DOI: 10.52950/ES.2024.13.2.003

ESG RISK ANALYSIS AND PREPAREDNESS OF COMPANIES IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC

DANIEL MACEK, STANISLAV VITÁSEK

Abstract:

This study examines the integration of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) principles into the strategies of companies in the Czech Republic, a region where ESG considerations are increasingly influencing investment decisions and corporate governance. As global sustainability concerns gain momentum, Czech companies face growing scrutiny from investors, regulators, and stakeholders. This research aims to assess the current state of ESG risk analysis and evaluate the readiness of these companies to address the challenges posed by environmental stewardship, social responsibility, and governance effectiveness. To achieve this, the study employs a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative data from semi-structured interviews with industry experts, corporate leaders, and regulatory authorities, and quantitative data from a survey distributed to a representative sample of companies across various sectors in the Czech Republic. The qualitative interviews provide in-depth insights into the challenges and strategies surrounding ESG integration, while the quantitative survey assesses the extent of ESG adoption, identifies key risk areas, and evaluates companies' preparedness to tackle these issues. Data analysis includes thematic analysis of interview transcripts and statistical analysis of survey responses, offering a comprehensive view of ESG practices in the Czech business landscape. The findings reveal both best practices and areas needing improvement, providing valuable insights for stakeholders committed to enhancing corporate sustainability. This study contributes to the broader discourse on ESG by highlighting the evolving role of these factors in shaping corporate resilience, innovation, and long-term value creation in the Czech Republic, ultimately promoting a more sustainable and responsible business environment.

Keywords:

environmental; ESG; governance; social; risk analysis

JEL Classification: M14, L21, Q01

Authors:

DANIEL MACEK, Czech Technical University in Prague Faculty of Civil Engineering, Czech Republic, Email: daniel.macek@fsv.cvut.cz
STANISLAV VITÁSEK, Czech Technical University in Prague Faculty of Civil Engineering, Czech Republic, Email: stanislav.vitasek@fsv.cvut.cz

Citation:

DANIEL MACEK, STANISLAV VITÁSEK (2024). ESG risk analysis and preparedness of companies in the Czech Republic. International Journal of Economic Sciences, Vol. XIII(2), pp. 38-54., 10.52950/ES.2024.13.2.003

Copyright © 2024, DANIEL MACEK et al., daniel.macek@fsv.cvut.cz

Copyright © 2024, DANIEL MACEK et al., daniel.macek@fsv.cvut.cz

1 Introduction

In an era where environmental, social, and governance (ESG) concerns have become integral to investment decisions, understanding how companies navigate these factors is paramount. The Czech Republic is a region where ESG considerations intersect with economic development and corporate governance. As the global discourse around sustainability intensifies, investors, regulators, and stakeholders are scrutinizing how Czech companies integrate ESG principles into their strategies and operations.

This paper delves into the ESG risk analysis landscape within the Czech Republic, assessing companies' readiness to address the evolving challenges and opportunities presented by environmental stewardship, social responsibility, and effective governance. By examining the intricacies of ESG risk management practices, this study aims to shed light on the current state of affairs, highlighting exemplary initiatives and areas for improvement.

As the global conversation around sustainability gains momentum, stakeholders across the spectrum—from investors seeking responsible capital allocation to regulators advocating for greater transparency and accountability—scrutinize how Czech companies (Hromada et al 2021) navigate the ESG landscape. The ability of these companies to effectively integrate ESG considerations into their core business strategies not only impacts their financial performance but also shapes their reputation, brand value, and talent retention capabilities.

This paper undertakes a comprehensive examination of the ESG risk analysis landscape within the Czech Republic, aiming to evaluate companies' preparedness to confront the multifaceted challenges of environmental stewardship, social responsibility, and effective governance. By delving into the nuances of ESG risk management practices, we aim to illuminate both exemplary initiatives and areas requiring improvement, providing valuable insights for stakeholders committed to promoting sustainable business practices.

At its core, this exploration acknowledges the evolving nature of ESG considerations and their transformative impact on corporate resilience and long-term value creation. By embracing ESG principles as fundamental drivers of business strategy rather than peripheral add-ons, Czech companies can not only mitigate risks but also unlock new opportunities for innovation, growth, and competitive differentiation in a sustainability-focused global economy.

Furthermore, as the Czech Republic pursues a trajectory towards a more sustainable and inclusive economy, the necessity for robust ESG risk analysis becomes even more apparent. Whether grappling with the implications of climate change, addressing social inequalities, or enhancing governance structures, companies must navigate a complex web of interconnected challenges while aligning with evolving regulatory frameworks and societal expectations (Hromada and Čermáková 2021).

Through a comprehensive examination of ESG risk preparedness among Czech companies, drawing on insights from industry experts, corporate leaders, and regulatory authorities, this paper seeks to equip stakeholders with actionable insights to navigate the ESG landscape effectively. By showcasing best practices, highlighting emerging trends, and identifying areas for improvement, we aspire to foster a culture of sustainability, responsibility, and resilience within the Czech business community, thereby catalyzing positive change and driving towards a more sustainable future for Czech companies and society as a whole.

Copyright © 2024, DANIEL MACEK et al., daniel.macek@fsv.cvut.cz

2 Literature Review

In recent years, the landscape of ESG risk analysis has witnessed a significant surge in attention and engagement, propelled by a burgeoning societal consciousness regarding the profound impact of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) factors on investment portfolios. This momentum is further accentuated by the discernible shift in client priorities, with even major players like BlackRock, the world's largest asset manager, now prioritizing environmental considerations. As a consequence, sustainable investments have experienced an exponential growth trajectory, with total assets under management catapulting from US$21 trillion in 2010 to an impressive US$120 trillion in 2021 (Dunbar et al 2023)).

This escalating emphasis on sustainability has catalyzed a demand for businesses and investors to recalibrate their strategies and capital allocation frameworks to address climate change and other ESG concerns. Consequently, integrating ESG principles has become a cornerstone objective in asset management, exerting a discernible influence on portfolio decisions and pricing dynamics (Chen et al 2024).

The burgeoning interest in sustainable investing has coincided with an augmented reliance on ESG ratings as barometers of sustainability risk. However, investors often encounter hurdles in accurately gauging a firm's authentic ESG risk profile, hampered by a lack of standardized and dependable measures for assessing mutual fund investments' ESG performance. Consequently, there exists a pressing need to evaluate the efficacy and risk-adjusted performance of ESG portfolios, confronting prevalent disparities in research surrounding biases in ESG ratings and performance evaluation methodologies (Fafaliou et al 2022).

This surge in ESG investment fervor has ignited a flurry of research activity in sustainable finance across myriad dimensions, spanning from the profitability of ESG portfolios to their ramifications on firms' financial performance and credit ratings. Nevertheless, this research has yielded a mosaic of findings concerning ESG performance, often stemming from discrepancies arising from diverse ESG proxies. While theoretical underpinnings posit that investor preferences for ESG factors influence portfolio performance, practical investment decisions tend to be steered by ESG ratings, underscoring the imperative of rectifying rating construction disparities and provider disagreements (Jin 2022).

Indeed, given the pricing of ESG risk, the outperformance of the ESG risk premium vis-à-vis non-ESG peers should accurately mirror the compensation for investors shouldering this supplementary risk burden. Leveraging an ESG-adjusted capital asset pricing model thus becomes pivotal in assimilating additional compensation for holding ESG-risky mutual fund assets relative to other precarious assets (Lashkaripour 2023).

The burgeoning influence of sustainable investing has spurred the mutual fund industry to introduce novel or repurposed products marketed as "socially responsible" funds. Nonetheless, inconsistencies in ESG ratings measurement across providers have engendered biased ESG metrics. Understanding the valuation of compensation for assuming ESG risk is thus paramount, particularly in light of the pronounced ambiguity surrounding an investment's genuine ESG-risk profile (Luo et al 2023).

Profitability alone no longer suffices as the sole determinant of a company's trajectory. Investors now compel firms to disentangle their growth trajectories from environmental degradation, opaque societal contributions, and unethical governance, thereby aligning profit motives with broader social

Copyright © 2024, DANIEL MACEK et al., daniel.macek@fsv.cvut.cz

imperatives. Regulators, governments, and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), buoyed by the amplifying influence of social media, increasingly shine a spotlight on firms' operational adeptness concerning ESG practices(Shakil 2021) .

Moreover, consumers are increasingly demanding elevated standards of ESG performance and employment quality from firms. Regulators and policymakers, cognizant of the pivotal role of the corporate sector in tackling issues like environmental pollution and workplace diversity, are correspondingly amplifying their focus on ESG considerations. Simultaneously, the investor community's interest in the ESG prospect has surged, signifying a transformative shift towards a more holistic and responsible investment paradigm (Pollard et al 2018).

One can identify at least five sources of fundamental business value behind the relationship between ESG risks and financial outcomes. The first is top-line growth. Companies with a stronger ESG proposition tend to attract customer loyalty and new customer segments. On the business-to-business side, lies an additional link. Large companies are seeking to channel ESG through their value chain. For example, suppliers to the world's largest retailers, display a strong sustainability proposition on plastics, packaging, water use, and so on. The second source relates to cost; more resource-efficient (e.g., more water-efficient) firms have generally had a lower unit-cost structure. The third relates to regulatory relationships. Firms that are responsible for their assets' environmental footprint decrease the chances of an adverse, punitive regulatory outcome; therefore, there is potentially regulatory value here. The fourth source is talent. Nowadays, newer recruits and millennials demand purposeful work and if companies can meet that need, then they will be able to attract and retain that talent, and likely enjoy higher productivity in the workplace. Lastly, the fifth source is investment optimization. There are enormous opportunities for ESG-related investments. For example, there is a huge demand for technology that could improve air quality; conversely, there is a downside risk of holding assets that become stranded (e.g., coal assets and oil tankers) (Yu et al 2023).

Stakeholders (consumers, employees, and investors) prefer transparent firms, as economies move to more responsible accounting, concerning firms' ESG risks to avoid costly fines, which can have a major impact on firms' performance and profits. In addition, the firm's ESG reputation is of utmost importance for its status, fundraising, and consequently in fending competition pressures and survival in the market. Nevertheless, there is a dearth of studies when it comes to a firm's ESG reputational risks and market longevity (Heralova 2018).

It is also noteworthy that ESG reputational risks may adversely affect the equity raising and growth dynamics of the firm. This happens since increased ESG reputational risks, lower the firm's potential in raising new equity due to the fact that investors may be reluctant to invest in risky businesses. As a result, restricted financing options may impede the growth opportunities of the firm. Overall, firms with ESG reputational risks seem to have limited access to external financing and still have reduced growth opportunities (Kanno 2023).

The effectiveness of ESG performance on corporate financial outcomes has been thoroughly investigated by researchers and academicians. However, a significant gap remains uncultivated. Specifically, the existing studies have shed light on the relationship between ESG/CSR performance and corporate innovation output or firm's value neglecting the impact on market longevity and growth dynamics of the firm. In exploring sustainability and ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) factors, methodologies frequently entail qualitative assessments,

resulting in methodological disparities. Nonetheless, contemporary empirical studies generally observe a positive correlation between financial performance and social responsibility (Jin 2022).

Examining the integration of ESG criteria in corporate management and its impact on security performance reveals an evolving landscape. While earlier studies exhibited a neutral stance, recent analyses increasingly recognize a positive correlation between sustainable strategies and superior performance. Further investigations delve into sector-specific implications of corporate social responsibility on financial performance (Jasová et al 2017).

Carbon risk refers to the potential uncertainties stemming from the utilization of fossil fuels and the impacts of climate change. It comprises regulatory, physical, and commercial dimensions. Regulatory risk emerges from potential future carbon regulations and policies, while physical risk is tied to climate change-induced events such as droughts, floods, and rising sea levels. Commercial risk pertains to the potential legal, reputational, and market competition-related consequences resulting from a firm's environmental negligence. Carbon risk perception denotes a company's awareness level regarding carbon risk. An escalation in carbon risk perception usually indicates a firm's heightened adjustment to increased carbon risks. Assessing carbon risk perception comprehensively poses challenges due to various subjective and objective factors (Karásek and Pavlica 2016).

Recent research primarily focuses on how carbon risk influences firms' operational performance, investment and financing behaviors, and responses from capital markets. Investors can discern firms' carbon risks accurately, influencing returns and the cost of equity capital. Higher carbon risks lead to elevated borrowing costs and alterations in corporate capital structure. Moreover, carbon risk not only impacts corporate financing costs but also affects corporate financial leverage (Karásek and Pojar 2018).

At the core of ESG lies the harmonization of economic, social, and environmental benefits, recognizing their interconnectedness. Increasingly, investors integrate ESG factors into their decision-making processes, acknowledging their linkage to long-term value and sustainability. Corporate managers are urged to balance ESG considerations with financial performance for sustainable growth. Existing research examines various factors influencing firm ESG performance to understand the drivers behind it (Hübel and Scholz 2020).

ESG investments have been found to yield greater hidden returns and enhance corporate reputation compared to other investment forms. By bolstering ESG performance, firms can mitigate risks and establish a positive external reputation, serving as a valuable risk management tool for carbon risk management. Increasing carbon risk perception aids in raising corporate awareness of carbon risks, encouraging enterprises to adopt proactive strategies to address associated risks (Matějka and Vitásek 2018.

Ecological modernization theory advocates for considering economic growth and environmental issues comprehensively. Firms facing environmental risks can benefit economically and environmentally from implementing environmental management practices. In low-carbon transition economies, companies face triple carbon reduction pressures, leading to the adoption of proactive low-carbon transformation strategies after perceiving external carbon risks. These strategies include green technological innovation and the establishment of low-carbon emission regulations and targets, enhancing corporate environmental performance and attracting customers and investors (Liu et al 2024).

Copyright © 2024, DANIEL MACEK et al., daniel.macek@fsv.cvut.cz

According to the legitimacy theory, enterprises respect social responsibilities while utilizing production elements from society. Corporate decisions and actions are influenced by legitimacy pressures from various stakeholders. Heightened external carbon risk increases public demands for corporate legitimacy. Companies can enhance their legitimacy and reputation by assuming social employment responsibilities and increasing sustainable development initiatives. The increase in carbon risk perception motivates enterprises to embrace social employment responsibilities, enhancing their legitimacy and improving their ESG performance (Sherwood and Pollard 2018).

3 Materials and Methods

The research design for this study is based on a mixed-methods approach, incorporating both qualitative and quantitative methodologies to provide a comprehensive analysis of ESG risk analysis and preparedness among companies in the Czech Republic.

Qualitative data was collected through semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders, including industry experts, corporate leaders, and regulatory authorities. These interviews were conducted to gain insights into the current state of ESG practices, challenges faced, and strategies employed by Czech companies.

Quantitative data was gathered through a survey distributed to a representative sample of Czech companies across various sectors. The survey was designed to assess the level of ESG integration, identify key risk areas, and evaluate companies' readiness to address ESG challenges.

Purposive sampling was employed to select participants for qualitative interviews, ensuring representation from diverse backgrounds and expertise within the Czech business community. Key criteria for selection included industry experience, organizational role, and involvement in ESG-related activities.

A stratified random sampling technique was utilized to select companies for the survey. The sample was stratified based on industry sectors, company size, and geographical location to ensure a balanced representation of the Czech business landscape.

Qualitative data from the interviews were transcribed and analyzed thematically. The result is a structured questionnaire for qualitative analysis with the aim of gaining insight into the state of ESG risk analysis and preparedness among Czech companies.

Quantitative data from survey responses were analyzed using statistical methods, namely descriptive statistics.

Ethical principles, including informed consent, confidentiality, and voluntary participation, were upheld throughout the research process. Participants were provided with clear information about the purpose of the study, and their consent was obtained prior to data collection. Confidentiality of responses was maintained, and data were anonymized to protect participants' identities.

While efforts were made to ensure the validity and reliability of the findings, several limitations should be acknowledged. These include potential biases in participant responses, sample representativeness, and the dynamic nature of ESG practices, which may impact the generalizability of the results.

The methodology outlined in this chapter provides a robust framework for conducting a comprehensive analysis of ESG risk analysis and preparedness among companies in the Czech

Copyright © 2024, DANIEL MACEK et al., daniel.macek@fsv.cvut.cz

Republic. By integrating qualitative and quantitative approaches, this study aims to generate actionable insights to inform stakeholders and drive positive change towards sustainability and responsible business practices.

4 Qualitative Analysis

The qualitative analysis involved engaging with a diverse group of respondents representing key stakeholders within the Czech business community. These respondents were strategically selected to provide comprehensive insights into the current state of ESG practices, challenges encountered, and strategies implemented by companies in the Czech Republic.

Industry Experts: This group comprised individuals with extensive experience and knowledge in various sectors related to ESG practices. They could include academics, consultants, or analysts specializing in sustainability, environmental management, social responsibility, or corporate governance.

Corporate Leaders: High-level executives and decision-makers from Czech companies were also interviewed to offer perspectives from within the organizations. These individuals could include CEOs, CFOs, sustainability officers, or directors with responsibilities for ESG initiatives within their companies.

Regulatory Authorities: Representatives from regulatory bodies or governmental organizations responsible for overseeing corporate governance, environmental regulations, or sustainability policies in the Czech Republic were included. These individuals provided insights into the regulatory landscape, compliance requirements, and expectations from companies regarding ESG practices.

NGO Representatives: In addition, representatives from non-governmental organizations (NGOs) focused on environmental conservation, social welfare, or corporate accountability were engaged. These stakeholders offered perspectives from civil society and advocacy groups, highlighting societal expectations and pressures regarding ESG issues.

Academics: Scholars and researchers with expertise in ESG-related fields, such as sustainability studies, environmental sciences, or business ethics, were also part of the respondent group. Their academic insights provided a theoretical foundation and deeper understanding of ESG concepts and practices.

By engaging with this diverse group of respondents, the qualitative analysis aimed to capture a broad spectrum of perspectives and experiences related to ESG risk analysis and preparedness among companies in the Czech Republic. These insights served as valuable inputs for understanding the challenges and opportunities associated with ESG integration and guiding the development of effective strategies for sustainable business practices. A total of 23 respondents were contacted.

4.1 Results of Qualitative Analysis

The results of the semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders provided valuable insights into the current state of ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) practices, the challenges faced, and the strategies employed by Czech companies. Several key findings emerged from the analysis:

Environmental Sustainability: Many Czech companies have initiated environmental sustainability measures, including energy efficiency programs, waste reduction initiatives, and renewable energy

adoption. However, the extent of implementation varies across industries, with some sectors exhibiting more advanced practices than others.

Social Responsibility: Stakeholders highlighted efforts by companies to engage in community development projects, support social welfare programs, and promote diversity and inclusion within their workforce. Nevertheless, there were concerns regarding the depth and sincerity of these initiatives, with some stakeholders emphasizing the need for more substantive actions to address social issues.

Governance Frameworks: Interviewees acknowledged the importance of robust governance structures in ensuring transparency, accountability, and ethical conduct. Czech companies were found to be increasingly focused on enhancing board diversity, strengthening risk management practices, and aligning executive compensation with long-term sustainability goals.

Regulatory Complexity: Participants expressed concerns about the intricate regulatory landscape surrounding ESG practices in the Czech Republic. Compliance with multiple and sometimes conflicting regulations posed challenges for companies, particularly smaller enterprises with limited resources.

Resource Constraints: Many companies cited resource constraints as a significant barrier to implementing comprehensive ESG initiatives. Limited budgets, competing priorities, and a lack of specialized expertise were identified as impediments to scaling up sustainability efforts.

Cultural Resistance: Stakeholders noted cultural barriers within organizations, including resistance to change and a short-term mindset focused primarily on financial performance. Overcoming cultural inertia and fostering a culture of sustainability were identified as ongoing challenges for Czech companies.

Collaboration and Partnerships: Companies highlighted the importance of collaborating with stakeholders, including government agencies, NGOs, and industry peers, to address complex ESG challenges effectively. Partnerships were seen as a way to leverage expertise, share resources, and amplify impact.

Integration into Business Strategy: Successful companies emphasized the integration of ESG considerations into core business strategies rather than treating them as separate initiatives. Aligning ESG objectives with overall business objectives was seen as essential for driving meaningful change and long-term value creation.

Stakeholder Engagement: Interviewees underscored the importance of engaging with various stakeholders, including investors, employees, customers, and local communities, to foster trust and transparency. Open dialogue and stakeholder consultation were recognized as vital components of effective ESG governance.

Overall, the results highlight both progress and challenges in the adoption of ESG practices among Czech companies. While there is evidence of growing awareness and commitment to sustainability, significant barriers remain, necessitating concerted efforts from businesses, regulators, and other stakeholders to overcome them. These findings provide valuable insights for policymakers, investors, and companies seeking to advance sustainable business practices in the Czech Republic.

Copyright © 2024, DANIEL MACEK et al., daniel.macek@fsv.cvut.cz

Regulatory Compliance Risks: Non-compliance with ESG regulations and standards can lead to legal penalties, fines, and reputational damage.

4.2 Selected Risks for Quantitative Analysis

From the aforementioned findings, the following ESG risks were compiled for qualitative analysis.

1. Regulatory Compliance Risks: Non-compliance with ESG regulations and standards can lead to legal penalties, fines, and reputational damage.
2. Reputational Risks: Poor ESG performance or controversies related to environmental or social issues can damage a company's reputation, leading to loss of customer trust and investor confidence.
3. Financial Risks: Failure to adequately manage ESG risks can result in financial losses due to increased operating costs, litigation expenses, or decreased market value.
4. Operational Risks: Inefficient resource management, supply chain disruptions, or labor disputes related to social issues can negatively impact operations and profitability.
5. Market Risks: Failure to adapt to changing market trends and consumer preferences towards sustainable products and services can lead to loss of market share and competitiveness.
6. Strategic Risks: Inadequate integration of ESG considerations into business strategies can result in misalignment with long-term sustainability goals and missed opportunities for innovation and growth.
7. Stakeholder Risks: Poor engagement with stakeholders, including investors, employees, communities, and regulators, can lead to resistance, activism, and conflicts that undermine business objectives.
8. Talent Risks: Failure to promote a culture of sustainability and social responsibility can affect employee morale, retention, and recruitment efforts, leading to talent shortages and decreased productivity.
9. Supply Chain Risks: Dependency on suppliers with poor ESG practices can expose companies to reputational damage, operational disruptions, and legal liabilities.
10. Litigation Risks: Legal actions related to environmental violations, labor practices, or corporate governance issues can result in costly lawsuits, damage awards, and regulatory sanctions.
11. Transition Risks: Transitioning to more sustainable practices may involve upfront costs, technological challenges, and resistance from stakeholders, impacting short-term financial performance.
12. Greenwashing Risks: Misleading or exaggerated claims about ESG performance can lead to accusations of greenwashing, undermining credibility and trust among stakeholders.
13. Disclosure Risks: Inaccurate or incomplete reporting of ESG metrics and performance can result in regulatory scrutiny, investor skepticism, and reputational harm.

Copyright © 2024, DANIEL MACEK et al., daniel.macek@fsv.cvut.cz

14. Innovation Risks: Failure to innovate and adapt to evolving ESG trends and best practices can result in missed opportunities for differentiation and competitive advantage in the market.
15. Resilience Risks: Inadequate risk management and preparedness for climate-related events, social unrest, or governance failures can undermine business resilience and long-term sustainability.

5 Quantitative Analysis

The group of respondents for the quantitative analysis comprised a representative sample of Czech companies across various sectors. The sample size and composition were carefully selected to ensure a balanced representation of the Czech business landscape.

Industry Sectors: The sample included companies from diverse industries such as manufacturing, finance, technology, healthcare, retail, and energy, among others. This ensured that insights were gathered from a broad spectrum of economic sectors, reflecting the diversity of businesses operating in the Czech Republic.

Company Size: The sample encompassed companies of different sizes, ranging from small and medium enterprises (SMEs) to large corporations. By including companies of varying scales, the analysis could capture the perspectives and practices of both smaller, more agile firms, as well as larger, established organizations.

Geographical Location: Companies from different regions and locations within the Czech Republic were included in the sample. This geographic diversity ensured that regional differences and nuances in ESG practices and preparedness were accounted for in the analysis.

Decision-Makers: The survey targeted key decision-makers within the participating companies who were responsible for ESG-related activities or had insights into their organization's ESG practices and strategies. These individuals could include sustainability managers, corporate governance officers, environmental officers, or senior executives with oversight of ESG initiatives.

Sample Size: The sample size was determined to be statistically significant, ensuring that the findings could be extrapolated to the broader population of Czech companies with a reasonable degree of confidence. The specific number of respondents depended on factors such as the industry distribution and the desired level of statistical power. 130 respondents are included in the survey.

Overall, the quantitative analysis aimed to provide systematic and statistically robust insights into the level of ESG integration, key risk areas, and the readiness of Czech companies to address ESG challenges. By incorporating companies from diverse sectors, sizes, and geographical locations, the analysis aimed to offer a comprehensive understanding of ESG practices and preparedness across the Czech business landscape.

5.1 Risk Scale

The risk rating scale ranging from 1 to 5 provides a structured framework for assessing and categorizing the level of risk associated with different factors or entities. Here's a description of each rating on the scale:

Least Risk - 1: This rating indicates the lowest level of risk, suggesting minimal or negligible potential for adverse outcomes. Factors or entities categorized as level 1 pose minimal threats to objectives, operations, or outcomes. They are typically considered safe, stable, and unlikely to cause significant harm or disruption.

Low Risk - 2: A rating of 2 signifies a relatively low level of risk, indicating a slight potential for adverse outcomes. While factors or entities categorized as level 2 may present some degree of risk, they are generally manageable and do not pose significant threats to objectives or operations. Proactive measures may be necessary to mitigate potential risks, but the overall impact is expected to be limited.

Moderate Risk - 3: A rating of 3 suggests a moderate level of risk, signifying a notable potential for adverse outcomes that may require attention or action. Factors or entities categorized as level 3 pose moderate threats to objectives, operations, or outcomes. While manageable, these risks may necessitate proactive measures and monitoring to prevent escalation or mitigate potential impacts.

High Risk - 4: This rating indicates a high level of risk, signaling a significant potential for adverse outcomes that may pose substantial challenges or threats. Factors or entities categorized as level 4 present considerable risks to objectives, operations, or outcomes, requiring urgent attention and comprehensive risk management strategies. Immediate action and mitigation efforts are typically necessary to address these risks effectively.

Highest Risk - 5: The highest rating of 5 denotes the most severe level of risk, highlighting an extreme potential for adverse outcomes that may result in severe consequences or irreparable harm. Factors or entities categorized as level 5 pose critical threats to objectives, operations, or outcomes, necessitating immediate and decisive action to mitigate risks and prevent catastrophic outcomes. These risks may have profound impacts on the organization or system and require urgent and comprehensive intervention.

5.2 Risk Assessment

The Table 1 presents the results of the quantitative risk analysis conducted to assess the perceived level of risk associated with implementing ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) practices within a company. The average ratings provided in the table represent the aggregated evaluations of various risks, rounded to one decimal place. These ratings offer valuable insights into the prioritization and significance of different risk categories in the context of ESG implementation.

Copyright © 2024, DANIEL MACEK et al., daniel.macek@fsv.cvut.cz

Table 1: Risk Assessment

n.	risk	average rating
1	Regulatory Compliance Risks	4,1
2	Reputational Risks	4,8
3	Financial Risks	3,8
4	Operational Risks	3,2
5	Market Risks	3,5
6	Strategic Risks	3,3
7	Stakeholder Risks	4,3
8	Talent Risks	3,4
9	Supply Chain Risks	3,6
10	Litigation Risks	3,2
11	Transition Risks	3,1
12	Greenwashing Risks	3,4
13	Disclosure Risks	3,4
14	Innovation Risks	3,5
15	Resilience Risks	4,3

Source: Author

These ratings provide a assessment of the perceived level of risk associated with each aspect of implementing ESG practices within a company, rounded to one decimal place.

The results indicate that while some risks associated with implementing ESG practices are perceived to be relatively moderate (rated around 3 to 3.5), several others are considered significant (rated above 4). Reputational risks, regulatory compliance risks, stakeholder risks, and resilience risks are among the highest-rated, suggesting that they are of paramount concern for organizations. These risks highlight the importance of maintaining compliance with ESG regulations, safeguarding reputation through transparent and responsible practices, engaging effectively with stakeholders, and building resilience to environmental and social challenges. While some risks, such as financial and operational risks, are also notable, they are rated slightly lower, indicating that organizations may perceive them as more manageable with appropriate risk mitigation strategies in place. Overall, the results underscore the multifaceted nature of risks associated with ESG implementation and emphasize the need for comprehensive risk management approaches to ensure sustainable and responsible business practices.

Regulatory Compliance Risks: Non-compliance with ESG regulations can lead to legal penalties, fines, and reputational damage. This risk is significant as regulatory frameworks around ESG are evolving, and non-compliance can have severe consequences. Companies need to stay abreast of regulatory changes and ensure compliance to mitigate this risk effectively.

Reputational Risks: Poor ESG performance can damage a company's reputation, leading to loss of trust and confidence from customers and investors. Reputational risks are substantial as they directly impact stakeholder perceptions. Building and maintaining a positive reputation through transparent and responsible ESG practices is crucial for long-term success.

Financial Risks: Inadequate management of ESG risks can result in financial losses due to increased operating costs, litigation expenses, or decreased market value. Financial risks are

significant, as they directly affect the bottom line. Companies must carefully assess the financial implications of ESG initiatives and implement robust risk management strategies to safeguard their financial health.

Operational Risks: Inefficient resource management and supply chain disruptions related to ESG issues can impact operations and profitability. Operational risks are notable as they can disrupt business continuity and affect day-to-day operations. Implementing ESG practices that promote operational efficiency and resilience is essential to mitigate these risks.

Market Risks: Failure to adapt to changing market trends towards sustainable products and services can lead to loss of market share and competitiveness. Market risks are significant as consumer preferences are shifting towards sustainability. Companies that fail to align with these trends risk losing their competitive edge and market relevance.

Strategic Risks: Inadequate integration of ESG considerations into business strategies can result in misalignment with long-term sustainability goals. Strategic risks are substantial as they impact the overall direction and purpose of the company. Aligning ESG objectives with business strategies is critical for sustainable growth and innovation.

Stakeholder Risks: Poor engagement with stakeholders can lead to resistance, activism, and conflicts that undermine business objectives. Stakeholder risks are significant as they affect relationships with investors, employees, communities, and regulators. Building trust and fostering positive stakeholder relationships are essential for successful ESG implementation.

Talent Risks: Failure to promote a culture of sustainability can affect employee morale, retention, and recruitment efforts. Talent risks are notable as they impact workforce productivity and engagement. Companies that prioritize ESG values attract and retain top talent, driving organizational success.

Supply Chain Risks: Dependency on suppliers with poor ESG practices can expose companies to reputational damage and operational disruptions. Supply chain risks are substantial as they extend beyond organizational boundaries. Implementing robust supply chain management practices and fostering supplier accountability are essential to mitigate these risks.

Litigation Risks: Legal actions related to environmental violations or labor practices can result in costly lawsuits and regulatory sanctions. Litigation risks are significant as they can have severe financial and reputational implications. Proactively addressing compliance issues and implementing risk mitigation measures are essential to minimize legal exposure.

Transition Risks: Transitioning to sustainable practices may involve upfront costs and resistance from stakeholders, impacting short-term financial performance. Transition risks are notable as they can hinder the adoption of ESG practices. Companies need to carefully plan and communicate their transition strategies to mitigate resistance and manage financial implications effectively.

Greenwashing Risks: Misleading claims about ESG performance can undermine credibility and trust among stakeholders. Greenwashing risks are significant as they erode trust and credibility. Companies must ensure transparency and authenticity in their ESG reporting to mitigate the risk of greenwashing.

Disclosure Risks: Inaccurate reporting of ESG metrics can result in regulatory scrutiny and reputational harm. Disclosure risks are substantial as they impact transparency and trust.

Copyright © 2024, DANIEL MACEK et al., daniel.macek@fsv.cvut.cz

Implementing robust reporting processes and ensuring accuracy in ESG disclosures are essential to mitigate these risks.

Innovation Risks: Failure to innovate and adapt to evolving ESG trends can result in missed opportunities for differentiation and competitive advantage. Innovation risks are significant as they impact long-term competitiveness. Companies that embrace ESG innovation can gain a strategic advantage and drive sustainable growth.

Resilience Risks: Inadequate risk management and preparedness for climate-related events or governance failures can undermine business resilience. Resilience risks are notable as they impact business continuity and sustainability. Companies need to assess and mitigate risks related to climate change and governance failures to ensure long-term resilience and viability.

6 Conclusions

The comprehensive analysis of individual ESG risks provides valuable insights into the intricate landscape that companies encounter when striving to implement environmental, social, and governance practices. It is evident from the evaluation that numerous challenges exist across various dimensions, each carrying its unique implications and demands for strategic attention.

The overarching prominence of regulatory compliance risks signals the imperative for companies to diligently track and adhere to evolving ESG regulations. Failure to comply not only exposes organizations to legal penalties and fines but also poses a considerable threat to their reputation, a sentiment echoed in the significant emphasis placed on reputational risks. As stakeholders increasingly scrutinize corporate behavior, the preservation of trust and confidence becomes indispensable, underscoring the pivotal role of transparent and responsible ESG practices in safeguarding corporate reputation.

Financial risks emerge as a critical consideration, highlighting the intricate interplay between ESG performance and financial outcomes. While companies recognize the potential for ESG initiatives to drive long-term value creation, inadequate management of associated risks can result in tangible financial losses, underscoring the importance of robust risk management strategies in mitigating adverse financial impacts.

Operational risks, market risks, and stakeholder risks collectively underscore the multifaceted nature of challenges that companies face in navigating operational disruptions, market dynamics, and stakeholder engagements within the ESG context. Effectively managing these risks necessitates agility, resilience, and proactive engagement with stakeholders to ensure alignment with evolving expectations and market trends.

Furthermore, talent risks, supply chain risks, and litigation risks accentuate the broader ecosystem within which companies operate and the interconnectedness of ESG considerations across organizational boundaries. Fostering a culture of sustainability, enhancing supply chain resilience, and proactively addressing legal exposures are paramount in attracting and retaining talent, safeguarding supply chain integrity, and mitigating legal liabilities.

Transition risks, greenwashing risks, and disclosure risks underscore the complexities inherent in transitioning to sustainable practices, maintaining transparency, and avoiding misleading claims in ESG reporting. Navigating these risks requires a balanced approach that prioritizes authenticity, accuracy, and ethical conduct in ESG disclosures and communications.

Copyright © 2024, DANIEL MACEK et al., daniel.macek@fsv.cvut.cz

In addition, innovation risks and resilience risks emphasize the imperative for companies to embrace innovation and build resilience to environmental and social disruptions. Leveraging innovation to drive sustainable practices and fortifying resilience against climate-related events and governance failures are crucial for ensuring long-term competitiveness and sustainability in an evolving business landscape.

In addressing these multifaceted challenges, companies must adopt a holistic approach to ESG management that integrates environmental, social, and governance considerations into their core business strategies, operations, and stakeholder engagements. By prioritizing transparency, accountability, and responsible business practices, companies can navigate the complexities of the ESG landscape, mitigate risks effectively, and unlock opportunities for sustainable growth, resilience, and value creation in the long term.

Acknowledgements

This paper originated as a part of a Czech Technical University in Prague, Faculty of Civil Engineering research project SGS24/014/OHK1/1T/11.

References

Chen, YT; Ren, YS; Narayan, S et al. (2024). Does climate risk impact firms' ESG performance? Evidence from China. *Economic Analysis and Policy*, 81, 683-695.

Dunbar, K; Treku, D; Sarnie, R et al. (2023). What does ESG risk premia tell us about mutual fund sustainability levels: A difference-in-differences analysis. *Finance Research Letters*, vol. 57, 2023.

Fafaliou, I; Giaka, M; Konstantios, D et al. (2022). Firms' ESG reputational risk and market longevity: A firm-level analysis for the United States. *Journal of Business Research*, 149, 161-177.

Heralová, RS (2018) Importance of life cycle costing for construction projects. Engineering for rural development. *In Proceedings of the 17th International Scientific Conference. Latvia University of Agriculture*, pp. 1223–1227.

Hromada, E and Čermáková, K (2021). Financial unavailability of housing in the Czech Republic and recommendations for its solution. *Int. J. Econ. Sci.* 2021, 10, 47–57.

Hromada, E, Vitásek, S, Holcman, J, Heralová, RS and Krulický, T (2021).Residential construction with a focus on evaluation of the life cycle of buildings. *Buildings*, 11, 524.

Hübel, B; Scholz, H. (2020). Integrating sustainability risks in asset management: the role of ESG exposures and ESG ratings. *Journal of Asset Management*, 21(1), 52-69.

Jasova, E, Kaderabkova, B and Cermakova, K (2017). Use of the method of the stochastic trend for NAIRU estimation in the Czech Republic and Slovakia at the Macro- and Meso-Levels. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 30:1, 256-272

Jin, I. (2022). ESG-screening and factor-risk-adjusted performance: the concentration level of screening does matter. Journal of Sustainable *Finance & Investment*, 12(4), 1125-1145.

Jin, I. (2022). Systematic ESG Risk and Passive ESG Investing. *Journal of Portfolio Management*, 48(5), 71-86.

Kanno, M. (2023). Does ESG firm creditworthiness? *Finance Research Letters*, 55.

Copyright © 2024, DANIEL MACEK et al., daniel.macek@fsv.cvut.cz

Karásek, J and Pavlica, J (2016). Green Investment Scheme: Experience and results in the Czech Republic. *Energy Policy*, 90(90), 121-130. ISSN 0301-4215.

Karásek, J and Pojar, J (2018). Programme to reduce energy poverty in the Czech Republic. *Energy Policy*, Volume 115 131-137.

Lashkaripour, M. (2023). ESG tail risk: The Covid-19 market crash analysis. *Finance Research Letters*, 53. ISSN 1544-6123.

Liu, JJ; Ge, ZZ; Wang, YH. (2024). Role of environmental, social, and governance rating data in predicting financial risk and risk management. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 31(1), 260-273.

Luo, DQ; Yan, JZ; Yan, QH. (2023). The duality of ESG: Impact of ratings and disagreement on stock crash risk in China. *Finance Research Letters*, 58.

Matějka, P and Vitásek, S (2018). Comparison of different cost estimation methods with use of building information modelling (BIM). Engineering for rural development. *In Proceedings of the 17th International Scientific Conference*, pp. 843–849.

Pollard, JL; Sherwood, MW; Klobus, RG. (2018). Establishing ESG as risk premia. *Journal of Investment Management*, 16(1), 32-43.

Shakil, MH. (2021). Environmental, social and governance performance and financial risk: Moderating role of ESG controversies and board gender diversity. *Resources Policy*, 72. ISSN 0301-4207.

Sherwood, MW; Pollard, JL. (2018). The risk-adjusted return potential of integrating ESG strategies into emerging market equities. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, 8(1), 26-44.

Yu, HX; Liang, CY; Liu, ZH et al. (2023). News-based ESG sentiment and stock price crash risk. International Review of Financial Analysis, 88.

Copyright © 2024, DANIEL MACEK et al., daniel.macek@fsv.cvut.cz