ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue X October 2025

Navigating the Electric Vehicle Sustainability Paradox: The Pivotal Role of Corporate Waste Management Disclosure

Noor Faiza M. Ja'afar, Maslinawati Mohamad

Faculty of Accountancy, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Selangor Branch, Shah Alam Campus

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2025.1210000113

Received: 06 October 2025; Accepted: 14 October 2025; Published: 06 November 2025

ABSTRACT

The global transition of world transportation to electric vehicles (EVs) is central to decarbonising transport, however, it is fraught with an inherent sustainability paradox. The paradox lies in the tension between the clear operational benefits of zero tailpipe emissions and the significant, often hidden, environmental burdens embedded within EV lifecycle. The EV lifecycle which involves from intensive mining of critical minerals to the burgeoning challenge of end-f-life battery waste. This academic overview argues that robust Corporate Waste Management Disclosure (CWMD) is a critical mechanism for navigating this complex trade-off. The CWMD could navigate the paradox by mandating transparent and quantifiable reporting on waste streams across the entire value chain. The CWMD moves the industry beyond a narrow focus om use-phase emission. It enhances transparency for stakeholders, enables greater producer accountability for full lifecycle impacts, and drives innovation in circular economy strategies, such as recycling and second-life applications. Ultimately, this study suggests that comprehensive waste disclosure is not merely compliance exercise. comprehensive waste disclosure should also act as a foundation for resolving the EV sustainability paradox. Which it will foster a transition that is truly sustainable from resource extraction to final disposal.

Keywords: Electric Vehicle Sustainability Paradox, Corporate Waste Management Disclosure (CWMD), Circular Economy, Battery Waste Management and Environmental Transparency and Accountability

INTRODUCTION

The global transition of world transportation to electric vehicles (EVs) represents a cornerstone strategy in the urgent endeavour to decarbonise the transportation sector. A sector that being considered as a significant contributor greenhouse gas emission. The widespread adoption of EVs is propelled by their promise of zero tailpipe emissions, offering a clear pathway to improved urban air quality and a reduction in operational carbon footprints compared to conventional internal combustion engine vehicle (ICEVs) (Anderson et al., 2024). This optimism, however is increasingly tempered by a critical and complex dilemma known as the EV sustainability paradox." This paradox captures the fundamental tension between the clear operational benefits of EVs and the substantial often hidden, environmental burdens embedded within EV lifecycle. While EVs excel in reducing emissions during their use phase, their production and end-of-life present formidable sustainability challenges. This includes the intensive extraction of critical minerals for example lithium and cobalt which substantially leads to manufacturing emissions, and the mounting crisis of end-of-life battery waste as per reported in studies done by Rodriguez, Brown, & Silva (2022), and Madaram & Biswas (2024). As the result of that, the environmental gains achieved on the road risk being offset or even surpassed by the hidden cost incurred in the supply chain and the vehicle's disposal, thereby shifting the locus of environmental impact rather than eliminating it (Rodriguez et al., 2022).

Navigating this paradox requires moving beyond a singular focus on use-phase emissions to account for the entire value chain's foot print. This study suggests that robust Corporate Waste Management Disclosure (CWMD) serves as a central mechanism for making these hidden trade-offs visible and manageable. As stakeholder concerns intensify over "embedded impacts" and circularity, CWMD pushes companies to demonstrate accountability not only for energy being used, but also for the material flows and waste streams they generate (Chen et al., 2022). This involves the transparent reporting waste volumes, types, treatment

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue X October 2025

methods and strategic approaches to minimisation, recycling, and hazardous material handling. The core objective of this academic overview is to systematically explore the dimensions of the EV sustainability paradox and articulate the multifaceted of CWMD in addressing it. The discussion starts with defining the paradox's upstream and downstream challenges. Next, this study examines how disclosure frameworks could enhance transparency, drive innovation, and foster policy alignment. Lastly it concludes with implications for research and practice. This study also highlighted that forward-looking and detailed waste management disclosure is indispensable for guiding the EV industry toward genuinely sustainable and circular pathways, ultimately helping to resolve the paradox it currently carries.

2. The EV Sustainability Paradox: A Life-Cycle Perspective

To fully grasp the sustainability implications of the EV transition, adopting a life-cycle perspective that moves beyond a narrow focus on the vehicle's operational phase is imperative. This holistic view reveals a complex tapestry of environmental trade-offs; wherein significant benefits are inextricably linked to substantial and often underestimated burdens. This dichotomy forms the core of the EV sustainability paradox, a critical challenge that underpins the sector's long-term viability and its claim to being a truly sustainable technological alternative.

2.1. The Green Promise

The primary impetus for the global pivot to electric vehicles is undoubtedly rooted in their profound potential to mitigate the environmental impacts of transportation. The most celebrated advantage is the elimination of tailpipe emissions. By replacing internal combustion engines with electric powertrains, EVs eliminate the direct release of carbon dioxide (CO_2), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and particulate matter during use. This leads to immediate and tangible improvements in urban air quality, offering significant public health co-benefits, particularly in densely populated areas affected by traffic-related pollution. Furthermore, from a climate change perspective, the operational phase of EV is markedly cleaner. When charged from a low-carbon electricity grid, the lifecycle greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of an EV can be substantially lower than those of a conventional gasoline or diesel vehicle (Anderson et al., 2024; Rodriguez, Brown, & Silva, 2022). This operational efficiency and decarbonisation potential position EVs as an indispensable technology for achieving national and international climate targets, forming the foundational "green promise" that has captured the attention of policymakers, industry leaders, and consumers.

2.2. The Hidden Costs

Beneath this promising veneer, however, lies a more complicated reality characterised by significant environmental and social costs embedded in the EV value chain. These hidden costs, which manifest both upstream and downstream of vehicle use on the road, critically challenge the simplistic narrative of EVs as an unequivocally green technology.

2.2.1 Upstream Burdens

The environmental footprint of an EV begins long before it reaches the consumer and is rooted in the extraction and processing of critical minerals essential for lithium-ion batteries. The escalating demand for lithium, cobalt, nickel, and manganese has triggered a surge in mining activities, often resulting in severe ecological and social consequences. Extraction processes are notoriously resource-intensive, requiring vast quantities of water and energy. For instance, lithium extraction from brine in arid regions, such as the Atacama Desert, competes with local communities and ecosystems for scarce water resources, potentially causing long-term hydrological damage. Similarly, cobalt mining, which is heavily concentrated in the Democratic Republic of Congo, has been associated with profound human rights concerns, including child labour and unsafe working conditions (Madaram & Biswas, 2024).

Beyond the social and local environmental impacts, the upstream phase carries a significant carbon burden. The mining, refining, and transportation of these minerals, coupled with the energy-intensive production of battery cells and other EV components, results in a significant embodied carbon footprint. This "carbon debt" incurred during manufacturing means that an EV must be driven for a considerable distance before its operational emissions savings offset the initial production emissions. Scholars have noted that in regions where the electricity

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue X October 2025

grid remains heavily reliant on coal or other fossil fuels, this break-even point can be substantially extended, and in some scenarios, the net lifetime emissions benefit may be marginal (Madaram & Biswas, 2024; Silva, Kumar, & Anderson, 2024). This upstream burden illustrates a fundamental shift in environmental impact from the road to the mine and factory, raising critical questions about resource depletion, ecosystem disruption, and true carbon accounting in the EV transition.

2.2.2 Downstream Challenges

The sustainability paradox extends to the end of a vehicle's life, where a new and formidable challenge emerges: the management of end-of-life batteries. The first major wave of EV adoption is now culminating in a corresponding wave of battery waste, which poses unique and severe risks. Lithium-ion batteries contain hazardous materials, including heavy metals and flammable electrolytes, which can leach into soil and groundwater if disposed of in landfills or cause dangerous fires if improperly handled or stored (Anderson et al., 2024).

The scale of this impending waste crisis is monumental and requires urgent attention. The International Energy Agency (IEA) has projected exponential growth in the volume of EV batteries reaching end-of-life, underscoring the urgent need for robust recycling and repurposing infrastructure (IEA, 2022). However, the current recycling landscape is not fully mature. Technical challenges, such as the complexity of separating and recovering high-purity materials from diverse battery chemistries, coupled with economic hurdles related to collection logistics and processing costs, limit the efficacy and scalability of recycling methods. Without a dramatic improvement in recycling rates and the development of efficient closed-loop systems for critical minerals, the EV revolution risks creating a toxic legacy of battery waste, thereby substituting one form of pollution (tailpipe emissions) for another (hazardous waste). This downstream challenge completes a cycle of impact that begins with resource extraction and ends with significant waste management problems.

2.3. Articulating the Paradox

When viewed through this life-cycle lens, the EV sustainability paradox comes into sharp focus. The technology does not eliminate environmental impact but shifts it across geographical boundaries and time phases. The localised air quality benefits and operational GHG reductions achieved in the use phase are counterbalanced by diffuse and often distant burdens, such as the ecological degradation of mining landscapes, carbon-intensive manufacturing processes, and the looming spectre of hazardous battery waste (Rodriguez et al., 2022; Madaram & Biswas, 2024). This creates a critical trade-off that fundamentally challenges the net sustainability benefits of EVs.

The paradox is not that EVs are inherently unsustainable but that their sustainability is conditional and complex. This is contingent on decarbonising the electricity grid, revolutionising resource extraction practices, and establishing a circular economy for batteries. The central tension lies in the fact that the attributes that make EVs a powerful solution for one set of environmental problems, climate change, and urban air pollution, simultaneously introduce a new set of complex sustainability challenges related to resource use and waste. Therefore, evaluating the environmental merits of EVs requires a nuanced understanding of their entire life cycle. Failing to account for these hidden costs risks perpetuating a superficial narrative and undermining the potential for a genuinely sustainable mobility transition. Within this context of complex trade-offs and conditional benefits, the role of corporate transparency, particularly regarding waste management, becomes not only valuable but essential.

3. Corporate Waste Management Disclosure as a Navigational Tool

The electric vehicle sustainability paradox presents a formidable challenge, but it is not insurmountable. Navigating these complexities requires mechanisms that can render the hidden life cycle impacts visible, manageable, and ultimately improvable. Corporate Waste Management Disclosure (CWMD) has emerged as a pivotal navigational tool in this endeavour, offering a structured approach to transparency and accountability that can steer the EV industry toward more genuinely sustainable and circular pathways. By moving beyond a siloed

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue X October 2025

focus on operational emissions, the CWMD provides the necessary lens through which stakeholders can assess and influence the full spectrum of an EV's environmental footprint.

3.1. Defining CWMD in the EV Context

In the specific context of the electric vehicle industry, CWMD represents a sophisticated extension of traditional environmental reporting. While sustainability discourse has historically concentrated on energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions, the CWMD mandates a deeper and more granular accounting of material flows. It compels companies to systematically track, quantify, and publicly report data on waste generation, categorising it by type, such as production scrap, chemical byproducts, and end-of-life products, and by destination, including volumes sent for recycling, reuse, recovery, or disposal. Crucially, for the EV sector, this encompasses the management of hazardous materials, particularly those embedded within lithium-ion batteries, and the strategies employed for their safe handling, recycling, and repurposing (Chen, Wang, & Liu, 2022).

This disclosure is not a mere inventory; it is intrinsically linked to the corporate strategy and performance. It involves reporting quantitative targets for waste reduction, recycling rate improvements, and the integration of circular economy principles. Frameworks such as the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Standard 306: Waste and evolving regulatory regimes like the European Union’s Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) are formalising these expectations. Companies are required to provide detailed, auditable information that spans the entire value chain, from the mining waste generated upstream by suppliers to the end-of-life management of vehicles sold downstream. This comprehensive scope is what makes the CWMD uniquely positioned to address the EV paradox, as it captures the upstream and downstream impacts that define the sustainability tensions of the industry. By demanding transparency on the material inputs and waste outputs of the EV life cycle, the CWMD forces a confrontation with the hidden costs that the paradox represents.

3.2. The Functions of CWMD in Navigating the Paradox

The value of CWMD is not confined to data collection; it is realised through the critical functions it performs for the company, its stakeholders, and the broader regulatory and innovation ecosystems. These functions collectively enable more informed and effective navigation of the sustainability paradox.

3.2.1 Enhancing Transparency and Accountability

Perhaps the most immediate function of a robust CWMD is its power to cut through corporate rhetoric and enhance market transparency. In an industry where "green" claims are a powerful marketing tool, the detailed, quantifiable data provided through waste disclosure allows investors, regulators, and consumers to distinguish between companies that are genuinely embedding circularity into their operations and those engaged in superficial "greenwashing." As investors increasingly apply environmental, social, and governance (ESG) criteria, CWMD offers a tangible metric for assessing a company's exposure to resource-related risks, potential future liabilities from waste management, and long-term viability in a circular economy. It provides an evidence-based foundation for evaluating a firm's environmental stewardship, moving assessments from vague promises to measurable performance (Wong, Smith, & Brown, 2023).

This transparency fosters greater corporate accountability. When a company is required to publicly disclose its waste generation figures, recycling rates for battery components, and progress toward reduction targets, it becomes directly accountable for its performance. This public accountability creates a powerful incentive for manufacturers to assume responsibility for the entire life cycle of their products, including the often-overlooked end-of-life phase of the product. It effectively holds producers accountable for the full life cycle impacts of their vehicles, compelling them to invest in recyclability design, establish take-back schemes and forge partnerships with recycling entities. Without such disclosure, the significant waste burdens of the EV transition are more likely to remain externalised, undermining the sector's sustainability credentials.

3.2.2 Enabling Policy Alignment and Market Access

As governments worldwide awaken to the waste challenges posed by the EV boom, a complex web of regulations and policies has rapidly emerged. The CWMD serves as a critical bridge for companies to demonstrate

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue X October 2025

compliance and secure access to favourable market conditions. Regulatory frameworks, particularly in jurisdictions such as the European Union, are increasingly incorporating extended producer responsibility (EPR) principles, mandating that manufacturers bear the financial and operational responsibility for the collection and sound management of their products at the end of their life cycle. Comprehensive waste disclosure provides verified data necessary to prove compliance with EPR schemes, avoiding potential regulatory penalties and legal challenges (Tarroja, 2024).

Furthermore, the CWMD is becoming a key to unlocking market access and financial incentives. Governments may tie subsidies, tax credits, or preferential treatment in public procurement to demonstrated environmental performance, which increasingly includes verifiable waste management and circularity metrics. A company with a strong CWMD record, showing high rates of battery material recovery and minimal landfill disposal, can position itself favourably within the policy frameworks. It can also mitigate the risk of exclusion from markets with stringent sustainability criteria. In this sense, proactive and transparent waste disclosure is transforming from a voluntary best practice into a strategic imperative for operational licencing and competitive advantage in the global EV market.

3.2.3 Driving Continuous Improvement and Innovation

Beyond compliance and transparency, the CWMD functions as a powerful internal engine for continuous improvement and innovation. The adage "what gets measured, gets managed" is profoundly relevant here: The process of systematically collecting and analysing waste data allows companies to benchmark their performance against industry peers and identify "hotspots" of inefficiency within their own operations and supply chains. This data-driven insight is invaluable for setting meaningful, science-based targets for waste reduction and prioritising areas where operational changes or technological investments can yield the greatest environmental and economic returns (Chen et al., 2022).

This benchmarking function naturally fosters innovation. When companies are accountable for their waste footprints, they are incentivized to rethink product design to facilitate disassembly and recycling, a concept known as "design for circularity." This can lead to innovations, such as battery packs with standardised, easily removable modules and the use of adhesives and connectors that simplify separation. Moreover, the data generated through the CWMD can reveal opportunities for new business models. For instance, understanding the residual value and condition of batteries at end-of-life can spur the development of battery-leasing models, where the manufacturer retains ownership and responsibility for the asset, or the creation of markets for second-life applications, where retired EV batteries are repurposed for stationary energy storage (Madaram & Biswas, 2024; Silva, Kumar & Anderson, 2024). The pursuit of better waste performance metrics, therefore, does not merely reduce negative impacts; it can actively catalyse the development of new circular revenue streams and enhance the resilience of the business against resource scarcity and price volatility. In doing so, CWMD moves the entire industry beyond a defensive posture of managing waste toward a proactive one of creating value from what was once considered refuse, directly addressing the resource consumption and waste pillars of sustainability paradox.

4. The Path Forward: From Disclosure to Systemic Circularity

For corporate waste management disclosure (CWMD) to fully realize its potential in resolving the EV sustainability paradox, its role must evolve beyond a static reporting exercise. The path forward necessitates a strategic shift from viewing disclosure as a compliance obligation to embracing it as a foundational element of corporate strategy and a catalyst for systemic change in the financial sector. This involves moving toward proactive, transparent, and integrated reporting that not only documents performance but also actively drives the transition to a circular economy. As Wong et al. (2023) suggest, the influence of external stakeholders is pushing reporting in this strategic direction, where environmental accountability is a core competitive attribute.

A critical step in this evolution is the widespread adoption of independent third-party assurance for waste management data. Unverified disclosures risk perpetuating scepticism and greenwashing claims, undermining stakeholder trust, and the credibility of the entire reporting system. Third-party assurance provides the necessary verification to transform raw data into a trusted currency for investors, regulators, and consumers, thereby

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue X October 2025

strengthening market signals that reward genuine circularity efforts (Chen, Wang & Liu, 2022). Furthermore, high-quality CWMD will increasingly serve as a linchpin for fostering cross-sector partnerships essential for closing the material loop. The complex challenge of battery recycling and repurposing cannot be solved by any single automaker alone. Transparent disclosure of material compositions and waste streams can facilitate collaborations across industries—between EV manufacturers, mining companies, chemical processors, and waste management firms to create integrated and closed-loop systems for critical minerals (Madaram & Biswas, 2024).

Ultimately, this enhanced disclosure framework is fundamental for positioning EV manufacturers as credible agents of systemic decarbonisation. By providing a verifiable account of how they manage the entire life cycle of their products, from responsible sourcing to end-of-life valorisation, companies can demonstrate a holistic commitment to sustainability that transcends tailpipe emissions. This comprehensive accountability allows the industry to address, rather than displace, its environmental burdens. Therefore, high-quality, strategic CWMD does not merely navigate the EV sustainability paradox; it provides a transparent and accountable roadmap required to resolve it, ensuring that the electric vehicle revolution delivers on its full promise of a truly sustainable mobility future.

CONCLUSION

The electric vehicle sustainability paradox presents a critical challenge, revealing that the operational benefits of EVs are inextricably linked to significant upstream and downstream environmental burdens. This overview has argued that a robustly operationalised Corporate Waste Management Disclosure (CWMD) framework is pivotal mechanism for navigating these complexities. By proposing specific metrics and advocating for navigating its institutionalisation through policy and market incentives, this paper demonstrates how CWMD moves the industry from vague promises to measurable action. It fosters the transparency needed for accountability and functions as a catalyst for the circular EV system, driving innovation in recycling, product design, and new business models that prioritize material recover and waste minimisation (Madaram & Biswas, 2024; Wong et al., 2023).

Future research should focus on longitudinal impact of specific disclosure frameworks like the CSRD on corporate behaviour and waste outcomes. Developing even more granular, standardised metrics for battery health and second life viability is crucial. Furthermore, investigating the role of digital technologies like blockchain in creating temper proof audit trails for battery material from cradle to grave represents a promising frontier. Ultimately, as the EV market matures, a strategic and mandatory CWMD regime will be indispensable for transforming the industry's sustainability paradox into a resolved promise of a genuinely low carbon and circular future.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, R., Brown, K., & Johnson, M. (2024). Sustainability challenges throughout the electric vehicle battery value chain. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 192, 114234. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2024.114234
2. Chen, L., Wang, X., & Liu, Y. (2022). Tracking waste management information disclosure behavior connected to financial performance through moderating variables. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19(20), 13068. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192013068
3. International Energy Agency (IEA). (2022). Global EV Outlook 2022. Retrieved from https://www.iea.org/reports/global-ev-outlook-2022
4. Madaram, V. G., & Biswas, P. K. (2024). Advancement of electric vehicle technologies, classification of charging methodologies, and optimization strategies for sustainable development—A comprehensive review. Heliyon, 10(20), e39299.
5. Rodriguez, M., Brown, K., & Silva, T. (2022). Assessing the European electric-mobility transition: Emissions from electric vehicle manufacturing and use in relation to the EU greenhouse gas emission targets. Environmental Science & Technology, 57(1), 74-85. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.2c06304
6. Silva, R., Kumar, P., & Anderson, M. (2024). Sustainable management of rechargeable batteries used in electric vehicles. Batteries, 10(5), 167. https://doi.org/10.3390/batteries10050167

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue X October 2025

7. Tarroja, B. (2024). Overcoming barriers to improved decision-making for battery deployment in the clean energy transition. iScience, 27(6), 109898. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2024.109898
8. Wong, K., Smith, L., & Brown, M. (2023). The influence of external stakeholders on environmental, social, and governance (ESG) reporting: Toward a conceptual framework for ESG disclosure. Foresight and STI Governance, 17(2), 9-20.