CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF INNOVATIONS ON TOURISM MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE

https://cajitmf.centralasianstudies.org/index.php/CAJITMF

Volume: 07 Issue: 04 | October 2026 ISSN: 2660-454X

Article

Ai-Enabled Environmental Monitoring as a Driver of Corporate Social Responsibility: Evidence from Jsc "Uzbekcoal"

Mirabbos Mira'loevich Murataev*[1]

1. Independent Researcher (PhD), Higher School of Business and Entrepreneurship under the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan

*Correspondence: Mirabbosjon@mail.ru

Abstract: This study evaluates the economic, environmental, and social implications of deploying artificial intelligence (AI)-enabled environmental monitoring stations at JSC "Uzbekcoal", Uzbekistan's principal coal producer. The case study integrates company environmental and production records with a structured before–after assessment, an environmental performance index, a corporate social responsibility (CSR) linkage model, and a cost–benefit framework. The proposed architecture combines Internet of Things sensors, edge validation, a centralized data platform, and AI-supported anomaly detection and forecasting. Company records associated with the monitoring initiative indicate a 44.5% reduction in environmental penalties, a 20–25% reduction in harmful emissions, and an estimated reduction of up to 20% in adverse environmental exposure affecting nearby communities. These values are interpreted as case-specific operational outcomes rather than universal causal effects because the available dataset does not support randomized attribution. The analysis shows how continuous measurement can convert environmental management from periodic compliance reporting into a preventive decision system: exceedances are detected earlier, mitigation resources are targeted more precisely, and auditable data improve stakeholder transparency. Economically, avoided penalties, lower incident-response expenditure, resource savings, and reduced downtime constitute the principal benefit channels. Socially, improved exposure control, disclosure, and grievance responsiveness strengthen the environmental and social dimensions of CSR. The paper proposes a phased implementation roadmap that emphasizes sensor co-location and calibration, data governance, human oversight, cybersecurity, and alignment with ISO 26000 and ESG reporting. The study contributes an applied evaluation framework for AI-enabled environmental governance in coal-mining enterprises in emerging economies.

Keywords: artificial intelligence; environmental monitoring; Internet of Things; coal mining; corporate social responsibility; ESG; particulate matter; digital transformation.

Citation: Murataev M. M. Ai-Enabled Environmental Monitoring as a Driver of Corporate Social Responsibility: Evidence from Jsc "Uzbekcoal". Central Asian Journal of Innovations on Tourism Management and Finance 2026, 7(4), 164-172.

Received: 10th Apr 2026
Revised: 21st May 2026
Accepted: 08th June 2026
Published: 27rd July 2026

1. Introduction

Digital transformation is changing the way extractive industries identify, evaluate, and manage environmental risk. Conventional monitoring commonly depends on periodic sampling, fragmented spreadsheets, and retrospective compliance reports. Although these instruments remain necessary, they may provide insufficient temporal and spatial resolution for rapidly changing mining conditions. Dust generated during excavation, blasting, loading, haulage, crushing, storage, and transport can vary within minutes as a function of wind, humidity, traffic intensity, and production load. Continuous monitoring therefore has strategic value: it can reveal short-duration peaks, support early intervention, and create a traceable evidence base for both managers and external stakeholders.

The public-health relevance is substantial. Particulate matter with aerodynamic diameters below 10 μm and 2.5 μm can penetrate the respiratory system, while fine particles may enter the bloodstream and contribute to respiratory and cardiovascular disease. The World Health Organization consequently recommends stringent guideline values for $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} and also identifies nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, ozone, and carbon monoxide as priority pollutants [1]. Coal operations may additionally release methane and fugitive dust. Monitoring these pollutants is therefore not merely a technical compliance function; it is part of the enterprise's responsibility toward employees, surrounding communities, and the natural environment.

Corporate social responsibility has evolved from a largely philanthropic concept into a management system that links economic obligations, legal compliance, ethical conduct, stakeholder expectations, and long-term value creation. Bowen's foundational formulation [2] and Carroll's responsibility framework [3] provide the normative foundation, while the shared-value perspective emphasizes that societal and competitive benefits can be developed together [4]. Contemporary environmental, social, and governance (ESG) practice makes these responsibilities measurable through indicators, controls, disclosure, and accountability. A large body of empirical evidence reports a generally non-negative association between ESG performance and corporate financial performance, although outcomes depend on context, materiality, and implementation quality [5].

AI-enabled monitoring can connect this responsibility framework with operational practice. IoT devices provide continuous streams of pollutant and meteorological data; edge computing performs preliminary quality checks; centralized platforms integrate production and environmental information; and machine-learning models identify anomalies or predict threshold exceedances. Recent reviews show that AI can support air- and water-quality assessment, pollution-source identification, and environmental forecasting [6], while mining research demonstrates the value of sensor-driven learning systems for hazard prediction [7]. The technology, however, does not automatically guarantee valid measurements or socially legitimate decisions. Sensor drift, missing data, distribution shift, opaque models, weak cybersecurity, and the use of low-cost sensors outside their validated purpose can undermine confidence. Quality assurance, reference co-location, calibration, and human review are therefore essential [8].

Against this background, the objective of this study is to assess how AI-enabled environmental monitoring can improve environmental performance and CSR at JSC "Uzbekcoal". Three research questions guide the analysis: (1) through which operational mechanisms can continuous monitoring reduce environmental impacts and compliance costs; (2) how can environmental outcomes be translated into CSR and ESG indicators; and (3) what governance conditions are required for credible scaling across production sites? The contribution is an applied, multi-dimensional evaluation framework tailored to a coal enterprise in an emerging-economy context. Rather than presenting AI as a stand-alone algorithm, the study treats it as a socio-technical system comprising sensors, communications, analytics, procedures, managers, and affected stakeholders.

Environmental monitoring networks have rapidly evolved toward hybrid architectures that combine reference instruments with lower-cost sensors, mobile devices, and remote sensing. Although lower-cost sensors expand spatial coverage and observational resolution, their data quality remains highly vulnerable to extreme environmental conditions, such as temperature, humidity, and dust composition in mining areas. Therefore, defining fit-for-purpose monitoring objectives and evaluating instrument performance are critical prior to implementation [8].

Through the Internet of Things (IoT) layer and platform-level data integration, real-time sensor observations are combined with mining operational variables (such as excavation volume, haul-truck movements, and water-spraying status). At this stage, Artificial Intelligence (AI) models optimize monitoring through three core functions: descriptive detection of abnormal conditions, predictive estimation of future emission concentrations, and prescriptive recommendation of mitigation actions. However, the effectiveness of these AI models depends heavily on data representativeness, model transparency, and ethical governance [9].

From a Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) perspective and within the framework of ISO 26000 [10], this digital monitoring capability creates tangible value through rapid environmental impact mitigation, evidence-based resolution of community grievances, and long-term capital planning support. Consequently, this study proposes a conceptual model wherein **digital monitoring capability** enhances information quality and response speed, driving **targeted environmental control**, reducing **emissions and penalties**, and ultimately strengthening **CSR/ESG performance and stakeholder trust**. Furthermore, the model highlights key moderating variables—such as sensor validity, data governance, and management responsiveness—emphasizing that without strong moderators, an increase in data volume will merely produce dashboards without delivering real environmental improvements.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Research design and case boundaries

A single-enterprise explanatory case-study design was applied. The unit of analysis is the environmental management system associated with coal extraction, handling, and supporting operations at JSC “Uzbekcoal”. The evidence base consists of production and environmental monitoring records made available for the study, internal compliance indicators, applicable policy documents, and peer-reviewed and institutional literature. The assessment focuses on operational changes associated with the introduction of automated monitoring and AI-supported analysis. Because the source dataset supplied for this article does not contain a complete station-by-station panel, exact observation counts, uncertainty intervals, and randomized controls, the study does not claim experimental causality. Reported percentage changes are treated as enterprise case indicators and are triangulated through process logic and consistency across environmental, economic, and social dimensions.

The case is relevant because open-pit and coal-handling activities generate spatially heterogeneous emissions and require rapid operational response. Uzbekistan’s broader development policy also emphasizes digitalization, environmental protection, and green-economy transition [11, 12]. The enterprise setting therefore allows examination of how global CSR principles can be implemented within national institutional and industrial conditions.

2.2. Proposed monitoring and analytics architecture

Table 1. Functional architecture of the proposed AI-enabled environmental monitoring system.

Layer	Core components	Control objective	CSR/ESG output
Field sensing	$PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10}, SO_2, NO_x, CO, CH_4; wind, temperature and humidity	Continuous detection of pollutant and weather conditions	Environmental exposure and emissions evidence
Edge and communications	Time synchronization, range checks, buffering, secure transmission	Reduce missing/invalid data and preserve continuity	Reliable and auditable information
Data platform	Historian, production-data integration, metadata and role-based access	Create a single environmental record	Governance, traceability and disclosure
AI analytics	Anomaly detection, forecasting, hotspot classification and alert prioritization	Anticipate exceedances and target controls	Preventive risk management
Decision and response	Escalation matrix, dust suppression, maintenance and stakeholder communication	Convert alerts into accountable action	Reduced impact and improved responsiveness

A valid implementation should retain raw measurements, corrected values, model outputs, alert histories, and operator actions as separate fields. This distinction prevents later corrections from erasing the original evidence. Reference-grade co-location is required before deployment and periodically thereafter. Models should be retrained only under controlled versioning, and every alert should display the contributing variables and confidence or quality flag [13]. Automated recommendations may support, but should not replace, legally accountable managerial decisions.

2.3. Indicators and analytical procedures

The environmental assessment compares the baseline and post-implementation values of penalties, harmful emissions, and estimated adverse exposure [14]. Percentage change is calculated as:

$$Reduction\ (\%) = [(Y_0 - Y_1) / Y_0] \times 100,$$

where Y_0 is the baseline-period indicator and Y_1 is the corresponding value after implementation. When the result is reported as a range, the interval reflects the range contained in the enterprise evidence rather than a statistical confidence interval. An environmental performance index (EPI) can be constructed for routine management as a weighted sum of normalized indicators:

$$EPI_t = \Sigma_i\, w_i\, z_{it}, \quad \Sigma_i\, w_i = 1,$$

where z_{it} denotes the normalized score for pollutant or control indicator i in period t and w_i represents its materiality weight. Weights should be approved through a documented process that considers legal limits, toxicity, community exposure, and operational relevance. To avoid concealing serious exceedances through aggregation, the dashboard must show both the composite index and individual pollutant values.

Economic efficiency is evaluated through identifiable benefit and cost channels [15]. The annual net benefit is defined as $NB = AP + OC + RS + AD - (CAPEX_a + OPEX)$, where AP is avoided environmental penalties, OC is avoided incident and disruption cost, RS is resource and energy savings, AD is the monetized value of avoided damage where a defensible valuation exists, $CAPEX_a$ is annualized capital expenditure, and OPEX is annual operating expenditure. For a multi-year investment, net present value is $NPV = \Sigma_t(B_t - C_t)/(1 + r)^t - C_0$. The source material does not provide monetary values for every component; accordingly, this article identifies the structure and direction of economic effects but does not fabricate an NPV or payback period.

Social effectiveness is assessed through exposure-related risk, employee and community complaint responsiveness, disclosure quality, and stakeholder trust. Health improvement cannot be inferred solely from reduced ambient emissions; it requires exposure measurement and health data adjusted for confounders. Consequently, the reported "up to 20%" social effect is described as an estimated reduction in adverse environmental exposure or impact, not as a clinically verified reduction in disease incidence. This distinction aligns the interpretation with available evidence and reduces the risk of overstating the finding.

3. Results

3.1. Environmental and compliance outcomes

The company evidence indicates improvement across all three reported outcome categories following the monitoring initiative. Environmental penalties decreased by 44.5%. Harmful emissions declined by 20–25%, and adverse environmental exposure affecting nearby communities was estimated to decline by up to 20%. Table 2 reports these results together with the appropriate level of inference.

Table 2. Reported outcomes associated with the environmental monitoring initiative.

Outcome indicator	Reported change	Operational interpretation	Evidentiary qualification
Environmental penalties	−44.5%	Fewer or less severe compliance events and faster corrective action	Case-specific before–after indicator
Harmful emissions	−20% to −25%	Improved detection, targeted suppression, maintenance and process control	Range reported in enterprise evidence; pollutant-specific panel required for causal inference
Adverse community environmental impact/exposure	Up to −20%	Lower duration or intensity of off-site exposure	Estimated impact; not a direct epidemiological outcome

The largest relative improvement occurred in penalties. This is plausible because compliance expenditure is influenced not only by the total mass of emissions but also by the timing of detection, documentation, and corrective response. A monitoring system can reduce the duration of an exceedance and provide evidence that mitigation was initiated promptly. The emissions reduction is smaller but operationally more fundamental: it indicates that data were linked to action rather than used solely for reporting. Potential mechanisms include better scheduling of road watering, identification of malfunctioning dust-control equipment, changes to haulage during unfavorable wind conditions, and maintenance triggered by abnormal pollutant patterns.

The monitoring system also changes the temporal structure of environmental management. Periodic sampling answers whether a sampled condition complied at a particular time; continuous data reveal when, where, and under which operational conditions elevated concentrations occur. This supports hotspot maps, event reconstruction, comparison of shifts, and identification of recurring production–pollution relationships. AI adds value primarily by prioritizing attention within a high-volume data stream. For example, a forecasting model may combine lagged PM values, wind speed and direction, humidity, production load, and traffic to estimate short-term exceedance probability. The output is useful only when an alert threshold is connected to a predefined response owner and action deadline.

3.2. Economic efficiency

The observed 44.5% decline in penalties provides the clearest direct economic channel. Additional benefits are likely to arise from avoiding emergency response, reducing unplanned stoppages caused by environmental incidents, optimizing water and energy used for dust suppression, and prioritizing maintenance according to actual condition. Better records may also reduce the administrative time required to compile reports and respond to inspections. At the strategic level, credible environmental data can support lender due diligence, ESG disclosure, and investment planning. These channels are consistent with the broader evidence that materially relevant ESG practices can support financial performance [5], but their monetary magnitude at JSC "Uzbekcoal" should be established through a dedicated investment appraisal.

Costs include sensing equipment, reference co-location, communications, platform licensing or development, cybersecurity, system integration, calibration consumables, specialist personnel, and training. A common appraisal error is to budget for hardware while underestimating recurrent quality-assurance and data-governance expenses. The economically efficient solution is not necessarily the network with the greatest number of sensors; it is the smallest validated network that provides sufficient spatial and temporal resolution for decisions. A phased deployment allows the enterprise to test this relationship and update its business case before full-scale rollout.

3.3. CSR and social outcomes

The initiative strengthens CSR through prevention, accountability, and stakeholder responsiveness. Prevention follows from shorter detection and response times. Accountability follows from time-stamped records showing what was measured, which alert was generated, who acknowledged it, and which action was taken. Responsiveness improves when community complaints can be compared with wind direction, production events, and measured concentrations. These capabilities correspond to ISO 26000 principles of accountability, transparency, respect for stakeholder interests, and environmental responsibility [10].

The estimated reduction of up to 20% in adverse community impact is important but should be verified through a more rigorous social monitoring protocol. Such a protocol should combine boundary-station measurements, residential-area sampling where appropriate, complaint logs, worker exposure data, and anonymized health indicators obtained under ethical and data-protection safeguards. Community-facing disclosure should communicate both concentrations and understandable interpretations, including measurement uncertainty. Publishing an unexplained composite score may create false reassurance; publishing raw numbers without context may create confusion. Effective disclosure therefore requires pollutant-specific limits, trend explanations, incident notes, and contact channels.

4. Discussion

The results support the proposition that environmental digitalization can be a practical mechanism for CSR rather than a separate technology project. The key mechanism is organizational: information latency is reduced and environmental signals are incorporated into daily operating decisions. This finding is consistent with AI-environmental monitoring literature [6] and IoT-based mine hazard research [7], but the present case extends the argument to compliance cost, stakeholder transparency, and ESG governance. The 44.5% penalty reduction suggests that response and documentation processes may improve more rapidly than physical emission performance. This difference is analytically useful because it shows that compliance indicators and environmental outcomes should not be treated as interchangeable.

The findings also illustrate the limits of technology-centered claims. An AI model trained on uncalibrated sensors can generate precise but invalid predictions. A network without maintenance will deteriorate through drift and fouling. A dashboard without assigned decision rights may detect exceedances without reducing them. Conversely, a modest predictive model embedded in a disciplined response system can create substantial value. Implementation should therefore be evaluated through an integrated maturity model covering measurement quality, data infrastructure, analytic validity, operational response, governance, and stakeholder engagement.

For JSC "Uzbekcoal", five priorities follow. First, establish a quality-assurance plan defining measurement objectives, performance requirements, calibration, co-location, maintenance, data completeness, and audit procedures, following fit-for-purpose sensor guidance [8]. Second, integrate environmental and production timestamps so that causes and effective interventions can be identified. Third, create a formal alert matrix with pollutant thresholds, quality flags, responsible positions, response time, and closure evidence. Fourth, establish model governance: documented training data, validation metrics, drift monitoring, version control, explainability, and human override. Fifth, align internal indicators with CSR and ESG disclosure while protecting personal and commercially sensitive data.

A phased roadmap is advisable. During the diagnostic phase, the enterprise should map emission sources, receptors, existing instruments, data gaps, and stakeholder concerns. During the pilot phase, sensors should be co-located with reference instruments and tested across seasons and operating regimes. During the integration phase, validated signals should be connected to production data and selected control actions. During the scaling phase, stations should be added according to demonstrated information value, not uniform geographic spacing alone. Finally, independent audit and periodic community review should test whether the system remains credible and useful.

The study has limitations. It relies on a single organizational case and summarized enterprise outcomes. It lacks raw time-series data, a matched control site, pollutant-specific baseline distributions, meteorological normalization, detailed investment costs, and direct epidemiological observations. The reported changes may therefore reflect, in part, simultaneous operational or regulatory changes. Future research should construct a station-level panel and use interrupted time-series or difference-in-differences designs. Models should control for production volume, weather, seasonality, and changes in fuel or equipment. Economic evaluation should report capital and operating costs, avoided penalties, resource savings, downtime, discount rate, NPV, internal rate of return, and sensitivity scenarios. Social evaluation should combine exposure science with structured stakeholder surveys and ethically governed health data.

5. Conclusion

AI-enabled environmental monitoring offers JSC "Uzbekcoal" a pathway to integrate environmental protection, operating efficiency, and corporate social responsibility. The case evidence associates the initiative with a 44.5% reduction in environmental penalties, a 20–25% reduction in harmful emissions, and an estimated reduction of up to 20% in adverse community environmental exposure or impact. The strongest conclusion is not that AI alone produced these outcomes, but that continuous, quality-controlled information—when connected to accountable response procedures—can shift environmental management from retrospective reporting toward prevention.

The proposed framework shows how benefits should be assessed without overstating the available evidence. Environmental improvement must be reported by pollutant and site; economic benefits must be compared with full life-cycle costs; and social claims must distinguish ambient exposure, perceived impact, and verified health outcomes. Scaling should be conditional on sensor validation, secure data governance, model oversight, staff competence, and meaningful stakeholder disclosure. Under these conditions, environmental monitoring becomes both an operational control system and an institutional mechanism for implementing ESG principles in the coal industry.

REFERENCES

[1] World Health Organization, WHO Global Air Quality Guidelines: Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10}), Ozone, Nitrogen Dioxide, Sulfur Dioxide and Carbon Monoxide. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO, 2021.

[2] H. R. Bowen, Social Responsibilities of the Businessman. New York, NY, USA: Harper & Brothers, 1953.

[3] A. B. Carroll, "The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders," Business Horizons, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 39–48, 1991, doi: 10.1016/0007-6813(91)90005-G.

[4] M. E. Porter and M. R. Kramer, "Creating shared value," Harvard Business Review, vol. 89, no. 1–2, pp. 62–77, 2011.

[5] G. Friede, T. Busch, and A. Bassen, "ESG and financial performance: Aggregated evidence from more than 2,000 empirical studies," Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 210–233, 2015, doi: 10.1080/20430795.2015.1118917.

[6] D. B. Olawade, O. Z. Wada, A. O. Ige, B. I. Egbewole, A. Olojo, and B. I. Oladapo, "Artificial intelligence in environmental monitoring: Advancements, challenges, and future directions," Hygiene and Environmental Health Advances, vol. 12, Art. no. 100114, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.heha.2024.100114.

[7] P. Dey, S. K. Chaulya, and S. Kumar, "Hybrid CNN-LSTM and IoT-based coal mine hazards monitoring and prediction system," Process Safety and Environmental Protection, vol. 152, pp. 249–263, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.psep.2021.06.005.

[8] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Enhanced Air Sensor Guidebook. Research Triangle Park, NC, USA: U.S. EPA, Office of Research and Development, 2022.

[9] C. C. Corrigan and S. A. Ikonnikova, "A review of the use of AI in the mining industry: Insights and ethical considerations for multi-objective optimization," The Extractive Industries and Society, vol. 17, Art. no. 101440, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.exis.2024.101440.

[10] International Organization for Standardization, ISO 26000:2010—Guidance on Social Responsibility. Geneva, Switzerland: ISO, 2010.

[11] Republic of Uzbekistan, Decree of the President No. PF-5863: Concept of Environmental Protection of the Republic of Uzbekistan until 2030. Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 2019.

[12] Republic of Uzbekistan, Decree of the President No. PF-60: Development Strategy of New Uzbekistan for 2022–2026. Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 2022.

[13] A. Kaginalkar, S. Kumar, P. Gargava, and D. Niyogi, "Review of urban computing in air quality management as smart city service: An integrated IoT, AI, and cloud technology perspective," Urban Climate, vol. 39, Art. no. 100972, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.uclim.2021.100972.

[14] Global Reporting Initiative, GRI 305: Emissions 2016. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Global Reporting Initiative, 2016.

[15] N. Kshetri, "Blockchain and sustainable supply chain management in developing countries," International Journal of Information Management, vol. 60, Art. no. 102376, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2021.102376.