

Climate Disclosure as an Organizational Capability

Steven Turner - Corresponding author

Abstract

This management review examines climate disclosure as an organizational capability. The organizing question is how firms can connect reported climate information to strategy, capital allocation, operations, and accountability. Ten related scholarly sources are synthesized through a decision-centered framework spanning problem definition, mechanism, measurement, evaluation, implementation, and governance. The review does not invent experiments, pooled estimates, or unreported quantitative results. It instead evaluates the strength and transferability of the available evidence, with particular attention to treating disclosure volume as evidence of organizational capability or environmental performance. The resulting framework links technical or empirical performance to explicit use conditions and identifies tests that should precede wider adoption in corporate climate strategy and sustainable finance.

Keywords: climate disclosure, corporate governance, organizational capability, sustainability, assurance

Synthesis lens	Principal question
Mechanism	the chain from measurement boundaries and scenario analysis through governance, controls, assurance, and decisions
Evaluation	comparability, materiality, estimation uncertainty, strategic consistency, and evidence of operational response
Primary risk	treating disclosure volume as evidence of organizational capability or environmental performance

1. Introduction

Research on climate disclosure as an organizational capability sits at the boundary between a promising component and a consequential decision. The core question is how firms can connect reported climate information to strategy, capital allocation, operations, and accountability. Answering it requires more than assembling favorable results. It requires a chain of evidence that makes the problem boundary, mechanism, measurement, comparator, uncertainty, and accountable decision visible to the reader.

This article presents a structured narrative review of ten related publications. Sources were selected for topical relevance, traceable publication metadata, and complementary coverage of technical, empirical, and governance questions. No meta-analytic pooling is attempted because the included studies differ in designs, populations, system boundaries, and outcomes. The purpose is decision-oriented synthesis: to identify what each source can support, where transfer remains uncertain, and which evidence would justify the next stage of use.

The central risk is treating disclosure volume as evidence of organizational capability or environmental performance. A top-line metric or broad policy label can appear decisive while concealing the conditions that produced it. Accordingly, the synthesis separates observation from interpretation and implementation from validation. This separation is especially important when the same system creates benefits for one user or institution while transferring cost, risk, or administrative burden to another.

2. Evidence Base and Problem Boundary

A defensible review begins by defining the unit of analysis. For the present topic, the relevant boundary includes inputs, institutional or technical context, the mechanism producing an output, the person or system acting on that output, and the downstream outcome. Evidence falls outside the boundary when it measures only an intermediate proxy yet is used to claim an end-to-end benefit.

Ben-Amar et al. (2015) addresses "Board Gender Diversity and Corporate Response to Sustainability Initiatives: Evidence from the Carbon Disclosure Project." In this synthesis, that work is used as a source on problem definition within climate disclosure as an organizational capability. The connection is deliberately bounded: the cited study informs the evidence map, but it does not by itself establish readiness for corporate climate strategy and sustainable finance. That distinction keeps the review close to the published record and prevents an adjacent result from being converted into a broader causal claim.

Palea and Drogo (2020) addresses "Carbon emissions and the cost of debt in the eurozone: The role of public policies, climate-related disclosure and corporate governance." In this synthesis, that work is used as a source on conceptual boundary within climate disclosure as an organizational capability. The connection is deliberately bounded: the cited study informs the evidence map, but it does not by itself establish readiness for corporate climate strategy and sustainable finance. That distinction keeps the review close to the published record and prevents an adjacent result from being converted into a broader causal claim.

Toukabri and Youssef (2022) addresses "Climate change disclosure and sustainable development goals (SDGs) of the 2030 agenda: the moderating role of corporate governance." In this synthesis, that work is used as a source on measurement within climate disclosure as an organizational capability. The connection is deliberately bounded: the cited study informs the evidence map, but it does not by itself establish readiness for corporate climate strategy and sustainable finance. That distinction keeps the review close to the published record and prevents an adjacent result from being converted into a broader causal claim.

Together, these works provide complementary entry points, but their conclusions should not be flattened into a single ranking. Differences in data generation, setting, temporal horizon, and outcome definition may be substantively meaningful. A review should therefore preserve those differences and state where analogy, rather than direct replication, connects one domain to another.

3. Mechanism and System Design

The operative mechanism is the chain from measurement boundaries and scenario analysis through governance, controls, assurance, and decisions. This formulation discourages component-only reasoning. A model, platform, policy, assay, or infrastructure service acquires practical meaning only when its interfaces and use conditions are specified. The evidence chain should describe what information is available, what transformation occurs, which assumptions make that transformation credible, and who is authorized to act.

Cosma et al. (2022) addresses "Sustainable governance and climate-change disclosure in European banking: the role of the corporate social responsibility committee." In this synthesis, that work is used as a source on system mechanism within climate disclosure as an organizational capability. The connection is deliberately bounded: the cited study informs the evidence map, but it does not by itself establish readiness for corporate climate strategy and sustainable finance. That distinction keeps the review close to the published record and prevents an adjacent result from being converted into a broader causal claim.

Haque et al. (2016) addresses "Demand for, and impediments to, the disclosure of information about climate change-related corporate governance practices." In this synthesis, that work is used as a source on representation choice within climate disclosure as an organizational capability. The connection is deliberately bounded: the cited study informs the evidence map, but it does not by itself establish readiness for corporate climate strategy and sustainable finance. That distinction keeps the review close to the published record and prevents an adjacent result from being converted into a broader causal claim.

Gebhardt et al. (2024) addresses "Climate reporting in the fast lane? The impact of corporate governance on the disclosure of climate-related risks and opportunities." In this synthesis, that work is used as a source on failure analysis within climate disclosure as an organizational capability. The connection is deliberately bounded: the cited study informs the evidence map, but it does not by itself establish readiness for corporate climate strategy and sustainable finance. That distinction keeps the review close to the published record and prevents an adjacent result from being converted into a broader causal claim.

These studies also show why modular claims require interface tests. A component may perform well while the complete pathway fails because inputs drift, users interpret outputs differently, recovery semantics are ambiguous, or institutional incentives change. Design documentation should therefore include not only the intended pathway but also foreseeable deviations, degraded modes, and conditions under which the system should stop or defer.

4. Evaluation and Uncertainty

Evaluation should center on comparability, materiality, estimation uncertainty, strategic consistency, and evidence of operational response. Average performance remains useful, but it should be accompanied by distributions, error categories, relevant subgroups or operating regimes, and uncertainty at the point where a decision changes. Comparators must isolate the value of the proposed addition rather than compare a mature intervention with an intentionally weak baseline.

Dilling et al. (2024) addresses "The Impact of Corporate Characteristics on Climate Governance Disclosure." In this synthesis,

that work is used as a source on comparative evaluation within climate disclosure as an organizational capability. The connection is deliberately bounded: the cited study informs the evidence map, but it does not by itself establish readiness for corporate climate strategy and sustainable finance. That distinction keeps the review close to the published record and prevents an adjacent result from being converted into a broader causal claim.

Krueger et al. (2019) addresses "The Importance of Climate Risks for Institutional Investors." In this synthesis, that work is used as a source on uncertainty within climate disclosure as an organizational capability. The connection is deliberately bounded: the cited study informs the evidence map, but it does not by itself establish readiness for corporate climate strategy and sustainable finance. That distinction keeps the review close to the published record and prevents an adjacent result from being converted into a broader causal claim.

External validation should introduce meaningful shifts in setting, time, population, workload, market structure, or environmental conditions. A nominally independent sample can still be too similar to test transfer. Conversely, a failed transfer is scientifically informative when the changed conditions are measured and the mechanism of failure is examined rather than hidden in an aggregate score.

5. Translation and Governance

Translation to corporate climate strategy and sustainable finance depends on more than technical readiness. Decision rights, documentation, maintenance, monitoring, appeal, and recovery are part of the intervention. The governance requirement is board oversight, organizational controls, assurance, incentive alignment, and correction of prior statements. Each control should be connected to a named failure mode and should identify an owner, evidence source, review interval, and escalation path.

Honey et al. (2024) addresses "The impact of governance quality on corporate climate risk disclosure: The role of the governance committee." In this synthesis, that work is used as a source on implementation within climate disclosure as an organizational capability. The connection is deliberately bounded: the cited study informs the evidence map, but it does not by itself establish readiness for corporate climate strategy and sustainable finance. That distinction keeps the review close to the published record and prevents an adjacent result from being converted into a broader causal claim.

Alsayegh et al. (2020) addresses "Corporate Economic, Environmental, and Social Sustainability Performance Transformation through ESG Disclosure." In this synthesis, that work is used as a source on governance within climate disclosure as an organizational capability. The connection is deliberately bounded: the cited study informs the evidence map, but it does not by itself establish readiness for corporate climate strategy and sustainable finance. That distinction keeps the review close to the published record and prevents an adjacent result from being converted into a broader causal claim.

A credible implementation plan also defines sunset and revalidation conditions. New data, software updates, institutional restructuring, population change, or shifts in incentives can invalidate previously reasonable assumptions. Monitoring should therefore test the validity of the evidence chain, not merely whether a service remains online or a headline metric remains stable.

6. Research Agenda

Future studies should preregister or otherwise predefine the intended decision, principal outcomes, exclusions, and analysis plan when feasible. They should report missingness, sensitivity analyses, negative or null findings, and the cost of errors to differently situated stakeholders. Reproducible artifacts should include sufficient metadata to reconstruct data provenance, model or analytical versions, parameter choices, and the sequence from evidence to conclusion.

Cross-disciplinary work needs a shared object of explanation rather than a collection of adjacent vocabularies. For climate disclosure as an organizational capability, that shared object is the complete decision pathway. Technical, clinical, social, environmental, or economic expertise should each change the design or interpretation of the study. When evidence remains incomplete, the useful output is a bounded hypothesis, a transparent uncertainty statement, or a request for additional measurement.

7. Conclusion

The literature supports a disciplined approach to climate disclosure as an organizational capability: define the decision, preserve system boundaries, test consequential failure modes, connect uncertainty to action, and assign accountable control. The strongest conclusion is not that one method is universally superior. It is that credible use in corporate climate strategy and sustainable finance requires an auditable link from source evidence to design choice, evaluation result, and governed decision.

References

- Alsayegh, M. F., Rahman, R. A., & Homayoun, S. (2020). Corporate Economic, Environmental, and Social Sustainability Performance Transformation through ESG Disclosure. *Sustainability*, 12(9), 3910. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12093910>
- Ben-Amar, W., Chang, M., & McIlkenny, P. (2015). Board Gender Diversity and Corporate Response to Sustainability Initiatives: Evidence from the Carbon Disclosure Project. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 142(2), 369-383. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2759-1>
- Cosma, S., Principale, S., & Venturelli, A. (2022). Sustainable governance and climate-change disclosure in European banking: the role of the corporate social responsibility committee. *Corporate Governance*, 22(6), 1345-1369. <https://doi.org/10.1108/cg-09-2021-0331>
- Dilling, P. F. A., Harris, P., & Caykoylu, S. (2024). The Impact of Corporate Characteristics on Climate Governance Disclosure. *Sustainability*, 16(5), 1962. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16051962>
- Gebhardt, M., Schneider, A., Siedler, F., Ottenstein, P., & Zülch, H. (2024). Climate reporting in the fast lane? The impact of corporate governance on the disclosure of climate-related risks and opportunities. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 33(7), 7253-7272. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.3852>
- Haque, S., Deegan, C., & Inglis, R. (2016). Demand for, and impediments to, the disclosure of information about climate change-related corporate governance practices. *Accounting and Business Research*, 46(6), 620-664. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00014788.2015.1133276>
- Honey, D., Ahsan, T., & Migliori, S. (2024). The impact of governance quality on corporate climate risk disclosure: The role of the governance committee. *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 98, 103901. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2024.103901>
- Krueger, P., Sautner, Z., & Starks, L. T. (2019). The Importance of Climate Risks for Institutional Investors. *Review of Financial Studies*, 33(3), 1067-1111. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhz137>
- Palea, V., & Drogo, F. (2020). Carbon emissions and the cost of debt in the eurozone: The role of public policies, climate-related disclosure and corporate governance. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 29(8), 2953-2972. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2550>
- Toukabri, M., & Youssef, M. A. M. (2022). Climate change disclosure and sustainable development goals (SDGs) of the 2030 agenda: the moderating role of corporate governance. *Journal of Information Communication and*

Ethics in Society, 21(1), 30-62. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jices-02-2022-0016>