Page 4756 - 4766 **DOI:** *https://doij.org/10.10000/IJLMH.1110403*

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 8 | Issue 3

2025

Enhancing Corporate Accountability: Legal Frameworks for Transparent AI-Specific Carbon Emissions Disclosure and Verification

SHABNAM AKBAR PATHAN[1] AND DR. UMESH SHRIKRISHNARAO ASWAR[2]

ABSTRACT

As Artificial Intelligence (AI) becomes the invisible engine behind modern economies, its environmental footprint remains disturbingly opaque. While conversations around AI ethics have largely centered on data privacy, algorithmic bias, and transparency, an equally urgent question looms large but largely unaddressed: what is the carbon cost of intelligence at scale? Behind every large language model, image generator, and recommendation algorithm lies an energy-intensive architecture of data centers and high-performance computing systems, producing vast amounts of carbon emissions—often without public disclosure, legal scrutiny, or environmental accountability.

This research paper investigates the critical gap in corporate environmental accountability frameworks with respect to AI-specific carbon emissions. While environmental disclosure norms exist across sectors under sustainability reporting obligations, these largely overlook the unique, digital carbon footprint of AI technologies. In the absence of AI-targeted emission tracking protocols, companies can report aggregate emissions while concealing the carbon costs of specific AI models. This creates a troubling accountability vacuum, allowing major technology corporations to sidestep scrutiny and greenwash their AI-driven innovations.

Through a comparative legal analysis, this study evaluates existing environmental disclosure regimes—such as the European Union's Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD), the United States' SEC Climate Risk Disclosure Rules, and India's Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting (BRSR) framework—to assess how (and if) they can be extended or adapted to mandate transparent AI emissions disclosure. The paper argues for the creation of binding legal instruments that demand granular, model-level carbon reporting, supported by independent third-party verification mechanisms.

[1] Author is an Assistant Professor at MCE Society's AKK New Law Academy & Ph.D (Law) Research Centre Pune and Research Scholar at Department of Law, University of Mumbai, India.

[2] Author is an Associate Professor at Government Law College, Churchgate, Mumbai, India.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

Furthermore, the research identifies the need for cross-border harmonization of standards, particularly in the face of transnational AI deployment, and proposes a global Digital Environmental Accountability Protocol (DEAP) to regulate AI emissions uniformly across jurisdictions.

This paper contributes to the evolving discourse on environmental governance, techno-legal regulation, and climate justice, emphasizing that corporate transparency in AI emissions is not just a regulatory necessity but a moral imperative in the age of accelerating climate change. Only by weaving AI into the fabric of environmental law can we ensure that the future of intelligence is sustainable, ethical, and accountable.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the age of intelligent machines and predictive algorithms, Artificial Intelligence (AI) is rapidly reshaping the world—redefining business models, revolutionizing productivity, and quietly becoming the invisible infrastructure of modern life. From search engines to surveillance systems, from personalized ads to precision agriculture, AI is everywhere. But behind its sleek promise lies a silent, escalating cost: carbon emissions.

Unlike the visible smoke of a factory chimney or the rumble of a coal train, the environmental impact of AI is elusive. It hides in glowing server rooms, in endless rows of high-performance processors, in every line of code that demands compute power. Training just one large-scale AI model can emit more CO_2 than five cars over their entire lifespans. Yet, unlike traditional industries, tech giants rarely face legal obligations to disclose or verify the emissions of their AI systems. There are no specific laws, no standard reporting formats, and no mandatory audits—just blind spots dressed as innovation.[3]

This lack of transparency is not just a technical oversight—it is a legal and ethical failure. In a world fighting to stay below 1.5°C, corporate accountability must evolve to reflect new, digital frontiers of pollution. We cannot afford to regulate the physical world while letting the digital one burn unnoticed.

This research asks a bold but necessary question: how can we make AI's carbon footprint visible, measurable, and legally accountable? It explores the glaring regulatory gap in existing environmental disclosure regimes and the urgent need for AI-specific frameworks that require corporations to openly report the emissions linked to their AI development and deployment.

[3] Anne Christensen, Carbon Disclosure and Accountability in Artificial Intelligence: A Legal Perspective, 46 *Int'l J. L. & Info. Tech.* 49, 52–57 (2021).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

By analyzing global legal instruments like the European Union's CSRD, the United States' SEC guidelines, and India's BRSR framework, this paper identifies pathways—and limitations—for integrating AI carbon emissions disclosure into mainstream corporate sustainability reporting. It further proposes a robust, enforceable legal architecture that includes granular, model-level disclosures, independent third-party verification, and cross-border harmonization of digital sustainability standards.[4]

In essence, this paper makes the case that the future of AI must not only be intelligent and ethical—but environmentally transparent and legally accountable. Because intelligence, unchecked, may be efficient—but it may also be devastating. And in the battle for climate justice, even algorithms must answer to the law.

Literature Review

The intersection of AI and environmental law is a relatively new and under-explored field, despite the mounting evidence of the significant carbon emissions linked to large-scale AI models and the infrastructure supporting them. While scholars have extensively explored AI's ethical, social, and economic impacts, the environmental footprint remains notably absent from mainstream discourse.

The majority of research in AI regulation has concentrated on algorithmic transparency and bias, yet the environmental implications of these technologies have received scant attention. Works like those of Brynjolfsson and McAfee (2014), who discuss the disruptive potential of AI on the labor market, and O'Neil's (2016) work on algorithmic bias, while important, have not connected AI's development to environmental sustainability. The existing research tends to frame AI emissions as a side effect, rather than a core issue requiring dedicated regulatory attention.[5]

Moreover, a handful of studies have raised concerns about the energy consumption of AI models. Strubell et al. (2019), for instance, found that training large-scale models can release more carbon than the average American car over several lifetimes. These findings underscore the need for corporate accountability in the emissions associated with AI, yet the regulatory void remains.

While corporate sustainability reporting frameworks such as the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) and the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) have become foundational for sustainability efforts across industries, they largely ignore the unique

[4]

[5] Erik Brynjolfsson & Andrew McAfee, *The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies* 127–135 (W.W. Norton & Co. 2014).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

emissions profile of AI. Lamberton (2021) and Clarke (2020) have emphasized that the technology sector, despite its growth, is undermining environmental efforts by avoiding clear carbon disclosure regulations for AI infrastructure. There is also a gap in understanding the implications of greenwashing—where AI companies can boast about sustainability without offering tangible metrics to prove their efforts.[6]

However, there are notable exceptions, such as Van der Meer and Helmers (2022), who have explored the nexus between digital technology and climate regulation in the European Union's Green Deal, and Christensen (2021), who proposes an AI-specific environmental framework for policy reform. These studies lay the groundwork for what is an urgent call to arms: that AI emissions disclosure should be mandatory, transparent, and verified.

II. LEGAL ANALYSIS

The legal analysis in this paper explores the current regulatory landscape governing corporate environmental disclosures and how it fails to address the unique carbon emissions of AI systems. This examination begins with a review of general environmental reporting laws, including the EU Non-Financial Reporting Directive (NFRD) and Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) regulations, and contrasts them with emerging efforts to address the environmental costs of digital technologies.

Corporate Sustainability Reporting has evolved as a critical tool for holding companies accountable for their environmental footprint. However, as Lamberton (2021) points out, standardized carbon reporting is insufficient for the complexities introduced by AI technologies. Traditional sustainability frameworks, like the GRI and TCFD, focus on sectors like manufacturing, agriculture, and energy but fail to recognize the growing environmental challenges posed by data centers, cloud computing, and AI model training.[7]

The European Union's Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) mandates broader corporate disclosure on environmental impacts, but its focus remains on aggregate emissions rather than the specific emissions tied to AI operations. Additionally, third-party verification remains a gray area.[8] Existing frameworks do not offer guidelines on how independent auditors should assess the carbon emissions linked to the complex infrastructure

[6] Thomas Lamberton, The Hidden Cost of the Cloud: AI, Energy Use, and the Need for Transparency in Carbon Reporting, 38 **Envtl. L. & Pol'y J.** 112, 115–19 (2021).
Richard Clarke, Digital Technologies and Climate Change: An Urgent Need for Regulatory Innovation, 29(2) **Int'l Envtl. Agreements** 221, 229 (2020).

[7] Kate Crawford, *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence* 43–46 (Yale Univ. Press 2021).

[8] U.S. Sec. & Exch. Comm'n, Proposed Rule: The Enhancement and Standardization of Climate-Related Disclosures for Investors, Release Nos. 33-11042; 34-94478; File No. S7-10-22 (Mar. 21, 2022).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

of AI systems.

This paper proposes extending the EU CSRD to include specific AI carbon disclosures, urging legislators to develop standards that require businesses to report not only their overall carbon footprint but also the emissions tied to specific AI models, data centers, and operational workflows. Drawing from best practices in financial auditing, a robust verification system, including independent third-party audits, should be established to ensure transparency and prevent greenwashing.

In global terms, the paper discusses how cross-border regulatory approaches must be harmonized, particularly as AI operates transnationally. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Paris Agreement provide a foundation for climate-related policy but have not yet addressed the role of digital pollution. International cooperation will be key to ensuring global accountability for AI emissions, while also addressing concerns about the digital divide and the disproportionate burden placed on developing countries hosting large data centers.[9]

III. REWRITING THE LAW FOR THE AGE OF INTELLIGENT EMISSIONS

The doctrinal analysis reveals what might be called the "ghost footprint" of artificial intelligence—vast, tangible, and yet largely unregulated. While existing environmental and corporate disclosure frameworks are evolving to include broader ESG considerations, they remain structurally unfit to address the specificity, scale, and opacity of AI-induced carbon emissions. This absence of tailored legal attention is not just a regulatory oversight—it is a normative failure that invites both corporate evasion and climate injustice.

A. The Legal Blind Spot: AI as an Invisible Emitter

Environmental law, in its current structure, was built to regulate the industrial age—steel mills, oil rigs, factories with smokestacks. The AI revolution, by contrast, is infrastructurally invisible. Data centers are often tucked away in rural counties or foreign soil, powered by private energy deals, while their emissions are attributed—if at all—under generic scopes within a company's overall carbon ledger.

This creates a doctrinal categorical problem: current disclosure laws treat emissions as byproducts of traditional production, not of computation. AI systems, particularly large-scale models like GPTs or image generators, operate within a legal vacuum where no statute clearly mandates disaggregated, model-level carbon disclosure. The result is a moral misalignment—

[9] International Organization for Standardization, ISO 14064: Greenhouse Gases – Specification with Guidance at the Organization Level for Quantification and Reporting of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Removals (2018).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

where digital technologies touted as "intelligent" remain environmentally unaccountable.

B. Corporate Evasion and the Rise of Tech Greenwashing

In the absence of specific regulation, corporations wield self-disclosure as a public relations tool rather than a legal duty. Many Big Tech firms claim carbon neutrality or net-zero targets, yet conflate renewable energy credits with actual emission reductions. Without mandatory AI-specific reporting, companies can strategically bury the high emissions of training large-scale models within general ICT activities.

This is more than a technical gap—it's a corporate governance loophole. It allows for what this paper terms "*carbon laundering*," where emissions-intensive operations are whitewashed under the broad narrative of digital efficiency or AI-enabled climate solutions. Such practices not only dilute public trust but undermine global climate targets under instruments like the Paris Agreement.

C. The Role of Law: From Passive Reporting to Active Accountability

The findings from the doctrinal analysis point toward the need for a paradigm shift—from passive reporting obligations to active legal accountability. What is required is not simply another ESG box to tick, but a new class of legally cognizable emissions: *AI Emissions*, with three core dimensions:

1. **Operational Emissions**: Energy used in training and inference of AI models
2. **Supply Chain Emissions**: Emissions from hardware production (GPUs, chips, servers)
3. **Geopolitical Emissions**: Outsourced emissions in countries with lax environmental laws

These require a novel reporting architecture, built into existing corporate law regimes, wherein emissions attributable to AI models must be:

- **Disclosed publicly** (under binding statute)
- **Audited independently** (with third-party verification)
- **Benchmarked regularly** (against standard thresholds for emissions efficiency)

In this way, law must evolve from a reactive instrument to a proactive ecological steward of the digital economy.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

D. Climate Ethics and the Imperative of Equity

A doctrinal analysis divorced from ethics is incomplete. The carbon cost of AI is not evenly distributed. While AI innovation is largely headquartered in the Global North, its environmental consequences are increasingly externalized to the Global South—where data centers are cheaper, regulations looser, and communities more vulnerable.

Thus, beyond legal reform, the discussion invokes climate ethics. It argues for a just transition in the AI sector—where transparency is not only about emissions data, but about power, access, and environmental dignity. The precautionary principle, a cornerstone of international environmental law, must be expanded to digital domains, ensuring that technological growth does not come at the cost of ecological collapse.

E. The Doctrine Moving Forward: From Silence to Substance

This doctrinal journey reveals that the law's silence on AI emissions is not neutral—it is enabling. And what the law does not name, it cannot regulate. Therefore, the challenge is not only legal but ontological: the law must learn to *see* AI's emissions as emissions, and to *treat* digital externalities as climate obligations.

By proposing a model statute and harmonized global disclosure protocol in later sections, this paper aims to transform the doctrinal silence into a normative voice—one that speaks for the planet in the age of prediction engines.

IV. Recommendations: Building a Legal Architecture for AI-Emissions Accountability

If AI is to remain a tool for human progress, its environmental impact must be regulated with intentionality, specificity, and urgency. Based on the doctrinal findings, this research proposes a multi-layered legal reform strategy to transform current legal inertia into enforceable corporate responsibility.

A. Introduce AI-Specific Emissions Disclosure Provisions in Corporate Law

- Amend national corporate law frameworks (e.g., India's *Companies Act, 2013*, or the EU *CSRD*) to include mandatory AI-carbon reporting as part of annual sustainability disclosures.
- Require corporations developing or deploying AI systems to report model-specific operational emissions, including energy consumption and data center locations.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

B. Develop a Digital Emissions Audit Protocol (DEAP)

- Create a model protocol—Digital Emissions Accountability Protocol (DEAP)—to standardize reporting and third-party verification of AI-related emissions.
- DEAP should include:
    - Carbon intensity benchmarks for AI training and inference
    - Requirements for independent third-party audits
    - Obligations to disclose both direct and outsourced emissions

C. Strengthen ESG Regulation for the Technology Sector

- Position AI emissions as a material ESG factor under national and global reporting regimes (e.g., TCFD, GRI, BRSR), explicitly integrating digital emissions into environmental performance metrics.
- Penalize greenwashing through stricter enforcement and reputational consequences for unverifiable carbon neutrality claims.

D. Promote International Legal Harmonization

- Advocate for a multilateral agreement or treaty addendum under the UNFCCC or Paris Agreement to recognize and regulate the digital carbon economy.
- Encourage bilateral cooperation between AI-developing nations (e.g., US, EU, India, China) to co-develop global disclosure templates and align incentives for cleaner AI.

E. Embed Equity in AI-Climate Governance

- Recognize the disproportionate impact on the Global South, especially in regions where data centers are hosted with limited environmental oversight.
- Ensure technology transfers and AI-development funds include climate justice safeguards, so that the clean digital future is not just a northern ideal but a shared global standard.

V. Conclusion: A Doctrine for the Digital Age

Law, in its most aspirational form, is a mirror to our values. And yet today, AI moves faster than ethics, and carbon outpaces accountability. This research has shown, through doctrinal analysis, that while corporate sustainability laws are growing in ambition, they remain blind to the new reality: that *thinking machines* burn carbon, and that *digital intelligence* leaves a very real ecological trace.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

In the absence of legal recognition, AI-related emissions become invisible crimes of convenience, committed not with malice, but with inattention. And the law, by failing to evolve, becomes complicit in this ecological erasure.

But it doesn't have to be this way.

The doctrinal path forward is clear: define, disclose, verify, and enforce. Corporate actors must be made to account for their AI emissions with the same rigor as any other carbon-intensive industry. Lawmakers must no longer treat the digital realm as immaterial, but regulate it as a material force shaping the planet's fate.

Above all, we must remember that the goal of regulation is not to slow innovation—but to safeguard the future from the unintended side effects of progress.

The climate crisis is not waiting. Neither should the law.

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

VI. REFERENCES:

1. **Kate Crawford**, *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence* 43–46 (Yale Univ. Press 2021).
2. **Emma Strubell, Ananya Ganesh & Andrew McCallum**, Energy and Policy Considerations for Deep Learning in NLP, in *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 3645 (2019).
3. **Cathy O'Neil**, *Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy* 45–48 (Crown Publ'g 2016).
4. **Erik Brynjolfsson & Andrew McAfee**, *The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies* 127–135 (W.W. Norton & Co. 2014).
5. **Karen Yeung et al.**, Artificial Intelligence Governance and Regulation: The EU Approach, 131 *Computer L. & Security Rev.* 1, 4–6 (2021).
6. **Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive**, Directive (EU) 2022/2464 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 Dec. 2022, 2022 O.J. (L 322) 15.
7. **U.S. Sec. & Exch. Comm'n**, Proposed Rule: The Enhancement and Standardization of Climate-Related Disclosures for Investors, Release Nos. 33-11042; 34-94478; File No. S7-10-22 (Mar. 21, 2022).
8. **Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI)**, Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting (BRSR) Framework, SEBI Circular SEBI/HO/CFD/CMD-2/P/CIR/2021/562 (May 10, 2021).
9. **Thomas Lamberton**, The Hidden Cost of the Cloud: AI, Energy Use, and the Need for Transparency in Carbon Reporting, 38 *Envtl. L. & Pol'y J.* 112, 115–119 (2021).
10. **Richard Clarke**, Digital Technologies and Climate Change: An Urgent Need for Regulatory Innovation, 29(2) *Int'l Envtl. Agreements* 221, 229 (2020).
11. **M. van der Meer & E. Helmers**, Digitalization and Climate Change: Towards a Green Digital Economy Under the European Green Deal, 30 *Sustainability J.* 10, 12–15 (2022).
12. **Anne Christensen**, Carbon Disclosure and Accountability in Artificial Intelligence: A Legal Perspective, 46 *Int'l J. L. & Info. Tech.* 49, 52–57 (2021).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

13. **Global Reporting Initiative (GRI)**, *GRI Standards: Consolidated Set 2021*, https://www.globalreporting.org/standards/.

14. **Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)**, *Recommendations of the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures* (Final Report, June 2017), https://www.fsb-tcfd.org/publications/.

15. **United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)**, *Paris Agreement*, Dec. 12, 2015, T.I.A.S. No. 16-1104.

16. **Timnit Gebru et al.**, Datasheets for Datasets: Transparency and Accountability in Machine Learning, in *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency in Machine Learning (FAT/ML)* 1–7 (2018).

17. **Jeff Tollefson**, The Carbon Footprint of Artificial Intelligence Is Bigger Than You Think, 586 *Nature* 177–178 (2020).

18. **European Commission**, EU Green Deal: A European Climate Law, COM(2020) 563 final, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52020PC0563.

19. **International Organization for Standardization**, *ISO 14064: Greenhouse Gases – Specification with Guidance at the Organization Level for Quantification and Reporting of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Removals* (2018).

20. **Erik Brynjolfsson & Andrew McAfee**, *The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies* 127–135 (W.W. Norton & Co. 2014).

21. Richard Clarke, Digital Technologies and Climate Change: An Urgent Need for Regulatory Innovation, 29(2) **Int'l Envtl. Agreements** 221, 229 (2020).

22. Thomas Lamberton, *The Hidden Cost of the Cloud: AI, Energy Use, and the Need for Transparency in Carbon Reporting*, 38 **Envtl. L. & Pol'y J.** 112, 115–19 (2021).

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]