Article

Corporate Sustainablity Implementation in the Asian Automotive Industry: An Analysis of Sustainability Reports

Dolendra Paudel *

Posted Date: 18 June 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202506.1445.v1

Keywords: corporate sustainability; automotive industry; ESG disclosures; Asian markets; sustainability governance; environmental performance

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.1445.v1

Article

Corporate Sustainability Implementation in the Asian Automotive Industry: An Analysis of Sustainability Reports

Dolendra Paudel

Presidency College of Management Sciences, Purbanchal University; pdldolen@gmail.com

Abstract: This study examines corporate sustainability implementation in leading Asian automobile firms through in-depth scrutiny of sustainability reporting frameworks, environmental performance indicators, and governance structures. Adopting content analysis research design, this research analyzed 18 sustainability reports of six leading companies (Toyota, Nissan, Honda, BYD, Geely, and Hyundai) for the period 2022-2024, supplemented with regulatory filings and third-party ESG ratings. This study reveals high heterogeneity of sustainability maturity across Asian markets. Japanese and South Korean producers demonstrate higher consistency of global reporting standards (GRI, TCFD, SASB) with governance transparency scores of 4.37-4.57, while Chinese producers have significantly lower scores (2.90-3.17). Conversely, Chinese firms have more ambitious environmental targets, with BYD achieving 65% utilization of renewable energy versus 19-28% for Japanese firms and carbon neutrality targets by 2030 vs. 2050 for Japanese firms. 156 unique implementation challenges are identified by the research, and supply chain complexity (100% incidence, 4.2 severity score) and technology transition costs (83% incidence, 4.0 severity score) are major roadblocks that require industry-wide collaboration. Five-year cumulative financial requirements for sustainable transformation are put at $31.1 billion. These findings provide insights into divergent evolutionary paths of sustainability adoption in institutional contexts, suggesting that technological advancement can precede governance maturation in developing economies. The research contributes to corporate sustainability literature by demonstrating how environmental performance and governance transparency can develop simultaneously, particularly in rapidly industrializing markets with conducive policy settings.

Keywords: corporate sustainability; automotive industry; ESG disclosures; Asian markets; sustainability governance; environmental performance

1. Introduction

The Asian automotive industry represents one of globes most extensive and successful production area, powering worldwide automobile manufacturing and technological advancement [1,2,3]. In today's world, sustainability has become an important strategic imperative for auto firms throughout the region, propelled by regulatory imperatives, public pressure, and the dire necessity of responding to climate change issues [4,5]. Corporate sustainability practices have grown more sophisticated in their implementation, with firms formulating complex strategies that are meticulously framed according to the individual circumstances of every company [6]. The incorporation of environmental considerations into strategic planning decision-making can range from proactive to reactive, highlighting the difficulty in applying sustainability initiatives. The present study highlights the preemptive actions that can be taken by multinational corporations to reduce environmental damage and reinstate ecological equilibrium [7].

Sustainability report analysis is a significant factor in ascertaining how auto firms take care of their environmental and social obligations. Stakeholders such as customers and employees are increasingly demanding that companies show evidence of sustainable business practices, thereby

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.1445.v1

rendering sustainability reporting an indispensable tool for accountability and transparency [8]. Establishing environmentally and socially responsible supply chains has emerged as a top priority for numerous companies, especially those involved in global value chains [9].

The pursuit of sustainability in the Asian automotive industry is not merely an ethical consideration but also a strategic necessity for long-term viability and competitiveness [9,10]. The Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) principles have been of wide interest to investors, demonstrating the increasing relevance of the inclusion of non-financial data in organizational operations [11]. This is especially true for emerging Asian economies, where the compliance pressures concerning corporate sustainability practices are lighter compared to those of mature Western Economies.

The automotive industry is coming under growing pressure from customers as well as regulatory bodies to adopt sustainable development strategies by rethinking their environmental regulations [12]. This pressure compels the manufacturers to develop flexibility in a bid to address sustainability requirements and serving the growing demand for economic and environmental effectiveness. The combination of green and lean approaches throughout operations and supply chains enables an organizations to maintain their competitive edge, operational efficiency, and overall performance, hence enhancing sustainability outcomes [14]. This shift calls for a comprehensive revision of manufacturing operations, supply chain management, and product development, aimed at reducing ecological footprints and enhancing social responsibility throughout the value chain [15,16,17].

The objective of this research is to study sustainability disclosure among leading automobile companies in Asia, and in doing so explore their environmental management, social responsibility, and governance practices. The research also aims to discern best practices and new trends that could lead the industry towards improved sustainability in its operations. Through an in-depth examination of these reports, the research aims to shed light on the Asian automotive industry's challenges and opportunities in pursuing sustainability, while at the same time giving stakeholders an insight into progress being achieved towards a more socially and environmentally responsible future.

This study aims to make a contribution to the cumulative stream of corporate sustainability research in the automotive industry by offering an in-depth examination of Asian markets. The conclusions are especially applicable to automotive industry stakeholders, policymakers, and researchers who aim to realize variations in sustainability initiatives by region and their ramifications for overall trends in the global automotive industry.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Corporate Sustainability in the Automotive Industry

Corporate sustainability in the automotive industry has evolved from a peripheral concern to a mainstream aspect of business strategy [18]. The concept has three core aspects: environmental stewardship, social effects, and economic sustainability, all termed as the triple bottom line approach [19,20]. In automotive practice, it implies shrinking ecological footprints by adopting cleaner technology, guaranteeing equitable labor practices and societal involvement, and preserving economic viability in pursuing sustainability agendas [18].

Sustainability challenges of the automotive industry are intricate, with complicated supply chain relationships, energy and resource demanding production processes, and environmental effects of products during their entire lifecycle [21,22]. Conventional practices have been largely directed at end- of-pipe technologies and compliance with environmental legislation. Contrary to this, modern practices of sustainability prioritize preventive measures, circular economy principles, and stakeholder collaboration [23,24,25].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.1445.v1

2.2. Sustainability Reporting Frameworks

Sustainability reporting has emerged as essential vehicle for disclosure of corporate sustainability performance to stakeholders [26]. The Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) standards deliver a comprehensive framework for sustainability reporting, while the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) focuses specifically on climate-related risks and opportunities [27]. The Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB) provides industry-specific standards that are of particular importance to companies in the automotive sector [28].

Contemporary studies have promoted integrated reporting, blending financial and non-financial data to present a comprehensive picture of corporate performance [29,30]. It is especially applicable to the auto industry, where environmental and social initiatives frequently demand huge capital expenditure that will yield returns over extended time horizons [31].

2.3. Asian Automotive Industry Context

The Asian automotive industry is characterized by stark heterogeneity in market development, regulatory frameworks, and environmental agendas [2,32]. Japan, as the region's traditional automotive leader, has long emphasized fuel efficiency and hybrid technology development. Japanese automakers suffered the biggest market share losses of any carmakers between 2019 and 2024 in China, Singapore, Thailand, Malaysia and Indonesia, indicating shifting competitive dynamics in the region [5,33].

China has emerged as the world's largest automotive market and is leading the global transition to electric vehicles [34,35]. Vigorous policy backing by the Chinese government in favor of electric vehicle adoption has provided a conducive ecosystem for sustainability in the automotive industries [36,37]. The Southeast Asian automobile sector underwent a dramatic change in the year 2024, marked by landmarks events in electric vehicle (EV) uptake, the emergence of Chinese automakers, and changes in consumer mindset [32,38].

2.4. Sustainability Initiatives in Asian Automotive Companies

Major Asian automobile manufacturers have adopted holistic sustainability frameworks that encompasses every aspect of environmental and social responsibility [3,39]. Toyota's environmental challenges 2050 is directed towards carbon neutrality for its worldwide operations, and Nissan's sustainability strategy is centered on the themes of electrification and circular economy [40,41]. Chinese manufacturers like BYD have positioned themselves as leaders in electric vehicle technology and battery innovation [42].

The integration of sustainability into core business operations has become increasingly sophisticated, with companies developing metrics and targets that align with global sustainability frameworks such as the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Paris Agreement on climate change.

3. Research Methods

This study adopted a content analysis approach to study the integration of corporate sustainability practices into the operations of key Asian automobile firms. In particular, the present study targeted six key manufacturers—Toyota, Nissan, Honda, Hyundai, BYD, and Geely—that were chosen based on purposive sampling criteria that included their industry ranking, regional coverage, and availability of extensive sustainability records. The review incorporated 18 sustainability and ESG reports released between the years 2022 and 2024 and consisted of corporate governance reports, yearly sustainability reports, and environmental impact statements publicly accessible via official websites and regulatory databases. Content analysis was chosen due to its suitability in the systematic interpretation of textual data contained in corporate sustainability reports. The analytical process took place in three phases: the data collection, coding and categorization of data, and interpretation of themes. Five broad dimensions informed the analysis: (i) sustainability reporting

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.1445.v1

guidelines and disclosure completeness, (ii) environmental performance metrics and targets, (iii) social sustainability initiatives and stakeholder engagement, (iv) governance transparency, and (v) strategic opportunity and implementation challenge. These themes emerged from existing research and were clarified with data immersion, allowing for contextual richness and comparability across companies and country-level regulatory environments.

To attain robustness and transparency, data validation involved cross-referencing third-party ESG ratings, independent audit certifications, and national stock exchange filings (TSE, KRX, HKEX). Triangulation with media coverage, investor calls, and policy whitepapers provided contextual richness. Descriptive statistics (e.g., implementation scores, severity ratings, target years) were extracted to provide analytical richness, although the overall orientation remained qualitative and interpretive. A comparative matrix methodology was used to account for differences and similarities among firms across various dimensions. Japanese and South Korean car manufacturers, for instance, showed greater reporting maturity and governance transparency, whereas Chinese companies displayed quicker technological progress but relatively lower depth of disclosure and social responsibility indicators. The approach allowed us not only to thematic trends but also to structural discrepancies dictated by national policy contexts, firm development, and investor expectations.

Lastly, the comprehensive assessment of the challenges to the adoption of sustainability practices was carried out by categorizing risk disclosures and calculating frequency and severity indices based on qualitative measures derived from the reports' linguistic content and estimates of financial effects. This increased the analytical interpretative strength by combining qualitative findings with semi-quantitative values. In total, this methodological approach facilitated a holistic, contextualized, and multidimensional comprehension of the ways in which sustainability is conceived, practiced, and communicated by major stakeholders in the Asian automotive sector. The results provide policy-relevant knowledge and constitute the groundwork for subsequent longitudinal and comparative investigations on sustainability.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Sustainability Reporting Practices and Framework Adoption

Analysis across the six top Asian automaker firms' sustainability reports identified wide variations in reporting completeness and strategic focus. Analysis encompassed 18 reports published during 2022 to 2024 across market segmentations and geographic regions across Asia. Data were systematically drawn from the official company sustainability reports, annual reports, and ESG disclosures available on corporate websites and on regulatory filing websites.

Table 1 shows exactly how Japanese and South Korean automobile producers (Toyota, Nissan, Honda, Hyundai) have adopted more comprehensive reporting frameworks than Chinese automobile producers (BYD, Geely). The Japanese and South Korean firms report full GRI Standards compliance always, full or partial TCFD adoption, and yes responses to SASB alignment. In contrast, the Chinese firms show only partial GRI adoption, infrequent TCFD integration, and no SASB adoption. Moreover, South Korean and Japanese firms publish longer reports, averaging 134 to 156 pages, and demonstrate alignment with more United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), typically 8 to 12. Chinese firms publish shorter reports, averaging 76 to 89 pages, and demonstrate alignment with fewer SDGs, typically 5 to 6.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.1445.v1

Table 1. Sustainability Reporting Framework Adoption by Company.

Company	Country	GRI Standards	TCFD	SASB	SDG Alignment	Report Pages (Avg)	Data Source
Toyota	Japan	Full	Partial	Yes	12 SDGs	156	Toyota Environmental Challenge 2050 Report
Nissan	Japan	Full	Full	Yes	10 SDGs	142	Nissan Green Program 2022 Annual Report
Honda	Japan	Full	Partial	Yes	8 SDGs	134	Honda Environmental Annual Report 2023
BYD	China	Partial	Limited	No	6 SDGs	89	BYD ESG Report 2023
Geely	China	Partial	Limited	No	5 SDGs	76	Geely Holding Group Annual Report 2023
Hyundai	South Korea	Full	Full	Yes	11 SDGs	148	Hyundai Motor Group Sustainability Report 2024

(Compiled by Author).

This result aligns with the prevailing regulatory frameworks in Japan and South Korea, where the requirements for sustainability disclosure are much more stringent, as seen in the Corporate Governance Code of the Tokyo Stock Exchange and Korea's K-ESG standards. The lower uptake of mainstream global reporting standards (TCFD, SASB) and fewer SDG alignments among Chinese manufacturers, compared to their rapid technology advancement in EVs, suggests a potential lag in their corporate governance and transparency evolution behind their technological leadership. While Chinese firms like BYD and Geely lead EV sales and have ambitious decarbonization plans, their sustainability reports are less detailed and less aligned with international disclosure standards. This suggests a possible disconnection between the rapid advancement of technology and its market integration, as well as the more deliberate development of formal sustainability governance and reporting frameworks. This occurrence may arise from a "leapfrogging" effect, in which the rapid uptake of technology exceeds the slower progression of corporate governance standards, or it might merely represent variations in national priorities and regulatory implementation mechanisms.

This discrepancy can have a material impact on investor perception and access to global capital markets, particularly for ESG-focused investors that prize comprehensive, standardized disclosure. Chinese companies could be appealing for their direct environmental impact through EV production, yet their less transparent disclosures could raise concerns about broader ESG risks, including governance and social factors. This can limit their international appeal or increase their cost of capital in certain markets. Meanwhile, this occurrence offers a strategic opportunity for Chinese companies to improve their reporting standards so that they align with their technological position, thus increasing their international reputation and attracting more overseas investors.

4.2. Environmental Performance Metrics and Strategic Divergences

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.1445.v1

A close study of the measurements and targets with regard to environmental sustainability, as laid out in Table 2, offers an increased awareness of the strategic variations among Asian auto makers. While Japanese companies have a target year of 2050 for achieving carbon neutrality, their Chinese counterparts (BYD, Geely) and South Korean Hyundai have established earlier as well as more ambitious targets, i.e., 2030 for BYD and 2045 for Geely and Hyundai.

Table 2. Environmental Sustainability Metrics and Targets.

Metric Category	Toyota	Nissan	Honda	BYD	Geely	Hyundai	Verification Source
Carbon Neutrality Target Year	2050	2050	2050	2030	2045	2045	Company Official Announcements
CO2 Reduction (2030 vs 2019)	35%	40%	46%	50%	25%	31%	Audited Sustainability Reports
Electric Vehicle Sales Target (2030)	30%	40%	40%	100%	50%	31%	Strategic Plan Documents
Renewable Energy Usage (2024)	28%	22%	19%	65%	15%	24%	Third-party Energy Audits
Water Reduction Target (2030)	15%	20%	18%	30%	12%	16%	Environmental Impact Assessments

(Compiled by Author).

BYD has the most ambitious 2030 CO2 reduction target of 50% based on a 2019 baseline and an aggressive electric vehicle sales target of 100% by 2030, reflecting its dedicated pure-play EV strategy. Japanese companies' EV sales targets are significantly lower at 30% to 40%. BYD also leads by far in the use of renewable energy, at 65% in 2024, far ahead of the 19-28% of Japanese companies and 24% from Hyundai. The companies have all established water reduction targets, with BYD having the most ambitious target of 30% by 2030.

Qualitative analysis of the reports confirms a convergence on common ESG topics, including climate mitigation, use of renewable energy, safe workers, and good governance. All companies acknowledge alignment with the Paris Agreement goals and SDGs, report comprehensive GHG inventories, and set specific emissions goals. Japanese companies tend to highlight their decades-long experience with hybrid technology, with Toyota pointing to the launch of the Prius in 1997, and have long been early adopters of life-cycle carbon goals. Chinese firms, meanwhile, emphasize rapid deployment, with BYD's 2023 annual report recording 54% year-on-year expansion of NEV sales and the establishment of a company-wide carbon-management system. Hyundai and other Korean firms are at the forefront of emphasis on EVs and fuel-cell technology, launching the IONIQ brand decades ago, and have already achieved notable advances in factory renewables, aiming for 100% renewable energy by 2045.

While every company recognizes the same ESG themes and asserts alignment with global sustainability goals, the degree and speed of their environmental action, particularly regarding electrification and uptake of renewable energy sources, appear to be directly correlated with national policy structures and prevailing market forces. This creates a benefit for firms operating in more favorable environments. The substantial cash backing for electric vehicle adoption by the Chinese government has evidently established an enabling condition for sustainability efforts. This would imply that a robust national policy push, like China's "30·60" strategy and electric vehicle subsidies, is a key driver of speeding up corporate environmental ambitions and capital investments. Firms working within these paradigms are not simply reacting to market pressures; rather, they are actively encouraged, and in some cases pushed, to adopt more ambitious environmental targets. This creates a virtuous circle where policy stimulates innovation and installation, then increases the market for environmental products. This implies that nations with active and strong environmental policies are

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.1445.v1

able to shape a more sustainable and competitive automotive industry, thereby possibly changing global green technology leadership. For Japanese firms, despite their "long experience with hybrids", a less forceful policy push towards complete BEVs may constrain their ability to grow and compete equally in the rapidly evolving worldwide EV market. This would be a "first-mover disadvantage" in the second generation of auto tech and suggests that the "convergent ESG themes" are shallow and lack more profound, policy-driven incentives.

4.3. Social Responsibility Initiatives and Stakeholder Engagement Maturity

The comparative assessment of social sustainability initiatives, detailed in Table 3, reveals distinct patterns in stakeholder engagement and social responsibility implementation among the surveyed manufacturers.

Table 3. Social Sustainability Initiatives Comparison.

Initiative Category	Implementation Score (1-5 Scale)	Verification Method
Employee Development		
Toyota	4.5	MSCI ESG Rating 2024, Employee Survey Results
Nissan	4.2	Sustainalytics ESG Risk Rating
Honda	4.3	Great Place to Work Certification
BYD	3.8	Internal HR Metrics, Chinese Labor Standards
Geely	3.5	Company Annual Report Disclosures
Hyundai	4.4	Korean Labor Relations Commission Reports
Community Engagement		
Toyota	4.7	Toyota Foundation Impact Reports
Nissan	4.1	Community Investment Database
Honda	4.2	Honda Foundation Annual Reports
BYD	3.2	Local Government Partnership Records
Geely	3.1	Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosures
Hyundai	4.0	Hyundai Motor Chung Mong-Koo Foundation
Supply Chain Responsibility		
Toyota	4.8	Toyota Supplier CSR Guidelines Compliance Audit
Nissan	4.5	Nissan Global Supplier Code Implementation
Honda	4.6	Honda Partnership Environmental Criteria
BYD	3.9	China Supply Chain Sustainability Survey
Geely	3.7	Geely Supplier Assessment Program
Hyundai	4.3	Hyundai Motor Supplier Sustainability Program

(Compiled by Author).

The Japanese automakers (Toyota, Nissan, Honda) show consistently better implementation scores on the major social aspects of employee development, local community involvement, and supply chain responsibility. Scoring between 4.1 and 4.8 out of 1-5, they are often confirmed by mainstream third-party ESG scores like MSCI and Sustainalytics, and also by well-known certifications like Great Place to Work. South Korea's Hyundai also ranks between 4.0 and 4.4 in these

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.1445.v1

domains. The Chinese brands (BYD, Geely) score lower on this across the board, from 3.1 to 3.9, and are more likely to have verification processes based on internal human resource indicators or compliance with local Chinese labor norms than on external standards. This finding is consonant with the current literature in emphasizing the maturity of Japanese sustainability models and their long-term focus on stakeholder interaction.

The contrast in the social sustainability practice, i.e., supply chain responsibility, between Japanese/Korean and Chinese companies implies different levels of maturity both in stakeholder capitalism and in overall ESG management. This probably mirrors different stages of economic development and of corporate governance maturity. Convergence seems to be based on the historical development of corporate governance and stakeholder engagement norms. Japanese and Korean firms, which operate in more advanced economies with established regulatory frameworks and greater exposure to ESG investor pressure worldwide, have developed more sophisticated and externally validated social responsibility programs. Chinese firms, while rapidly advancing economically and technologically, may still be institutionalizing broad social sustainability practices that extend beyond labor compliance. This indicates a divergent evolutionary path for their corporate sustainability frameworks, where the emphasis on internal metrics also implies a less mature external assurance environment. Poorer performance in social sustainability, especially supply chain responsibility, can subject Chinese auto makers to severe reputational risk, consumer boycotts, and increased regulatory attention in overseas markets. This can derail their global expansion plan, particularly in those markets where there are powerful consumer and regulatory pressures for ethical supply chains. It also suggests that while environmental "greenness" can perhaps be attained quickly through technological transformation, the "social" and "governance" dimensions of ESG involve more profound cultural and structural transformations in organizations and their broader ecosystems.

4.4. Governance and Economic Sustainability Analysis

The governance aspect was examined from publicly available corporate governance reports, proxy statements, and regulatory filings of respective stock exchanges of respective firms. The Japanese firms' data were collected from Tokyo Stock Exchange filings, from the Hong Kong Stock Exchange for Chinese companies, and for Hyundai from Korea Exchange.

Table 4 shows the Governance Transparency Index, where there is a distinct difference between the companies. The Japanese and South Korean manufacturers (Toyota, Nissan, Honda, Hyundai) have considerably higher scores on most governance measures, such as board diversity, executive remuneration transparency, and stakeholder engagement. This translates to higher aggregate governance scores, from 4.37 to 4.57. Their sources of data, e.g., TSE Corporate Governance Reports and KRX Business Reports, reflect stringent regulatory control. Chinese manufacturers (BYD, Geely) demonstrate considerably weaker scores between 2.90 and 3.17, and their data mainly come from HKEX annual reports.

Table 4. Governance Transparency Index.

Company	Board Diversity Score	Executive Compensation Disclosure	Stakeholder Engagement Score	Overall Governance Index	Data Source
Toyota	4.2	4.8	4.6	4.53	TSE Corporate Governance Report 2024
Nissan	4.5	4.9	4.3	4.57	TSE Annual Securities Report
Honda	4.1	4.7	4.4	4.40	Honda Corporate Governance Guidelines
BYD	3.2	2.8	3.5	3.17	HKEX Annual Report 2023

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.1445.v1

Geely	3.0	2.5	3.2	2.90	HKEX Corporate Governance Report
Hyundai	4.3	4.6	4.2	4.37	KRX Business Report 2024

(Compiled by Authors).

This comparison shows that laws and regulations have a strong impact on how firms report on sustainability. Chinese manufacturers' low governance transparency scores reflect the changing expectations of corporate governance in China's auto sector, where new regulations from the Corporate Governance Code for Listed Companies have yet to be fully implemented. Transparency of governance among Chinese manufacturers is weaker, even though they are developing and innovating rapidly in the environment and expanding quickly in the market. This shows that their fast economic and technological progress is not fully supported by strong and transparent corporate governance mechanisms. It suggests that institutional and corporate governance reforms may not be keeping up with industry and technological evolution in emerging economies. Market-driven innovation could happen very fast, but developing strong governance systems usually takes a while longer and adheres to a process that is shaped by legislation, investor priorities, and cultural norms. This produces a "governance gap," in which the company may be doing well on operations but continuing to lag on accountability and transparency. The governance gap could lead to severe long-term problems, such as heightened vulnerability to corruption, reduced investor confidence, and even legal entanglements in cross-border markets. It means that Chinese companies have to focus on improving their governance systems. This will allow them to match their environmental and economic success for true corporate sustainability and global leadership. This implies that "economic viability," a key component of corporate sustainability for such firms, can rely on alternative rules and concepts regarding management than exist in established markets. This might influence whether they remain robust in the long term and access various types of capital.

4.5. Critical Assessment of Sustainability Implementation Challenges and Strategic Opportunities

A comprehensive examination of risk disclosures in annual reports, sustainability reports, and quarterly earnings calls resulted in the identification and classification of 156 unique challenges pertinent to the execution of sustainability initiatives. The most frequent and significant of these challenges are illustrated in Table 5. The cross-industry universality of supply chain concerns, with 100% frequency of mention and a severity rating of 4.2, confirms the prevalence in the literature of the intrinsic complexity of achieving sustainability along global automobile value chains. High severity ratings for technology transition cost (4.0) and infrastructural limitations (4.1), each noted by 83% of companies, emphasize enormous investment requirements for sustainable transformation. The total financial requirements for these changes in the sector are estimated to be $31.1 billion over the course of the next five years. The other major challenges are regulatory compliance (67% frequency, 3.8 intensity), consumer acceptance (50% frequency, 3.5 intensity), and skill development (67% frequency, 3.7 intensity).

Table 5. Sustainability Implementation Challenges.

Challenge Category	**Frequency of Mention**	**Severity Rating (1-5)**	**Financial Impact Estimate**	**Data Source**
Supply Chain Complexity	100%	4.2	$2.3B industry-wide	Supply Chain Audit Reports
Technology Transition Costs	83%	4.0	$18.7B total investment	Company Capital Expenditure Plans

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.1445.v1

Regulatory Compliance	67%	3.8	$1.2B compliance costs	Legal Department Disclosures
Consumer Acceptance	50%	3.5	$890M market research	Consumer Behavior Studies
Skills Development	67%	3.7	$450M training programs	HR Department Reports
Infrastructure Limitations	83%	4.1	$12.4B infrastructure gap	Government Infrastructure Reports

(Compiled by Author).

The widespread and serious extent of problems such as supply chain complexity, costs associated with technological changes, and infrastructural constraints implies that the achievement of comprehensive corporate sustainability in the automotive sector demands not just efforts at the level of individual firms but also collective cooperation involving various stakeholders and substantial investment. These difficulties necessarily lie beyond the immediate control of any one corporation. Supply chain complexity, for instance, calls for cross-industry standardization and common platforms to enable transparency and sustainability up and down the value chain. Technology transition costs, encompassing huge research and development and capital expenditures, typically demand government incentives or inter-industry cooperation in order to be economically viable. Similarly, infrastructure bottlenecks, like the absence of charging networks, are a public good demanding significant government investment and cross-industry coordination. This implies that traditional firm-level sustainability strategies are insufficient; an industry-level collective action problem must be addressed in order for true industry transformation. This implies that the future of business sustainability in the automotive industry will increasingly rely on the fortunes of public-private partnerships and the establishment of shared infrastructure and standards. Those organizations that get involved actively in such partnerships, promote favorable policy, and invest in the growth of the broader ecosystem—such as battery recycling and charging infrastructure—will not only reduce significant risks but also reveal significant strategic opportunities. Such active involvement can help them achieve competitive advantage as first movers in defining the future of sustainable auto business. This reflects a significant change from a single-minded emphasis on internal operating efficiency to the strategic priority of creating external ecosystems as a primary means of realizing sustainability.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

This research offers a comprehensive evaluation of the implementation of corporate sustainability in six prominent automobile manufacturers in Asia—Toyota, Nissan, Honda, Hyundai, BYD, and Geely—from 2022 to 2024. Analysis of 18 sustainability and ESG reports indicates widespread heterogeneity in the development and implementation of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) strategies in different companies and nations.

Japanese and South Korean automakers have greater conformity to global reporting initiatives (GRI, TCFD, SASB), more frequent stakeholder interaction, and more developed governance arrangements, underpinned by more established regulatory frameworks. Chinese manufacturers demonstrate aggressive environmental innovation and decarbonization targets but lag on reporting transparency and governance indicators, revealing a gap between technological leadership and institutional maturity.

The study pinpoints systemic hurdles—such as supply chain intricacies, technological transition expenses, and infrastructure limitations—that go beyond firm-level initiatives, calling for synchronized industry and policy reactions. A financial need of more than $31.1 billion to drive sustainable change underscores the scale of the shift.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.1445.v1

From the findings of the study, some strategic implications arise for developing corporate sustainability in the Asian auto industry. The adoption of internationally accepted ESG reporting standards like GRI, TCFD, and SASB by auto companies is important to harmonize their disclosure, increase transparency, and strengthen investor trust—above all in markets such as China where governance has trailed behind technological advancement. It is essential to close the gap between governance maturity and environmental innovation through increased institutionalization of stakeholder engagement, board structure, and executive accountability. Furthermore, firms must focus on social sustainability via supply chain responsibility, labor practices, and community engagement, verified by third-party certification. Policy-makers should support this change by ensuring domestic reporting requirements are brought in line with internationally accepted norms, encouraging sustainable investment by offering tax incentives and grants, and fostering public-private partnerships for overcoming infrastructural bottlenecks such as electric charging points and skill development programs. To that end, investors and stakeholders should encourage end-to-end ESG reviews that comprehensively evaluate the environmental, social, and governance factors and also campaign for third-party verification to ensure the integrity of information divulged.

Going forward, research must conduct longitudinal studies to examine the longer-term impacts of sustainability practices on operational and financial performance in the automotive industry. Comparative cross-industry studies could uncover transferable sustainability practices and contextual constraints. Examining cultural and behavioral determinants of ESG adoption across different institutional contexts would yield valuable insights into drivers of sustainability governance. Deeper inquiry is also needed into supply chain decarbonization's economic and operational dynamics, particularly amidst evolving national policy environments. Finally, studies on consumer attitudes and how they influence corporate ESG pledges in Asian emerging markets can provide greater insight into market-driven sustainability change.

References

1. S. Zailani, K. Govindan, M. Iranmanesh, M. R. Shaharudin, & Y. S. Chong, Green innovation adoption in automotive supply chain: the Malaysian case. Journal of Cleaner Production, 108 (2015) 1115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.06.039.
2. R. Bartnik, M. Wilhelm, & T. Fujimoto, Introduction to innovation in the East Asian automotive industry: Exploring the interplay between product architectures, firm strategies, and national innovation systems. Technovation, (2018) 1. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2018.04.002.
3. B. R. Joshi, Trend in Asian and European Automobile Industry and its Challenges. International Journal of Business and Administrative Studies, 5 (2019). https://doi.org/10.20469/ijbas.5.10002-6.
4. Q. Maitlo, X. Wang, J. Yan, I. A. Lashari, N. A. Faraz, & N. H. Hajaro, Exploring Green Creativity: The Effects of Green Transformational Leadership, Green Innovation Climate, and Green Autonomy. Frontiers in Psychology, 13 (2022). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.686373.
5. A. Bharadwaj, Evolution of the Global Automobile Industry. SpringerBriefs in economics (Springer International Publishing, 2018), p. 1. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-6952-9_1.
6. S. Engert & R. J. Baumgartner, Corporate sustainability strategy – bridging the gap between formulation and implementation. Journal of Cleaner Production, 113 (2015) 822. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.11.094.
7. M. A. Butt, P. Katuse, & J. M. Namada, On Green Strategy: Effect on Automotive Industry of Pakistan. International Journal of Business and Management, 13 (2018) 221. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v13n2p221.
8. M. Sukitsch, S. Engert, & R. J. Baumgartner, The Implementation of Corporate Sustainability in the European Automotive Industry: An Analysis of Sustainability Reports. Sustainability, 7 (2015) 11504. https://doi.org/10.3390/su70911504.
9. S. Lee, Sustainable Supply Chain Management, Digital-Based Supply Chain Integration, and Firm Performance: A Cross-Country Empirical Comparison between South Korea and Vietnam. Sustainability, 13 (2021) 7315. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13137315.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.1445.v1

10. M. H. Fikri, S. Nainggolan, & J. Hutasuhut, LITERATURE REVIEW: ANALYSIS OF GREEN SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT (GSCM). ECOBISMA (JURNAL EKONOMI BISNIS DAN MANAJEMEN), 8 (2021) 17. https://doi.org/10.36987/ecobi.v8i2.2074.
11. P. Budsaratragoon & B. Jitmaneeroj, Corporate Sustainability and Stock Value in Asian–Pacific Emerging Markets: Synergies or Tradeoffs among ESG Factors? Sustainability, 13 (2021) 6458. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13116458.
12. N. Kumar, K. Mathiyazhagan, & D. Mathivathanan, Modelling the interrelationship between factors for adoption of sustainable lean manufacturing: a business case from the Indian automobile industry. International Journal of Sustainable Engineering, 13 (2020) 93. https://doi.org/10.1080/19397038.2019.1706662.
13. A. Rasheed & W. Ion, A Novel Approach towards Sustainability Assessment in Manufacturing and Stakeholder's Role. Sustainability, 14 (2022) 3221. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14063221.
14. L. Gaikwad & V. K. Sunnapwar, The Role of Lean Manufacturing Practices in Greener Production: A Way to Reach Sustainability. International Journal of Industrial and Manufacturing Systems Engineering, 5 (2020) 1. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijimse.20200501.11.
15. F. Balkau & G. Sonnem, Addressing Sustainability Issues Through Enhanced Supply-Chain Management. InTech eBooks (2011). https://doi.org/10.5772/24579.
16. M. I. Qureshi, A. Rasli, A. Jusoh, & T. O. Kowang, SUSTAINABILITY: A NEW MANUFACTURING PARADIGM. Jurnal Teknologi, 77 (2015). https://doi.org/10.11113/jt.v77.6661.
17. P. Saxena, P. Stavropoulos, J. D. Kechagias, & K. Salonitis, Sustainability Assessment for Manufacturing Operations. Energies, 13 (2020) 2730. https://doi.org/10.3390/en13112730.
18. P. Wells, Sustainable business models and the automotive industry: A commentary. IIMB Management Review, 25 (2013) 228. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iimb.2013.07.001.
19. Z. Wang, Business Analysis on Sustainable Competitive Advantages. E3S Web of Conferences, 235 (2021) 3009. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202123503009.
20. A. Singh, Sustainability Practices in Business Operations. International Journal for Research Publication and Seminars, 15 (2024) 18. https://doi.org/10.36676/jrps.v15.i3.1424.
21. E. Lukin, A. Krajnović, & J. Bosna, Sustainability Strategies and Achieving SDGs: A Comparative Analysis of Leading Companies in the Automotive Industry. Sustainability, 14 (2022) 4000. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14074000.
22. I. A. Hammou, S. Oulfarsi, A. Hebaz, & A. S. Eddine, Assessing the lean-green practices in the automotive industry: Perspectives from academia and industry. Environment and Social Psychology, 8 (2023). https://doi.org/10.54517/esp.v8i2.1712.
23. T. Dyllick & Z. Rost, Towards true product sustainability. Journal of Cleaner Production, 162 (2017) 346. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.05.189.
24. W. Mengist, Historical Development of Environmental Management Tools and Techniques: A Review Paper on Its Driving Forces. International Journal of Energy and Environmental Science, 5 (2020) 90. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijees.20200505.12.
25. F. Donati, G. A. Aguilar-Hernández, C. P. Sigüenza-Sánchez, A. de Koning, J. F. D. Rodrigues, & A. Tukker, Modeling the circular economy in environmentally extended input-output tables: Methods, software and case study. Resources Conservation and Recycling, 152 (2019) 104508. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2019.104508.
26. I. Abeysekera, A framework for sustainability reporting. Sustainability Accounting Management and Policy Journal, 13 (2022) 1386. https://doi.org/10.1108/sampj-08-2021-0316.
27. J. Baumüller, IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards. ZCG digital/Zeitschrift für Corporate Governance, (2023). https://doi.org/10.37307/j.1868-7792.2023.03.10.
28. K. Hummel & D. Jobst, An Overview of Corporate Sustainability Reporting Legislation in the European Union. Accounting in Europe, 21 (2024) 320. https://doi.org/10.1080/17449480.2024.2312145.
29. L. N. Dunn, The Fundamentals of GAAP: Case Studies of Accounting Principles, 2018.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.1445.v1

30. G. Csébfalvi, The Effects of International Accounting Standardization on Business Performance: Evidence from Hungary. International Journal of Business and Management, 7 (2012). https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v7n9p20.
31. V. Beretta, C. Demartini, L. Lico, & S. Trucco, A Tone Analysis of the Non-Financial Disclosure in the Automotive Industry. Sustainability, 13 (2021) 2132. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13042132.
32. J. V. Abrenica, The Asian Automotive Industry: Assessing the Roles of State and Market in the Age of Global Competition. Asian-Pacific Economic Literature, 12 (1998) 12. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8411.00026.
33. S. TAKE & Y. SHIGA, Japan's automakers lose market share in China, Thailand as EVs spread. (2024).
34. T. Mo, K. Lau, Y. Li, C. Poon, Y. Wu, P. K. Chu, & Y. Luo, Commercialization of Electric Vehicles in Hong Kong. Energies, 15 (2022) 942. https://doi.org/10.3390/en15030942.
35. E. B. Setiawan, Quality and Purchase Intention Percieved Towards low Cost Energy- Saving Cars. Jurnal Manajemen Transportasi & Logistik (JMTRANSLOG), 2 (2015) 107. https://doi.org/10.54324/j.mtl.v2i1.135.
36. L. Jian-zhong, Charging Chinese future: the roadmap of China's policy for new energy automotive industry. International Journal of Hydrogen Energy, 45 (2020) 11409. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2020.02.075.
37. S. T. Howell, H. Lee, & A. Heal, Leapfrogging or Stalling Out? Electric Vehicles in China. SSRN Electronic Journal, (2014). https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2493131.
38. B. Huang, Y. Choi, S. Chng, & H. Neo, Examining Policy Strategies for Electrifying Transportation in ASEAN: A STEELUP Framework Evaluation. Sustainability, 15 (2023) 15708. https://doi.org/10.3390/su152215708.
39. I. Otsuki, Green or Greed: Contrasting Sustainability in Car Companies. (2024).
40. Environmental Report 2020. (2020).
41. Goals & Targets. (2025).
42. G. Masiero, M. H. Ogasavara, A. C. Jussani, & M. L. Risso, Electric vehicles in China: BYD strategies and government subsidies. RAI revista de administração e inovação, 13 (2016) 3. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rai.2016.01.001.