PriMera Scientific Engineering
Volume 8 Issue 2 February 2026
DOI: 10.56831/PSEN-08-251
ISSN: 2834-2550

Engineering Trust in Sustainability Data: From ESG Ambition to Audit-Ready Execution

Type: Review Article
Received: December 15, 2025
Published: February 03, 2026

Citation:
Sameera Fernandes. "Engineering Trust in Sustainability Data: From ESG Ambition to Audit-Ready Execution". PriMera Scientific Engineering 8.2 (2026): 35-39.

Sameera Fernandes*

Garden City University, Bengaluru, India

***Corresponding Author:** Sameera Fernandes, Garden City University, Bengaluru, India.

Abstract

Sustainability has moved from narrative to necessity, and the next phase of ESG is no longer about intent—it is about engineering: how organizations measure, validate, and operationalize environmental and social performance with the same rigor they apply to financial reporting, safety, and quality. Yet many ESG programs still depend on fragmented spreadsheets, inconsistent boundaries, and "best effort" estimates that cannot withstand assurance. This creates a trust gap that slows decision-making, limits access to sustainable finance, and undermines confidence among regulators, investors, employees, and customers.

This editorial proposes a practical engineering approach to close that gap: build an audit-ready "Sustainability Data Stack" that integrates materiality, data architecture, calculation engines, internal controls, and decision loops. The objective is not to produce more dashboards, but to create traceable, reproducible sustainability metrics that reliably inform capital allocation, procurement, product design, and risk management. The article outlines design principles (traceability, interoperability, governance by design, and human-centered workflows), a reference architecture, and a staged implementation roadmap—from a minimum viable system to enterprise-scale integration. Finally, it argues that the organizations most prepared for the low-carbon economy will be those that treat ESG as a systems engineering challenge: measurable, testable, and continuously improved.

Keywords: Sustainability engineering; ESG data; engineering management; audit readiness; digital transformation

Introduction

Across industries, ESG has matured from a communications exercise to a performance discipline. The question leaders now face is simple: *Can we prove what we claim—and can we act on it?* In my work at the intersection of sustainability, governance, and finance, I see growing alignment around the "why" of sustainability—and persistent friction around the "how". Collaboration across sectors is expanding, and that is encouraging. But collaboration without measurement discipline quickly turns into good intentions without reliable outcomes.

Engineering has always existed to translate ambition into execution. Whether the goal is safety, quality, uptime, or resilience, engineering makes progress real by defining systems, requirements, controls, and verification. ESG needs the same treatment. The shift underway is not merely toward reporting; it is toward operational accountability—where climate and social performance influence real decisions such as asset upgrades, supplier selection, product design, and funding costs.

This is where sustainability professionals must partner deeply with engineers, data teams, and internal audit functions. The future belongs to organizations that can build trust in their sustainability data—because trust is what turns commitments into capital, and metrics into management.

The Core Problem: ESG's "Measurement Debt"

Many organizations carry what I call *measurement debt*: the accumulated cost of incomplete definitions, weak data lineage, and inconsistent calculation logic. It grows quietly until a triggering event—assurance, regulatory scrutiny, investor due diligence, a client questionnaire, or a reputational incident—forces a reckoning.

Common symptoms include:

1. ***Unclear boundaries:*** Which sites, subsidiaries, joint ventures, or leased assets are included? Are boundaries consistent year-to-year?
2. ***Inconsistent activity data:*** Utility bills, fuel logs, travel data, refrigerant leaks, procurement spend, and supplier emissions are captured differently across units.
3. ***Opaque calculations:*** Emission factors, assumptions, and conversion logic live in spreadsheets that are difficult to reproduce.
4. ***Weak control environment:*** There is limited evidence of review, approvals, and change management for sustainability metrics.
5. ***Low decision usefulness:*** Reports are published, but the numbers don't reliably influence operations, procurement, or investment choices.

These weaknesses do not reflect a lack of commitment—rather, they reflect a lack of engineered infrastructure. ESG is inherently cross-functional and data-heavy. Without deliberate system design, it defaults to manual workarounds and "heroics" that do not scale.

Design Principles for an Audit-Ready Sustainability Data Stack

If ESG is to be decision-grade, it must be engineered like any other critical business system. The following principles have proven to be the difference between "reporting" and "readiness".

Traceability over perfection

Early ESG datasets will never be perfect, especially for value-chain metrics. The goal is not perfection; it is traceability—a clear line from each KPI to source data, ownership, assumptions, and version history.

Interoperability by default

Sustainability data must flow across ERP, finance systems, procurement platforms, travel tools, facility management, and supplier portals. Designing for interoperability prevents ESG from becoming another silo.

Controls embedded in the workflow

Internal controls cannot be an afterthought. They must be built into data collection and approval pathways: reconciliations, variance checks, role-based access, review logs, and auditable change control.

Materiality drives architecture

Materiality is not just a reporting concept; it is an engineering prioritization tool. Build the system around what is materially decision-relevant for your business model, geography, stakeholders, and risk profile.

Human-centered sustainability operations

The best systems fail when they ignore reality: people are busy, incentives are mixed, and data owners are distributed. Sustainability operations must be designed so that contributors can do the right thing with minimal friction.

Reference Architecture: The Sustainability Data Stack

An effective ESG infrastructure can be described as five integrated layers.

Layer 1: Materiality and KPI registry

Start with a controlled registry of KPIs that defines: metric owner, scope and boundary rules, cadence, source systems, calculation logic, and required evidence. This registry becomes the "single source of truth" for what the organization measures and why.

Layer 2: Data acquisition and normalization

Capture activity data from the most reliable available sources, such as:

- Utilities and energy management systems.
- Fleet and fuel systems.
- Travel and expense platforms.
- Procurement and supplier spend data.
- Refrigerant and equipment maintenance logs.
- HR and H&S systems for social metrics.

Normalize units, timestamps, site identifiers, and organizational hierarchies. Poor normalization creates downstream chaos.

Layer 3: Calculation engines and factor governance

Centralize conversions and calculations (for example, emissions factors and global warming potentials) with strict versioning. Treat factors like controlled engineering inputs: documented, reviewed, and updated with change logs.

Layer 4: Controls, assurance readiness, and audit trail

Embed:

- Automated validation rules (missing data checks, outlier detection, period-on-period variance flags).
- Reviewer workflows and approvals.
- Evidence attachments (bills, contracts, meter exports).
- Immutable audit logs for changes to data and calculation logic.

This layer is what transforms ESG from "estimated" to "assurable".

Layer 5: Decision loops and management integration

The final layer is where ESG becomes operational:

- ***Procurement:*** supplier requirements, preferred materials, and emissions-informed sourcing.

- ***CapEx:*** retrofit decisions, building performance upgrades, and fleet transition planning.
- ***Risk:*** climate scenario sensitivity, asset resilience, and transition exposure.
- ***Finance:*** product design for sustainable finance instruments and investor-grade disclosures.

If ESG does not reach this layer, it remains a reporting activity rather than a business capability.

From Reporting to Engineering Management: Practical Use Cases

When ESG systems are engineered correctly, they enable tangible management applications:

Operational performance and cost optimization

Energy and emissions reduction are often strongly correlated with efficiency gains. A reliable data stack identifies where consumption is structural versus behavioral, and where upgrades produce the highest returns.

Supplier engagement with credible baselines

Supplier emissions programs fail when baselines are unclear. A structured data model clarifies which categories matter most, how estimates are derived, and what evidence is required for improvement claims.

Product and service innovation

Engineering-grade ESG data can shape product offerings that meet evolving client expectations—especially in markets where sustainable procurement and disclosure requirements are increasing.

Building a "digital twin" mindset for sustainability

Not every organization needs a formal digital twin. But every organization benefits from digital twin thinking: a living model that links operational inputs to sustainability outputs, enabling scenario testing and continuous improvement.

Implementation Roadmap: A Staged Approach That Works

A practical rollout avoids two traps: (1) trying to implement an enterprise system before definitions are stable, and (2) staying forever in spreadsheets.

Phase 1 (0–90 days): Minimum Viable Sustainability Stack

- Establish KPI registry and boundaries.
- Identify top 10–20 data sources that drive material metrics.
- Define calculation rules and factor governance.
- Implement basic controls (reviews, variance checks, evidence retention).

Phase 2 (3–12 months): Integration and assurance readiness

- Integrate with finance and procurement systems
- Expand coverage across sites and subsidiaries
- Automate data ingestion where feasible
- Formalize internal control testing and documentation

Phase 3 (12+ months): Optimization and strategic value

- Move from historical reporting to predictive insights.
- Embed sustainability metrics in management scorecards.

- Use scenario analysis to guide investment and resilience planning.
- Strengthen supplier data collection and verification pathways.

Conclusion

The next era of ESG will be defined by engineering discipline. The organizations that lead will not be those with the most polished sustainability narratives, but those with the strongest underlying systems—systems that can produce consistent metrics, withstand assurance, and guide real decisions.

Sustainability is ultimately a transformation of how we design, build, operate, procure, and invest. That transformation requires collaboration—but also architecture, controls, and verification. If we treat ESG as a systems engineering challenge, we move from ambition to execution, from reporting to readiness, and from intention to impact.

Acknowledgement

The author acknowledges the contributions of sustainability practitioners, engineers, data teams, and governance leaders whose work continues to advance practical, measurable approaches to sustainable transformation.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest for this editorial.

References

1. United Nations. "Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development". United Nations (2015).
2. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). "World Investment Report 2023: Investing in sustainable energy for all". UNCTAD (2023).
3. World Resources Institute and World Business Council for Sustainable Development. "The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard". WRI/WBCSD (2004).
4. IFRS Foundation. "International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB) Standards IFRS S1 and IFRS S2". IFRS Foundation (2023).
5. International Organization for Standardization. "ISO 14064-1: Greenhouse gases — Part 1: Specification with guidance at the organization level". ISO (2018).