Short communication

Investigating Sustainability Practices in Fortune 500 Companies and Their Impact on Broader Business Practices

This study assesses the incorporation of sustainable practices in selected Fortune 500 firms, examining their overall effects on corporate governance, and industry benchmarks. It utilizes an integrative methodology that merges qualitative literature reviews, and content analysis of corporate sustainability reports, and case studies of leading multinational firms.

Evidence shows that organizations that incorporate sustainable practices into their operations are likely to reap long-term financial benefits, better brand visibility, and strategic differentiation. However, several challenges persist, notably the requirement for substantial upfront capital investments, the complexity of accurately quantifying sustainability outcomes, and internal resistance to organizational transformation.

Keywords: Sustainable practices, corporate governance, Financial Performance, Industry benchmarks, Sustainability Reporting, Strategic Differentiation

Introduction

The growing emphasis on sustainability marks a fundamental shift in how businesses view their roles in society and their responsibilities toward the environment. Historically seen mostly through the lens of corporate social responsibility (CSR), environmental sustainability initiatives are becoming more and more acknowledged as an essential component of corporate strategy, profoundly impacting profitability, competitive differentiation, and market longevity [1] [2]. With their great influence and large resources, Fortune 500 firms are at the forefront of this transition, setting precedents for industry-wide practices and standards [3].

Recent global events, including climate change, resource constraints, and changing regulatory environments have further underscored the urgency of integrating sustainability into core business practices [4]. Businesses today operate in an environment marked by increased scrutiny from diverse stakeholder groups including consumers, investors, policymakers, and civil society, each demanding accountability and proactive efforts towards environmentally sustainable practices [2].

Studies show that organizations adopting comprehensive sustainability strategies not only satisfy ethical obligations but also enjoy operational and financial advantages [1][7]. From resource efficiency, cost savings, better brand reputation, customer loyalty, enhanced employee engagement, and greater resilience against regulatory and market risks [2][8]. As a result, sustainable practices have evolved from peripheral initiatives to strategic imperatives, radically changing management and corporate governance.

Despite this recognized importance, implementing sustainability practices remains complex and fraught with challenges. Obstacles include substantial upfront investments, resistance to organizational change, and difficulties in quantifying and disclosing outcomes [5]. Furthermore, considering the variety of industries within the Fortune 500 list, sustainable practices vary widely, reflecting industry-specific challenges and stakeholder expectations [6].

This paper seeks to provide a thorough examination of these sustainability practices among top Fortune 500 firms. It seeks to identify the critical success factors and barriers in sustainability integration, examine the wider implications on industry-wide practices, and discuss the implications for future business strategies. By doing so, this study contributes valuable insights for academics, industry practitioners, policymakers, and stakeholders seeking to grasp the strategic value of sustainability in today’s corporate environment.

Literature Review

The academic discourse on corporate sustainability has dramatically changed, reflecting a growing awareness of businesses' roles and obligation towards environmental, social, and governance (ESG) factors. The foundational conceptualization of sustainability in business is often traced to Elkington’s [4] triple bottom line approach, which advocates balancing economic, social, and environmental responsibilities within corporate operations. This framework emphasizes the connection between financial profitability, ecological stewardship, and social accountability, asserting that sustainable practices drive long-term value generation and corporate resilience.

Hart and Milstein [1] built upon this basis by articulating a strategic approach to sustainability, highlighting its potential to deliver competitive advantages via innovation, resource efficiency, and improved stakeholder engagement. Their model incorporates sustainability practices into strategic planning, arguing that organizations that proactively address global environmental concerns can access new markets, reduce operational costs, and improve long-term profitability.

Porter and Kramer [2] came up with the concept of "shared value," which made the strategy implications of sustainability even clearer. They proposed that sustainability should not be viewed solely as ethical compliance or corporate philanthropy but as an integral business strategy capable of creating competitive advantages. By harmonizing corporate goals with societal needs, companies can generate economic benefits while simultaneously addressing environmental and social challenges.

These theoretical claims are supported by a wealth of evidence, underscoring the financial advantages of integrating sustainability into business practices. Eccles, Ioannou, and Serafeim [3] provided robust evidence indicating that companies implementing thorough sustainability plans

outperform competitors financially over the long run. Their findings highlighted improved market valuation, higher operational efficiency, and better risk management capabilities among sustainably focused companies.

Carroll and Shabana [9] supported the business case for CSR, emphasizing that aligning social and environmental responsibilities with corporate strategy can enhance long-term financial performance. They argued that effective CSR requires a balance of ethical commitment and strategic intent, supported by empirical evidence, stakeholder engagement, and integration into core business operations

Similarly, Friede, Busch, and Bassen [7] conducted a meta-analysis that synthesized over 2,000 empirical studies, demonstrating a strong positive correlation between financial outcomes and sustainability performance (ESG criteria). This analysis strengthened the business case for sustainability in business strategy practices. It also highlighted benefits such as increased investor trust, improved reputation, and enhanced market competitiveness.

Despite the compelling evidence supporting sustainability's strategic importance, integrating such practices into business operations remains challenging. Epstein and Buhovac [8] identified various challenges that companies encounter in integrating sustainability practices, including difficulties in measuring and reporting intangible outcomes, internal opposition stemming from organizational culture, and significant upfront investments required for these transformations. Their research suggests that these barriers often hinder companies from fully leveraging the potential benefits of a sustainable practices.

Kolk and Pinkse [6] underscored sector-specific differences, indicating that sustainable practices and their corresponding advantages markedly differ among industries. Their research indicated that heavily regulated industries, like energy, automotive, and manufacturing, generally include sustainable practices more thoroughly into their strategy planning due to increased regulatory oversight and stakeholder demands relative to less examined sectors.

Lozano [10] reinforced the view, advocating a holistic approach to sustainability integration, and emphasizing the importance of aligning sustainability practices within corporate culture, governance structures, and business operations. He argued that successful sustainability integration requires comprehensive stakeholder engagement, continuous monitoring, and robust governance mechanisms.

In general, the existing literature emphasizes the multidimensional strategic significance of sustainability, highlighting the critical challenges in its integration as well as the benefits. The purpose of this review is to establish a foundation for comprehending the sustainability practices of selected Fortune 500 companies, which will inform subsequent analyses of the ways in which these practices affect broader industry standards, competitive dynamics, and regulatory environments.

Methodology

Research Design and Approach

A multiple-case study approach was chosen to examine sustainable practices across various industries, providing comparative insights and enhancing the generalizability of findings.

Each case (company) is treated as an embedded unit of analysis, allowing in-depth exploration of firm-specific sustainability strategies while also facilitating cross-case comparisons. The research is grounded in established sustainability frameworks – for example, the *Triple Bottom Line* perspective (covering environmental, social, and economic performance) and stakeholder theory. These frameworks ensure that the analysis captures a holistic view of corporate sustainability, going beyond environmental metrics to include social responsibility and governance. Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) guidelines and the U.N. Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) were used as reference points.

Aligning the analysis with these criteria ensures consistency in evaluating each company's performance and signals what is expected in terms of disclosure and impact. Overall, the research design is descriptive (mapping out what sustainability initiatives companies have and their outcomes)

Data Collection Methods and Sources

Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected from multiple sources to ensure a robust, triangulated assessment. Primary qualitative data consist of corporate sustainability reports, annual reports, and official ESG (Environmental, Social, Governance) disclosures from the selected companies. These reports are rich in narrative detail about goals, initiatives, and self-reported progress. A *content analysis* was performed on these documents to identify key themes, commitments, and strategies – an approach similar to prior studies that analyzed Fortune 500 sustainability reports using text analysis software

In some instances, qualitative interviews or statements from corporate leaders (sourced from public interviews, earnings calls, or case studies) were used to enrich the understanding of internal motivations and implementation challenges. However, the bulk of data is documentary. All data were collected for the most recent reporting periods available (generally the past 5–8 years of sustainability reports and updates) to capture the current state of practices and recent progress. This multi-source data collection strengthens the study's validity through triangulation – cross-verifying claims (for example, if a company report claims a certain emissions reduction, this was cross-checked with CDP disclosures or third-party analyses when available).

Case Studies

(The following case studies examine five Fortune 500 companies, each representing a different industry: technology, finance, energy, manufacturing and retail. We analyse how each company approaches sustainability, what initiatives and strategies they have implemented, the challenges they face, and the outcomes of their efforts. We also discuss how each company's sustainability journey influences or reflect trend in its broader industry.)

Technology Sector – Apple Inc.

Sustainability Strategy: Apple has integrated sustainability into its product design, supply chain, and corporate operations, with the aim for full carbon neutrality across its business and product lifecycle by 2030. The company already uses 100% renewable energy for its global corporate operations and encourages suppliers to adopt renewable power as well [11].

Sustainability measures include using recycled and responsibly sourced materials like recycled aluminium and rare earth elements in new devices. Apple also designs products for enhanced energy efficiency and extended lifespan, offering better battery life and regular software updates. Additional initiatives include investments in renewable energy projects, logistics optimizations such as compact packaging, and programs like Apple Renew for device trade-in and recycling. These initiatives show Apple's commitment to integrating innovation with environmental stewardship, tracked annually in its Environmental Progress Reports [11].

Challenges and Outcomes: Despite its strong commitments, Apple faces several sustainability challenges and criticisms. One challenge is that Apple's rapid growth and product demand can counteract some gains. For instance, even as each device becomes more efficient, the sheer volume of products means Apple's total environmental impact remains significant. Critics have also questioned whether Apple's pledges are fully substantive. Some argue that Apple's sustainability push could be partly *marketing-driven*, noting that certain efforts might not tackle core issues. Accusations of "greenwashing" have been made, suggesting Apple's impressive initiatives may "lack substantial impact or depth" [12]. For example, while Apple has reduced packaging and increased recycling, it also has been criticized for product design choices that limit repairability and upgradability of devices

Another challenge is in Apple's supply chain. Ensuring that suppliers (often in developing countries) adhere to environmental and labour standards is complex. Apple has implemented stringent Supplier Codes of Conduct and regularly audits suppliers for compliance, [13] but past issues (e.g. factory labour conditions or mining impacts for minerals) show the difficulties in managing sustainability end-to-end.

In terms of outcomes, Apple has made substantial progress in sustainability by achieving 100% renewable energy for its internal operations and significantly reducing emissions across its supply chain and products [11]. Investments in renewable energy and improvements in product efficiency have resulted in millions of tons of emissions reductions annually. Recent MacBook and iPhone models incorporate 100% recycled aluminium enclosures, reducing environmental impacts from mining [11].

Apple's sustainability initiatives influence the broader industry. Her transparency and annual reporting (detailing scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions, etc.) contribute to making such disclosures an industry norm in tech driving competitors and suppliers towards setting higher transparency standards through detailed annual emissions reporting.

Finance Sector – JPMorgan Chase & Co.

Sustainability Strategy: JPMorgan Chase, the largest bank in the United States, approaches sustainability mostly via sustainable finance and risk management. As a financial institution, its direct environmental impact from buildings and operations is rather minimal; but, its sponsored emissions, stemming from the firms and projects it supports, are substantial. Recognizing this, JPMorgan has made a series of commitments to align its lending and investment portfolios with climate goals. In 2021, it announced a goal to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050 across its financing operations (joining the Net-Zero Banking Alliance at the time) [14]

JPMorgan also developed its *Carbon Compass* methodology to measure, monitor and report progress on her financed emissions goals [15], illustrating a data-driven approach to track the climate alignment of its lending.

Challenges and Performance: JPMorgan's role as a bank means its sustainability record is often judged by the companies it finances. A major challenge for JPMorgan is the inherent conflict between its sustainability pledges and its historical role as a top financier of fossil fuels. Advocacy groups have repeatedly identified JPMorgan as, historically, the world's largest financier of the fossil fuel industry. Lamar Johnson [16] noted that, since the Paris Agreement (2016–2023), JPMorgan has provided over $430 billion in financing to fossil fuel companies, the most of any bank globally

Another challenge is methodological: accurately measuring financed emissions depends heavily on client data and market scenarios, with uneven reporting by clients. Short-term financial opportunities may also conflict with long-term climate goals and JPMorgan seeks to mitigate this tension by encouraging clients to adopt Paris-aligned transition plans rather than abruptly divesting, although the effectiveness of engagement versus exclusion remains debated.

Looking at outcomes. On the climate alignment front, early reports show slight reductions in the carbon intensity of its power generation portfolio and auto manufacturing portfolio, indicating incremental progress. However, overall financed emissions are still very high, and JPMorgan's success in bending the curve will be clearer closer to 2030 [17]

The bank has also excelled in some social sustainability metrics. For example, it reached a milestone of 50% of hires being women and 45% ethnically diverse in the U.S., ESG News (2024), reflecting efforts to improve diversity and inclusion (often included in its sustainability reporting)

In terms of industry impact, JPMorgan often serves as a bellwether for the banking sector. Its large commitments (like the $2.5 trillion announcement, [18]) have arguably pushed other banks to announce similar sustainable finance goals, fuelling a sort of *"race to the top"* in green financing. Conversely, when JPMorgan pulled out of the net-zero alliance, it sparked concerns that

other banks might follow (and indeed some did), this showing how its actions can affect norms in sustainable finance.

Energy Sector – Exxon Mobil Corporation

Sustainability Strategy: Being an oil & gas supermajor, Exxon's approach to sustainability is complex and often controversial. Historically, ExxonMobil was slower than some peers to acknowledge and tackle climate change; but, in recent years it has developed a sustainability strategy centred on what it calls the "dual challenge": meeting the world's rising energy demand while also mitigating climate change and environmental impacts [19].

In practice, ExxonMobil's sustainability efforts have focused on operational efficiency and technological solutions rather than a pivot away from fossil fuels. For example, Exxon has set targets to reduce methane leaks and routine flaring from its oil and gas production, aiming to lower its operational greenhouse gas intensity. The company states it supports the Paris Agreement and has *endorsed the idea of carbon pricing* as a means to address climate change [20]

Notably, unlike some European oil majors, ExxonMobil has not committed to a company-wide net-zero emissions target by 2050 for its full value chain, focusing instead on a 2050 net-zero ambition for its operational (Scope 1 and 2) emissions and not its Scope 3 (product use) emissions [21]

Challenges and Industry Implications: The main challenge is that Exxon's core business model does not align with global climate goals. The company has continued to make significant investments in new oil and gas projects, spending tens of billions of dollars annually on fossil fuel exploration and development, even though the burning and exploration of its products (oil, gasoline, natural gas) is a major source of CO_2 emissions globally [21]

Public and investor pressure has presented another difficulty. When activist hedge fund Engine No. 1 won three seats on Exxon's board in 2021 in an attempt to compel the company to take more action on climate strategy, it sparked a shareholder revolt against Exxon's unwillingness to change fast enough [22]

As for outcomes, ExxonMobil can point to some progress: by 2025 (vs. 2016 levels), it aims to cut upstream flaring and methane emissions by 40–50%, and early reports indicate it's on track, having eliminated routine flaring in some operations and improved detection of methane leaks. The company has operational excellence in areas like safety and spill prevention, which are also aspects of environmental performance. However, in contrast to other cases, Exxon's measurable sustainability outcomes in terms of absolute emission reduction are limited. Its overall carbon footprint remains enormous and has not shown a significant decline, given that oil and gas output has not radically fallen. The company's positive contributions, like storing a few million tons of CO_2 or researching new energy, are often perceived as overshadowed by the scale of emissions from its main business.

The **broader industry implications** of ExxonMobil's stance are significant. Exxon's cautionary approach is emblematic of much of the oil and gas industry's dilemma: how to stay profitable

today (largely via fossil fuels) while preparing for a low-carbon future. If Exxon were to meaningfully pivot or set a net-zero target, it could signal a stronger industry shift; instead, its strategy has somewhat *held back the pace* among U.S. oil companies. (Notably, European competitors like BP and Shell have taken more aggressive stances on transitioning, whereas Exxon and some U.S. peers have not, possibly influencing others to also take a slower route in North America).

Manufacturing Sector – The Procter & Gamble Company (P&G)

Sustainability Strategy: Leading global consumer goods manufacturer, Procter & Gamble (with brands like Tide, Pampers, Gillette, etc.), has a comprehensive sustainability plan that considers the company's environmental impact throughout the supply chain and product life cycles. P&G's approach is summed up in its "Net Zero 2040" pledge and its ambitious goals for 2030 and beyond, frequently referred to as "Ambition 2030" [23]. It established a science-based goal to reduce GHG emissions by 50% by 2030 in comparison to a baseline set in 2010 [24].

Beyond climate, P&G's sustainability strategy has key pillars in Waste, Water, and Forestry/Materials. Launching the first recyclable shampoo bottle made partially of ocean plastic (under the Head & Shoulders brand) was one well-known waste initiative. P&G set out to source billions of litres of water from circular (reused) sources. By creating detergents that clean well in cold water, P&G encourages customers to wash their laundry in cold cycles, which saves energy, and it runs campaigns to educate consumers about water conservation (such as taking shorter showers with efficient shower products). The company also focuses on helping consumers use less water and energy with its products. On material sourcing, P&G it requires that all wood pulp and palm oil in its products come from responsible sources [25].

Challenges and Results: One challenge is the complexity of its supply chain and product formulations; ensuring that thousands of suppliers (from chemical manufacturers to packaging suppliers to farmers of raw materials) meet environmental and social standards is a continuous task. P&G frequently has to collaborate with suppliers to innovate new materials (like biodegradable ingredients or recycled resins) that meet performance and safety standards. And there can be higher costs or technical hurdles in switching to greener alternatives, which P&G must balance against its financial goals.

The inherent sustainability trade-offs in some of P&G's product categories presents another difficulty. For instance, single-use consumer products like razors and diapers generate waste. P&G has tried recycling diapers and extending the life of razors, but at its core, a large portion of its business depends on disposables.

Although P&G tries to support it, it is partially beyond its control to change consumer behaviour, such as encouraging people to recycle packaging or accept reuse models. Environmental organizations have also criticized P&G for certain issues, such as the sourcing of palm oil that contributes to tropical deforestation and the sourcing of wood pulp for tissue products that contributes to the loss of Canadian boreal forests.

In terms of **outcomes**, P&G has made measurable progress across multiple sustainability fronts. Climate-wise, the aforementioned >50% reduction in operational GHG emissions by 2020 is a significant achievement [26]. The company noted that since 2010, its energy efficiency improvements have saved it hundreds of millions of dollars in energy costs [27].

This reinforces the business case for sustainability: eco-efficiency often lowers operating costs. By 2021, P&G reported reaching 97% renewable electricity globally [28], including 100% in North America and Europe, putting it very close to its 100% goal well ahead of 2030.

One notable result of P&G's **influence** is that many of its suppliers and peer companies have adopted similar sustainability metrics, multiplying the impact. For instance, P&G's early move to score suppliers on sustainability [25], likely encouraged the creation of industry-wide tools for supplier sustainability assessments (now common in manufacturing supply chains). The broader implication in the consumer goods and manufacturing industry is that sustainability has become a key component of corporate strategy. Competitors like Unilever, Nestlé, etc., often try to one-up each other in sustainability commitments, which overall raises industry standards.

Retail Sector – Walmart Inc.

Sustainability Strategy: The largest retailer in the world, Walmart, has implemented sustainability policies emphasizing its vast supply chain and store operations. Recognizing that the bulk of its environmental impact comes from the production of goods it sells, Walmart's flagship initiative is Project Gigaton, launched in 2020. The goal of Project Gigaton was to work with suppliers to reduce or avoid one billion metric tons (a gigaton) of greenhouse gases from the global value chain by 2030 [29]. Walmart's approach has been to enrol suppliers in climate action by providing toolkits, education, and an online reporting platform for emissions reduction projects.

Walmart also drove sustainability initiative largely through its products and sourcing models. It developed a Sustainability Index (in collaboration with The Sustainability Consortium) to evaluate the environmental effect of items on its shelves, encouraging suppliers to improve scores. Essentially, Walmart's sustainability strategy is defined by leveraging its massive scale for influence on her suppliers: *"when the world's largest retailer takes on a supply chain initiative, the results can have global ramifications"* [30]

Walmart has also advanced in its own activities; it has reduced energy intensity in stores through LED lighting and efficient HVAC systems, increased electric vehicle use in its logistics, and diverted waste from landfills (many Walmart locations have recycling programs, and some achieved zero waste status). While exact figures vary by region, Walmart has steadily increased its use of renewables (dozens of onsite solar installations and wind power contracts) and is aiming for a 100% renewable electricity by 2035

Challenges and Outcomes: Internally, a key difficulty was getting tens of thousands of suppliers, mainly in developing nations, to prioritize emissions reduction and other goals. One way Walmart tackled this was by offering incentives and resources: it taught suppliers on the benefit of sustainability (for example, how cutting energy use can lower costs) and even facilitated access to financing for sustainability improvements.

Culturally, Walmart had to educate its customers and merchandisers to consider sustainability in product sourcing decisions, which meant redefining metrics of success beyond price and quality to include environmental impact. Inspite of these challenges, Walmart has reported impressive financial outcomes. In 2024, the company announced that it met its Project Gigaton target, a full six years ahead of schedule [30]

The **broader implications** of Walmart's sustainability initiatives are substantial for the retail industry. Walmart effectively set new norms for supply chain engagement on sustainability – its Project Gigaton demonstrated that a retailer can influence Scope 3 (supply chain) emissions at scale, something many companies struggled with. And this has put pressure on other retailers and large brand manufacturers to implement similar programs or risk falling behind in climate action. Indeed, peers like Target, Amazon, and others have announced their own supplier sustainability programs, in part to keep up with the standards Walmart helped establish.

Conclusion: These case studies of these companies across different industries demonstrates a spectrum of sustainability practices and their outcomes. Each company – Apple, JPMorgan, , ExxonMobil, Procter & Gamble, and Walmart– has integrated sustainability into their operations to varying extents, reflective of its industry context and stakeholder pressures. From the tech sector's push for carbon-neutral products to retail's supply-chain-wide initiatives, and from finance's capital reallocation to manufacturing's lifecycle management, it is clear that sustainability has become a strategic imperative for large corporations. The challenges are as notable as the achievements: companies must continuously innovate, invest, and sometimes fundamentally change their business models to meet sustainability goals, all while maintaining profitability and navigating stakeholder expectations [32].

Collectively, these analyses underscore that effective sustainability practices require robust methodology – careful planning, data-driven evaluation, and willingness to learn and adapt – as well as bold leadership to set and follow through on ambitious targets. So, the broader implication for industry is that sustainability is no longer a niche add-on but is increasingly central to business excellence and long-term competitiveness [31].

References

1. Hart, S. L., & Milstein, M. B. (2003). Creating sustainable value. *Academy of Management Executive*, 17(2), 56-67
2. Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(1-2), 62-77
3. Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2014). The impact of corporate sustainability on organizational processes and performance. *Management Science*, 60(11), 2835-2857
4. Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with Forks: The Triple Bottom Line of 21st Century Business*. Capstone, Oxford
5. Dyllick, T., & Muff, K. (2016). Clarifying the meaning of sustainable business: Introducing a typology from business-as-usual to true business sustainability. *Organization & Environment*, 29(2), 156-174.
6. Kolk, A., & Pinkse, J. (2008). A perspective on multinational enterprises and climate change: Learning from "an inconvenient truth"? *Journal of International Business Studies*, 39(8), 1359-1378.
7. Friede, G., Busch, T., & Bassen, A. (2015). ESG and financial performance: Aggregated evidence from more than 2000 empirical studies. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, 5(4), 210-233.
8. Epstein, M. J., & Buhovac, A. R. (2014). *Making Sustainability Work: Best Practices in Managing and Measuring Corporate Social, Environmental, and Economic Impacts*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers
9. Carroll, A. B., & Shabana, K. M. (2010). The business case for corporate social responsibility: A review of concepts, research, and practice. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(1), 85-105
10. Lozano, R. (2015). A holistic perspective on corporate sustainability drivers. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 23(1), 32-47
11. Greener wisdom (2024) 'Apple and Sustainability: How far are they really going, 28 November. Available at: https://www.greenerwisdom.com/blog/apple-and-sustainability/ (Accessed: 24 March 2025).
12. Nando, T. (2023) 'Apple's first 'carbon neutral' products: Greenwashing or genuine sustainability?', Impakter, 13 September. Available at: https://impakter.com/apples-first-carbon-neutral-products-greenwashing-or-genuine-sustainability/ (Accessed: 24 March 2025).
13. Apple (2022). How we work with suppliers. Available at: https://www.apple.com/euro/supplier-responsibility/l/generic/pdf/How-We-Work-With-Suppliers.pdf (Accessed: 24 March 2025).
14. Sow, A.Y. (2024) *JP Morgan Chase & Co: Report on Climate Transition Planning — As You Sow*. https://www.asyousow.org/resolutions/2023/12/04-jpmorgan-chase-report-climate-transition-planning#:~:text=JP%20Morgan%20Chase%20%26%20Co%3A,financing%20activity%20in%20nine%20sectors (Accessed: March 29, 2025).
15. JP Morgan (2025). Carbon Compass Methodology. Available at: https://www.jpmorgan.com/investment-banking/center-for-carbon-transition/carbon-compass#:~:text=Carbon%20Compass%C2%AE%20Methodology%20,strategy%20is%20helping%20our (Accessed: 24 March 2025).

16. Lamar J (2025). Global banks have spent $6.9 trillion on fossil fuels since 2016. Available at: https://www.utilitydive.com/news/banking-climate-chaos-2024-banks-6-9t-fossil-fuel-finance-expansion-jpmorgan-citi-bofa-rbc/716109/#:~:text=measurement%20to%20an%20%E2%80%9Cenergy%20mix%E2%80%9D,target (Accessed: 24 March 2025).
17. JP Morgan (2025, 2). Sustainability initiatives. Available at https://www.jpmorganchase.com/impact/environmental-sustainability/es-initiatives#:~:text=Sustainability%20Initiatives%20,reduction%20in%20operational%20carbon (Accessed: 24 March 2025)
18. ESG News (2024). JP Morgan to Invest $2.5trillion for sustainable Development Financing by 2030. Available at: https://esgnews.com/jp-morgan-to-invest-2-5-trillion-for-sustainable-development-financing-by-2030-reveals-new-2023-esg-report/#:~:text=development%20financing%20target%20by%202030,fostering%20an%20inclusive%20workplace%20culture. (Accessed: 25 March 2025)
19. ExxonMobil (2025). 2024 Advancing Climate Solutions Report. Available at: https://corporate.exxonmobil.com/sustainability-and-reports/advancing-climate-solutions?print=true#Abouttheреport. (Accessed: 25 March 2025)
20. ExxonMobil (2021). Our position on climate change Policy and carbon pricing. Available at: https://corporate.exxonmobil.com/news/viewpoints/our-position-on-climate-policy#:~:text=Our%20position%20on%20climate%20change,Paris%20Agreement%20since%20its%20inception. (Accessed: 25 March 2025)
21. Client Earth (2021). Greenwashing files. Available at: https://www.clientearth.org/projects/the-greenwashing-files/exxonmobil/#:~:text=ExxonMobil%20has%20not%20set%20a,of%20its%20Scope%203%20emissions. (Accessed: 25 March 2025)
22. Hiller, J. and Herbst-Bayliss, S. (eds) (2021) *Exxon loses board seats to activist hedge fund in landmark climate vote*. https://www.reuters.com/business/sustainable-business/shareholder-activism-reaches-milestone-exxon-board-vote-nears-end-2021-05-26/#:~:text=May%2026%20%28Reuters%29%20,efforts%20to%20combat%20climate%20change (Accessed: March 25, 2024).
23. Procter & Gamble. (2022). *A closer look – P&G's first year progress toward net zero 2040*. P&G News. https://us.pg.com/blogs/first-year-progress-toward-net-zero-2040/ .(Accessed: March 25, 2025).
24. *Engie Impact* (2019) 'Procter & Gamble's sustainable business practices,' 26 October.
25. Lucà, F. (2016) *Successful Sustainability Strategy: Procter & Gamble case*. https://www.bsl-lausanne.ch/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Luca-F-Procter-Gamble-Case-Study.pdf.
26. Procter & Gamble (2021) A closer look at Procter & Gamble's net zero 2040 ambition. https://us.pg.com/blogs/net-zero-closer-look/ (Accessed: March 26, 2025).
27. Kapadia, S. (2018) 'P&G pledges 100% renewable energy at its plants,' *Supply Chain Dive*, 17 April. https://www.supplychaindive.com/news/procter-gamble-100-percent-renewable-energy/521447/#:~:text=,P%26G%20stated%20in%20its%20report.
28. Ambition 2040 Ctap (2021) *P&G Climate Transition Action Plan*
29. Walmart Inc. (n.d.) *Project Gigaton*. Walmart Sustainability Hub. Available at: https://www.walmartsustainabilityhub.com/project-gigaton (Accessed: 28 March 2025)

30. Unglesbee, B. (2024) 'Flexing for the planet: How Walmart crushed its supplier emissions target,' *Supply Chain Dive*. https://www.supplychaindive.com/news/walmart-project-gigaton-scope-3-supplier-emissions-ron-voglewede/710733/#:~:text=With%20over%20100%2C000%20suppliers%2C%20the,boggling.
31. Brand, P. (2025) *Sustainability reports track Fortune 500 corporate climate action*. https://purposebrand.com/blog/sustainability-report-examples-fortune-2023/#:~:text=Answering%20a%20renewed%20call%20for,practices%20in%202024%20and%20beyoKnd (Accessed: March 28, 2025).
32. Bonini, S., & Swartz, S. (2014). *Profits with purpose: How organizing for sustainability can benefit the bottom line*. McKinsey & Company.