Proceedings of CONF-BPS 2026 Symposium: Innovation, Finance, and Governance for Sustainable Global Growth
DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.BJ30281

Integrating ESG Principles into Directors' Fiduciary Duties: A Legal Framework for Regulatory Application

Sipei Zhou

Law School, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China
202322040176@mail.bnu.edu.cn

Abstract. From the EU's Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive to the SEC's climate disclosure proposals and Japan's ¥13.3 trillion TEPCO judgment, environmental, social, and governance (ESG) oversight has become a de facto global minimum for access to capital markets, yet directors' fiduciary duties continue to oscillate between shareholder primacy and indeterminate stakeholder rhetoric. This asymmetry fosters greenwashing, regulatory arbitrage, and strike suits, rendering the legal integration of ESG into board-level obligations an urgent cross-jurisdictional challenge. Drawing on comparative statutory analysis and reflexive law theory, the paper extracts legislative techniques from Delaware's Caremark doctrine, Germany's codified "systematic oversight" duty (AktG §§ 91(2), 87(1)), and Japan's low-threshold derivative enforcement regime to develop a transplantable framework for China's 2023 Company Law. The study finds that ESG is most effectively institutionalized when anchored in the duty of care rather than the duty of loyalty, operationalized through a board-level risk management safe harbor and reinforced by incentive-aligned remuneration and quantifiable, sector-specific benchmarks. The suggested one-sentence change to Article 180(2), along with a new governance code, changes sustainability from vague CSR promises into a fair and enforceable fiduciary standard. This makes long-term value creation and doctrinal clarity work together.

Keywords: ESG, directors' fiduciary duties, Company Law, corporate governance

1. Introduction

Accelerated convergence of capital markets and regulation has elevated ESG from CSR slogan to an organizing principle of corporate law, yet directors' fiduciary duties still oscillate between shareholder primacy and indeterminate stakeholder rhetoric, breeding greenwashing and strike suits [1]. Article 180 of China's Company Law centres on "the company's best interest" without statutory weight for ESG factors, while evidentiary asymmetry and fragmented disclosure impede private enforcement [2]. Dual-class structures and jurisdictional shopping further weaken credibility, whereas boards shielded by clear ESG mandates are more likely to integrate sustainability without eroding financial duties [3,4].

Through comparative statutory analysis and reflexive-law theory, this paper distills legislative techniques from Delaware's Caremark doctrine, Germany's codified oversight duty (AktG §§ 91(2), 87(1)) and Japan's low-threshold derivative regime to craft a portable framework for the 2023

© 2025 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.BJ30281

revision. The study proposes a one-sentence amendment to Article 180(2)—"reasonable care includes systematic oversight of environmental, social and governance risks"—complemented by a CSRD-calibrated governance code that sets sector-specific benchmarks, Caremark-compliant information pipelines and incentive-aligned remuneration. The design converts sustainability from hortatory CSR into a justiciable yet proportionate fiduciary standard, creates a procedural safe harbour for good-faith compliance, and unlocks derivative enforcement where directors disregard red flags.

By anchoring ESG in the duty of care rather than an open-ended social purpose, the model preserves the shareholder-oriented structure of Chinese company law while embedding long-term value protection as a core directorial obligation. The research offers an immediately operable blueprint for regulators, courts and issuers seeking to align China's green-finance infrastructure with global capital-market expectations.

2. Theoretical justification: from shareholder primacy to stakeholder-infused loyalty

2.1. Stakeholder theory as fiduciary logic

Modern corporations are considered a "nexus of specific investments" [5]. Each stakeholder, including employees, creditors, communities, and ecosystems, provides firm-specific assets that residual claimants have the power to expropriate. Equity's traditional response is to extend fiduciary protection only to shareholders. Yet the economic justification for this exclusivity collapses when systemic risk (climate, pandemic, social unrest) erodes the going-concern surplus that underpins residual returns. Integrating ESG into the duty of loyalty therefore realigns the fiduciary vector with the "collective" pool of firm-specific capital, not merely the equity tranche. The UK Companies Act 2006, s. 172(1) offers a statutory template: directors must "have regard" to stakeholder interests "as a pathway" to promoting the success of the company "for the benefit of its members as a whole". The syntax preserves ultimate shareholder orientation while legitimising stakeholder data as "inputs" into loyalty analysis.

2.2. Business-judgment theory re-calibrated

Delaware's "Aronson v Lewis" shield protects disinterested, informed decisions. The precondition is "rationality", not "shareholder exclusivity". Empirical studies show that portfolios screened for high ESG scores exhibit lower idiosyncratic tail risk. Hence, an ESG-informed decision is "prima facie" rational. Conversely, ignoring material ESG data may breach the "informed" prong, as confirmed in "Marchand v Barnhill", where food-safety is "mission-critical," oversight failure is "not" protected by business-judgment. ESG integration therefore "refines" rather than "replaces" the business-judgment rule.

2.3. Shareholder-Wealth-Maximisation (SWM) reinterpreted

Financial economics distinguishes "shareholder value" (discounted cash-flow to equity) from "enterprise value" (discounted cash flow to total capital). Carbon-price shocks, human-rights scandals and biodiversity litigation transfer value from equity to debt and external stakeholders, shrinking "enterprise" value. A director who maximises short-term equity at the expense of enterprise value violates the "going-concern" dimension of loyalty [6]. ESG variables are thus "leading indicators" of future cash-flow volatility. Their incorporation is "consistent" with SWM provided the temporal horizon is inter-temporal rather than quarterly.

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.BJ30281

3. Impact of ESG principles on directors' fiduciary duties

3.1. United States: ESG special committees and the normative reframing of directors' oversight duty

Confronted with climate-related derivative lawsuits, supply-chain scandals, and SEC rulemaking on climate disclosures, an increasing number of companies are establishing standalone ESG or sustainability committees. This trend is justified by the board's dual obligations—decision-making and supervision—and the "nexus-of-contracts" theory, under which the board serves as the "residual guardian" of corporate assets, requiring directors to act loyally and with care in the best interests of the company [7]. Empirical evidence indicates that firms with boards centrally positioned within interlocking director networks exhibit significantly higher ESG ratings, underscoring the strategic value of governance structure [8]. Today, corporate interests are inextricably linked to ESG risks and opportunities due to social-cost pricing and regulatory escalation, thereby expanding the scope of directors' duty of care. To fulfill this enhanced obligation and avoid functioning as a nominal or symbolic body, administrators must prioritize staying informed and receiving training on ESG issues—or face potential liability [9].

The supervisory duty was first recognized in Caremark and further clarified in Stone v. Ritter, where the Delaware Supreme Court delineated two scenarios constituting a breach. First, directors' failure to build any information pipeline that would bring red flags to the table; second, the presence of such pipelines but a conscious decision to look away, letting material risks slip silently past. Therefore, evolving fiduciary standards should impose an affirmative obligation on directors. They must establish compliance systems covering emerging regulatory domains, including carbon regulations, supply-chain due diligence, and data protection. They must actively monitor management's integration of these systems into corporate strategy, and disclose how compliance programs align with stated ESG targets [10]. Hence, fiduciary norms should treat a deliberately diverse board composition as a core component of the baseline duty of care, not merely an optional CSR initiative. At the same time, for directors to qualify for exemption from liability under the oversight duty, the supervisory work of board committees must transcend routine risk assessment and engage in substantive, issue-specific scrutiny of ESG matters.

3.2. Germany: the establishment of the statutory status of directors' ESG obligations and the improvement of the supporting incentive mechanism

German law reconceptualises Unternehmensinteresse so that sustainable value creation is not an appendage to profit but its constitutive element, thereby embedding environmental stewardship and social responsibility inside the very definition of corporate viability. This normative shift is given teeth through a duty of systematic oversight under AktG § 91(2). Management must architect governance processes that sweep the horizon for ESG hazards, translate them into numbers, and neutralise them before they metastasise. Courts treat this obligation as an integral layer of the statutory Sorgfaltspflicht in § 93(1): the prudent manager of 2025 must regard climate exposure, supply-chain labour risk and data-ethics gaps as financially material systemic dangers, every bit as real as a liquidity shortfall. Monetary alignment reinforces the command. § 87(1) statutorily couples executive pay to verifiable sustainability targets, fusing personal wealth with corporate resilience. Ethical aspirations are thereby converted into routine capital-budgeting hurdles, while empirical studies already record measurably superior ESG scores among firms caught by the provision. Transparency obligations complete the architecture by exposing both the design and performance of

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.BJ30281

these systems to continuous stakeholder scrutiny, ensuring that the redefined corporate purpose, the proactive oversight duty and the incentive calibrated remuneration operate as an interlocking ecosystem rather than isolated mandates. The cumulative message for global regulators is that fiduciary transformation occurs only when mandatory rules and incentive compatibility are engineered into a coherent whole that converts directors' duties from voluntary rhetoric into an operative driver of sustainable conduct.

3.3. Japan: ESG violations and mechanisms for director accountability

Japan's TEPCO judgment reframes fiduciary duty by imposing ¥13 trillion liability on directors who disregarded credible tsunami warnings, thereby fusing corporate self-preservation with public welfare and treating foreseeable environmental catastrophe as a mission-critical oversight failure rather than a regulatory breach [11]. Courts operationalise the Companies Act duties of care and loyalty by converting sustainability red flags into mandatory board action, an approach reinforced by Governance Code revisions that elevate climate and human rights to strategic status and by low-threshold derivative suits plus Article 429 third-party recourse for malice or gross negligence [12]. The precedent signals that enforceable ESG obligations can emerge through risk-sensitive judicial interpretation without new statutes, provided liability hinges on material, company-specific threats to long-term value and societal licence, while procedural gateways keep stakeholders empowered to police systemic governance lapses.

4. Case analysis

4.1. Theoretical anchoring in shareholder primacy: the sequana case

The theoretical framework for integrating ESG into directors' duties remains firmly grounded in the principle of shareholder primacy, as authoritatively established in BTI 2014 LLC v Sequana. The Supreme Court held that while the company was solvent directors owe duties to the company alone and its interests coincide with those of shareholders; therefore, Section 172's mandate to promote success continues to enshrine shareholder primacy. ESG does not create separate fiduciary responsibilities toward non-shareholders, even if the clause compels directors to take environmental and social aspects into account. Instead, these considerations are essential to improving long-term shareholder value. As a result, the decision maintains doctrinal coherence while also legitimizing sustainability analysis as long as it can be presented as safeguarding future cash flows and reputational capital that eventually accrue to shareholders. This allows ESG to be integrated into mainstream fiduciary risk assessment without undermining the primacy norm.

4.2. Procedural accountability as the enforcement mechanism: the clientearth case

The enforcement of ESG-related responsibilities operates through procedural accountability rather than substantive judicial oversight, a principle demonstrated in ClientEarth v Shell. The High Court refused permission, declining to assess the adequacy of Shell's climate plan and concentrating instead on the integrity of the board's process. It noted the existence of a documented strategy, measurable targets and periodic review, then held that where directors act in good faith and embed material ESG factors within a rational deliberative structure judicial substitution of business judgment is excluded. By requiring verifiable integration of sustainability risks into governance architecture while leaving strategic calibration to the board, the ruling indicates that s.172 imposes a

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.BJ30281

duty of consideration rather than outcome. This reinforces the business judgment rule and grounds ESG enforcement in procedural fidelity rather than prescriptive performance standards [13].

5. Recommendations for a new legal framework

By requiring directors to create, maintain, and continuously improve systems that identify, assess, and mitigate material environmental, social, and governance risks, legislative reform should incorporate ESG oversight as an explicit statutory component of the duty of care. This would replace the current inference-based approach, which depends on vague references to social responsibility and leaves boards without practical guidance. Subordinate instruments must translate this general mandate into concrete board functions that encompass proactive surveillance of climate, human rights, and data privacy exposures; the installation of Caremark-compliant information pipelines that deliver verified ESG data to the board without delay; and the incorporation of long-term ESG implications into strategic planning and capital allocation decisions.

To close the current liability gap, shareholders should be authorised to initiate derivative actions where directors have knowingly failed to institute any monitoring architecture or have consciously disregarded red flags indicating severe ESG risk and external accountability should be carefully extended to third party harm through Article 191 of the revised Company Law only when egregious oversight amounts to gross negligence and produces concrete injury in regulated domains such as environmental contamination or product safety while the business judgment rule continues to shield good faith strategic prioritisation.

Complementary governance architecture mandates the creation of specialised ESG committees within the boards of large listed firms endowed with narrowly tailored charters that oversee critical exposures, including food safety, cybersecurity, and climate transition. A remuneration structure that conditions a quantifiable portion of executive compensation on the attainment of verifiable ESG metrics aligned with long term value creation and a statutory safe harbour that protects directors who demonstrate robust procedural discipline through committee competence, regular reporting, and documented deliberations even when an adverse ESG event materialises thus preserving entrepreneurial risk-taking yet penalising systemic dereliction.

6. Conclusion

This article demonstrates that the most doctrinally sustainable approach to embedding ESG in Chinese company law is to recalibrate the existing duty of care, rather than to introduce an open-ended social purpose into the corporate framework. By triangulating Delaware's Caremark jurisprudence, Germany's statutory oversight mandate (AktG § 91(2)), and Japan's post-TEPCO third-party liability regime, the paper extracts three transferable components: an affirmative, board-level duty to establish information systems capable of identifying material ESG risks; a procedural safe harbor that shields good-faith compliance from hindsight-based litigation; and an incentive alignment mechanism linking executive remuneration to verified sustainability metrics. Inserting a single sentence into Article 180(2)—"reasonable care includes systematic oversight of environmental, social and governance risks"—and supplementing it with a CSRD-calibrated governance code would transform the hortatory language of Article 20 into a private-law enforcement mechanism, while preserving the shareholder-oriented structure of the 2023 Company Law revision.

The study's doctrinal focus inevitably leaves empirical gaps. Comparative evidence on reduced cost of capital primarily comes from EU and U.S. markets; Chinese SME data linking carbon

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.BJ30281

intensity disclosure to credit spreads would strengthen the proportionality analysis. Likewise, the interaction between the proposed oversight duty and the new director-to-third-party liability regime (Art. 191) remains undertheorized—an intersection with significant public law implications for state-owned enterprises. Future research should therefore examine the deterrent effect of the safe harbor on strike suits by leveraging Korea's 2021 corporate governance reform as a natural experiment, and develop sector-specific protocols for financial institutions whose Scope 3 emissions far exceed direct emissions. If these blind spots are addressed, the fiduciary pathway outlined in this paper could evolve from an academic blueprint into an operational pillar of China's green finance infrastructure.

References

[1] Pollman, E. (2024). The making and meeting of ESG. Harv. Bus. L. Rev., 14, 403.

[2] Cui, X., Zhang, M., Chen, J., & Cao, Z.(2025).Directors' fiduciary Duties in Cross-Border Listing: A comparative Analysis of Mainland China and HongKong. journal of Law, Psychology, and Communication Studies, 1(1), 85-122.

[3] Shill, G. H. & Strand, M. L.(2021). Diversity, ESG, and latent board power. Del. J. Corp. L., 46, 255.

[4] Otsuka, A.(2021). ESG investment and reforming the fiduciary duty. Ohio St. Bus. Lj, 15, 136.

[5] Blair, M. M., & Stout, L. A. (1999). A team producuction theory of corporate law. "Virginia Law Review", 85(2), 247-328. https: //doi.org/10.2307/1076427

[6] Mitchell, L. E. (2001) Corporate irresponsibility: America's newest export. Yale University Press.

[7] Easterbook, F. H., & Fischel, D. R. (1991). The economic structure of corporate law. Harvard University Press.

[8] Ballester, J. M. (2024). The Legal Treatment of ESG Objective and the Modification of the Duty of Diligence in the Prosposed Directive on Due Diligence. Cuadernos Derecho Transnacional, 16, 460.

[9] Feng, H., Zhang, Z., Wang, Q., & Yang, L. (2024). Does a Company's position within the interlocking director network influence its ESG performance? — Empirical evidence from Chinese listed companies. Sustainability, 16(10), 4190.

[10] Jiang, Y. & Han, F.(2025). The impact of management compliance attention and board faultlines strength on ESG performance: Evidence from Chinese listed companies. Plos one, 20(8), e0331004.

[11] Goto, T. (2024). Judicial Expansion of directors' ESG oversight duties: Lessons from the TEPCO Fukushima derivative litigation. Journal of Japanese Corporate Law, 19(2), 145-168.

[12] He, X. (2025). Embedding ESG into fiduciary duties: A comparative analysis of statutory and judicial pathways. Stanford Journal of International law, 61(1), 33-59.

[13] Lan, L., &Wan, Z.(2023). Calibration director liability for ESG failures: A Caremark-plus standard for derivate actions. Virginia Law & Business Review, 17(3), 421-456.