



Governance Alerts (Short-Form Analysis)

Alert 24-01

Reconciling IFRS Sustainability Disclosures with U.S. SEC Mandates

Category: Corporate Governance | Audience: Boards, Audit Committees, CFOs, General Counsel, and Risk Leaders

Purpose: To alert directors and senior managers that sustainability reporting is becoming a controlled, finance-grade disclosure function, not a marketing narrative.

Board-Level Alert

For U.S. companies, the SEC climate disclosure rule may be legally dormant, but sustainability disclosure obligations are not dormant. IFRS S1 and IFRS S2 now provide a global investor-focused baseline; the EU and California continue to impose mandatory sustainability and climate reporting obligations on many cross-border or large U.S.-based companies; and existing SEC rules still require disclosure of material risks, known trends, uncertainties, and risk factors.^{1-8,11} The fiduciary issue is consistency: a company cannot safely tell one sustainability story in SEC filings, another to foreign regulators, another to customers, and another to lenders.

Why This Alert Matters Now

Sustainability disclosure has entered a transitional and potentially confusing period. The International Sustainability Standards Board issued IFRS S1 and IFRS S2 in 2023, effective for annual reporting periods beginning on or after January 1, 2024, and the IFRS Foundation has published jurisdictional guidance to support global adoption and comparability.¹⁻³ At the same time, the SEC adopted final climate-related disclosure rules in March 2024, delayed their effective date indefinitely in April 2024 pending judicial review, and voted in March 2025 to end its defense of those rules.⁴⁻⁶

The result is not regulatory silence. It is regulatory fragmentation. The federal SEC climate rule is stayed, but Regulation S-K still requires material MD&A and risk-factor disclosure, including known trends, uncertainties, and risks that are reasonably likely to materially affect financial condition, liquidity, results of operations, or investment risk.^{7,8} In parallel, California now requires certain large U.S.-based entities doing business in California to report Scope 1 and Scope 2 greenhouse gas emissions beginning in 2026, Scope 3 emissions beginning in 2027, and biennial climate-related financial-risk reports for covered entities above the lower revenue threshold.¹¹

Boards should therefore treat sustainability reporting as a disclosure-control issue. The danger is not merely that the company may miss a filing deadline. The more serious risk is that sustainability data, climate-risk narrative, public commitments, SEC disclosures, lender packages, customer questionnaires, international reports, and website statements diverge from one another. Once that divergence occurs, management has created a record that may be characterized as incomplete, misleading, inadequately controlled, or unsupported.

The Core Friction: Different Standards Are Asking Similar Questions in Different Legal Languages

IFRS S1 requires disclosure of sustainability-related risks and opportunities useful to users of general purpose financial reports when they make resource-allocation decisions. IFRS S2 applies that architecture to climate-related risks and opportunities.^{1,2} The standards are investor-focused and designed to connect sustainability matters to enterprise value, prospects, cash flows, access to capital, and financial resilience. IFRS S1 also emphasizes connected information, timing with related financial statements, and qualitative characteristics such as comparability, verifiability, timeliness, and understandability.¹

The SEC framework is legally different. U.S. disclosure obligations are anchored in materiality, management discussion and analysis, risk factors, financial statement requirements, and antifraud principles. Even without an operative SEC climate rule, the company must evaluate whether climate, sustainability, transition, regulatory, supply chain, energy, physical-risk, customer-demand, or capital-market factors are material under existing SEC disclosure rules.^{7,8}

The EU framework adds a third vocabulary. The Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive and European Sustainability Reporting Standards introduced a broader sustainability reporting architecture, including double materiality concepts, although the EU Omnibus simplification process has narrowed and delayed significant elements. Directive (EU) 2026/470, published in the Official Journal on February 26, 2026, raises key thresholds for third-country undertakings and simplifies parts of the reporting and due diligence regime.^{9,10} For a U.S. board, simplification should not be confused with elimination. Foreign subsidiaries, EU revenue, EU customers, supply-chain demands, financing terms, and acquisition strategy can still pull a domestic company into sustainability reporting expectations before it becomes a direct legal registrant.

What the Board Needs to Understand

Materiality does not mean the same thing everywhere. IFRS sustainability disclosures are investor-oriented; SEC disclosures are grounded in U.S. securities-law materiality; EU sustainability reporting may require impact and financial materiality analysis. A board-level crosswalk is needed before management can safely harmonize disclosures.^{1,2,7-10}

Scope boundaries differ. The stayed SEC rule would have required climate-risk disclosures and, for certain filers, material Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions disclosures, but not Scope 3 emissions.

IFRS S2, California, and EU reporting can create broader emissions-data expectations, including value-chain data.^{2,4,11-13}

Assurance expectations are rising. Sustainability information is moving toward the same control discipline historically reserved for financial reporting. COSO has expressly extended internal-control concepts to sustainability reporting through its ICSR guidance.¹⁴

Public statements are evidence. Sustainability commitments, net-zero claims, supplier questionnaires, investor decks, RFP responses, public website language, annual reports, and lender materials should be reconciled to the same controlled data set.

The CFO and General Counsel must be synchronized. Finance owns data reliability, measurement discipline, controls, and assurance readiness. Legal owns materiality, liability, privilege, disclosure consistency, regulatory interpretation, and claims substantiation. The board needs both functions operating from one disclosure architecture.

The Fiduciary Risk: A Disclosure-Control Failure Disguised as an ESG Issue

Directors do not need to become climate scientists or sustainability accountants. They do need to require a reliable reporting system. The governance question is whether management can prove that sustainability disclosures are complete enough, consistent enough, and controlled enough to support the company's regulatory, financing, customer, investor, and strategic-growth needs.

This is where many companies are exposed. The sustainability team may use one emissions methodology; finance may use another set of assumptions for capital planning; legal may draft risk factors without seeing customer-facing climate claims; procurement may respond to EU customer questionnaires without disclosure review; and investor relations may describe sustainability performance using metrics that have not been tested through controls. The company then creates multiple disclosure records, each plausible in isolation, but inconsistent when compared by a regulator, lender, plaintiff, acquirer, auditor, or activist investor.

The board response should not be to wait until every rule is final. It should be to build an adaptable disclosure-control platform that can absorb jurisdictional changes. That platform should begin with a master inventory of sustainability claims, metrics, owners, source systems, methodologies, reporting obligations, assurance status, and legal review protocols.

Board-Level Red Flags

Red Flag	Why It Matters	Board Response
No disclosure crosswalk	Management cannot reconcile IFRS, SEC, EU, California, lender, and customer requirements.	Require a jurisdictional crosswalk showing scope, materiality, emissions, assurance, timing, and responsible owners.
Separate sustainability data system	Data used in sustainability reports may not match data used in finance, risk, legal, or operations.	Create a controlled source of truth with documented methodologies, change controls, and approval workflow.
Unsupported climate claims	Website, investor, sales, or RFP claims can become misleading if they exceed verified evidence.	Require substantiation files and legal review for material sustainability or climate-performance claims.
No Scope 3 plan	Value-chain data can be required or requested even when federal SEC rules do not require it.	Map material suppliers, customers, data gaps, estimation methods, and transition reliefs before first mandatory reporting cycle.
Audit committee not engaged	Sustainability reporting is becoming assurance-ready financial information.	Assign oversight to the audit committee or a coordinated audit/risk committee with CFO and GC reporting.
Disconnected risk factors	SEC filings may omit sustainability trends that are discussed elsewhere.	Reconcile MD&A, risk factors, financial-statement estimates, enterprise risk registers, and public sustainability narratives.

Board Questions for the Next Meeting

Which sustainability or climate disclosure regimes directly apply to us today, and which may apply based on our growth plan, customer base, EU activity, California nexus, financing strategy, or acquisition pipeline?

Do we maintain one inventory of all sustainability claims, reports, metrics, questionnaires, website statements, investor materials, lender submissions, and regulatory filings?

Which function owns greenhouse-gas data, and who validates the methodology, organizational boundary, operational boundary, source data, estimates, and changes?

Have we mapped IFRS S1/S2, SEC Regulation S-K, EU/ESRS, California, GHG Protocol, and customer/lender reporting requirements into a single disclosure-control framework?

Are sustainability disclosures subject to the same discipline as financial disclosures - documentation, review, version control, sign-off, escalation, and retention?

What is our assurance roadmap, and what would an auditor or attestation provider identify today as the largest evidence gaps?

Recommended Management Response

Within 30 days, management should prepare a sustainability disclosure inventory: all required, voluntary, investor-facing, lender-facing, customer-facing, regulator-facing, and website-based sustainability statements. The inventory should identify data owners, source systems, calculation methods, legal review status, and whether the information is used in any SEC filing or board-approved strategic plan.

Within 60 days, management should produce a jurisdictional crosswalk. At minimum, it should compare IFRS S1, IFRS S2, existing SEC Regulation S-K obligations, the stayed SEC climate rule, EU/ESRS obligations or exposure, California SB 253/SB 261 exposure, and GHG Protocol emissions data requirements.¹⁻¹³ The crosswalk should separate direct legal obligations from market-driven obligations such as customer questionnaires, lender covenants, vendor codes of conduct, and acquisition due diligence.

Within 90 days, management should deliver a board dashboard showing material sustainability risks, reporting obligations, data gaps, assurance-readiness gaps, major public claims, Scope 1, Scope 2, and Scope 3 readiness, and unresolved legal positions. The dashboard should be owned jointly by the CFO and General Counsel, with sustainability, operations, procurement, investor relations, and internal audit operating as contributing functions.

Bottom Line

The board should not view IFRS sustainability reporting, the stayed SEC climate rule, EU sustainability standards, California climate disclosure, and customer or lender ESG requests as separate compliance projects. They are different entry points into the same fiduciary problem: whether the company has a controlled, finance-grade sustainability information architecture. The companies most exposed are not necessarily those with the highest emissions or most complex global footprint. They are the companies whose disclosures are fragmented, unsupported, inconsistent, and not owned by a synchronized CFO-GC governance process.

The prudent board response is therefore not to wait for regulatory certainty. It is to require disclosure consistency, controlled data, jurisdictional mapping, claims substantiation, and board-visible accountability before the company is forced to reconcile divergent stories under regulatory, investor, litigation, or transaction pressure.

References

1. IFRS Foundation. IFRS S1 General Requirements for Disclosure of Sustainability-related Financial Information. Issued June 2023; effective for annual reporting periods beginning on or after January 1, 2024. Accessed April 28, 2026. <https://www.ifrs.org/issued-standards/ifrs-sustainability-standards-navigator/ifrs-s1-general-requirements/>
2. IFRS Foundation. IFRS S2 Climate-related Disclosures. Issued June 2023; effective for annual reporting periods beginning on or after January 1, 2024. Accessed April 28, 2026. <https://www.ifrs.org/issued-standards/ifrs-sustainability-standards-navigator/ifrs-s2-climate-related-disclosures/>
3. IFRS Foundation. Inaugural Jurisdictional Guide for the Adoption or Other Use of ISSB Standards. Published May 2024. Accessed April 28, 2026. <https://www.ifrs.org/ifrs-sustainability-disclosure-standards-around-the-world/jurisdictional-guide/>
4. Securities and Exchange Commission. The Enhancement and Standardization of Climate-Related Disclosures for Investors. Release Nos. 33-11275; 34-99678; File No. S7-10-22. March 6, 2024. Accessed April 28, 2026. <https://www.sec.gov/rules-regulations/2024/03/s7-10-22>
5. Securities and Exchange Commission. The Enhancement and Standardization of Climate-Related Disclosures for Investors; Delay of Effective Date. Federal Register. 2024;89:25805. Published April 12, 2024. Accessed April 28, 2026. <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2024/04/12/2024-07648/the-enhancement-and-standardization-of-climate-related-disclosures-for-investors-delay-of-effective>
6. Securities and Exchange Commission. SEC Votes to End Defense of Climate Disclosure Rules. Press release 2025-58. Published March 27, 2025. Accessed April 28, 2026. <https://www.sec.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2025-58>
7. 17 CFR Section 229.303. Item 303 - Management's discussion and analysis of financial condition and results of operations. Electronic Code of Federal Regulations. Accessed April 28, 2026. <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-17/chapter-II/part-229/subpart-229.300/section-229.303>
8. 17 CFR Section 229.105. Item 105 - Risk factors. Electronic Code of Federal Regulations. Accessed April 28, 2026. <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-17/chapter-II/part-229/subpart-229.100/section-229.105>
9. Directive (EU) 2026/470 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 February 2026 amending Directives 2006/43/EC, 2013/34/EU, (EU) 2022/2464 and (EU) 2024/1760 as regards

certain corporate sustainability reporting requirements and certain corporate sustainability due diligence requirements. Official Journal of the European Union. Published February 26, 2026. Accessed April 28, 2026. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/dir/2026/470/oj>

10. Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2023/2772 of 31 July 2023 supplementing Directive 2013/34/EU as regards sustainability reporting standards. Official Journal of the European Union. Published December 22, 2023. Accessed April 28, 2026. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg_del/2023/2772/oj

11. California Air Resources Board. CARB approves climate transparency regulation for entities doing business in California. Published February 26, 2026. Accessed April 28, 2026. <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/news/carb-approves-climate-transparency-regulation-entities-doing-business-california>

12. Greenhouse Gas Protocol. Corporate Standard. Accessed April 28, 2026. <https://ghgprotocol.org/corporate-standard>

13. Greenhouse Gas Protocol. Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard. Accessed April 28, 2026. <https://ghgprotocol.org/corporate-value-chain-scope-3-standard>

14. Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission. Internal Control - Integrated Framework; Achieving Effective Internal Control Over Sustainability Reporting. Accessed April 28, 2026. <https://www.coso.org/guidance-on-ic>

About the Author:



George (Keoki) Wallace, PhD, LLM, JD, is a multi-disciplinary executive with an extensive background spanning finance, law, and corporate leadership. As a licensed attorney, CPA candidate, CEO, CFO and General Counsel, he specializes in bridging the gap between complex financial data and legal compliance.