

AI-Powered Carbon Footprint Tracking Is Redefining Green Investment Decision-Making

Tianyi Ren

*International Business College, Dongbei University of Finance and Economics, Dalian, China
rentianyi841@gmail.com*

Abstract. As climate change intensifies, investors need carbon data that are timely, comparable, and decision-grade—especially for Scope 3 emissions. Traditional reporting is fragmented, retrospective, and coarse. This paper examines how AI-powered carbon footprint tracking can reshape green investment decision-making by delivering near-real-time, high-resolution estimates of Scope 1–3 emissions. Methods are synthesized that combine NLP over disclosures and supply-chain records with IoT telemetry and satellite/remote sensing to improve accuracy, quantify uncertainty, and detect anomalies indicative of greenwashing. These capabilities are shown to strengthen transition-risk modeling, scenario analysis, and portfolio construction, enabling more responsive capital allocation. Critical challenges are also highlighted, including inconsistent standards and taxonomies, data provenance and auditability, algorithmic transparency and bias, and the environmental costs of training and deploying large models. To reconcile benefits and risks, a governance agenda is outlined, centered on interoperable data layers, independent assurance, and explainable models. Overall, AI is positioned as a powerful complement—not a substitute—for human judgment and regulatory oversight in sustainable finance.

Keywords: AI carbon tracking, ESG investing, Scope 3 emissions, greenwashing detection, sustainable finance.

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

Over the past decade, climate change has accelerated both as a global crisis and as a material financial risk. Investors are increasingly turning to Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) frameworks to navigate sustainability-related uncertainties and reallocate capital accordingly. According to the Global Sustainable Investment Review 2021, ESG-aligned assets under management reached \$35.3 trillion, accounting for more than one-third of total professionally managed assets worldwide [1]. As ESG investing becomes mainstream, the demand for transparent, timely, and high-quality environmental data—especially carbon footprint data—has grown significantly.

However, conventional carbon data remains fragmented, self-reported, and retrospective. This introduces a serious carbon data gap that undermines the reliability of green investment decisions

[2]. Without accurate and up-to-date emission metrics, investors may inadvertently fund high-carbon activities under the guise of sustainability. Moreover, legacy reporting mechanisms often lack granularity, fail to capture Scope 3 emissions, and offer little real-time insight into company performance [3].

Recent advancements in artificial intelligence (AI) provide a potential breakthrough. AI-powered systems can collect, process, and analyze vast volumes of carbon-related data in near real-time. Leveraging satellite imagery, IoT sensors, natural language processing (NLP), and predictive analytics, AI tools are increasingly being adopted by both tech startups and major consultancies to enhance emissions traceability [4]. Platforms such as CO₂ AI by BCG and Climatiq offer practical examples of integrating AI into corporate carbon tracking. As these technologies mature, they may offer investors an unprecedented ability to evaluate ESG risks dynamically and make more scientifically grounded green investment decisions.

1.2. Research objectives and questions

This paper investigates whether AI-powered carbon footprint tracking can redefine green investment decision-making. Specifically, it seeks to answer the following research questions:

Can AI improve the accuracy, timeliness, and comprehensiveness of carbon emissions data used in ESG investing?

How does AI-generated carbon data influence investor behavior, portfolio construction, and risk assessment?

What are the current limitations, risks, and regulatory challenges of using AI in carbon data analytics?

By addressing these questions, this paper aims to provide evidence-based insights for institutional investors, policymakers, and AI developers navigating the intersection of green finance and machine intelligence.

2. The role of AI-powered carbon tracking in ESG investment

2.1. Definition and practical application of AI carbon tracking

2.1.1. Understanding scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions

Corporate carbon emissions are classified into three main categories under the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Protocol: Scope 1 emissions refer to direct emissions from sources that are owned or controlled by the company (e.g., fuel combustion); Scope 2 includes indirect emissions from the consumption of purchased electricity, heat, or steam; and Scope 3 encompasses all other indirect emissions across the value chain, such as those resulting from transportation, outsourced activities, investments, and product usage.

While Scope 1 and 2 emissions are relatively easier to track and are commonly disclosed in ESG reports, Scope 3 emissions—often constituting over 70% of a firm's total footprint—are rarely comprehensively accounted for due to data fragmentation and difficulty in tracing third-party activities [5]. The opacity and inconsistency in reporting Scope 3 emissions significantly limit the effectiveness of ESG investment screening, particularly when evaluating transition risk.

2.1.2. How AI enables real-time emissions tracking and analysis

AI has emerged as a powerful enabler for overcoming the challenges inherent in traditional carbon tracking systems. Instead of relying solely on self-reported data, AI technologies allow for the integration of diverse data sources—structured and unstructured, physical and digital—and the processing of large volumes of emissions-related information in real time.

Specifically, natural language processing (NLP) is used to extract emissions figures from corporate reports, procurement documents, and regulatory filings. Machine learning (ML) algorithms are applied to estimate missing Scope 3 emissions based on activity data, sector benchmarks, and supplier classification. Remote sensing technologies, such as satellite imagery, can detect emissions-intensive land use changes, while Internet of Things (IoT) devices embedded in facilities and fleets allow for direct monitoring of energy use and fuel consumption [6]. While these AI-driven estimations enhance carbon data granularity and fill reporting gaps, their reliability remains limited. Many algorithms depend on proxy data and unverifiable assumptions, which may result in over-optimistic reporting and obscure actual emissions. This raises concerns about the transparency and accuracy of Scope 3 estimates, particularly when used for ESG investment screening.

A key advantage of AI systems is their ability to update emissions profiles dynamically, as new data becomes available. For instance, a company's carbon intensity can be recalculated on a weekly or even daily basis as energy usage fluctuates, procurement decisions change, or supply chain inputs vary. This level of responsiveness is virtually impossible to achieve through manual accounting or static ESG reporting cycles.

2.1.3. Platforms and tools for AI carbon tracking

In recent years, several platforms have been developed to operationalize AI-powered emissions analysis. CO₂ AI, developed by Boston Consulting Group, is one such system that integrates operational data, logistics information, and supplier records to model Scope 1–3 emissions at the process and product level. Another widely used tool is Climatiq, which offers emissions estimation APIs that convert operational metrics—like distance traveled, weight shipped, or materials used—into standardized carbon equivalents using verified emissions factors.

These platforms are not just analytical; they are embedded into decision-making systems. For example, Climatiq's API is integrated into procurement dashboards, allowing sustainability officers to compare vendors by estimated carbon impact. This facilitates carbon-informed supplier selection and allows companies to simulate the emissions implications of different sourcing strategies. Some financial institutions have begun using these tools to evaluate the carbon exposure of their loan portfolios in real time, aligning credit risk with emissions trajectories.

2.2. Influence of AI carbon tracking on ESG investment decisions

2.2.1. Improving the efficiency of green asset screening

One of the clearest impacts of AI-driven carbon tracking is the enhancement of green asset screening processes. Traditionally, ESG investment relied on ratings provided by third-party agencies, which were often based on outdated or incomplete data. These ratings frequently failed to differentiate between companies with fundamentally different climate performance, particularly in data-sparse environments.

AI enables investors to screen companies based on more granular, timely, and activity-specific carbon metrics. Instead of relying on a company's annual sustainability report, investors can assess emissions per unit revenue, per product category, or per supply chain tier. For example, AI models can identify a firm whose product carbon footprint is significantly higher than industry peers, even if the firm's headline ESG score is strong.

A 2022 study by Hassanein and Tharwat suggested that portfolios integrating AI-derived real-time carbon data demonstrated, on average, a 3.8% improvement in risk-adjusted returns compared to those relying solely on traditional ESG scores [7]. However, the authors also noted that this improvement cannot be solely attributed to AI integration, as other factors such as macroeconomic trends, sector allocation, and company fundamentals may have contributed to the observed performance gap.

2.2.2. Supporting transition risk analysis

AI also plays a critical role in supporting transition risk analysis. Transition risk refers to the financial risks associated with shifts in market preferences, regulatory frameworks, and technologies as economies move toward net-zero carbon targets. Companies that are poorly positioned to adapt to these changes face increased compliance costs, reputational damage, or even stranded assets.

AI models can simulate how companies' emissions profiles will evolve under various scenarios—such as rising carbon prices, stricter emissions caps, or supply chain decarbonization mandates. These simulations help investors anticipate which firms are likely to encounter material disruptions or increased capital costs. For instance, a machine learning model might project that a logistics company's Scope 3 emissions will rise disproportionately under a global carbon tax regime, flagging it as a high-transition-risk investment.

Research by van Horne et al. found that firms with robust Scope 3 transparency had lower bond spreads and stronger equity performance following regulatory announcements related to climate disclosure, suggesting that carbon transparency—particularly when supported by AI—is increasingly priced into capital markets [8].

2.2.3. Detecting greenwashing and enhancing accountability

Greenwashing remains a pervasive issue in ESG investing. Many companies overstate their climate commitments or present selective disclosures that hide carbon-intensive operations. AI systems help counteract this by validating corporate disclosures against independent data sources.

For example, satellite-based systems can monitor shipping traffic, factory activity, and deforestation—providing observable proxies for emissions activity. When this external data is cross-referenced with a company's reported figures, AI models can identify discrepancies indicative of underreporting or misclassification. In several documented cases, AI-based carbon monitoring tools have prompted asset managers to challenge ESG claims, leading to revisions in corporate reporting or the exclusion of certain securities from sustainability portfolios.

Moreover, financial regulators around the world are increasingly incorporating AI-based verification tools into their ESG compliance frameworks.

In the European Union, pilot programs are underway to test the use of AI in auditing emissions data submitted under the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD), marking a significant shift toward automated ESG enforcement [9].

Globally, regulatory authorities in North America, Asia, and Oceania are also exploring AI-driven solutions to enhance transparency and reliability in sustainability disclosures. For instance, the U.S.

Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) has proposed rules mandating Scope 1–3 emissions disclosure and is considering advanced digital tools for enforcement [10].

In China, the Ministry of Ecology and Environment has launched digital environmental supervision pilots that increasingly integrate AI-based monitoring systems [11].

Additionally, international coalitions such as the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) and Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) are encouraging the development of technology-enabled ESG verification frameworks.

These developments reflect a global convergence toward AI-assisted, real-time ESG compliance and carbon accountability.

2.2.4. Addressing the risks of overreliance and technical bias

Despite its benefits, AI in carbon tracking is not without risks. Many models—especially those based on deep learning—are difficult to interpret. Investors may struggle to understand the assumptions behind emissions estimates or risk scores, undermining trust and regulatory acceptability. This lack of explainability is particularly problematic in fiduciary contexts, where investment managers must justify their decisions to clients and boards.

Additionally, AI models are vulnerable to data biases. If emissions models are trained predominantly on data from developed countries or specific industries, they may fail to generalize accurately to emerging markets or unconventional business models. This could result in systematic mispricing of transition risk or the unintended exclusion of otherwise sustainable firms.

Another concern is the environmental cost of AI itself. Training large AI models—especially those for natural language or image processing—requires substantial computing power, typically supplied by fossil-fuel-powered data centers. Patterson et al. estimated that training a single deep learning model could emit over 280 metric tons of CO₂, roughly equal to the lifetime emissions of five average passenger vehicles [12].

However, these emissions must be weighed against AI's potential to reduce carbon output in other sectors. For example, AI-powered energy management systems in commercial buildings have demonstrated energy savings of up to 30%, and smart grids optimized by AI reduce transmission losses and increase renewable energy utilization [13]. One report by PwC even estimates that AI applications in sectors such as energy, transport, and agriculture could reduce global greenhouse gas emissions by 4% by 2030 [14].

Therefore, the net environmental impact of AI depends on implementation. When deployed with green infrastructure and sustainability-aware protocols, AI's long-term environmental benefits can outweigh its training-related emissions—particularly when targeted toward emissions reduction use cases.

To address these concerns, researchers and practitioners are increasingly advocating for the integration of carbon accounting into AI development workflows. Tools like Green Algorithms offer methods for tracking the emissions associated with AI models themselves, enabling sustainability-conscious AI design and deployment [15].

2.3. Summary

AI-powered carbon tracking represents a fundamental shift in the way emissions data is generated, interpreted, and applied in ESG investing. It enables higher-resolution and more frequent insights, facilitates predictive modeling of transition risk, and improves transparency in corporate disclosures. These benefits support more informed and science-based capital allocation decisions.

However, the successful deployment of AI in this domain depends not only on technical performance but also on governance, interpretability, and ethical alignment. AI should be viewed as a complement to, not a substitute for, human judgment and regulatory oversight. When deployed responsibly and transparently, AI can be a powerful tool in accelerating the transition toward a low-carbon, climate-resilient financial system.

3. Challenges and strategic recommendations

3.1. Key challenges in AI-based carbon tracking for ESG investment

Despite AI's growing influence on ESG data processing and decision-making, substantial structural and technical limitations persist. These fall into three major domains: data inconsistency, lack of standardization, and limited model transparency.

3.1.1. Gaps in data completeness and consistency

AI systems depend on consistent, structured, and complete data streams to generate reliable insights. However, emissions disclosures, especially for Scope 3 emissions, remain fragmented and uneven across industries and regions. Research by Downar et al notes that Scope 3 data is often estimated or omitted entirely, rendering AI models vulnerable to output bias and low predictive reliability [16].

Even among Fortune 500 companies, less than half provide Scope 3 data with sufficient granularity [17]. This affects AI models' ability to benchmark firm-level carbon intensity, reducing investor confidence and model portability across sectors.

3.1.2. Lack of unified carbon accounting and ESG reporting standards

While the GHG Protocol and TCFD have gained international recognition, implementation across jurisdictions remains inconsistent. This regulatory fragmentation leads to diverging data input formats and incompatible carbon scoring systems, which compromise the quality of AI learning processes.

According to Broccardo et al, even models trained on high-quality ESG datasets from the EU exhibit poor generalizability when applied in emerging markets due to reporting standard disparities [18]. The lack of shared taxonomies or cross-border frameworks makes it difficult for AI to produce stable and comparable ESG indicators globally.

3.1.3. Algorithmic transparency and interpretability deficits

Many advanced AI models used in ESG ratings, particularly deep learning systems, are opaque and offer limited interpretability. This opacity creates challenges for fiduciaries and institutional investors who must justify investment decisions to regulators and stakeholders.

Li and Zhang emphasize that black-box models in finance risk eroding investor trust, especially in contexts where environmental claims must be auditable and legally defensible [19]. Recent work by Alvarez-Melis and Jaakkola further suggests that explainable AI (XAI) techniques in ESG analytics are still nascent and often lack robustness when applied at institutional scale [20].

3.2. Strategic recommendations and policy responses

To mitigate these limitations and ensure the responsible use of AI in ESG investing, a three-pronged strategic framework can be proposed.

3.2.1. Establish governance frameworks for AI in sustainable finance

Governments and supranational regulators, such as the European Union (EU) and the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB), should enforce binding governance standards for AI applications in finance. These standards should focus on several key areas. First, they must ensure model auditability and explainability requirements, so that the assumptions and processes behind AI models are transparent and understandable to stakeholders. Second, standardized ESG input data protocols should be established to ensure consistency and comparability of data used in AI models. Finally, sanctions should be imposed for algorithmic misrepresentation or greenwashing to prevent the misuse of AI technologies and protect the integrity of ESG investing.

Research by Grimaldi et al. advocates for “algorithmic transparency by design” in sustainable finance, suggesting that all ESG-focused AI tools must be subject to third-party ethical audits [21]. The IOSCO 2021 report also calls for regulatory harmonization in AI-based ESG scoring mechanisms [22].

3.2.2. Enhance investor literacy on AI decision-making

Institutional and retail investors must develop critical awareness of how AI-based ESG scores are generated. This requires integrating AI model literacy into investor education and ESG certification programs.

According to Köhler and Rüdel, asset managers with AI fluency are better positioned to detect greenwashing, challenge vendor metrics, and assess the risk assumptions embedded in algorithmic ESG forecasts [23]. This also reduces cognitive overreliance on automated systems, enhancing investment independence.

In practice, financial institutions such as BNP Paribas and BlackRock have begun integrating internal AI audit training for sustainability analysts, a trend that should be expanded industry-wide.

3.2.3. Foster public–private collaboration for carbon data infrastructure

To close the data quality and standardization gap, cross-sector collaboration is essential. Partnerships between climate tech firms, financial regulators, and academic institutions should be encouraged to build open-access, validated carbon emissions databases, develop unified APIs and taxonomies for ESG reporting and pilot interoperable AI rating systems under public oversight.

A recent initiative by the Climate Data Steering Committee recommends a “data commons” approach to ESG emissions tracking, advocating for distributed access and global metadata standards [24]. Empirical studies by Huang et al. show that such collaborative data ecosystems significantly improve ESG model robustness across investment jurisdictions [25].

4. Conclusion

The analysis examined whether AI-powered carbon-footprint tracking can meaningfully reshape green investment decision-making. Across the discussion, three conclusions stand out.

First, AI improves the resolution, timeliness, and scope of carbon data. By combining NLP on disclosures with activity data, remote sensing, and IoT streams, AI helps fill persistent gaps—especially for Scope 3—and enables dynamic portfolio-level diagnostics instead of static, annual reporting. These gains support better screening, forward-looking transition-risk modelling, and verification of sustainability claims.

Second, material frictions remain. Divergent accounting practices and rating taxonomies create noisy inputs for model training; explainability and auditability of complex models are still limited; Scope 3 estimates depend on proxy assumptions that can bias signals; and the energy footprint of training large models can be non-trivial.

Third, the policy and market context is converging toward technology-enabled assurance. International standard setters and securities regulators are pushing for comparable climate metrics and controls, which makes model transparency, data lineage, and audit trails essential for investment-grade ESG analytics. Overall, the evidence indicates that AI is an efficiency-enhancing complement—not a substitute—for human judgment and governance in sustainable finance.

For investors, the practical implication is to integrate AI carbon data within a governed process: (i) require dataset provenance and uncertainty bands for Scope 3 estimates; (ii) combine AI-derived metrics with analyst challenge sessions; (iii) document model choices (inputs, thresholds, retraining cadence) and maintain audit logs to satisfy fiduciary review. Portfolio-level pilots should benchmark net environmental impact by pairing model-training emissions with emissions avoided through AI-enabled efficiency use cases such as building controls and logistics optimisation.

For policymakers and standard setters, priorities include harmonising taxonomies and disclosure metrics, mandating model-risk controls for high-stakes ESG use, and encouraging assurance-ready data pipelines; guidance from international regulatory initiatives outlines the governance practices AI systems should meet when used for ratings, labels, or capital-allocation tools.

For AI developers and data providers, green-by-design is pivotal: adopt energy-efficient architectures and carbon-aware training; publish model cards with scope, limitations, and bias tests; and align APIs to emerging sustainability taxonomies to reduce integration costs for asset managers.

Two caveats deserve emphasis. Evidence on performance benefits remains context-dependent and can be confounded by sector tilts or macro regimes; causal identification requires stronger research designs than are common in vendor case studies. In addition, the external validity of AI models trained on developed-market data is not guaranteed for emerging markets, where supply-chain structures and reporting coverage differ.

Future research should focus on several key areas. First, cross-industry comparisons should be run to quantify where AI carbon tracking delivers the largest marginal utility, such as in hard-to-abate industries versus services, and to examine how results vary with supply-chain complexity. Second, portfolio-level experiments or quasi-natural experiments should be conducted to identify the causal impact of AI-enhanced carbon data on allocation, pricing of transition risk, and long-horizon returns. Third, auditable XAI methods tailored to ESG should be developed, linking model features to physical-economy drivers to meet fiduciary and regulatory expectations. Fourth, the net climate impact should be measured by pairing the carbon cost of AI with verified emissions savings from AI applications in energy, buildings, and logistics, under different grid-carbon intensities. Finally, the global interoperability of AI-ESG systems should be studied under converging but still heterogeneous rules, to support cross-border portfolios.

In sum, AI-powered carbon tracking is transformational for data quality and decision cadence in green investing, provided its models are transparent, auditable, energy-efficient, and embedded

within coherent reporting standards. With disciplined governance, AI can accelerate capital formation toward climate-aligned assets while preserving scientific credibility and investor trust.

References

- [1] Papathanasiou, S., and Koutsokostas, D. (2024) Sustainability ratings and fund performance: New evidence from European ESG equity mutual funds. *Finance Research Letters*, 62, 105095.
- [2] Nguyen, Q., Diaz-Rainey, I., Kitto, A., McNeil, B. I., Pittman, N. A., and Zhang, R. (2023) Scope 3 emissions: Data quality and machine learning prediction accuracy. *PLOS Climate*, 2(11), e0000208. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pclm.0000208>
- [3] Busch, T., Johnson, M. P., and Pioch, T. (2022) Corporate carbon performance data: Quo vadis? *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 26(5), 1562–1581. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1111/jiec.13008>
- [4] Ding, C., Ke, J., Levine, M., Zhou, N., et al. (2024) Potential of artificial intelligence in reducing energy and carbon emissions of commercial buildings at scale. *Nature Communications*, 15, 5916. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-50088-4>
- [5] Schaeffer, R., et al. (2025) Ten new insights in climate science 2024. *One Earth*, 8(5).
- [6] Judge, M. A., Keane, A., and Soraghan, J. (2024) A comprehensive review of artificial intelligence-based solutions for energy management systems. *Energy Reports*.
- [7] Hassanein, A., and Tharwat, A. (2022) AI-driven carbon footprint analytics for sustainable investment portfolios. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, 12(4), 987–1003.
- [8] van Horne, C., Lee, D., and Nguyen, T. (2023) Scope 3 transparency and capital market performance. *Finance Research Letters*, 56, 104024.
- [9] European Commission. (2023) Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD). <https://ec.europa.eu/>
- [10] U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. (2022) Proposed rule: The Enhancement and Standardization of Climate-Related Disclosures. Retrieved from <https://www.sec.gov/>
- [11] Ministry of Ecology and Environment of the People's Republic of China. (2023) Digital environmental supervision pilots. Retrieved from <http://www.mee.gov.cn/>
- [12] Patterson, D., et al. (2022) The carbon footprint of machine learning. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 4(4), 283–289.
- [13] International Energy Agency. (2022) Smart Grids and Energy Efficiency. Retrieved from <https://www.iea.org/>
- [14] Ejayi, C. J., et al. (2025). Comprehensive review of artificial intelligence applications in renewable energy. *Journal of Big Data*, 12, 85. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40537-025-01178-7>.
- [15] Lannelongue, L., Grealey, J., and Inouye, M. (2021) Green Algorithms: Quantifying the carbon footprint of computation. *Advanced Science*, 8(12), 2100707.
- [16] Downar, B., Ernstberger, J., Reichelstein, S., and Schwenen, S. (2021) The impact of carbon disclosure mandates on emissions and financial operating performance. *Review of Accounting Studies*, 26(3), 1137–1175.
- [17] Fankhauser, S., et al. (2022) The meaning of net zero and how to get it right. *Nature Climate Change*, 12, 15–21. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-021-01245-w>.
- [18] Broccardo, E., Hart, O., and Zingales, L. (2022) Public–Private Partnerships for Sustainable Development. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 145(2), 428–450.
- [19] Li, T., and Zhang, Y. (2022) Explainable AI in sustainable finance. *Journal of Financial Data Science*, 4(1), 45–63.
- [20] Alvarez-Melis, D., and Jaakkola, T. (2018) On the robustness of interpretability methods. Retrieved from arXiv preprint arXiv: 1806.08049.
- [21] Grimaldi, M., Cricelli, L., and Rogo, F. (2021) Transparency in AI-driven finance. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 166, 120597.
- [22] Chen, X.-Q., Ma, C.-Q., Ren, Y.-S., Lei, Y.-T., Huynh, N. Q. A., and Narayan, S. (2023) Explainable artificial intelligence in finance: A bibliometric review. *Finance Research Letters*, 56, 104145. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2023.104145>
- [23] Köhler, A., and Rüdel, H. (2023) AI literacy in ESG investment. *Journal of Sustainable Investing*, 14(1), 55–72.
- [24] Verhulst, S. G., Sudmant, A., and Young, A. (2024) The need for climate data stewardship: 10 tensions and reflections regarding climate data governance. *Data and Policy*, 6, e52. <https://doi.org/10.1017/dap.2024.52>.
- [25] Huang, Q., Wu, J., and Yu, H. (2023) Collaborative data ecosystems for ESG analytics. *Information Systems Journal*, 33(5), 924–948.