

Sustainability, ESG and Energy Transition

Prof Ir Rudy C Tarumingkeng, PhD

www.ruduct.com/cv.pdf

IBM-ASMI 2026

Academic Narrative Article

Abstract

Sustainability, environmental, social, and governance considerations, and the transition to a low-carbon energy system are no longer peripheral concerns for organizations. They shape the resilience of economies, the legitimacy of institutions, the cost of capital, the design of infrastructure, and the quality of life of communities. Sustainability provides the long-term purpose; ESG provides a language and set of information practices for evaluating how organizations create and distribute value; energy transition provides a concrete field in which climate, technology, finance, labor, and justice interact.

This article develops a comprehensive narrative framework for understanding the relationship among sustainability, ESG, and energy transition. It explains the intellectual foundations of sustainable development, the evolution and limits of ESG, the environmental, social, and governance dimensions of corporate responsibility, and the structural character of energy transition. It discusses climate risk, materiality, stakeholder governance, innovation, infrastructure, finance, disclosure, assurance, digitalization, responsible AI, just transition, organizational leadership, and the particular challenges and opportunities of Indonesia and the Global South. Practical cases from electricity, industry, transport, agriculture, buildings, finance, and family business illustrate how principles become decisions. The central argument is that sustainability is the destination of long-term value creation, ESG is a governance and measurement architecture, and energy transition is a strategic transformation whose success depends on technological capability, institutional trust, and social legitimacy.

Keywords

Sustainability; environmental social and governance; ESG; energy transition; climate resilience; just transition; sustainable finance; stakeholder governance; Indonesia; strategic management.

Glossary

Term	Meaning
Additionality	The extent to which an intervention produces an outcome that would not have occurred without that intervention.
Carbon pricing	A policy or market mechanism that assigns a monetary cost to greenhouse-gas emissions or creates value for verified reductions.
Climate resilience	The capacity of people, organizations, infrastructure, and ecosystems to anticipate, absorb, recover from, and adapt to climate impacts.
Double materiality	An approach that considers both how sustainability issues affect an organization and how the organization affects people, society, and the environment.
Energy transition	A structural change in energy sources, technologies, infrastructures, institutions, markets, and practices toward a more sustainable energy system.
ESG	Environmental, social, and governance factors used to understand organizational impacts, risks, opportunities, and conduct.
Just transition	A transition designed to distribute benefits and burdens fairly, protect affected workers and communities, and expand participation in decision making.
Materiality	The significance of information or an issue for decisions, performance, risk, impact, or accountability in a particular context.
Net zero	A condition in which anthropogenic greenhouse-gas emissions released to the atmosphere are balanced by removals over a specified period.
Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions	Direct emissions; indirect emissions from purchased energy; and other value-chain emissions, respectively.
Stakeholder	A person or group that affects, is affected by, or has a legitimate interest in an organization's decisions and activities.
Sustainable finance	Financial decision making that integrates environmental, social, governance, and long-term transition considerations.
Systems thinking	An approach that examines relationships, feedback, interdependence, time, and unintended consequences rather than isolated variables.
Transition risk	Financial, operational, legal, technological, market, or reputational risk arising from movement toward a lower-carbon economy.

1 Introduction

Sustainability has moved from a specialist concern to a central question of management. Organizations now operate in an environment where climate disruption, biodiversity loss, resource constraints, inequality, technological change, and institutional distrust interact. A factory depends on reliable energy and water; a bank depends on the quality of its borrowers and the stability of the communities in which they operate; a university depends on social confidence that it prepares people for a changing economy; and a public agency depends on infrastructure that remains functional under climatic stress. These are not separate issues. They are connected conditions of long-term value creation.

The language of ESG has helped bring these conditions into boardrooms and investment processes. Environmental factors include emissions, energy, water, land, biodiversity, pollution, and resource efficiency. Social factors include labor, safety, human rights, inclusion, customers, communities, and the effects of organizational decisions on people. Governance includes accountability, ethics, transparency, board oversight, controls, remuneration, anti-corruption, and the relationship between authority and responsibility. ESG is useful because it makes broad concerns more visible, but it is not identical to sustainability. A company can report many ESG indicators and still fail to change the underlying systems that produce harm.

Energy transition makes this distinction concrete. Moving from carbon-intensive energy toward renewable, efficient, flexible, and resilient systems requires more than replacing one machine with another. It involves electricity networks, storage, land, minerals, transport, buildings, industrial processes, consumer behavior, public policy, finance, and employment. It also raises distributive questions. Who pays for new infrastructure? Who gains access to affordable energy? Which workers and regions face disruption? Whose land and knowledge are recognized? A transition that reduces emissions while increasing energy poverty or community conflict is environmentally incomplete and socially fragile.

The purpose of this article is to connect these themes in a single management narrative. Sustainability is treated as a long-term orientation toward the conditions that allow people, organizations, economies, and ecosystems to flourish. ESG is treated as an information, governance, and accountability architecture that helps organizations make that orientation operational. Energy transition is treated as a strategic transformation that tests whether an organization can innovate, invest, collaborate, and distribute value responsibly. The discussion is intended for managers, educators, researchers, policy makers, investors, and leaders of public and private institutions.

The central thesis is that sustainability, ESG, and energy transition should be managed as an integrated capability. Sustainability without measurement can remain aspirational. ESG without purpose can become compliance theater. Energy transition without justice can lose legitimacy. Integrated management asks what the organization is trying to preserve, what it must change, how it will know whether change is real, and how it will maintain trust through uncertainty. Those questions provide the foundation for the sections that follow.

2 Sustainability as Long-Term Value

Sustainability is often defined through the relationship between present needs and the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. That formulation remains powerful because it places time at the center of management. An organization is not only a mechanism for producing immediate results. It is also a steward of assets, relationships, knowledge, and natural conditions that determine what will be possible later. The relevant assets include financial capital, but also human capability, social trust, ecological functions, institutional memory, and physical infrastructure.

The business case for sustainability is therefore broader than a promise of short-term cost savings. Energy efficiency can reduce operating costs, but resilience may require investment that pays off only when a disruption occurs. Employee well-being may improve retention and innovation, although its value will not always appear in a quarterly report. Protecting a watershed may support an entire regional economy rather than one company's immediate revenue. Sustainability management asks leaders to recognize these interdependencies and to design decisions that preserve the capacity to create value over time.

Dyllick and Hockerts (2002) emphasized that corporate sustainability concerns the simultaneous maintenance of economic, ecological, and social capital. The formulation helps avoid two errors. The first is to treat environmental and social concerns as obstacles to economic performance. The second is to treat economic performance as irrelevant to sustainability. An organization that cannot generate sufficient resources may be unable to maintain employees, services, innovation, or environmental commitments. The strategic task is to create economic value in ways that do not systematically deplete the ecological and social foundations on which future value depends.

Time also changes the meaning of responsibility. A decision that appears efficient today may create lock-in, liability, or adaptation costs later. Investments in long-lived infrastructure can determine emissions and exposure for decades. A procurement choice can create dependency on a supplier or technology. A training policy can determine whether an organization has the skills required for the next transition. Bansal and DesJardine (2014) argue that sustainability requires managers to address temporal tradeoffs rather than discounting the future until it disappears from the decision.

Sustainability is not a fixed endpoint. It is a continuing process of learning about thresholds, tradeoffs, and relationships. Scientific knowledge changes; social expectations evolve; technologies improve; and communities make their claims more visible. Responsible leaders create mechanisms for review and adaptation. They define long-term principles but permit methods to change. This combination of continuity and flexibility allows an organization to preserve its mission while responding to conditions that could not have been predicted in advance.

3 ESG as Measurement and Governance

ESG gained influence because organizations and investors needed a structured way to discuss non-financial drivers of risk, opportunity, impact, and conduct. Before ESG became common language, environmental management, corporate social responsibility, governance, and socially responsible investment were often discussed in separate professional communities. ESG brought many of these concerns into a shared vocabulary. It encouraged boards, analysts, lenders, regulators, and managers to ask how an organization's activities affect both performance and society.

The value of ESG depends on the quality of the questions behind the indicators. A disclosure can be complete in form and weak in meaning. Counting training hours does not demonstrate skill development; reporting a safety policy does not demonstrate safe work; publishing an emissions target does not demonstrate a credible pathway; and announcing a community program does not demonstrate that affected people have influence. ESG metrics are useful when they are linked to decisions, outcomes, responsibilities, and time-bound improvement. They become misleading when they are selected mainly because they are easy to report.

ESG also has a governance function. It can clarify which issues belong on the board agenda, which executives own performance, what information investors need, and how stakeholders can evaluate conduct. Governance is not limited to the composition of a board. It includes incentives, controls, escalation, audit, procurement, risk appetite, transparency, and the ability to correct a decision. A company whose sustainability department produces a report but cannot influence capital allocation has an ESG communication function, not yet an ESG governance system.

The empirical literature is mixed but informative. Friede, Busch, and Bassen (2015) aggregated evidence from more than 2,000 studies and found that the relationship between ESG and financial performance is often non-negative, although it varies by context, method, and dimension. Khan, Serafeim, and Yoon (2016) showed the importance of distinguishing material sustainability issues from immaterial ones. Gillan, Koch, and Starks (2021) reviewed how ESG research intersects with corporate finance and emphasized the need for stronger theory and measurement. These findings support a disciplined position: ESG can matter financially and socially, but no single score proves responsible performance.

The organization should therefore treat ESG as an architecture rather than a ranking. The architecture connects purpose, materiality assessment, target setting, investment decisions, operational controls, reporting, assurance, and stakeholder dialogue. Its quality can be judged by whether important information reaches the people with authority to act, whether targets influence resource allocation, and whether the organization is willing to disclose setbacks. ESG becomes credible when it changes behavior before it becomes a polished narrative.

4 Energy Transition as Systems Change

Energy transition is often described as a shift from fossil fuels to renewable energy. That description is directionally correct but strategically incomplete. Energy systems are socio-technical systems composed of resources, technologies, networks, markets, regulations, institutions, skills, routines, and cultural expectations. Changing the primary energy source affects electricity generation, transmission, storage, industrial processes, transport, buildings, agriculture, finance, and public policy. It also changes the distribution of political and economic power.

A transition has at least four dimensions. The first is decarbonization: reducing greenhouse-gas emissions and increasing removals where necessary. The second is reliability: ensuring that energy remains available when and where it is needed. The third is affordability: protecting households and businesses from excessive costs and unequal access. The fourth is legitimacy: enabling communities, workers, and citizens to see the transition as fair and meaningful. Ignoring any one of these dimensions creates vulnerabilities that can slow or reverse progress.

The multi-level perspective developed by Geels (2002) and extended in sustainability-transition research explains how change can emerge through interactions among niches, regimes, and landscapes. New technologies and practices develop in protected or experimental niches. Existing energy regimes contain infrastructures, regulations, firms, habits, and investments that stabilize established systems. External pressures such as climate impacts, geopolitical changes, or price shocks can create openings. Transition occurs when innovations, institutions, and social coalitions align sufficiently to alter the regime.

Energy transition is therefore not a single project with a single finish date. Different sectors move at different speeds. Electricity generation may decarbonize faster than cement, steel, shipping, aviation, or agriculture. Urban regions may have more options than remote communities. A national policy can produce different effects across provinces, islands, income groups, and occupations. Markard (2018) notes that the next phase of energy transition brings new complexity as renewable systems become larger and more integrated into existing infrastructure.

For managers, the system character of transition changes the investment question. The issue is not only whether a technology is efficient in isolation, but whether the organization has the infrastructure, skills, market access, regulatory permission, and social acceptance required for deployment. A solar installation may require grid upgrades and maintenance capability. Electric vehicles require charging networks, battery supply chains, and workforce adaptation. Industrial electrification may require new contracts and process redesign. Strategy must connect the asset to the system around it.

5 Climate Science and the Organizational Imperative

Climate change converts environmental uncertainty into operational and strategic exposure. Physical risks include heat, floods, droughts, storms, sea-level rise, wildfire, changing disease patterns, and water stress. Transition risks arise from policy, technology, market preferences, litigation, and changes in the value of carbon-intensive assets. The two categories interact. A company may face physical disruption while also needing to invest rapidly in lower-emission systems. Climate risk is consequently not a niche environmental issue; it is a condition of enterprise risk management.

The scientific basis for action has become increasingly clear. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change documents the relationship between greenhouse-gas accumulation, warming, impacts, and the need for rapid emission reductions. The concept of planetary boundaries further reminds decision makers that climate is connected to biodiversity, land-system change, freshwater, biogeochemical flows, and other Earth-system processes (Steffen et al., 2015). An organization may reduce one impact while intensifying another. Sustainability strategy should therefore avoid single-issue optimization.

Climate scenarios are useful when treated as tools for questioning assumptions rather than as forecasts with false precision. A business can ask how its facilities, suppliers, customers, financing, and insurance would perform under different pathways of warming, regulation, energy prices, and technology adoption. Scenario analysis should include low-probability, high-consequence events and compound disruptions. It should also be connected to decisions: asset location, maintenance, product design, capital expenditure, procurement, talent, and emergency planning.

Adaptation deserves equal attention with mitigation. Mitigation reduces the causes of climate change; adaptation reduces vulnerability to impacts. A coastal enterprise may need both lower-emission operations and protection from flooding. A farmer may need efficient irrigation, diversified crops, weather information, and market support. A city may need low-carbon transport and heat-resilient public space. Adaptation has distributional consequences because people with the fewest resources are often the most exposed and least able to recover.

The organizational imperative is to move from awareness to capability. A climate statement is not a capability. Capability includes reliable data, accountable leadership, resilient infrastructure, trained employees, financing options, supplier engagement, and a process for revising plans. Climate action becomes credible when the organization can explain what it will do, by when, with which resources, under which assumptions, and how it will respond if progress is slower than expected.

6 Stakeholder Governance and Materiality

Sustainability decisions affect multiple stakeholders whose interests may not be represented by the financial statements. Employees experience work conditions; communities experience pollution, land-use change, employment, or displacement; customers experience product quality and affordability; suppliers experience purchasing terms; investors experience risk and return; and future generations experience the cumulative consequences of present choices. Stakeholder governance begins by recognizing these relationships as part of the organization's value creation rather than as external public relations.

Freeman's stakeholder perspective and the work of Donaldson and Preston (1995) provide a foundation for examining who has legitimate interests in organizational decisions. Stakeholder governance does not mean that every preference has equal weight in every decision. It means that leaders identify relevant interests, assess impacts, create channels for voice, and explain how tradeoffs are made. Affected groups should not be invited only after the project is designed, when participation can no longer change the outcome.

Materiality is the process through which an organization determines which sustainability issues require attention and disclosure. Traditional financial materiality asks how an issue affects enterprise value. Impact materiality asks how the organization affects people and the environment. Double materiality considers both directions. The approach is useful because it recognizes that an issue may be socially significant before its financial consequences are visible, and that social harm can eventually become financial risk through regulation, litigation, market change, or loss of trust.

Good materiality assessment combines data with judgment. Heat maps and surveys can help prioritize, but they may reflect who was asked, how questions were framed, and which impacts are easiest to quantify. The process should include internal expertise, external evidence, stakeholder engagement, and review by accountable leaders. It should distinguish severity, scale, scope, irremediability, likelihood, and time horizon. The outcome should be a set of management priorities, not only a disclosure list.

Stakeholder governance is especially important in energy transition because infrastructure creates local and long-lived effects. A renewable project may provide clean power and employment while raising concerns about land, biodiversity, cultural sites, or access to resources. A mine may supply minerals for batteries while creating labor and environmental risks. A transmission corridor may benefit a national system but impose costs on particular communities. Responsible governance acknowledges these conflicts early and seeks consent, benefit sharing, mitigation, and remedy rather than assuming that aggregate benefit justifies every local burden.

7 The Environmental Dimension of ESG

The environmental dimension of ESG covers the relationship between organizational activity and ecological systems. Common topics include greenhouse-gas emissions, energy use, water, waste, pollution, land, biodiversity, materials, circularity, and climate resilience. The challenge is to avoid treating these as a collection of isolated indicators. Environmental systems interact. A decision to reduce emissions can increase mineral extraction, water use, or waste; a recycling program can shift impacts elsewhere in the value chain; and an efficiency improvement can increase total demand if lower cost stimulates consumption.

Emissions accounting provides a common starting point. Scope 1 emissions arise directly from owned or controlled sources. Scope 2 emissions arise from purchased electricity, heat, steam, or cooling. Scope 3 includes value-chain emissions such as purchased goods, transport, product use, and end-of-life treatment. The categories help locate responsibility, but they do not automatically identify the best intervention. Organizations need to understand which activities drive emissions, which reductions are feasible, which suppliers have influence, and which claims can be verified.

Environmental targets should be scientifically informed and operationally credible. A target needs a baseline, boundary, time horizon, interim milestones, responsible owners, financing, and a method for addressing changes in business structure. Net-zero claims should distinguish direct reduction from offsets and removals. Offsets may have a role in residual emissions, but their quality, additionality, permanence, leakage, and social effects require scrutiny. A target that depends on uncertain credits while delaying direct action can create reputational and transition risk.

Biodiversity and natural capital broaden environmental thinking beyond carbon. Organizations depend on ecosystem services such as pollination, water regulation, soil formation, coastal protection, and cultural value. Land conversion and pollution can weaken these services even when they do not appear in conventional financial accounts. A responsible environmental strategy asks where the organization's supply chains intersect with ecological thresholds and whether restoration, avoidance, or redesign is possible.

Circularity provides another route to environmental improvement. Rather than treating materials as a linear flow from extraction to disposal, circular strategies seek durability, repair, reuse, remanufacture, recycling, and resource recovery. Circularity is not automatically sustainable; transport, energy, contamination, and labor conditions matter. The managerial test is whether a product or process reduces total environmental pressure over its life cycle while maintaining quality and access. Environmental ESG becomes effective when it changes design, procurement, operations, and customer relationships.

8 The Social Dimension of ESG

The social dimension concerns how organizations affect people and how people participate in organizational value creation. It includes labor rights, occupational health and safety, fair pay, diversity, equity, inclusion, human rights, customer welfare, community relations, supply-chain conditions, and access to essential services. Social issues can be harder to quantify than energy use, but they are not less material. An organization that ignores social conditions may lose capability, legitimacy, and resilience even when its environmental metrics improve.

Work is a central social domain. A transition may create new technical jobs while eliminating or transforming existing occupations. Automation and digitalization can reduce dangerous tasks, but they can also intensify monitoring and insecurity. Responsible employers plan for reskilling, mobility, consultation, and fair treatment. They examine whether productivity gains are shared through better work, wages, time, or opportunity. The question is not only how many jobs are created, but what kind of work people can sustain with dignity.

Supply chains extend social responsibility beyond legal ownership. A company may purchase products from suppliers operating in jurisdictions where labor protections are weak or enforcement is limited. Due diligence should identify risks, engage suppliers, establish realistic improvement plans, and provide remedy when harm occurs. Simply terminating a supplier can shift harm to workers without solving the underlying problem. Responsible purchasing includes fair lead times, payment practices, traceability, and a willingness to invest in supplier capability.

Communities experience projects through land, water, traffic, noise, employment, services, and cultural identity. Social license is not a permanent approval that can be purchased with donations. It is a relationship sustained by credible information, respectful consultation, benefit sharing, grievance mechanisms, and performance over time. The quality of engagement is revealed when a community raises objections. If the organization listens only when the answer is favorable, participation becomes symbolic.

Customers and citizens are also social stakeholders. Products should be safe, accessible, affordable where appropriate, and marketed honestly. Energy transition creates opportunities to improve access through distributed systems, efficiency, and reliable public transport, but it can also increase costs for households unable to invest in

new technologies. Social ESG asks who can participate in the transition and who might be left paying for it. Inclusion must be designed into finance, technology, service delivery, and policy rather than added after the fact.

9 The Governance Dimension of ESG

Governance is the mechanism through which an organization converts intention into conduct. It determines who has authority, what information is available, how incentives work, how risks are escalated, and how errors are corrected. A sustainability strategy without governance depends on personal enthusiasm and may disappear when leadership changes. A governance system makes responsibility durable by embedding it in roles, processes, budgets, controls, and oversight.

Boards have a distinctive responsibility because they approve strategy, oversee risk, appoint and evaluate executives, and communicate with owners and stakeholders. Effective board oversight requires competence and curiosity. Directors should understand the organization's material environmental and social dependencies, the assumptions behind transition plans, the quality of data, and the limits of assurance. They should ask whether remuneration rewards long-term resilience or encourages narrow targets that can be achieved through symbolic action.

Executive incentives are a particularly important governance signal. If leaders are paid only for revenue and short-term earnings, ESG commitments may be treated as optional. If incentives are linked to a small number of poorly defined indicators, managers may optimize the measure rather than the underlying outcome. Balanced incentives should include operational performance, safety, transition milestones, workforce quality, stakeholder trust, and the organization's ability to learn. Targets should include safeguards against achieving one result by creating harm elsewhere.

Ethics and anti-corruption are central to governance. Energy and infrastructure projects involve contracts, permits, land, finance, and public decisions that can create opportunities for undue influence. Transparent procurement, conflict-of-interest controls, whistleblower protection, independent investigation, and consistent sanctions protect both the organization and stakeholders. Governance quality is demonstrated not by the absence of reported problems, but by the willingness to surface and address them.

Assurance strengthens credibility when it tests whether information and processes are reliable. Assurance should examine boundaries, methods, data controls, estimation, evidence, and the connection between reported indicators and operational reality. It should not become a ceremonial endorsement of management's preferred narrative. The organization should disclose limitations, restatements, and uncertainty. Transparent uncertainty is more trustworthy than invented precision.

Governance must also protect future adaptability. Long-term contracts, technology choices, and infrastructure investments can create path dependency. Leaders should preserve options where uncertainty is high, diversify critical dependencies, and review whether assumptions remain valid. Good governance is not rigid control; it is disciplined flexibility. It enables the organization to remain accountable while changing course when evidence, technology, or social conditions change.

10 Energy Pathways and Strategic Choices

There is no single energy-transition pathway that fits every country, region, sector, or organization. Pathways may combine renewable electricity, energy efficiency, electrification, storage, demand response, sustainable fuels, hydrogen, carbon capture, nuclear power, nature-based solutions, and changes in consumption. The appropriate portfolio depends on resource endowments, infrastructure, affordability, technology maturity, land, water, skills, policy, and public acceptance. Strategy should evaluate pathways as systems rather than as competing slogans.

Electrification is a major route because electricity can be generated from low-emission sources and used efficiently in many applications. Buildings can adopt heat pumps; transport can use electric vehicles and rail; industries can replace some fossil-fuel processes with electric heat. Electrification creates new demand for grids, storage, minerals, charging, and cybersecurity. It can also expose users to price volatility if markets and infrastructure are not designed for flexibility. The transition plan must consider both generation and the networks that make energy usable.

Efficiency is frequently underestimated because it is distributed across many small decisions. Efficient buildings, motors, appliances, logistics, industrial processes, and irrigation can reduce demand and lower the scale of new supply required. Efficiency also improves affordability and resilience. Its difficulty is institutional: benefits may be dispersed, split among owners and users, or delayed. Effective programs align incentives, provide finance, set standards, and make performance visible.

Renewables introduce variability but also geographic diversity and the possibility of distributed access. Solar, wind, hydro, geothermal, and sustainable biomass have different profiles and environmental effects. A responsible portfolio considers life-cycle impacts, storage, transmission, land, water, biodiversity, and local participation. Distributed systems can increase resilience and community control, but they require maintenance, technical support, standards, and financing. The choice is not simply centralized versus decentralized; hybrid systems can combine both.

Fossil fuels may remain in some transition contexts, but continued use must be examined against climate goals, lock-in, air pollution, cost, and future regulation. Carbon capture and storage may address residual emissions in selected sectors, but it should not be assumed to justify unlimited new fossil infrastructure. Sustainable fuels and hydrogen may be valuable where direct electrification is difficult, yet their production pathways, energy losses, leakage, land, and water requirements matter.

Strategic energy planning should use portfolios and decision points. Leaders can identify no-regret actions such as efficiency, maintenance, data improvement, safety, and workforce preparation. They can test options through pilots, partnerships, and scenario analysis. They can set trigger conditions for scaling or stopping. This approach reduces the risk of committing the organization to one technology before the surrounding system is ready.

11 Technology, Innovation, and Infrastructure

Technology is essential to energy transition, but technology alone does not determine outcomes. Innovation includes new products, processes, business models, institutions, and relationships. A battery is an invention; a reliable storage service is an innovation involving finance, maintenance, software, regulation, and customer behavior. A solar panel is a component; an affordable and resilient energy system is an institutional achievement. Managers should therefore evaluate innovation by the capability it creates rather than by the novelty of the device.

Infrastructure has long time horizons and strong path dependence. Transmission lines, ports, industrial plants, buildings, roads, and data systems shape future choices. Retrofitting is often more costly than designing for transition from the beginning. At the same time, infrastructure decisions should not assume that future demand and technology are known. Modular design, interoperability, open standards, and staged investment can preserve flexibility. Planning should consider maintenance and end-of-life, not only construction.

Digital technologies can improve visibility and coordination. Sensors can detect equipment failure; forecasting can balance renewable supply and demand; digital twins can test scenarios; platforms can connect distributed resources; and analytics can identify efficiency opportunities. Digitalization also creates cybersecurity, privacy, interoperability, and dependency risks. A smart grid that cannot operate during an attack or outage is not resilient. A data platform that excludes local operators may reduce, rather than improve, practical intelligence.

Innovation ecosystems matter because no single organization controls an energy transition. Utilities, manufacturers, startups, universities, governments, communities, financiers, and users contribute different resources. Partnerships can accelerate learning and share risk, but they need clear expectations about data, intellectual property, safety, benefit sharing, and accountability. Public policy can support experimentation through standards, procurement, demonstration projects, and finance without locking the system into favored suppliers.

Organizations should cultivate an innovation portfolio. Exploration searches for new possibilities under uncertainty; exploitation improves existing assets and processes. An organization focused only on exploitation may become efficient in a declining system. An organization focused only on exploration may never build reliable operations. The portfolio should include incremental efficiency, scalable transition investments, and carefully selected experiments. ESG governance helps determine which experiments are acceptable and how their impacts will be evaluated.

12 Finance, Capital, and Carbon Risk

Finance translates sustainability priorities into investment decisions, cost of capital, insurance, and access to markets. Energy transition requires substantial capital for generation, grids, storage, efficiency, transport, buildings, industry, adaptation, and workforce support. The capital challenge is not only the amount of money available, but also its allocation, time horizon, risk tolerance, and distribution. Projects that create public value may not produce returns under existing market rules, while projects with attractive returns may shift environmental or social costs to others.

ESG information can help investors evaluate risk and opportunity, but comparability remains difficult. Different standards, boundaries, assumptions, and data quality can produce different results. A score may combine issues that should not be aggregated, or it may reward disclosure without rewarding improvement. Investors and lenders should examine the underlying policies, targets, transition plans, governance, and outcomes. Organizations should be prepared to explain not only their performance but also the material uncertainties in their information.

Climate risk affects both assets and liabilities. Physical damage can interrupt production, reduce collateral value, raise insurance costs, and disrupt supply chains. Transition risk can make carbon-intensive assets uneconomic, create regulatory exposure, or change customer demand. Liability risk can arise when claims, disclosures, or due diligence do not match evidence. Scenario analysis and stress testing can help, but only if results influence lending limits, capital allocation, maintenance, and strategic planning.

Carbon pricing can change incentives by assigning a cost to emissions or a value to reductions. Its effectiveness depends on coverage, price level, integrity, enforcement, and how revenues are used. Internal carbon prices can support investment comparisons even when external prices are uncertain. However, an internal price should not become a license to continue harmful activity. It is a decision tool, not a substitute for direct reduction, regulation, or accountability.

Sustainable finance should also consider distribution. Green bonds, transition finance, blended finance, guarantees, and concessional capital can help mobilize investment in emerging markets and underserved communities. Yet complex instruments may exclude smaller organizations or disguise weak projects through attractive labels. Credible finance requires use-of-proceeds controls, impact measurement, transparency, and remedy. The strategic objective is to connect capital with real transformation rather than with the appearance of sustainability.

13 Just Transition and Energy Justice

Energy transition is just when people who bear its costs have voice, protection, and a fair share of its benefits. The principle of just transition emerged from labor and social movements and has expanded to include communities, consumers, regions, indigenous peoples, and future generations. Heffron and McCauley (2018) emphasize that energy justice includes distribution, recognition, and procedure. These dimensions provide a practical lens for examining who gains, who loses, who is seen, and who can influence decisions.

Distribution concerns prices, jobs, pollution, land, services, and opportunity. A new energy project may create national benefits while concentrating land disruption locally. A carbon tax may improve incentives while burdening households that cannot switch technologies. Closure of a coal plant may reduce emissions while weakening a town's tax base and identity. Distributional analysis should identify these effects in advance and provide targeted support rather than assuming that general economic growth will compensate everyone.

Recognition asks whether institutions understand different histories, vulnerabilities, and forms of knowledge. A rural community may value land through cultural and livelihood relationships that are not captured in a financial appraisal. An indigenous group may have rights and knowledge that should shape project design. Informal workers may be invisible in official employment statistics but highly exposed to price and technology changes. Recognition does not mean freezing the past; it means refusing to treat one administrative category as the whole reality.

Procedure concerns participation and remedy. Consultation should occur early enough to influence options. Information should be accessible in relevant languages and formats. Decision makers should explain how input

changed the project or why it could not be accepted. Grievance mechanisms must be independent enough to be trusted and practical enough to use. A transition that requires silence from affected people is a fragile transition.

A just transition also requires investment in capabilities. Workers need training linked to real employment opportunities, not generic workshops. Regions need economic diversification, infrastructure, entrepreneurship, and public services. Households need finance and technical support to adopt efficient or renewable technologies. Institutions need data and administrative capacity to identify those who require assistance. Support should begin before disruption, because waiting until a plant closes or prices rise makes adjustment more costly.

Justice should be viewed as a source of transition strength. People are more likely to support change when they trust the process and can see a future for themselves. Fairness improves social acceptance, reduces conflict, and broadens the coalition for innovation. It also improves design because affected communities possess knowledge about local conditions that technical plans may omit.

14 Organizations, Leadership, and Culture

Sustainability and energy transition require leaders to manage beyond the boundary of the current reporting cycle. The leader must protect immediate performance while investing in capabilities whose value emerges over time. This requires a narrative that connects mission, risk, innovation, people, and place. Employees should understand why the organization is changing, what will remain stable, what will be redesigned, and how decisions will be made when priorities conflict.

Organizational culture is revealed by behavior under pressure. A company may publish ambitious climate targets, but if managers are punished for slowing an unsafe project, the real culture favors speed. A university may endorse sustainability, but if procurement rewards only the lowest initial price, the institution's practices communicate a different priority. Culture becomes credible when incentives, resource allocation, promotion, and recognition reinforce the stated values.

Leadership must create cross-functional ownership. Sustainability cannot remain the responsibility of one department because emissions, labor, procurement, finance, technology, and community relations are connected. A chief sustainability officer may coordinate, challenge, and advise, but operating leaders must own the decisions that create impacts. Cross-functional teams can integrate engineering, finance, legal, operations, human resources, data, and stakeholder engagement.

Learning is a central capability. Energy transition involves uncertainty, and organizations will make mistakes. A learning culture distinguishes a good-faith experiment from negligence, records near misses, and adapts procedures. It encourages employees to report problems without fear of retaliation while maintaining standards for misconduct. Lessons should travel across projects so that the organization does not repeatedly pay for the same insight.

Family businesses provide a revealing case. Long-term ownership can support patience, reputation, and stewardship, but it can also create attachment to inherited assets and practices. Energy transition may require a family enterprise to modernize equipment, alter supply chains, change product portfolios, or share authority with professional managers. A responsible succession process preserves values while permitting evidence-based change. Strategic legacy is not the preservation of every old method; it is the transfer of purpose and capability to a new generation.

Leadership also involves restraint. Not every initiative should be branded green, and not every technology should be adopted because it is fashionable. Leaders must be willing to say that evidence is insufficient, that a claim is too strong, or that a project should be redesigned. This judgment protects credibility. In sustainability, the courage to limit an attractive story can be more valuable than the ability to create one.

15 Measurement, Reporting, and Assurance

Measurement gives sustainability management a memory. Without data, an organization relies on impressions and changing narratives. With data, it can establish baselines, compare performance, identify gaps, and learn. Yet measurement is not neutral. What is counted becomes visible; what is not counted may be ignored. The design of

indicators should therefore reflect material impacts, stakeholder concerns, decision needs, and the organization's theory of change.

A useful indicator has a clear definition, boundary, owner, frequency, source, method, and intended decision. Emissions data should identify organizational and operational boundaries. Safety indicators should distinguish incidents, exposure, severity, near misses, and reporting behavior. Social indicators should examine outcomes and distribution rather than only activities. Governance indicators should evaluate whether controls operate, issues are escalated, and corrective actions are completed. The aim is not maximum data volume; it is reliable information that changes action.

Targets should be connected to pathways. A long-term aspiration without interim milestones can hide delay. Short-term targets without a long-term direction can encourage local optimization. A credible transition plan explains capital expenditure, technology choices, operating changes, supply-chain engagement, workforce implications, and assumptions. It should disclose dependencies and contingency plans. Investors and stakeholders need to know whether progress comes from real change, divestment, accounting changes, or external conditions.

Reporting should communicate both performance and uncertainty. Estimates are often necessary, especially for value-chain emissions and social outcomes. The organization should explain methodology, confidence, limitations, restatements, and missing data. A transparent report can say that a measure is improving while its boundary remains incomplete. This is more useful than a precise number whose meaning cannot be defended. Assurance should test the evidence and controls without turning uncertainty into a reason for silence.

Greenwashing and greenhushing are opposite communication failures. Greenwashing exaggerates performance, attributes ordinary activity to sustainability, or uses vague claims that cannot be verified. Greenhushing suppresses legitimate progress because leaders fear scrutiny or lack confidence in perfect language. The remedy is disciplined communication: specific claims, clear boundaries, evidence, context, and a willingness to discuss shortcomings. Credibility grows when an organization's communication matches its operational reality.

Measurement must also avoid perverse incentives. If a factory is rewarded for reducing reported incidents, it may discourage reporting. If a manager is rewarded for reducing energy consumption, production may shift elsewhere. If a project is rewarded for carbon savings, it may ignore water or biodiversity. Balanced scorecards and independent review can reduce these distortions. The most important metric is whether measurement improves decisions without transferring hidden harm.

16 Digitalization, AI, and Sustainability

Digitalization can accelerate sustainability by improving information, coordination, prediction, and resource use. Smart meters can reveal demand patterns; sensors can reduce leakage; route optimization can lower fuel use; digital platforms can connect distributed energy resources; and analytics can support predictive maintenance. Digital tools can also broaden participation by making information accessible and enabling remote collaboration. Their contribution depends on whether they are integrated into decisions and whether their own material impacts are understood.

Artificial intelligence can identify patterns in energy demand, climate exposure, equipment performance, and supply chains. It can help generate scenarios, detect anomalies, optimize scheduling, and support research. However, AI systems require data centers, electricity, hardware, and supply chains. A sustainability claim about AI should consider the life cycle of computation, data, devices, cooling, and electronic waste. Efficiency improvements may be offset by increased use, a rebound effect that requires system-level evaluation.

Responsible use matters because algorithmic recommendations can influence access to finance, jobs, insurance, energy services, and public support. If a model uses historical data shaped by inequality, it may allocate transition assistance unfairly. If a platform prioritizes profitable customers, remote or low-income communities may be neglected. Human oversight, explainability, privacy, security, and contestability should be integrated into sustainability-related AI deployments. The objective is not to reject automation, but to ensure that optimization does not conceal whose interests are being optimized.

Digital twins and advanced analytics can support infrastructure planning by allowing managers to test interventions before implementation. A city can model transport, heat, flooding, energy, and land-use interactions. A utility can examine grid scenarios. A factory can test process changes. The model remains an abstraction. Its usefulness depends on data quality, boundary choices, local expertise, and how uncertainties are communicated. Decision makers should not mistake a detailed simulation for a complete representation of reality.

Data governance is also an ESG issue. Organizations should establish ownership, access, provenance, retention, cybersecurity, and data-sharing rules. Communities should know when their data contribute to planning or profiling. Vendors should provide information about model updates, security, and use of data. Employees need training to avoid exposing confidential or personal data through external tools. Digital sustainability is therefore both a resource question and a governance question.

The strategic opportunity is to connect digital capability with physical and social action. A dashboard that reports emissions but does not influence procurement is a visualization, not a transformation. An AI forecast that improves renewable integration but increases risk for vulnerable users is not automatically sustainable. Technology creates value when it helps people make better decisions, improves system performance, and remains accountable to the communities affected.

17 Indonesia and the Global South

Indonesia's sustainability and energy-transition agenda is shaped by geography, demographic diversity, economic development, natural resources, urbanization, and the need to expand reliable access. The archipelagic setting creates distinct challenges for grids, logistics, disaster resilience, and public services. Regions differ in resource endowments, industrial structure, institutional capacity, and exposure to climate hazards. A national strategy must therefore combine common direction with locally adapted pathways.

The country has opportunities to expand renewable energy, improve efficiency, develop geothermal and solar resources, modernize grids, electrify transport, improve public transit, and strengthen sustainable agriculture and forestry. It also faces dependence on existing energy systems, uneven infrastructure, financing constraints, and the need to protect workers and communities connected to carbon-intensive activities. Transition planning should recognize that economic development and decarbonization must be pursued together. Affordable energy and industrial competitiveness remain central social concerns.

ESG can strengthen Indonesian organizations when it is connected to local materiality rather than copied as a reporting ritual. Water, land, labor conditions, supply-chain informality, community relations, disaster risk, biodiversity, and governance quality may be especially important in particular sectors. Smaller firms may need shared data systems, training, technical assistance, and accessible finance. Large firms and public institutions can support supplier development instead of shifting compliance burdens to enterprises with limited capacity.

The Global South also raises questions about fairness in global value chains. Minerals, agricultural products, labor, land, and data may be sourced from developing economies while value, intellectual property, and decision power remain concentrated elsewhere. A responsible transition should examine who bears extraction and environmental costs, who owns the resulting capabilities, and whether local communities receive enduring benefits. Technology transfer and capacity building should be designed as partnership, not as a one-way delivery of tools.

Universities and professional schools have an important role. They can prepare managers who understand finance, engineering, public policy, ethics, stakeholder dialogue, and data. Research can connect global frameworks with local evidence. Executive education can help boards and senior managers interpret climate scenarios, ESG disclosures, and transition plans. The goal is to develop a generation of leaders who can translate sustainability from international language into organizational practice in Indonesian conditions.

A locally grounded strategy also values community knowledge. Farmers, fishers, urban residents, workers, and indigenous communities often understand environmental change through daily experience. Their knowledge can identify risks, maintenance needs, and practical adaptations that formal models omit. Inclusive planning improves both justice and effectiveness. Indonesia's contribution to global sustainability will depend not only on adopting

international standards, but on developing institutions and innovations that reflect its own social and ecological realities.

18 Sector Cases and Strategic Lessons

In the electricity sector, a utility may combine renewable generation with grid reinforcement, storage, demand response, and customer programs. The environmental objective is emission reduction, but success also depends on reliability and affordability. A utility that installs capacity without planning transmission may create curtailment. A tariff reform that improves cost recovery may burden low-income households. A responsible plan includes technical modeling, social protection, workforce preparation, community engagement, and transparent performance reporting.

In manufacturing, energy transition may require process electrification, efficient motors, waste-heat recovery, material substitution, renewable power procurement, and supplier collaboration. The strategic challenge is to maintain quality and competitiveness while reducing emissions and exposure to energy-price volatility. A plant manager should map energy intensity by process, identify bottlenecks, assess capital needs, and train technicians. Finance should evaluate total life-cycle cost rather than initial purchase price. Procurement should include environmental and labor criteria without weakening supply resilience.

Transport illustrates the relationship between technology and urban form. Electric vehicles can reduce tailpipe emissions, but their benefits depend on electricity generation, vehicle size, congestion, battery life, and access to charging. Public transport, walking, cycling, land-use planning, and logistics efficiency can reduce demand for private vehicles. A city that subsidizes cars while neglecting buses may produce a technologically modern but socially unequal system. ESG analysis should consider access, safety, air quality, affordability, and the use of public space.

Agriculture and forestry connect emissions, livelihoods, food security, land, and biodiversity. Digital advisory tools, precision practices, agroforestry, soil improvement, efficient irrigation, and restoration can improve resilience. Yet smallholders may lack finance, connectivity, tenure security, or bargaining power. Sustainability programs should provide practical support and fair market arrangements. Carbon projects need robust measurement and community rights; a project that produces certificates while weakening local livelihoods cannot be considered a successful transition.

Buildings offer many opportunities for efficiency through passive design, insulation, cooling systems, lighting, materials, and distributed energy. Building codes and finance influence whether improvements occur. Low-income residents and tenants may face split incentives because the person paying for upgrades is not the person receiving the energy savings. Public procurement, green affordable housing, and targeted finance can address this problem. Buildings should be designed for heat, flooding, and accessibility rather than only for energy labels.

Financial institutions influence transition through lending, underwriting, investment, and engagement. A bank may set sector policies, offer transition finance, assess collateral exposure, and support customers with technical assistance. Excluding every carbon-intensive borrower may reduce influence and harm communities; financing without milestones may prolong dependency. A credible approach differentiates activities, evaluates transition plans, sets safeguards, and monitors outcomes. The lesson across sectors is consistent: sustainability becomes strategic when environmental targets are connected to operating choices, social effects, and governance authority.

19 Implementation Roadmap and Organizational Maturity

A practical sustainability and ESG program can begin with a materiality and dependency map. The organization identifies how it depends on energy, water, land, labor, infrastructure, finance, data, suppliers, and public trust. It then identifies how its activities affect people and ecosystems. The map should be reviewed with stakeholders and used to prioritize issues. It is more useful than beginning with a generic list of indicators because it connects measurement to context.

The second step is to establish governance. The board or governing body defines oversight; executives assign owners; operational units integrate targets; finance connects plans to capital; risk and audit test controls; human resources develops skills; and communications ensures claims are evidence-based. Responsibilities should be documented.

Escalation should be possible when a project threatens material harm or when reported performance diverges from reality.

The third step is to create a baseline and transition pathway. The baseline includes emissions, energy, key social outcomes, governance controls, exposure, and existing capabilities. The pathway sets long-term direction, interim milestones, investment needs, dependencies, and decision points. It should contain no-regret actions, options for experimentation, and conditions for revising the plan. A pathway is credible when it can be translated into budgets, projects, job plans, procurement requirements, and performance reviews.

The fourth step is to build execution capacity. This may involve energy audits, equipment upgrades, supplier programs, workforce training, data systems, community agreements, and access to finance. Pilots should be designed to generate evidence about technical performance, user experience, cost, equity, and scalability. The organization should avoid treating pilots as public-relations displays. A pilot is valuable when it produces a decision: scale, modify, pause, or stop.

The fifth step is to monitor outcomes and consequences. Dashboards should combine environmental, social, financial, operational, and governance indicators. Review should include complaints, incidents, delays, overrides, near misses, and stakeholder feedback. Independent assurance and periodic external challenge can improve credibility. If a target is missed, leaders should explain why, what has changed, and what will be done next. Accountability is strengthened by response, not by pretending that plans always succeed.

Maturity can be described in four levels. At the emerging level, activities are fragmented and reporting is largely reactive. At the managed level, material issues, policies, owners, and basic data are established. At the integrated level, sustainability shapes strategy, capital, operations, incentives, procurement, and risk. At the adaptive level, the organization learns across the portfolio, anticipates system change, and collaborates to improve outcomes beyond its boundary. Maturity is not bureaucracy; it is the ability to act consistently under changing conditions.

20 Strategic Legacy and Conclusion

The lasting significance of sustainability, ESG, and energy transition lies in the kind of organization they require. They require leaders who can think across time, systems, and stakeholders. They require evidence that is useful rather than ornamental, governance that has authority rather than ceremony, technology that supports judgment rather than disguising uncertainty, and finance that recognizes long-term resilience. They require a culture willing to learn from setbacks and to share benefits fairly.

Sustainability provides the normative direction: maintain and improve the conditions that support human and ecological flourishing. ESG provides a managerial language for identifying material issues, allocating responsibility, measuring performance, and communicating with stakeholders. Energy transition provides a demanding field of action in which the organization must redesign assets, processes, markets, skills, and relationships. The three concepts are distinct, but they become strategically powerful when connected.

The energy transition will create winners, losers, new dependencies, and unexpected opportunities. Its legitimacy will depend on affordability, participation, recognition, and remedy. Its effectiveness will depend on infrastructure, innovation, investment, and institutional coordination. Its durability will depend on whether communities and workers can see a credible future in the changes being proposed. These conditions cannot be achieved by technology alone or by reporting alone.

For Indonesia and the Global South, the strategic task is to pursue development that expands access and capability while avoiding carbon-intensive lock-in and ecological degradation. Local knowledge, public institutions, universities, enterprises, communities, and financial actors each have a role. International standards can support comparability, but local materiality and justice must shape implementation. Capacity building is not an optional complement; it is a condition of sovereignty and resilience.

Strategic legacy is what current leaders leave to those who follow. It includes assets and liabilities, but also the quality of decision processes, the trust of stakeholders, the skills of employees, the condition of ecosystems, and the flexibility of institutions. An organization that announces ambitious targets but leaves unreliable data and weak

governance has created a fragile legacy. An organization that invests in credible transition pathways, capable people, fair relationships, and transparent learning leaves a more durable inheritance.

The central conclusion is therefore clear. Sustainability should be treated as the long-term purpose of value creation, ESG as the architecture of accountability and measurement, and energy transition as a system-wide transformation that tests both. When integrated, they allow organizations to move beyond compliance toward stewardship. They enable economic performance that is resilient, socially legitimate, environmentally responsible, and capable of adapting to a changing world. This is not only a technical or financial agenda. It is a question of institutional character and the responsibility of one generation to the next.

Strategic tradeoffs and the discipline of transition

Sustainability decisions become difficult when benefits and burdens are separated across time, places, or groups. An energy investment may reduce emissions but require land and minerals. A rapid industrial transition may protect future climate stability but create short-term employment disruption. A low-cost procurement choice may improve immediate affordability while increasing maintenance and environmental costs. These tradeoffs should not be hidden behind a single aggregate score. Leaders should describe the values involved, identify alternatives, and make the distribution of consequences visible.

The first discipline is to distinguish reversible from irreversible decisions. A pilot, modular installation, or short-term contract may preserve the ability to learn. A large long-lived asset can lock in emissions, land use, or technological dependence. Irreversibility does not make a decision wrong, but it increases the need for evidence, safeguards, and participation before commitment. Scenario analysis is especially valuable where future regulation, technology, or demand is uncertain.

The second discipline is to distinguish efficiency from sufficiency. Efficiency asks how to provide a service with fewer resources; sufficiency asks what level and pattern of consumption is necessary for well-being. Efficiency can lower cost and emissions, but lower cost may stimulate additional demand. Organizations should therefore consider whether efficiency gains will be used to expand output, reduce environmental pressure, improve affordability, or some combination. The answer affects the design of targets and incentives.

The third discipline is to consider rebound and displacement. A company may reduce emissions within its own facilities while outsourcing the same activity to suppliers. A city may electrify vehicles while expanding road capacity and congestion. A financial institution may sell a carbon-intensive asset and report a better portfolio while the asset continues operating under another owner. Sustainability claims should examine system boundaries and whether the intervention changes total impact rather than only the reported boundary.

The fourth discipline is to protect minimum standards. Negotiation is appropriate when stakeholders compare better pathways, but some outcomes should not be traded away for economic convenience. Safety, basic rights, non-discrimination, legal compliance, and the prevention of severe ecological harm create boundaries for optimization. A responsible transition identifies these limits explicitly. It does not allow a favorable cost-benefit calculation to justify conduct that violates fundamental obligations.

The fifth discipline is to use time intelligently. Delaying action can preserve options, but it can also increase cumulative damage, lock-in, and future cost. Acting quickly can create learning and momentum, but it can also produce poorly designed assets or social backlash. The appropriate question is not simply whether to act now or later. It is which actions should begin immediately, which require further evidence, which should be sequenced, and what trigger would change the decision.

These disciplines help leaders avoid two extremes. One extreme treats sustainability as a reason to suspend all innovation until certainty is complete. The other treats uncertainty as permission to continue without safeguards. A mature strategy combines precaution with experimentation. It acts where evidence is strong, pilots where learning is needed, protects people from severe harm, and revises decisions when conditions change. This is the practical meaning of adaptive sustainability management.

From commitments to a living transition plan

A transition plan becomes real when it enters the ordinary calendar of management. The annual strategy cycle should review climate and ESG dependencies alongside markets, technology, finance, and talent. The capital-planning cycle should test whether proposed investments are compatible with the pathway. Procurement should ask suppliers for credible data and improvement plans. Human resources should link workforce planning to changing occupations. Risk management should monitor both physical exposure and transition assumptions.

The plan should be written in a way that allows a new manager to understand it without relying on informal memory. It should state the baseline, boundary, objective, milestones, responsible owner, resources, dependencies, and escalation route. It should identify what is known, what is estimated, and what remains uncertain. It should also record stakeholder concerns and the organization's response. Documentation is not an administrative burden when it protects continuity and prevents each generation from starting the analysis again.

A living plan is reviewed after material events. A flood may change the assessment of site resilience. A new technology may alter the cost of electrification. A policy change may affect carbon exposure. A labor shortage may make a proposed schedule unrealistic. A community agreement may require redesign. Review does not weaken commitment; it tests whether the chosen pathway remains capable of delivering the intended outcome. The organization should explain changes rather than quietly moving the goalposts.

Implementation benefits from a small number of visible priorities. Too many targets can disperse attention and create reporting fatigue. A focused portfolio might combine energy efficiency, renewable procurement, worker capability, supply-chain due diligence, and community engagement. Each priority should have a clear owner and a cross-functional team. Progress should be reported in language that operational staff can use, not only in specialist sustainability terminology.

The final test is whether the plan improves the organization's relationship with its environment. It should help the organization use fewer resources, withstand shocks, create meaningful work, provide reliable services, and participate fairly in the communities on which it depends. If a plan produces impressive metrics but worsens trust or increases hidden burdens, it requires correction. Sustainability is achieved through the alignment of results, relationships, and responsibility over time.

ESG integration across the energy-transition cycle

Transition phase	Primary strategic task	ESG questions
Diagnose	Map dependencies, impacts, exposures, and stakeholders.	What is material, for whom, and over what time horizon?
Design	Select technologies, pathways, financing, and operating changes.	Are options environmentally credible, socially fair, and governable?
Invest	Allocate capital and build assets, skills, and partnerships.	Who bears cost, who benefits, and how are risks controlled?
Operate	Deliver reliable services and manage performance.	Do indicators reflect real outcomes, distribution, and safety?
Adapt	Review evidence, respond to shocks, and revise plans.	Can the organization learn, explain setbacks, and change course?

Organizational maturity for sustainability and transition

Level	Characteristic	Management priority
Emerging	Fragmented initiatives and reactive reporting.	Establish materiality, ownership, baseline data, and minimum controls.
Managed	Policies, targets, owners, and basic measurement exist.	Connect targets to budgets, incentives, procurement, and risk.
Integrated	Sustainability shapes strategy and operating decisions.	Scale transition investments and strengthen assurance and stakeholder trust.

Level	Characteristic	Management priority
Adaptive	The organization learns across systems and anticipates change.	Build resilience, innovation ecosystems, and long-term strategic legacy.

References

- Bansal, P., & DesJardine, M. R. (2014). Business sustainability: It is about time. *Strategic Organization*, 12(1), 70–78. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476127013520265>
- Dyllick, T., & Hockerts, K. (2002). Beyond the business case for corporate sustainability. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 11(2), 130–141. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.323>
- Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2014). The impact of a corporate culture of sustainability on corporate behavior and performance. *Management Science*, 60(11), 2835–2857. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2014.1984>
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.
- Friede, G., Busch, T., & Bassen, A. (2015). ESG and financial performance: Aggregated evidence from more than 2,000 empirical studies. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, 5(4), 210–233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20430795.2015.1118917>
- Geels, F. W. (2002). Technological transitions as evolutionary reconfiguration processes: A multi-level perspective and a case-study. *Research Policy*, 31(8–9), 1257–1274. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333\(02\)00062-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(02)00062-8)
- Geels, F. W. (2011). The multi-level perspective on sustainability transitions: Responses to seven criticisms. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 1(1), 24–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2011.02.001>
- Gillan, S. L., Koch, A., & Starks, L. T. (2021). Firms and social responsibility: A review of ESG and CSR research in corporate finance. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 66, 101889. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2021.101889>
- Hart, S. L. (1995). A natural-resource-based view of the firm. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(4), 986–1014. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9512280033>
- Heffron, R. J., & McCauley, D. (2018). What is the ‘just transition’? *Geoforum*, 88, 74–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.11.016>
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2022). *Climate change 2022: Mitigation of climate change*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157926>
- International Energy Agency. (2023). *Net zero roadmap: A global pathway to keep the 1.5 °C goal in reach*. <https://www.iea.org/reports/net-zero-roadmap-a-global-pathway-to-keep-the-15-c-goal-in-reach>
- Jenkins, K., McCauley, D., Heffron, R., Stephan, H., & Rehner, R. (2016). Energy justice: A conceptual review. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 11, 174–182. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2015.10.004>
- Khan, M., Serafeim, G., & Yoon, A. (2016). Corporate sustainability: First evidence on materiality. *The Accounting Review*, 91(6), 1697–1724. <https://doi.org/10.2308/accr-51383>
- Markard, J. (2018). The next phase of the energy transition and its implications for research and policy. *Nature Energy*, 3, 628–633. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41560-018-0171-7>
- Markard, J., Raven, R., & Truffer, B. (2012). Sustainability transitions: An emerging field of research and its prospects. *Research Policy*, 41(6), 955–967. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2012.02.013>
- Montiel, I. (2008). Corporate social responsibility and corporate sustainability: Separate pasts, common futures. *Organization & Environment*, 21(3), 245–269. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026608321329>
- Newell, P., & Mulvaney, D. (2013). The political economy of the ‘just transition’. *The Geographical Journal*, 179(2), 132–140. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12008>
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(1–2), 62–77.
- Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin, F. S., III, Lambin, E. F., Lenton, T. M., Scheffer, M., Folke, C., Schellnhuber, H. J., Nykvist, B., de Wit, C. A., Hughes, T., van der Leeuw, S., Rodhe, H., Sörlin, S., Snyder, P.

- K., Costanza, R., Svedin, U., ... Foley, J. A. (2009). A safe operating space for humanity. *Ecology and Society*, 14(2), Article 32. <https://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol14/iss2/art32/>
- Steffen, W., Richardson, K., Rockström, J., Cornell, S. E., Fetzer, I., Bennett, E. M., Biggs, R., Carpenter, S. R., de Vries, W., de Wit, C. A., Folke, C., Gerten, D., Heinke, J., Mace, G. M., Persson, L. M., Ramanathan, V., Reyers, B., & Sörlin, S. (2015). Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet. *Science*, 347(6223), 1259855. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1259855>
- Sovacool, B. K. (2016). How long will it take? Conceptualizing the temporal dynamics of energy transitions. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 13, 202–215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2015.12.020>
- Wüstenhagen, R., Wolsink, M., & Bürer, M. J. (2007). Social acceptance of renewable energy innovation: An introduction to the concept. *Energy Policy*, 35(5), 2683–2691. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2006.12.001>