Building Climate-Resilient and Sustainable Supply Chains in Global Manufacturing

Khatana Junaid Ahmed
Global Environment, Health & Safety Manager, BAT
Lahore, Pakistan.

DOI: 10.31364/SCIRJ/v13.i10.2025.P10251033
http://dx.doi.org/10.31364/SCIRJ/v13.i10.2025.P10251033

ARTICLE HISTORY:
RECEIVED: 20 AUGUST 2025 | REVISED: 1 SEPTEMBER 2025 | ACCEPTED: 25 SEPTEMBER 2025 | PUBLISHED: 5 OCTOBER 2025

Abstract: The article presents a theoretical analysis of the integration of climate resilience and sustainability in global manufacturing supply chains. The study is based on an interdisciplinary approach that encompasses risk management, sustainable development, digital transformation, and institutional economics. Particular attention is given to the classification of destabilizing factors at both factory and network levels, as well as the analysis of operational adaptation strategies such as agility, redundancy, collaboration, and closed-loop systems. The mechanisms of their impact on economic, environmental, and social performance indicators, defined by the triple bottom line concept, are examined. The article highlights the results of comparing typical trade-offs between environmental costs and socio-economic benefits when integrating sustainability and resilience into closed-loop supply chains. It is demonstrated that digital technologies, including digital twins, distributed ledgers, and generative algorithms, serve as a bridge between strategic planning and operational practice, linking corporate initiatives with international climate objectives such as Net Zero 2050. The author formulates the position that comprehensive implementation of sustainable operational measures, combined with political support, is a key condition for the development of climate-oriented global supply chains. The article will be useful for researchers in supply chain management, sustainability specialists, digital solution developers, and practitioners working with climate risks and production system transformation.

Keywords: climate resilience, supply chain resilience, global manufacturing, sustainable development, closed-loop systems, digital technologies.

Introduction

Global changes in the climate system and intensifying international competition are radically transforming approaches to managing manufacturing supply chains. In the early twenty-first century, growing attention has been devoted to sustainability and to enterprises' capacity to adapt to destabilizing factors, including extreme weather events, disruptions in supplies of critical raw materials, and geopolitical crises [3]. These challenges directly affect global manufacturing, where the resilience of supply chains has become both an economic and strategic task.

Contemporary supply chains are marked by high complexity and internationalization. Market diversification, extensive use of offshoring, and the integration of digital technologies have increased companies' dependence on global logistics systems [1]. These advantages, however, are accompanied by vulnerabilities. Even short-term disruptions can trigger cascading effects, resulting in production line stoppages, higher costs, and reduced competitiveness.

The problem is especially acute in sectors sensitive to climate and social factors, such as the agri-food complex, pharmaceuticals, and automotive manufacturing. Environmental pressures, tightening international standards, and the need to reduce

http://dx.doi.org/10.31364/SCIRJ/v13.i10.2025.P10251033

greenhouse gas emissions require producers to introduce new models of interaction with suppliers and consumers. Resilience and climate adaptation have become essential elements of strategic management, enabling the integration of environmental, social, and economic priorities.

The purpose of this article is to analyze mechanisms for building climate-resilient and sustainable supply chains in global manufacturing, identify key challenges and approaches to overcoming them, and substantiate promising directions for integrating sustainability and resilience into the strategic and operational practices of international companies.

Materials and Methods

This study is based on a systematic analytical review of contemporary theoretical and applied work on climate-resilient and sustainable supply chains in global manufacturing. The principal method was a thematic synthesis of models, frameworks, and empirical cases presented in peer-reviewed publications on risk management, the integration of sustainability and resilience, and adaptation to climate challenges.

The theoretical analysis drew on a body of research covering a broad spectrum of concepts, methodologies, and applied solutions in the field of climate-resilient and sustainable supply chains. Taken together, these works provide an integrated understanding of the interconnections among sustainability, resilience, and global manufacturing practice.

Alum E. [1] presents an agroecological approach to building sustainable farm-to-consumer chains, which is particularly important for food systems. Bag S. [2] proposes a mixed methodology that combines qualitative and quantitative analyses of strategies to enhance resilience. Shekarabi S. [3] conducts a critical review of risk-reduction methods and optimization technologies, identifying priority directions for further research. Kähkönen A. [4] focuses on managing sustainability risks in multi-tier supply chains, whereas Naicker M. [5] analyzes the impact of climate change on food supply chains, highlighting their high vulnerability. Padovano A. [6] develops a multidimensional model for integrating sustainability and viability, and Pan S. [7] emphasizes the need for new logistics norms amid post-pandemic transformations. Proff M. [8] applies a workshop-based approach to analyze the mutual influence of sustainability and resilience factors at factory and network levels, and Setyadi A. [9] systematizes operational responses to global disruptions. Tombido L. [10] concentrates on closed-loop supply chains, identifying trade-offs and research gaps in integrating environmental, social, and economic dimensions.

Accordingly, the methodological foundation of the study rests on a comprehensive comparison of the empirical and conceptual approaches of all these authors, enabling a holistic understanding of how global supply chains are being transformed under climate pressures.

Results

Building climate-resilient and sustainable supply chains requires a detailed analysis of destabilizing events that disrupt both factory processes and network interactions. Proff M. [8] proposes a systematization of such events into five key categories: natural, social, technological, political, and economic. This classification makes it possible to identify specific impacts on enterprises and global chains and to outline relationships between disturbance types and degrees of system vulnerability. A synthesis of these data is presented in Table 1.

Table 1 – Categories of destabilizing events and their impact on supply chains (Compiled by the author based on sources [2, 8, 9])

Category	Example events	Possible consequences
Natural	Earthquakes, fires, extreme weather events (e.g., floods in Slovenia that caused production	Damage to production facilities, supply disruptions, and reduced product quality

http://dx.doi.org/10.31364/SCIRJ/v13.i10.2025.P10251033

	stoppages at Volkswagen)	
Social	Shortage of skilled labor, demographic changes, trade union strikes, targeted attacks (e.g., sabotage of Tesla's power supply in Germany)	Factory shutdowns, threats to employee safety, multimillion-dollar losses
Technological	Power outages, logistics failures, cyber-attacks (e.g., shutdown of 14 Toyota plants due to a cyber-attack)	Disrupted production processes, blocked information systems, and increased operating costs
Political	Wars, geopolitical conflicts, trade wars, and political instability	Disruption of international supply flows, higher tariffs and costs, loss of market share
Economic	Raw material shortages, rising energy and material prices, corporate scandals (e.g., Volkswagen diesel scandal)	Loss of reputation, increased operational expenses, decline in demand, and sales

Analysis of this classification highlights several regularities. Most destabilizing factors exhibit a multiplicative effect: a local event at the factory level inevitably propagates across the entire supply chain. Interruptions in the power supply to a single plant, for example, can cause delays in global distribution networks, as confirmed by cases of cyber-attacks and climate disasters [7].

Cross-category interdependencies generate superposition effects. Natural disasters can be exacerbated by social and political factors when recovery is constrained by workforce shortages or international sanctions. This observation aligns with Padovano A. [6], who emphasizes the need for integrated incorporation of resilience and viability in network governance models.

The growing influence of climate factors elevates the significance of the natural and technological categories. Naicker M. [5] shows that food supply chains in Africa are particularly vulnerable to extreme weather events, confirming the need for multi-level adaptation measures. Similarly, Alum E. [1] underscores an agroecological approach that links sustainability to reducing systemic vulnerabilities in the early stages of the chain.

Finally, the systematization of destabilizing factors indicates differing levels of response. Natural and technological events require preventive and operational solutions (e.g., backup capacity and digital monitoring), whereas social and economic crises depend more on strategic management and supply diversification. This conclusion is consistent with Setyadi A. [9], who stresses the role of operational responses to global disruptions.

An examination of operational strategies for sustainably managing global supply chains shows that the shift from reactive to proactive approaches is essential for long-term resilience. Under climate pressures, emphasis shifts to a combination of agility, redundancy, collaboration, and circularity, each contributing in specific ways to the balance of the economic, environmental, and social dimensions defined by the triple-bottom-line concept. This typology is systematized by Setyadi A. [9], who considers operational measures in close relation to the consequences of global disruptions.

Analysis of these strategies shows that agility manifests in the ability of supply chains to reconfigure processes and routes quickly, minimizing time and resource losses. Redundancy, by contrast, entails deliberate duplication of capacity and inventories, reducing the risk of complete production stoppage. Collaboration strengthens horizontal and vertical ties, forming networked ecosystems in which risks and resources are shared among participants. Circularity reflects the shift toward reusing materials and products, reducing environmental burden, and bolstering social perceptions of sustainability.

Interpreting these strategies through the triple-bottom-line lens is crucial. Economic effects include greater income stability, lower recovery costs, and preservation of competitive advantage. Environmental effects are achieved by reducing emissions, raising energy efficiency, and minimizing waste. Social effects are realized in job creation, strengthened consumer trust, and improved employee safety. This tripartite structure enables the strategies to be viewed both as response instruments and as a foundation for

http://dx.doi.org/10.31364/SCIRJ/v13.i10.2025.P10251033

the long-term development of global manufacturing systems. Table 2 presents a typology of operational strategies with their contributions to sustainable management.

Table 2 – Typology of operational strategies for climate-resilient supply chains (Compiled by the author based on sources [1, 3, 9])

Strategy	Key mechanisms	Economic effects	Environmental effects	Social effects
Agility	Rapid process reconfiguration, flexible logistics	Reduced recovery costs, faster adaptation	Lower resource waste	Enhanced customer satisfaction, workforce adaptability
Redundancy	Safety stocks, backup facilities, multiple sourcing	Business continuity, lower disruption losses	Higher energy/material use (negative trade-off)	Job security, operational stability
Collaboration	Supplier partnerships, joint risk management, shared platforms	Cost-sharing, stable procurement	Shared sustainability initiatives	Strengthened trust, stakeholder inclusion
Circularity	Recycling, reuse, closed-loop systems	Long-term cost savings, new revenue streams	Reduced emissions, waste minimization	Social acceptance, community welfare

The data indicate that operational-level strategies constitute the foundation of the adaptive capacity of global supply chains. Their combination produces a systemic effect in which economic benefits align with environmental responsibility and social commitments. Coherence among approaches is critical: agility is most effective when linked with collaboration, whereas redundancy without closed-loop practices generates environmental costs. The analysis thus confirms the need for comprehensive implementation of sustainable management measures as an integral element of climate-oriented supply chains.

Discussion

Integrating the principles of sustainability and resilience within closed-loop supply chains (CLSCs) reveals predictable zones of tension in which environmental, social, and economic effects come into conflict. Strengthening supply chains' ability to withstand disruptions requires substantial investment in duplicate capacity, safety stocks, and supplier diversification. These measures increase stability and employment but simultaneously raise costs and environmental impacts [10].

A distinctive feature of such systems is that each resilience-enhancing measure entails costs along the sustainability dimension. The use of backup suppliers increases protection against shortages and supports job creation, but is accompanied by higher emissions and additional energy consumption [7]. CLSCs exhibit a dual character: recycling and reuse reduce vulnerability to disruptions, yet they generate excess capacity that demands additional resources.

Coherence is achievable only when effects are considered across all three sustainability dimensions. Bag S. [2] emphasizes that building sustainable supply chains requires strategic alignment between short-term stability and long-term environmental responsibility. Proff M. [8] shows that reactive measures—such as ramping up raw-material extraction during crises—lead to accelerated resource depletion and social losses. To capture typical trade-offs in integrating resilience and sustainability in CLSCs, Table 3 presents systematized examples.

http://dx.doi.org/10.31364/SCIRJ/v13.i10.2025.P10251033

Table 3 – Trade-offs in Integrating Resilience and Sustainability in CLSCs (Compiled by the author based on sources [4, 7, 10])

Primary objective	Resilience strategies	Products	Benefits	Problems
Impact of including resilience on sustainability	Backup suppliers	Copper mines	Improves supply chain profits and increases job security	Increases pollution
Interactions between sustainability and resilience	Information sharing, multiple sourcing	Tires	More jobs created	Increase in costs, pollution, and energy consumption
Impact of resilience on sustainability	Integrating electric power and supply chain	Dairy products	Lower costs during disruption, lower emissions	Increased costs of the network
Effects of resilience on sustainability	Opening backup facilities	Tires	Lowering emissions, creating more jobs	A decentralized network increases costs
Impact of resilience on sustainability	Backup facilities, lateral transshipment	Tires	Lateral transshipment lowers the costs of the network	None mentioned

Analysis of Table 3 confirms that the principal zone of tension lies in the relationship between environmental losses and socio-economic gains. Job creation and income protection strengthen public trust and bolster market positions, yet these benefits are accompanied by higher energy consumption and pollution. Padovano A. [6] underscores that future CLSC models must account for such contradictions, shaping balanced development scenarios.

CLSCs, therefore, cannot be viewed solely as instruments for cost reduction or reliability enhancement. They are complex systems in which every measure must be evaluated both in terms of short-term stability and long-term environmental and social objectives.

Within this study, a conceptual framework is formulated that links resilience and sustainability goals across three levels of global supply chain management. The framework indicates that adaptive strategies should be assessed not in isolation but simultaneously from corporate, industry, and international perspectives; it thereby provides a basis for climate-oriented strategic planning and enables the identification of both systemic trade-offs and points of synergy. The proposed conceptual framework is presented in Table 4, which systematizes relationships between resilience and sustainability strategies at the corporate, industry, and international levels.

Table 4 – Integrated CR–SSC Framework: Linking Resilience and Sustainability Across Levels (Developed by the author)

Levels	Resilience Strategies	Sustainability Strategies
Corporate	Agility, redundancy, and rapid response to disruptions	Green processes, digitalization, labor safety, and social trust
Industry	Collaborative platforms, joint risk management	Sectoral standards, circular models, and low-carbon logistics
International	Political coordination, supply diversification	Net Zero 2050, ESG commitments, climate agreements, and tax incentives

http://dx.doi.org/10.31364/SCIRJ/v13.i10.2025.P10251033

The framework fixes the balance between short-term resilience measures and long-term sustainable development objectives. At the corporate level, operational instruments (agility, digitalization) dominate, while the industry level presupposes standardization and joint initiatives. The international level connects corporate strategies with global goals, including Net Zero 2050 and ESG commitments. This structure makes it possible to systematize strategic priorities and identify potential zones of compromise between sustainability and resilience.

Modern global manufacturers must adapt operational processes to the increased frequency of destabilizing events and integrate climate resilience into strategic planning. This requires balancing short-term efficiency objectives with long-term aims of achieving climate neutrality. As Pan S. [7] shows, managing global supply chains is no longer possible within the confines of legacy practices; new norms require synthesizing sustainability and resilience within a unified system.

Aligning corporate strategies with international commitments is of particular importance, above all, the Net Zero 2050 goal enshrined in global climate accords. Achieving it is impossible without a systemic reconfiguration of supply chains that accounts for both direct emissions and indirect effects associated with raw-material flows, transportation, and product processing. Proff M. [8] argues that sustainability in manufacturing should be treated not as an add-on but as an integral component of strategic management. For companies, this means transitioning from isolated projects to comprehensive programs that link decarbonization goals with social stability and economic reliability.

Digital transformation is a key instrument for implementing such programs. Digital twin technologies make it possible to model complex scenarios for manufacturing and logistics systems, identify vulnerabilities, and assess the consequences of climate and geopolitical shocks in advance. Hosseini Shekarabi S. [3] emphasizes that the use of digital simulations combined with optimization methods improves forecasting precision and reduces response costs. Blockchain ensures transaction transparency and raw-material traceability—crucial for sectors tied to international trade and socially sensitive resources. Finally, generative AI algorithms open new possibilities for adaptive management, from automated route planning to designing ecologically optimized supply chains.

For global manufacturers, integrating climate resilience requires policy support and coordination with international initiatives. Alum E. [1] notes that, in agri-food systems, the transition to sustainable chains is impossible without institutional incentives, including tax benefits and certification standards. A similar conclusion applies to industrial sectors: without synchronizing corporate strategies with government policy instruments, individual company initiatives cannot achieve scale effects.

Accordingly, the practical and policy implications of integrating climate resilience into global manufacturing consist in the need for trilateral coordination: at the corporate level through technology adoption and strategic planning; at the industry level through practice-sharing and standardization; and at the international level through the pursuit of climate goals that align companies, governments, and societies. Only the comprehensive combination of these levels will make sustainability and resilience the foundation of long-term competitiveness for global manufacturers.

Conclusion

This study documents a persistent trend toward rethinking the management of global manufacturing supply chains in favor of comprehensively integrating the principles of climate resilience and sustainability. It has been established that the transition from linear models to closed-loop and adaptive systems reduces vulnerability to external destabilizing events and creates a long-term foundation for achieving international decarbonization goals.

Analysis of categories of destabilizing factors and operational strategies shows that effectiveness hinges not on individual measures but on their systemic combination. Balancing agility, redundancy, collaboration, and closed-loop practices simultaneously minimizes production risks, keeps environmental indicators within sustainable bounds, and builds social capital. The data confirm

http://dx.doi.org/10.31364/SCIRJ/v13.i10.2025.P10251033

characteristic trade-offs between environmental losses and socio-economic gains, necessitating carefully designed strategies at both corporate and industry levels.

Digital technologies play a pivotal role in integrating sustainability and resilience. The use of digital twins, distributed-ledger systems, and generative modeling algorithms expands forecasting capabilities, ensures transparency of flows, and reduces adaptation costs. These instruments form a bridge between strategic planning and operational practice, aligning corporate initiatives with international climate objectives, including Net Zero 2050.

The institutional dimension is of particular importance. Without policy support, standards, and international coordination, individual company initiatives risk remaining fragmented. Conversely, harmonizing corporate strategies with global climate commitments and social priorities creates preconditions for a new generation of manufacturing systems—sustainable, adaptive, and socially oriented.

Thus, integrating climate resilience and sustainability into global manufacturing supply chains represents a stable vector of industrial transformation. Future research should develop multi-level models that concurrently account for political, technological, and social aspects, ensuring balance among economic efficiency, environmental responsibility, and social stability amid intensifying global turbulence.

References

1. Alum, E. U. (2025). Agroecology and resilient supply chains: Building sustainability from farm to fork. Sustainable Futures, 10, 101135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sftr.2025.101135
2. Bag, S., Rahman, M. S., & Chiarini, A. (2024). Building sustainable supply chain resilience: Insights from a mixed-method study. Business Strategy and the Environment. Advance online publication, 34(2), 2103-2127. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.4071
3. Hosseini Shekarabi, S., Kiani Mavi, R., & Romero Macau, F. (2025). Supply chain resilience: A critical review of risk mitigation, robust optimisation, and technological solutions and future research directions. Global Journal of Flexible Systems Management, 26, 681–735. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40171-025-00458-8
4. Kähkönen, A.-K., Marttinen, K., Kontio, A., & Lintukangas, K. (2023). Practices and strategies for sustainability-related risk management in multi-tier supply chains. Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management, 29(3), 100848. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pursup.2023.100848
5. Naicker, M., Naidoo, D., Slotow, R., & Ngidi, M. S. C. (2025). Exploring the effect of climate change on food supply chains in Africa: A systematic review with a focus on South Africa. Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems, 9, 1604839. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2025.1604839
6. Padovano, A., & Ivanov, D. (2025). Towards resilient and viable supply chains: A multidimensional model and empirical analysis. International Journal of Production Research, 1–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2025.2470350
7. Pan, S., Ivanov, D., Chutani, A., Xing, X., Jia, F. J., & Huang, G. Q. (2025). New normal, new norms: Towards sustainable and resilient global logistics and supply chain management. Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review, 201, 104276. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tre.2025.104276
8. Proff, M., Kononova, N., Kishita, Y., Uhlig, E., Scheller, C., Mennenga, M., Herrmann, C., & Spengler, T. S. (2025). Resilient and sustainable supply chains and factories: A workshop-based approach for the analysis of the mutual influencing factors. Procedia CIRP, 135, 942–947. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2025.01.087
9. Setyadi, A., Pawirosumarto, S., & Damaris, A. (2025). Toward a resilient and sustainable supply chain: Operational responses to global disruptions in the post-COVID-19 era. Sustainability, 17(13), 6167. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17136167

http://dx.doi.org/10.31364/SCIRJ/v13.i10.2025.P10251033

10. Tombido, L. (2025). Resilient and sustainable closed-loop supply chains (CLSCs): A research agenda. Journal of Responsible Production and Consumption, 2(1), 254–287. https://doi.org/10.1108/JRPC-03-2024-0012

http://dx.doi.org/10.31364/SCIRJ/v13.i10.2025.P10251033