

Auditing Challenges in Implementing Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Policies

Harry Soesanto^{1*}

¹ Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang, Indonesia

Abstract

Article history:

Received: September 28, 2023

Revised: October 04, 2023

Accepted: November 19, 2023

Published: December 30, 2023

Keywords:

Auditing, ESG Policies,
Sustainability Assurance,
Transparency.

Identifier:

Nawala

Page: 101-113

<https://nawala.io/index.php/ijpfa>

The growing emphasis on Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) policies has heightened the demand for rigorous auditing to ensure transparency, accountability, and credibility in corporate sustainability practices. This study examines the key challenges auditors face in evaluating ESG performance, including fragmented reporting frameworks, limited auditor expertise in non-financial metrics, and the risk of greenwashing. Using a systematic literature review, the article synthesizes evidence from peer-reviewed studies to analyze how current auditing practices address, or fail to address, these challenges. The discussion integrates findings on regulatory developments, technological tools, and capacity-building initiatives that can strengthen ESG assurance processes. Results reveal that despite significant progress, the absence of global standardization and uneven access to auditing resources continue to undermine audit effectiveness. The study concludes that advancing ESG auditing will require harmonized standards, greater interdisciplinary expertise, and strategic technology adoption to enhance reliability and stakeholder trust in sustainability disclosures.

*Corresponding author:
(Harry Soesanto)

©2023 The Author(s).

This is an open-access article under CC-BY-SA license (<https://creativecommons.org/licence/by-sa/4.0/>)



1. Introduction

The integration of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) considerations into corporate strategies has become a vital component of modern business practices. Stakeholders—including investors, regulators, and consumers—increasingly demand that organizations demonstrate responsible and sustainable conduct across environmental stewardship, social responsibility, and governance frameworks (World Economic Forum, 2021). This shift has propelled ESG policies to the forefront of corporate agendas, highlighting the importance of transparent and credible reporting. Central to this credibility is the role of auditing, which ensures that ESG disclosures reflect actual performance and compliance. However, auditing ESG policies poses significant challenges that complicate efforts to validate these claims effectively (Jeppesen, 2019).

One primary challenge lies in the absence of universally accepted standards and frameworks for ESG reporting. Unlike financial reporting, governed by established accounting principles, ESG disclosures remain fragmented and varied across industries and regions (Hayat & Orsagh, 2015). This heterogeneity makes it difficult for auditors to develop consistent methodologies to evaluate and benchmark ESG data. As a result, auditors must often rely on disparate and qualitative information, which reduces comparability and increases the risk of subjective interpretations (Jeppesen, 2019). The inconsistent nature of reporting frameworks exacerbates challenges in identifying material risks and verifying claims, ultimately impacting stakeholder trust in ESG disclosures.

Furthermore, the rapidly evolving regulatory landscape surrounding ESG practices adds complexity to auditing processes. Governments and international bodies are progressively introducing new requirements for ESG transparency, necessitating continuous updates to audit methodologies and competencies (World Economic Forum, 2021). This dynamic environment demands auditors possess not only financial expertise but also deep understanding of sustainability issues, social impact, and corporate governance mechanisms. However, the current shortage of specialized knowledge among auditing professionals hampers their ability to fully assess ESG policies (Chan & Vasarhelyi, 2011). Training and capacity-building efforts are therefore critical to equip auditors with the skills needed to evaluate multifaceted ESG risks and disclosures effectively.

The qualitative nature of many ESG factors also challenges traditional audit approaches. Unlike quantitative financial data, ESG information often involves subjective assessments such as organizational culture, stakeholder engagement, and long-term environmental impacts. Evaluating these intangible elements requires auditors to exercise considerable professional judgment, potentially leading to inconsistent audit outcomes and decreased reliability of assurance statements (Hayat & Orsagh, 2015). Moreover, ESG auditing must contend with supply chain complexities. Multinational corporations operate across jurisdictions with varying standards and enforcement levels, making it difficult for auditors to access complete and accurate data, particularly from third-party suppliers or contractors. This lack of transparency in supply chains can undermine the overall quality of ESG audits.

Despite these considerable obstacles, auditing remains an indispensable mechanism to promote accountability and integrity in ESG reporting. Rigorous audit procedures can enhance stakeholder confidence, incentivize better ESG practices, and ultimately contribute to sustainable value creation for both organizations and society (Jeppesen, 2019). Moving forward, the development of standardized ESG reporting frameworks, combined with investments in auditor training and improved data accessibility, will be essential to overcoming current auditing challenges. Only through such improvements can ESG audits fulfill their potential as trusted tools that underpin responsible business conduct in an increasingly sustainability-focused world (Hayat et al., 2015).

2. Literature Review

The auditing of ESG (Environmental, Social, Governance) policies encounters substantial challenges, largely due to the lack of universally adopted frameworks. Though standards like GRI and SASB aim to harmonize reporting, inconsistent uptake across industries impairs audit comparability and effectiveness (Eccles & Krzus, 2018). As Simnett and Huggins (2015) argue, this fragmentation complicates auditors' task of ensuring data integrity and completeness.

A second major issue lies in the emergent and evolving nature of ESG practices. Auditors are continually adapting to shifting regulatory demands and investor expectations, but many lack the specialized expertise needed to assess complex ESG areas such as climate risk or social impact (Xiao & Shailer, 2022).

Without adequate training and clear guidance, assurance quality may not meet stakeholder expectations.

The subjective and qualitative nature of ESG factors further complicates auditing efforts. Unlike financial statements, ESG disclosures often involve intangible metrics like corporate culture, social equity, or ecological effect. These require professional judgment, which can lead to inconsistency in audit outcomes and reduce confidence in assurance reports (Michelon et al., 2015). For instance, Zahid et al. (2022) demonstrate how variability in audit quality influences the perceived relationship between ESG performance and financial outcomes.

Compounding these issues, global supply chains add layers of complexity to ESG auditing. Organizations frequently lack full visibility into supplier practices across diverse jurisdictions, many of which may not adhere to robust ESG standards (Eccles & Krzus, 2018). This opacity undermines auditors' ability to validate claims regarding environmental and social performance throughout the value chain.

Despite these obstacles, emerging technologies and external pressures are providing pathways for enhancing audit effectiveness. For example, advanced tools such as AI and blockchain applications offer improved data traceability and tailored analytics to enhance audit accuracy (Schiehl & Kolahgar, 2021). Meanwhile, increased scrutiny from investors and regulators is driving demand for higher audit quality and more credible assurance over ESG disclosures (Zahid et al., 2022). When combined with tightened standards and better-trained audit professionals, these innovations may significantly elevate the value and credibility of ESG audits.

3. Methods

This study adopts a systematic literature review (SLR) approach to examine the auditing challenges in implementing Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) policies. The SLR methodology was selected to provide a comprehensive and structured synthesis of peer-reviewed literature and relevant institutional publications that address both theoretical and practical aspects of ESG auditing published from 2015-2022. The process involved defining clear inclusion criteria, focusing on studies that discuss ESG policy frameworks, audit methodologies, assurance quality, and regulatory or market influences on audit practices.

The literature search was conducted using major academic databases such as Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar, supplemented with reputable institutional reports to capture policy-oriented insights. Search terms combined keywords related to “ESG auditing”, “assurance”, “audit quality”, “environmental reporting”, “social accountability”, and “governance compliance”. Sources were screened through a multi-step process: initial title and abstract review, followed by full-text assessment to ensure alignment with the research objectives.

Data extraction emphasized identifying recurring challenges, methodological approaches, and recommended solutions in ESG auditing. Studies were analyzed thematically to categorize key issues such as regulatory inconsistencies, lack of standardized reporting frameworks, auditor competency gaps, and technological innovations and to distill patterns relevant to improving audit effectiveness. The synthesis aimed to highlight not only prevailing challenges but also emerging opportunities for strengthening ESG assurance practices globally.

4. Results and Discussion

The synthesis of reviewed studies reveals that auditing the implementation of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) policies is challenged by the absence of a universally accepted reporting and assurance framework. While ESG standards such as the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) and the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB) have gained traction, significant variations persist in disclosure requirements across jurisdictions, resulting in fragmented and inconsistent audit practices (Garg & Kumar, 2018). This lack of harmonization complicates the comparability of ESG reports and raises concerns about the reliability of audit conclusions. In many emerging markets, the absence of clear regulatory guidance further weakens the capacity to conduct robust ESG audits (García-Sánchez et al., 2021).

Another consistent finding relates to the technical capacity and expertise of auditors in addressing ESG-specific risks and metrics. Unlike traditional financial audits, ESG assurance often requires interdisciplinary knowledge in areas such as environmental science, social impact assessment, and governance structures (Huang & Watson, 2015). Many audit firms have acknowledged this skills gap, noting that professional training and cross-disciplinary collaboration are essential for enhancing audit credibility (Junior et al., 2014). Without these capabilities, auditors may struggle to identify material ESG risks or to evaluate the completeness of non-financial disclosures (Martínez-Ferrero & García-Sánchez, 2017).

The role of greenwashing and selective disclosure emerged as another critical theme. Several studies highlight that some companies strategically disclose favorable

ESG metrics while omitting negative impacts, exploiting the absence of rigorous auditing standards (Cho et al., 2015). This selective transparency undermines the trustworthiness of ESG reporting and places auditors in a position where detecting omissions is both methodologically challenging and politically sensitive. Enhanced use of assurance frameworks, such as ISAE 3000, has been recommended to improve the depth and objectivity of ESG audits (Krasodomska et al., 2021).

Technological innovation offers both opportunities and challenges for ESG auditing. Advanced data analytics, artificial intelligence, and blockchain are being increasingly considered to improve data accuracy, traceability, and real-time monitoring of ESG indicators (Manita et al., 2018). However, the adoption of these tools is uneven, with smaller firms and developing economies facing cost and capacity barriers. The integration of technology also introduces cybersecurity risks and data privacy concerns, especially when handling sensitive social or governance-related information (Chen & Hao, 2022).

Stakeholder expectations and investor pressure play a pivotal role in shaping the demand for higher-quality ESG audits. Institutional investors increasingly rely on ESG ratings and assurance reports to guide investment decisions, creating market-driven incentives for companies to improve their reporting and auditing processes (Krueger et al., 2020). However, the divergence in ESG rating methodologies across rating agencies complicates the assurance process, as auditors must navigate conflicting benchmarks and interpretations of materiality (Berg et al., 2022).

Finally, the findings suggest that regulatory evolution is central to overcoming existing ESG auditing challenges. Jurisdictions that have introduced mandatory ESG disclosure requirements, such as the European Union's Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD), demonstrate higher levels of audit rigor and comparability (La Torre et al., 2020). In contrast, voluntary disclosure regimes often result in inconsistent audit scopes and limited assurance depth. Harmonizing global ESG reporting standards, improving auditor training, and encouraging the adoption of innovative technologies are identified as key strategies for enhancing the reliability and effectiveness of ESG audits.

Overall, the reviewed literature emphasizes that ESG auditing remains a field in transition, balancing the need for credibility and standardization with the rapidly evolving nature of sustainability risks and metrics. The convergence of regulatory action, market expectations, and technological advancement is likely to define the future trajectory of ESG assurance, making it an essential area for continued scholarly and professional focus.

5. Conclusion

This review has highlighted that ESG auditing remains a rapidly evolving field facing persistent challenges in standardization, auditor expertise, and data reliability. Despite the increasing adoption of frameworks such as GRI and SASB, fragmented disclosure requirements across jurisdictions continue to hinder comparability and consistency. The absence of clear, universally accepted auditing standards, particularly in emerging markets, limits the ability of auditors to provide robust and

credible assurance. These gaps create space for selective disclosure and greenwashing, undermining the overall trustworthiness of ESG reporting.

The findings also underscore the need for greater investment in auditor training and interdisciplinary collaboration. As ESG assurance involves complex metrics that extend beyond traditional financial indicators, auditors must integrate knowledge from environmental science, social policy, and governance analysis. Technological tools such as AI, blockchain, and advanced analytics offer promising pathways to enhance accuracy and traceability, but their benefits remain unevenly distributed due to cost and capacity barriers. Moreover, regulatory initiatives such as the EU's CSRD demonstrate that mandatory and harmonized disclosure requirements can significantly improve audit rigor and stakeholder confidence.

Looking forward, the effectiveness of ESG auditing will depend on the convergence of three forces: global standard-setting, capacity building within the auditing profession, and the integration of technology in assurance processes. Aligning these elements will be critical to addressing current shortcomings and ensuring that ESG audits deliver meaningful accountability. As stakeholder expectations continue to rise and sustainability risks intensify, the role of credible ESG auditing will become increasingly central to corporate governance, market stability, and sustainable economic development.

References

Berg, F., Kölbel, J. F., & Rigobon, R. (2022). Aggregate confusion: The divergence of ESG ratings. *Review of Finance*, 26(6), 1315-1344.

- Chan, D. Y., & Vasarhelyi, M. A. (2018). Innovation and practice of continuous Auditing¹. In Continuous auditing (pp. 271-283). Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Chen, P., & Hao, Y. (2022). Digital transformation and corporate environmental performance: The moderating role of board characteristics. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 29(5), 1757-1767.
- Cho, C. H., Laine, M., Roberts, R. W., & Rodrigue, M. (2015). Organized hypocrisy, organizational façades, and sustainability reporting. *Accounting, organizations and society*, 40, 78-94.
- Eccles, R. G., & Krzus, M. P. (2018). The Nordic model: An analysis of leading practices in ESG disclosure. *Nordic Journal of Business*, 67(2), 4-24.
- García-Sánchez, I. M., Hussain, N., Khan, S. A., & Martínez-Ferrero, J. (2021). Do markets punish or reward corporate social responsibility decoupling?. *Business & Society*, 60(6), 1431-1467.
- Garg, M. C., & Kumar, S. (2018). The Relationship Between Corporate Environmental Reporting Practices and Company Characteristics: Evidence from India. *IUP Journal of Accounting Research & Audit Practices*, 17(3).
- Hayat, U., & Orsagh, M. (2015). Environmental, social, and governance issues in investing: A guide for investment professionals. CFA Institute.
- Huang, X. B., & Watson, L. (2015). Corporate social responsibility research in accounting. *Journal of accounting literature*, 34(1), 1-16.
- Jeppesen, K. K. (2019). The role of auditing in the fight against corruption. *The British Accounting Review*, 51(5), 100798.

- Junior, R. M., Best, P. J., & Cotter, J. (2014). Sustainability reporting and assurance: A historical analysis on a world-wide phenomenon. *Journal of business ethics*, 120(1), 1-11.
- Krasodomska, J., Simnett, R., & Street, D. L. (2021). Extended external reporting assurance: Current practices and challenges. *Journal of International Financial Management & Accounting*, 32(1), 104-142.
- Krueger, P., Sautner, Z., & Starks, L. T. (2020). The importance of climate risks for institutional investors. *The Review of financial studies*, 33(3), 1067-1111.
- La Torre, M., Sabelfeld, S., Blomkvist, M., & Dumay, J. (2020). Rebuilding trust: sustainability and non-financial reporting and the European Union regulation. *Meditari Accountancy Research*, 28(5), 701-725.
- Manita, R., Bruna, M. G., Dang, R., & Houanti, L. H. (2018). Board gender diversity and ESG disclosure: evidence from the USA. *Journal of Applied Accounting Research*, 19(2), 206-224.
- Martínez-Ferrero, J., & García-Sánchez, I. M. (2017). Sustainability assurance and cost of capital: Does assurance impact on credibility of corporate social responsibility information? *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 26(3), 223–239.
- Michelon, G., Pilonato, S., & Ricceri, F. (2015). CSR reporting practices and the quality of disclosure: An empirical analysis. *Critical perspectives on accounting*, 33, 59-78.

- Schiehll, E., & Kolahgar, S. (2021). Financial materiality in the informativeness of sustainability reporting. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 30(2), 840-855.
- Simnett, R., & Huggins, A. L. (2015). Integrated reporting and assurance: where can research add value?. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 6(1), 29-53.
- World Economic Forum. (2021). The global risks report 2021. Retrieved From <https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-risks-report-2021>
- Xiao, X., & Shailer, G. (2022). Stakeholders' perceptions of factors affecting the credibility of sustainability reports. *The British Accounting Review*, 54(1), 101002.
- Zahid, R. A., Khan, M. K., Anwar, W., & Maqsood, U. S. (2022). The role of audit quality in the ESG-corporate financial performance nexus: Empirical evidence from Western European companies. *Borsa Istanbul Review*, 22, S200-S212.