing from mere philanthropic acts to comprehensive accountability. The SDGs thus establish a normative structure that redefines business achievement as inclusive prosperity instead of exclusive wealth accumulation.

Notwithstanding this rhetorical development, the shift from theory to practice continues to be laden with discord and inconsistency. Numerous firms overtly support the SDG objectives while concurrently engaging in behaviours that contradict it, a trend increasingly recognised as "SDG washing" (Agyenim-Boateng & Iddrisu, 2026). This disconnection is evident in multiple persistent challenges: sustainability efforts are frequently confined to corporate social responsibility divisions, detached from fundamental business strategy and lacking genuine decision-making power; immediate performance demands deter investments in long-term sustainability projects that may not provide instant financial benefits; and disjointed reporting systems obscure rather than clarify authentic advancements.

Rotheroe (2021) astutely notes that after years of lobbying, the core corporate objective has largely persisted, with sustainability frequently utilised as a means of enhancing reputation rather than as a catalyst for change. This deep-seated stagnation highlights the pressing necessity for governance change that addresses these inconsistencies and harmonises business behaviour with the objectives of the 2030 Agenda.

Key Governance Principles for SDG Integration

Realising SDG commitments thru corporate action demands the intentional redesign of governance architectures across three interrelated dimensions: accountability, transparency and strategic risk mapping. In the absence of such structural reinforcements, sustainability is optional rather than mandatory, subject to managerial whim and external instability.

Board-Level Accountability

The board of directors is the highest level of corporate decision-making and therefore the key point for integrating SDG responsibility. Effective oversight is not just a periodic review of sustainability reports, but requires dedicated board-level committees with explicit mandates for environmental, social and governance (ESG) performance and the expertise to interrogate management assumptions and challenge inadequate progress. Hegazy, Prior, and Zarea (2026) present strong evidence that the quality of board governance is a crucial factor in the alignment of corporate ESG ratings with actual SDG contributions, highlighting a persistent “ESG-SDG wedge” in which high ESG ratings do not necessarily translate into tangible sustainable development outcomes. This gap highlights the need to move from the symbolic gesture of forming committees to the meaningful inclusion of sustainability measures in executive compensation schemes. Aguiar (2026) makes a compelling case for an evolution in governance practices to go hand-in-hand with the evolution of ESG reporting frameworks, with remuneration tied directly to verifiable SDG-related performance indicators such as emissions reduction, diversity targets and supply chain labour standards. This perspective is supported by Bolen (2023), who demonstrates that strategic reputation management, based on genuine board-level commitment, provides superior triple-bottom-line outcomes compared to externally imposed compliance regimes.

Transparency and Disclosure

There is no use in accountability if there is no transparency. Without reliable, comparable and auditable data, stakeholders are unable to measure corporate SDG achievement. The proliferation of reporting frameworks has attempted to fill this gap, with the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) creating comprehensive sustainability disclosure standards and the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) developing climate risk reporting protocols that have informed regulatory developments internationally. Nyakuwanika and Panicker (2025) argue that the integration of environmental accounting techniques with these frameworks allows companies to systematically assess, manage and disseminate their climate-related consequences, thus decreasing knowledge asymmetry between corporations and investors. Gopal and Pitts (2025) build on this research, remarking that the convergence of legal demands and technology innovation, particularly in geographical data and artificial intelligence, is adding to the complexity and enforceability of sustainability reporting. The advice is mostly for the public sector, but Adams (2023) offers useful insights for private companies. Adams argues that sustainability reports should not simply be about disclosure but must ensure real accountability, allowing stakeholders to hold decision-makers to account for performance against stated SDG commitments.

Risk and Opportunity Mapping

Governance should enable companies to link their business risks and opportunities to specific SDGs in a methodical way, acknowledging that sustainability issues are not externalities but material issues that threaten the continuity of operations and competitive advantage. Haar (2024) has developed a pragmatic, company-level approach, showing how companies may transform global SDG objectives into actionable risk assessments, to detect weaknesses in supply chains, resource dependence, and labour demographics. As Van Zanten and Van Tulder (2020) note, resilient transformations in the post-pandemic world will need enterprises to reconceptualise risk thru the lens of sustainable development, linking operational resilience with societal well-being: “SDG logics. Berrone et al. (2023) synthesise these ideas, stating that management research must continue to refine the relationships between SDG frameworks and company strategy, enabling governance to act as the interpretive bridge between global goals and localised business actions. These three governance principles accountability, transparency, and risk mapping can help firms develop the institutional architecture required for credible SDG integration.

Strategic Integration

To reach the Sustainable Development Goals, we require more than corporate compliance to legal minima; we need a fundamental reorientation of business purpose from risk avoidance to value development. Good governance provides the strategic architecture that enables this change of firms from the defensive posture of “doing no harm” to the proactive pursuit of beneficial social and environmental benefits. Such a philosophical shift is expressed in the illuminating interview by Ghio and McGuigan (2020) with governance luminary Mervyn King. Integrated thinking, positive activism and accountability are shown as interlinked pillars of sustainable enterprise, through which a vision of corporate leadership is articulated. King's influential view is that governance should not just limit management excess, but inspire behaviour in organisations that is good for society as well as the bottom line. The authors of the article Tamasiga et al. (2024) are providing empirical evidence supporting this position, showing that ESG disclosures that are meaningfully embedded in governance structures improve firm value and operational performance thru rigorous analysis. This is a rejection of the old idea that sustainability is a net cost to business. This research demonstrates that the governance-enabled pursuit of SDG alignment is not a philanthropic diversion but a source of competitive advantage and long-term resilience.

As part of this strategic reorientation, the governance-facilitated materiality assessment is a key procedure in which organisations systematically identify and prioritise the sustainability challenges that are most relevant to their specific industry context, business model and stakeholder expectations. Karimov (2024) offers a thorough guide for undertaking double materiality assessments, clarifying the distinction between financial materiality the influence of sustainability issues on enterprise value and impact materiality the organisation's impact on society and the environment offering a dual-lens framework that supports the holistic goal of the SDGs. Sarkar et al. (2026) apply this methodology to the natural gas sector in India and show how double materiality assessments help energy companies deal with the complex trade-offs of the energy transition, identifying which SDGs, such as SDG 7 (Affordable and Clean Energy), SDG 13 (Climate Action), and SDG 12 (Responsible Consumption), require priority attention in their operational and strategic planning. Bux et al. (2025) extend this research by developing an experimental common framework for evaluating double materiality in different corporate contexts, seeking to solve the recurring problem of comparability and standardisation that has previously prevented effective SDG integration. These assessments help governance frameworks to steer boards and management away from generic sustainability clichés and toward industry-specific, evidence-based prioritisation to focus resources on the most consequential impact areas.

Good governance is also a crucial signal to capital markets and gives investors the confidence to provide funding for long-term projects aligned to SDGs that may not have immediate returns but promise sustained value creation over longer periods of time. This dynamic is described by Mazzucato (2023) through the lens of mission-oriented development banks, who argue that patient, purpose-driven capital supported by clear governance frameworks can catalyse innovation and systemic change at the scale required to address grand challenges such as climate change and inequality. This view is supported by Gao et al. (2026) who provide empirical evidence that ESG integration, when combined with strong sustainability governance and regulatory stringency, is a strong driver of sustainable innovation, creating virtuous cycles in which governance facilitates innovation which in turn enhances sustainability performance. Loang (2023) presents evidence from financial markets that corporate governance quality favourably affects sustainable investment flows, as investors increasingly see strong governance as a proxy for management competence, risk management skill and long-term strategic foresight. By this matrix of tools (value creation, materiality assessment and investor trust), governance converts the SDG agenda from a compliance cost to a strategic opportunity for sustainable development.

The Challenges

The rationale of governance-enabled SDG integration is clear, but firms face formidable challenges that threaten to unravel even the most well-intentioned governance improvements. These challenges from data limits, credibility deficits to temporal misalignment mean that governance frameworks can only unlock their revolutionary potential if they are recognised and handled systematically.

Data Collection and Impact Measurement

The fundamental obstacle for corporate SDG governance is the challenge of accurate and reliable measurement of impact. Financial measurements have decades of standardisation and auditability behind them; sustainability consequences are typically diffuse, long-term, and fundamentally hard to connect to specific company actions. In a very different context of counter-terrorism, Conway et al. (2020) also underscore a universal problem: assessing the impact of interventions on complex social systems requires sophisticated methodologies that capture direct and indirect effects, as well as unintended consequences. This means continued challenges for corporations in measuring contributions to SDGs like poverty reduction, ecosystem restoration or gender equality because causal paths are non-linear and subject to infinite externalities outside of corporate control. The result is a governance landscape where choices are often taken on incomplete or proxy facts, eroding the accountability and strategic alignment that governance is supposed to deliver.

Greenwashing and Standardisation Deficits

The measuring problem is compounded by the potential of rampant greenwashing, in which firms overstate or misrepresent their sustainability accomplishments to increase reputation without making substantial changes. Jones and Tremblay (2025) offer a comprehensive review of sustainability assurance practices. They also note that the lack of universally accepted standards and enforcement mechanisms creates opportunities for opportunistic behaviour, where companies only report good news and hide bad news. This credibility issue undermines stakeholder trust and results in a race to the bottom where façade compliance replaces real transformation and ultimately undermines the whole objective of SDG-aligned governance.

Short-Term Market Pressures

At the most basic level, governance for sustainable development is confronted with the structural contradiction between the expectation for quarterly earnings and long-term sustainability goals. Moreover, Terry (2023) highlights the macroeconomic effects of corporate short-termism, describing how the managerial fixation with short-term financial performance engenders systemic inefficiencies, which, in turn, result in reduced long-term investment, innovation and productivity development. Morin (2024) expands this theory, contending that financial markets systematically underestimate long-term value creation in favour of near-term profits, leading to perverse incentives that punish governance initiatives orientated toward SDG attainment. This temporal misalignment is not simply a cognitive prejudice but a structural element of modern financial capitalism, requiring governance reforms that might protect sustainability strategy from short-term market volatility.

Conclusions

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development is a historic worldwide commitment to address the interconnected concerns of poverty, inequality, environmental degradation and climate change. But, as our research has shown, the ambition of the Sustainable Development Goals cannot be achieved by government action alone. The private sector must play a vital role in providing the investment, innovation and operational capability needed for revolutionary change. Yet corporate engagement with the SDG agenda has too frequently been cosmetic, with aspirational rhetoric masking scant real action. This continuous implementation gap is not a lack of corporate goodwill but the lack of governance systems able to translate sustainability pledges into responsible, measurable and strategically integrated organisational behaviour.

The principles of governance — board accountability, transparency and disclosure, risk and opportunity mapping, materiality assessment, and strategic value creation — discussed thru the course of this article constitute the institutional infrastructure by which corporations can cross the chasm between declaration and delivery. Traditional governance frameworks, based on the primacy of shareholders and the short-term maximisation of profits, are fundamentally at odds with the long-term, multi-stakeholder focus that the SDGs require. The move to stakeholder capitalism, theoretically welcomed by many firms, demands purposeful governance reform that embeds sustainability into fiduciary duties, CEO compensation, risk management frameworks, and reporting systems. Without such reforms, corporate engagement with the SDGs will continue to be subject to greenwashing, fragmented departmental siloes and the relentless pressure of quarterly earnings expectations that systematically discount long-term value creation.

The path toward governance-enabled SDG integration, however, is peppered with significant challenges: the difficulty of measuring complex social and environmental impacts; the absence of standardised reporting frameworks that enable comparability and accountability; and the structural short-termism inherent in contemporary financial markets. These are not insurmountable challenges, but they will require pragmatic, multi-pronged approaches that combine internal governance improvements with external alliances and regulatory involvement. Below are proposals which give a practical roadmap for firms aiming to improve their governance frameworks to support the SDGs. Ultimately, good corporate governance is not merely a compliance requirement, but a strategic imperative – the vital means by which businesses can align their operations with the enduring success of people and planet, transforming the SDG agenda from an external expectation into an internal organisational reality.

Recommendations

1. Corporate boards should require regular training for directors to learn about ESG principles, SDG frameworks, climate-related financial challenges, and social impact measurement. Educational efforts must go beyond a basic introduction to empower directors to conduct informed oversight and rigorously test management assumptions. They should also examine scenario analysis, legislative developments, and sustainability's strategic effects on industry-specific business models.
2. Organisations should switch from fragmented sustainability disclosures to integrated yearly reporting for a certified, unified financial performance and sustainability framework. The integration allows stakeholders to evaluate long-term value creation, trade-offs, and management

accountability for financial and non-financial performance through a single narrative. This incorporation should follow Global Reporting Initiative and International Sustainability requirements Board requirements.

3. The company's leadership should create investor relations programs to explain SDG plans, make the business case for sustainability investments, and build a shareholder base committed to long-term wealth development. To reduce information asymmetry and protect sustainability strategy from short-term market volatility, this engagement should include regular sustainability roadshows, comprehensive impact briefings, and full transparency on interim SDG performance.

4. Organisations should disaggregate long-term Sustainable Development 5. Translate 2030 goals into three-year milestones with well-defined key performance indicators to bridge the gap between yearly operational plans and 2030 targets. These interim milestones should be part of strategic planning cycles, CEO compensation, and board evaluation. This will allow adaptive management to handle unexpected issues while retaining strategic coherence and accountability to goals.

5. Corporations should actively partner with non-governmental organisations, academic institutions, industry groups, and public sector agencies to fill knowledge gaps, share best practices, and standardise Sustainable Development Goals measurement criteria. These alliances should go beyond symbolism. They should involve information exchange, research and development partnerships, and advocacy for legislative frameworks that encourage and reward economic contributions to sustainable development.

References

1. Adams, C. (2023). Public sector sustainability reporting: time to step it up. *Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) Report*.

2. Aguiar, G. M. A. (2026). The Evolution and Integration of ESG Reporting: A Framework for Sustainable Business Accountability. *Business Strategy and the Environment*.

3. Agyenim-Boateng, C., & Iddrisu, S. (2026). Sustainability accounting research at the crossroads: an integrative review of tensions, dark side consequences and pathways toward SDGs alignment. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 1-41.

4. Berrone, P., Rousseau, H. E., Ricart, J. E., Brito, E., & Giuliodori, A. (2023). How can research contribute to the implementation of sustainable development goals? An interpretive review of SDG literature in management. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *25*(2), 318-339.

5. Bolen, H. (2023). *Achieving triple bottom line outcomes through strategic reputation management: A role for communications leadership* (Doctoral dissertation).

6. Bux, C., Geatti, P., Sebastiani, S., Del Chicca, A., Giungato, P., Tarabella, A., & Tricase, C. (2025). Toward an experimental common framework for measuring double materiality in companies. *Sustainability*, *17*(14), 6518.

7. Conway, M., Khawaja, M., Lakhani, S., Reffin, J., Robertson, A., & Weir, D. (2020). Disrupting Daesh: Measuring takedown of online terrorist material and its impacts. In *Islamic state's online activity and responses* (pp. 141-160). Routledge.

8. Cullen, K., Hartman, S., Hingst, M., Shahadat, M., Jorgensen, I., Maurer, T., ... & Sluder, M. K. (2025). Sustainable Development Goal 6 in the era of the Paris Agreement: changes and trade-offs in tailoring water challenges to global climate goals. *Ecology and Society*, *30*(3), 16.

9. Free, C., Jones, S., & Tremblay, M. S. (2025). Greenwashing and sustainability assurance: a review and call for future research. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, *47*(4), 739-764.

10. Gao, D., Li, K., Agyemang, A. O., & Hamza, F. (2026). Advancing sustainable innovation for sustainable development through ESG integration, sustainability governance, and regulatory stringency. *Sustainable Development*.

11. Ghio, A., & McGuigan, N. (2020). A life of good governance, positive activism, accountability & integrated thinking: An interview with Mervyn King. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *29*(4), 475-483.

12. Gopal, S., & Pitts, J. (2025). Regulation and frameworks: Current and future reporting trends. In *The FinTech revolution: Bridging geospatial data science, AI, and sustainability* (pp. 183-224). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.

13. Haar, G. (2024). Sustainable Development Goals in a Company Perspective. In *Rethink Economics*

and Business Models for Sustainability: Sustainable Leadership based on the Nordic Model (pp. 97-123). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.

14. Hegazy, M., Prior, D., & Zarea, M. (2026). Whose Sustainability Counts? Board Governance, ESG Ratings, and Sustainable Development Goals: Evidence on the ESG–SDG Wedge. *Business Strategy and the Environment*.

15. Karimov, E. (2024). A blueprint for double materiality assessment.

16. Loang, O. K. (2023). The road to sustainable investing: Corporate governance, sustainable development goals, and the financial market. *Institutions and Economies*, 33-57.

17. Mahajan, R., Kumar, S., Lim, W. M., & Sareen, M. (2024). The role of business and management in driving the sustainable development goals (SDGs): Current insights and future directions from a systematic review. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *33*(5), 4493-4529.

18. Martínez-Ferrero, J., & García-Meca, E. (2020). Internal corporate governance strength as a mechanism for achieving sustainable development goals. *Sustainable Development*, *28*(5), 1189-1198.

19. Mazzucato, M. (2023). Financing the Sustainable Development Goals through mission-oriented development banks.

20. Mhlanga, D. (2022). Stakeholder capitalism, the fourth industrial revolution (4IR), and sustainable development: Issues to be resolved. *Sustainability*, *14*(7), 3902.

21. Morin, S. L. (2024). The financial trap of short-term focus eroding long-term value in financial management: a theoretical analysis. *Financial Markets, Institutions and Risks*, *8*(4), 148-162.

22. Mrabure, K. O., & Abhulimhen-Iyoha, A. (2020). Corporate governance and protection of stakeholders rights and interests. *Beijing l. Rev.*, *11*, 292.

23. Nhamo, G., & Mjimba, V. (2020). Scaling up SDGs implementation: Down the road to fast approaching 2030. In *Scaling up SDGs Implementation: Emerging Cases from State, Development and Private Sectors* (pp. 3-19). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

24. Nyakuwanika, M., & Panicker, M. (2025). The role of environmental accounting in mitigating climate change: ESG disclosures and effective reporting—A systematic literature review. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, *18*(9), 480.

25. Rotheroe, N. (2021). *Business and Sustainable Development; Business Purpose, in Search of Improvement in the Business and Society Relationship* (Doctoral dissertation, University of York.)

26. Ruggie, J. G., Rees, C., & Davis, R. (2020). Making 'stakeholder capitalism'work: contributions from business & human rights.

27. Sarkar, S., Nair, M. M. S., Datta, A., Singh, V., Maurya, S., & Rathore, J. (2026). Integrating Double Materiality and SDG Alignment for the Energy Transition: Global Benchmarking and Evidence from India's Natural Gas Sector. *Highlights of Sustainability*, *5*(2), 206-229.

28. Tamasiga, P., Onyeaka, H., Bakwena, M., & Ouassou, E. H. (2024). Beyond compliance: evaluating the role of environmental, social and governance disclosures in enhancing firm value and performance. *SN Business & Economics*, *4*(10), 118.

29. Terry, S. J. (2023). The macro impact of short-termism. *Econometrica*, *91*(5), 1881-1912.

30. Van Zanten, J. A., & Van Tulder, R. (2020). Beyond COVID-19: Applying "SDG logics" for resilient transformations. *Journal of International Business Policy*, *3*(4), 451.