HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

THE GREEN HORIZON: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS, CARBON ACCOUNTING METRICS, AND OPERATIONAL PROTOCOLS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ACCOUNTING AND GREEN AUDITING

Nematullayev Hamidullo
Andijan State Technical Institute
3rd year student of the "Accounting and Audit" direction
E-mail: hamidullonematullaev.07@gmail.com
0009-0001-4040-8014
Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21331320

Abstract: Amidst accelerating climate degradation, expanding carbon regulatory regimes, and shifting global capital flows, traditional accounting models have proven structurally inadequate to capture the true environmental externalities of corporate operations. This research paper explores the strategic and operational paradigms of Environmental Accounting and Green Auditing within the framework of the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) and International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB) directives. By evaluating the quantitative evaluation models of Carbon Asset Valuation, the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Protocol, and Environmental Capitalized Risk Models, this study provides a comprehensive operational framework for external auditors and corporate controllers. Integrating rigorous carbon expenditure measurement with advanced environmental risk screening processes enables oversight bodies to prevent fraudulent greenwashing practices, maintain internal balance sheet transparency, and assure compliance with international sustainability disclosures.

Key words: Environmental Accounting, Green Auditing, Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB).

Introduction. The modern corporate landscape is undergoing a structural paradigm shift driven by institutional sustainability demands. Historically, industrial enterprises treated environmental resources as infinite, free externalities, excluding the deprecation of natural capital and localized carbon output from their traditional income statements. However, the rise of stringent international regulations, institutional carbon pricing mechanisms, and ESG-driven investment strategies have forced corporate boards to formalize the practice of environmental tracking. Environmental Accounting acts as the analytical bridge that internalizes these ecological costs into a company's financial records. Concurrently, Green Auditing serves as the independent verification mechanism designed to evaluate an organization's ecological footprint, resource efficiency, and compliance with statutory environmental mandates. Without independent green verification protocols, external corporate sustainability claims run the high risk of devolving into superficial public relations maneuvers or outright greenwashing. Integrating environmental impacts into mainstream corporate finance requires standardized reporting protocols to ensure comparability across diverse global capital markets. The International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB), established under the IFRS Foundation, introduced IFRS S1 and IFRS S2, which require companies to publish complete sustainability and climate-related risk disclosures alongside standard financial balance sheets. Similarly, the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) offers comprehensive frameworks for measuring natural resource depletion and waste impacts.

These strict compliance mandates force corporate auditors to go beyond traditional invoice verification and evaluate operational environmental inputs. Auditors must review tracking

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

mechanisms for carbon credits, measure potential future environmental liability allowances, and ensure that liabilities related to hazardous waste cleanups or legal penalties are accurately recorded. Consequently, green auditing has transitioned from a voluntary corporate citizenship gesture into a core legal compliance requirement. Evaluating an enterprise's environmental impact requires robust, repeatable quantitative methods that translate environmental usage into financial metrics. The primary framework used globally is the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Protocol, which divides emissions into three core areas: Scope 1 (direct emissions from owned operations), Scope 2 (indirect emissions from purchased electricity), and Scope 3 (indirect value chain emissions, including supplier logistics and product end-of-life cycles).

Beyond simple emissions tracking, environmental accountants must use specialized financial valuation methods like the Internal Carbon Pricing (ICP) model and Full-Cost Environmental Accounting. These methods assign an internal financial cost to carbon output, allowing corporate planning teams to stress-test future infrastructure choices against potential carbon tax increases and regulatory changes before committing capital. To assist financial controllers in selecting the appropriate framework, Table 1 delineates the technical execution parameters, primary use-cases, and unique auditing vulnerabilities across core environmental accounting models.

Technical execution parameters, primary use-cases, and unique auditing vulnerabilities across core environmental accounting models

Table 1.

Accounting Framework	**Technical Execution Parameters**	**Primary Asset/Liability Targets**	**Core Auditing Risk & Vulnerability**
GHG Protocol Framework (Scopes 1-3)	Measures total direct and indirect carbon output in metric tons of CO2 equivalent across production lines.	Carbon liabilities, corporate emissions footprints, supply chain metrics.	High double-counting risk and data collection complexity within Scope 3 supply networks.
Internal Carbon Pricing (ICP)	Applies a strategic internal shadow price to carbon emissions to evaluate capital expenditures.	Future investment pipelines, regulatory risk reserves.	Vulnerable to arbitrary price adjustments by management to make investments look more favorable.
Full-Cost Environmental Accounting	Integrates both direct financial outlays and indirect ecological damage costs into corporate profit metrics.	Environmental remediation funds, cleanup liabilities.	Relies heavily on subjective assumptions when putting a monetary value on biodiversity loss.

Deep Analysis of Table 1: The technical details outlined in Table 1 emphasize that every environmental framework has distinct data requirements and auditing challenges. The GHG Protocol is highly effective for tracking direct emissions, but calculating Scope 3 value chain emissions involves analyzing external vendor data that can be difficult to verify. Similarly, Full-Cost Accounting

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

provides an honest assessment of environmental impacts, but calculating the precise financial cost of biodiversity loss or habitat destruction involves complex estimations. Consequently, green auditors must look closely at the underlying assumptions to ensure management has not manipulated environmental figures to hide long-term ecological risks. Traditional financial audits verify balances by matching invoices with bank records. A comprehensive green audit, however, requires combining physical, legal, and operational source verification. Auditors cannot rely solely on corporate sustainability reports; they must trace the flow of raw materials, energy inputs, and waste outputs through the entire production system. Verification protocols include reviewing utility bills and smart meter logs to track energy inputs, testing wastewater and chimney emissions to confirm compliance with regulatory limits, and reviewing environmental permit lifespans. Additionally, auditors must verify carbon offset transactions by reviewing registry data to ensure the credits are legitimate, unique, and have not been double-counted by other organizations.

Environmental liabilities can cause rapid balance sheet adjustments due to regulatory changes or unexpected cleanup requirements. Table 2 outlines the primary risk categories, warning signs, and verification protocols for these environmental exposures.

Primary risk categories, warning signs, and verification protocols for these environmental exposures.

Table 2.

Environmental Risk Area	Primary Drivers of Financial Volatility	Key Audit Risk Indicators (Red Flags)	Mandatory Audit Verification Protocol
Stranded Fossil Fuel & Industrial Assets	Strict carbon regulations rendering traditional facilities unprofitable.	Industrial facilities operating below capacity; unexpected updates to carbon tax laws.	Reviewing asset lifespans against future carbon tax projections; confirming realistic impairment charges.
Regulatory Remediation & Cleanups	Changes in environmental laws requiring site cleanups.	Unresolved environmental disputes; history of hazardous spills near production sites.	Reviewing legal correspondence; checking independent geological reports to verify cleanup cost estimates.
Greenwashing & Public Disclosure Discrepancies	Discrepancies between public sustainability claims and actual emissions.	Sudden changes in ESG metrics; marketing materials that lack clear data support.	Reconciling marketing statements with verified internal emissions data and third-party green certifications.

Deep Analysis of Table 2: The risk mapping in Table 2 highlights that environmental factors present real, immediate financial risks to modern corporations. If a government increases its carbon tax or tightens environmental standards, a facility can become unprofitable overnight, creating a stranded asset that requires an immediate write-down under IAS 36. This volatility means auditors must cross-verify management's internal financial estimates with actual regulatory updates, legal

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

records, and independent environmental reports to ensure financial reporting remains realistic and transparent. As sustainability reporting becomes more standardized, traditional, manual auditing methods are no longer sufficient to process complex environmental data. To ensure transparency, future environmental accounting must move away from static annual reports and embrace continuous, automated tracking platforms. Integrating IoT energy tracking sensors and satellite emissions monitoring allows firms to capture verifiable, real-time data from their manufacturing facilities. Tracing these environmental inputs on a blockchain ledger ensures that carbon credits and emissions histories cannot be altered, providing green auditors with a reliable record that simplifies verification and prevents misleading greenwashing practices.

Conclusion. In conclusion, this paper demonstrates that establishing disciplined environmental accounting and green auditing practices is essential for accurate financial reporting in a resource-constrained economy. By combining standardized carbon tracking models with independent physical and operational verification protocols, companies can manage long-term climate risks and protect financial transparency. As international sustainability rules expand, adopting automated tracking tools will ensure that corporate accounting frameworks remain realistic, resilient, and responsive to the real cost of environmental impacts.

References:

1. Global Reporting Initiative (GRI). (2020). GRI Standards for Sustainability Reporting. GRI Publishing.
2. International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB). (2023). IFRS S1 General Requirements for Disclosure of Sustainability-related Financial Information & IFRS S2 Climate-related Disclosures. IFRS Foundation.
3. Greenhouse Gas Protocol. (2004). A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised ed.). World Resources Institute & World Business Council for Sustainable Development.
4. Schaltegger, S., & Burritt, R. (2022). Contemporary Environmental Accounting: Issues, Concepts and Practice. Greenleaf Publishing.
5. Callan, S. J., & Thomas, J. M. (2023). Environmental Economics and Management: Theory, Policy, and Applications (6th ed.). Cengage Learning.