ADVANCED BUSINESS JOURNAL
e-ISSN 3110-4053 · advancedbusinessjournal.com
Vol. 2 No. 4 (2026), pp. 41-63
DOI: https:// 10.65875/pr225654

RESEARCH PAPER | Climate Finance & Development Economics

Financing the Energy Transition: Assessing the Macroeconomic Determinants of Carbon Finance Adoption in Emerging Markets

Fatma Nisa Demirel[1], **İnci yıldız**[2*] **Rumesya Yaman**[3]

[1] *Gaziantep University, Türkiye*
[2] *Giresun university, Türkiye*
[2] *Asia University, Taiwan*
***Corresponding author:** yildizinci2828@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article history
Received: 12 June 2026
Revised: 14 August 2026
Accepted: 22 October 2026
Published: 3 November 2026

Keywords
Carbon finance
Emerging markets
Energy transition
Financial development
Institutional quality
Macroeconomic stability

JEL Classification
Q54; Q56; F33; O16

ABSTRACT

The transition toward low-carbon energy systems requires large and sustained investment, yet emerging markets face financing constraints that extend beyond the availability of climate-oriented instruments. This article examines the macroeconomic, institutional, and financial conditions associated with the adoption of carbon finance in emerging markets. Carbon finance is conceptualized broadly to include carbon pricing and crediting mechanisms, green and sustainability-linked debt, climate funds, blended finance, and other arrangements that connect capital allocation with emissions mitigation. Drawing on financial-development theory, institutional economics, the resource-mobilization perspective, and the political economy of energy transitions, the article develops a framework linking macroeconomic stability, financial-market depth, institutional quality, trade exposure, energy structure, and international climate-finance access to carbon finance adoption. It proposes a comparative panel-data research design for emerging and developing economies, with adoption measured through instrument presence, market activity, capital mobilized, and the sectoral allocation of proceeds. The synthesis suggests that stable macroeconomic conditions and deeper domestic financial markets can lower transaction costs and broaden the investor base, while credible institutions, transparent measurement, and predictable climate policy improve confidence in carbon-related assets. However, the relationships are conditional: high interest rates, currency volatility, fiscal constraints, fossil-fuel dependence, and weak verification systems can undermine adoption or redirect capital toward low-integrity projects. Carbon finance is therefore unlikely to scale through financial innovation alone. Its effectiveness depends on the interaction of macroeconomic credibility, institutional capacity, project pipelines, and a transition strategy that connects emissions reductions with productive investment and inclusive growth.

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by PT Advanced Business Journal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license.

1. INTRODUCTION

The energy transition is often described as a technological shift from fossil fuels toward renewable energy, electrification, efficiency, and other low-emissions systems. In economic terms, however, it is also a financing challenge. Renewable power plants, transmission networks, storage, efficient buildings, industrial retrofits, clean transport, and transition-enabling infrastructure require capital before many of their benefits are realized. Investment decisions are shaped by interest rates, currency risk, fiscal capacity, market depth, policy credibility, and the expected stability of future revenues. These constraints are especially consequential in emerging markets, where demand for energy and infrastructure is rising while the cost of capital can remain high and domestic financial systems vary considerably in depth and resilience (CPI, 2023, 2024; IEA, 2023, 2024; Phan, 2025).

Carbon finance has developed as a set of mechanisms intended to direct financial resources toward emissions reduction and low-carbon investment. The term covers several instruments that should not be treated as interchangeable. Carbon taxes and emissions trading systems create explicit prices or compliance obligations for greenhouse-gas emissions. Carbon-crediting mechanisms generate tradable units associated with quantified mitigation or removals. Green bonds earmark proceeds for eligible environmental projects,

while sustainability-linked instruments connect financing terms to specified performance targets. Climate funds, concessional loans, guarantees, blended finance, and results-based payments can lower project risks or fill financing gaps where commercial capital is insufficient. These mechanisms differ in their revenue models, risk allocation, governance requirements, and relationship to real-economy investment (World Bank, 2023, 2024; Amundi & IFC, 2024).

The potential scale of carbon finance is significant, but aggregate growth should not be confused with equitable or effective allocation. Climate Policy Initiative estimates that global climate finance reached approximately USD 1.46 trillion in 2022, with preliminary analysis indicating further growth in 2023; nevertheless, flows remain below estimated investment needs, and finance is concentrated in a limited number of economies and sectors (CPI, 2024). The World Bank reports that carbon-pricing revenues reached a record USD 104 billion in 2023 and that 75 carbon-pricing instruments were operating worldwide in 2024, covering around 24% of global emissions (World Bank, 2024). These developments demonstrate that carbon-related financial mechanisms are expanding, but they do not establish that countries with the greatest transition needs are receiving capital at an appropriate cost or that the instruments are consistently delivering additional emissions reductions.

Emerging markets face a distinctive combination of opportunities and constraints. Many have substantial renewable-energy potential, growing electricity demand, and large infrastructure needs. At the same time, they may face high sovereign borrowing costs, shallow capital markets, foreign-exchange exposure, policy uncertainty, limited project-preparation capacity, and dependence on carbon-intensive exports or domestic energy sources. These conditions affect both the supply of capital and the bankability of projects. A solar or wind project may be economically competitive at the technology level but remain difficult to finance if revenues are denominated in local currency while debt is in foreign currency, if grid access is uncertain, or if regulatory decisions can change after capital has been committed. Carbon finance must therefore be studied within the broader macroeconomic environment rather than as a stand-alone sustainability innovation.

A central issue is that the adoption of carbon finance is itself an economic and institutional choice. Governments decide whether to introduce carbon pricing, establish registries, authorize crediting programs, and develop taxonomies. Firms decide whether to issue green bonds, purchase credits, invest in emissions-reduction projects, or disclose climate-related financial risks. Financial institutions decide whether to develop climate products, lend to transition projects, or participate in carbon markets. Each decision depends on expected returns, compliance costs, institutional credibility, market infrastructure, and the distribution of risks. The same macroeconomic condition may affect different instruments in opposite ways. For example, fiscal stress can increase the attraction of carbon-pricing revenues while simultaneously weakening public capacity to establish monitoring systems or support vulnerable households.

The existing policy debate often emphasizes the technical design of carbon markets, the integrity of carbon credits, or the size of climate-finance gaps. These issues are essential, but they do not fully explain why adoption varies across countries with broadly similar climate ambitions. The macroeconomic determinants of adoption deserve a more systematic treatment. Economic growth can enlarge the investment base and fiscal resources, but growth driven by energy-intensive industrialization may reinforce fossil-fuel dependence. Financial development can widen access to capital, yet a large financial sector does not automatically allocate funds to low-carbon assets. Trade openness can transmit international climate standards and sustainable-finance demand, but it can also expose exporters to carbon-related trade measures. Institutional quality can reduce policy risk, while political instability and weak enforcement can increase transaction costs and undermine market confidence.

This article addresses these issues by examining how macroeconomic conditions shape the adoption and effectiveness of carbon finance in emerging markets. It makes three contributions. First, it distinguishes adoption from scale and impact: the existence of an instrument, the volume of finance mobilized, and the environmental effectiveness of that finance are related but separate outcomes. Second, it integrates macroeconomic stability, financial development, institutional quality, energy structure, trade exposure, and international climate-finance access into a unified explanatory framework. Third, it develops a research

design suitable for comparative panel analysis while identifying endogeneity, measurement, and heterogeneity challenges that must be addressed before causal claims can be made.

The study is guided by four research questions.

RQ1. Which macroeconomic and institutional factors are associated with the adoption of carbon finance instruments in emerging markets?

RQ2. How do financial depth and macroeconomic stability influence the volume and composition of carbon-related capital?

RQ3. Does institutional quality strengthen the relationship between economic and financial conditions and carbon finance adoption?

RQ4. Under what circumstances does carbon finance support productive low-carbon investment rather than merely expand financial activity or permit weakly substantiated environmental claims?

The article proceeds as follows. Section 2 defines carbon finance and reviews the theoretical and empirical foundations. Section 3 develops the conceptual framework and hypotheses. Section 4 presents a proposed research design, including variables, data sources, and econometric strategy. Section 5 offers a critical synthesis of expected relationships and the mechanisms through which macroeconomic conditions may shape adoption. Section 6 discusses policy implications, limitations, and future research, followed by the conclusion and references. Because no harmonized country-level dataset or estimation output was supplied, the article does not present invented regression coefficients or claim that the hypotheses have been empirically confirmed. Instead, it provides a theory-driven analytical framework and a reproducible empirical strategy for subsequent testing.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Defining carbon finance and separating instrument families

Carbon finance is not a single market or product. It is a broad category for financial mechanisms that price, trade, fund, or otherwise reward activities associated with emissions reduction and climate transition. A useful analytical distinction separates four instrument families. The first comprises explicit carbon-pricing instruments, including carbon taxes and emissions trading systems (ETSs). These change the relative price of emissions and may generate public revenue or create compliance demand for allowances. The second comprises carbon-crediting mechanisms, through which eligible activities issue units representing reductions or removals under specified accounting rules. The third comprises labeled and performance-linked debt, including green bonds and sustainability-linked bonds. These instruments connect capital markets with environmental uses or targets, but their environmental additionality depends on use-of-proceeds rules, target ambition, verification, and issuer behavior. The fourth comprises public and blended climate finance, such as concessional loans, guarantees, grants, and results-based payments, which can make projects viable where risks or public benefits prevent purely commercial financing (World Bank, 2022, 2023, 2024; Amundi & IFC, 2024).

The distinction matters for measurement. A country may have a carbon tax but a very low effective carbon price; another may lack an economy-wide carbon price but host a substantial green-bond market. A third may receive concessional climate finance without developing a domestic carbon-credit market. Combining these cases into a single binary measure would obscure the mechanisms that determine adoption. Researchers should therefore measure instrument presence, implementation intensity, market activity, financial volume, and environmental outcomes separately. This article uses “carbon finance adoption” as an umbrella concept but recommends instrument-specific dependent variables and a higher-level index only where its construction is transparent and theoretically defensible.

Carbon finance also differs from climate finance in a narrower sense. Climate finance includes mitigation and adaptation funding, whereas carbon finance usually emphasizes emissions-related incentives or financial instruments. The categories overlap but are not identical. A flood-resilience project may qualify as climate finance without generating carbon credits, while a carbon-credit transaction may occur without directly financing new infrastructure. A green bond may fund renewable power or energy efficiency, but its

label does not by itself prove that the financed activity would not have occurred otherwise. This conceptual precision is important because the research question concerns adoption and economic determinants, not simply the total amount of funding described as climate-related.

2.2 Financial development and the cost of capital

Financial-development theory suggests that deeper and more efficient financial systems can mobilize savings, evaluate projects, allocate risk, and channel capital toward productive investment. Carbon finance may benefit from these functions because low-carbon projects often involve large initial expenditure, long asset lives, uncertain policy conditions, and cash flows dependent on regulation or energy-market arrangements. Domestic bond markets can support local-currency funding, institutional investors can provide longer-duration capital, and banks can develop expertise in assessing technology and transition risks. Financial depth may also support the market infrastructure needed for bond issuance, carbon-credit transactions, and project finance.

However, the relationship between financial development and carbon finance is not mechanically positive. Financial systems may continue to favor established borrowers, short maturities, collateral-rich projects, and incumbent energy companies. If lenders lack technical capacity to assess renewable-energy or efficiency projects, greater credit availability may flow to familiar carbon-intensive sectors. Capital-market sophistication can also expand speculative trading without improving investment in emissions reduction. The relevant construct is therefore not only financial depth but also the ability of financial institutions to price climate risk, evaluate transition opportunities, and allocate capital to viable projects.

The cost of capital is especially important in emerging markets. Higher domestic interest rates raise the cost of local-currency borrowing, while sovereign risk can increase the spread applied to corporate and infrastructure debt. Foreign-currency borrowing may appear cheaper but creates a mismatch when project revenues are denominated in local currency. Exchange-rate depreciation can raise debt-service burdens even when the underlying project performs as expected. These risks can be particularly severe for renewable-energy projects with fixed-price power-purchase agreements or for firms whose climate investments generate local savings but require imported equipment. A carbon price or green label cannot eliminate these macro-financial constraints.

2.3 Macroeconomic stability and investment horizons

Macroeconomic stability affects the predictability of cash flows, inflation-adjusted returns, and government capacity to sustain policy commitments. High and volatile inflation can complicate long-term contracts, raise construction costs, and make the real value of carbon-price signals less predictable. Exchange-rate volatility affects imported equipment and foreign-currency liabilities. Sovereign debt stress may crowd out public investment, reduce the capacity to offer guarantees, and raise risk premia across the economy. By contrast, credible monetary and fiscal frameworks can improve investor confidence and make long-horizon projects easier to evaluate.

Yet stability should not be interpreted as an argument for austerity at all costs. Carbon finance often requires public investment in grids, transmission, project preparation, registries, verification, and support for affected households. Excessive fiscal restraint may reduce the very infrastructure and institutional capacity needed to crowd in private capital. The policy challenge is to preserve debt sustainability while allocating public resources to investments with high social returns and limited private capture. Guarantees and concessional finance should be targeted at clearly identified risks rather than used to subsidize projects that would already be commercially viable.

Macroeconomic conditions can also influence the relative attractiveness of different instruments. When public debt is expensive, governments may prefer carbon-pricing instruments that generate revenue rather than subsidy-heavy schemes. However, carbon pricing can create distributional pressures if energy costs rise before households and firms have access to alternatives. In periods of high inflation or energy-price volatility, governments may also hesitate to impose explicit carbon costs, even if those instruments would improve long-term investment signals. This suggests that adoption depends not only on economic fundamentals but also on the political feasibility of translating them into durable policy.

2.4 Institutional economics and credible commitment

Institutional economics emphasizes the role of rules, enforcement, property rights, transparency, and credible commitment in shaping investment. Carbon finance is particularly sensitive to institutional quality because the value of many instruments depends on future policy, reliable measurement, and trust in claims about environmental outcomes. Investors need confidence that contracts will be honored, registries will prevent double counting, project approvals will be predictable, and environmental claims will be verified. Where rules change unexpectedly or enforcement is inconsistent, investors may demand higher returns or avoid the market altogether.

Institutional quality also affects the credibility of carbon accounting. Carbon credits are financial claims linked to environmental outcomes that are not always directly observable. Their integrity depends on baselines, additionality, monitoring, permanence, leakage control, and rules against double counting. Weak governance can allow low-quality credits to circulate, undermining buyer confidence and the reputation of the entire market. Strong institutions do not guarantee perfect environmental integrity, but they can establish transparent procedures, independent verification, grievance mechanisms, and penalties for misrepresentation. These features lower information asymmetry and support market participation.

The role of institutions is broader than regulatory quality. Public agencies need technical staff, reliable emissions inventories, registry systems, and the capacity to coordinate across ministries. Courts and regulators must be able to resolve disputes. Statistical agencies need to provide credible macroeconomic and energy data. Financial supervisors may need to clarify disclosure expectations and monitor climate-related financial risks. Institutional capacity is therefore both a determinant of adoption and a potential outcome of market development, creating a feedback relationship that empirical research must consider.

2.5 Political economy and energy-system structure

Energy transitions redistribute costs and benefits across sectors, regions, firms, workers, and consumers. Countries with large fossil-fuel industries may face concentrated resistance to carbon pricing or policies that threaten existing assets. Governments may also depend on fossil-fuel royalties, fuel taxes, or state-owned energy companies for revenue and employment. Under these conditions, the adoption of carbon finance is not merely a technical decision; it is shaped by bargaining power, distributional conflict, and the credibility of compensation measures.

Fossil-fuel dependence can have opposing effects. High emissions intensity creates a larger theoretical opportunity for carbon finance to support reductions. At the same time, dependence on coal, oil, or gas can make governments reluctant to impose carbon costs, particularly where energy access and affordability remain urgent concerns. A transition strategy must therefore distinguish between financing new low-carbon capacity, managing the decline of high-carbon assets, and supporting workers and communities affected by structural change. Financial instruments that ignore these distributional dimensions may be politically fragile even when their economic logic is sound. Research on listed coal companies similarly emphasizes that investors weigh environmental disclosure against underlying transition exposure, with corporate governance shaping its credibility (Mustofa et al., 2026).

The structure of the electricity system also matters. Renewable investment depends on grid access, dispatch rules, storage, transmission, and the ability to integrate variable generation. A country may have strong investor interest in solar and wind but limited project deployment if grid constraints prevent connection or curtail output. Carbon finance can lower financing costs, but it cannot substitute for physical infrastructure or credible power-market design. The interaction between finance and energy-system readiness should therefore be included in cross-country analysis.

2.6 Trade openness, export exposure, and external standards

Trade integration can influence carbon finance through several channels. Export-oriented firms may face requirements from international buyers concerning emissions disclosure, renewable electricity, and supply-chain decarbonization. Financial institutions may adopt standards developed in international markets, and foreign investors may transfer sustainable-finance practices. At the same time, carbon-related trade measures can increase compliance costs for exporters in emissions-intensive sectors. These pressures may

encourage firms and governments to develop emissions data, carbon pricing, and transition investment plans.

Trade openness is not necessarily synonymous with stronger carbon finance adoption. Countries specializing in energy-intensive commodities may experience strong incentives to protect export competitiveness and resist measures perceived to raise production costs. Conversely, countries with diversified exports and access to green supply-chain finance may be better placed to integrate low-carbon investment into industrial upgrading. The empirical relationship may therefore depend on export composition, market destination, and exposure to climate-related trade policies rather than on the trade-to-GDP ratio alone.

External standards can improve credibility but may also impose fixed compliance costs. Smaller firms and lower-income countries may lack the technical capacity to measure product-level emissions or prepare internationally comparable disclosures. If carbon finance requires expensive verification and reporting, market access may concentrate among large firms and projects. Technical assistance, common methodologies, and proportionate standards can reduce this barrier while preserving environmental integrity.

2.7 International climate finance and blended finance

International climate finance can provide concessional resources, guarantees, technical assistance, and risk-sharing arrangements that help projects reach financial close. These instruments are especially relevant where social returns exceed private returns, where policy uncertainty is high, or where foreign-exchange and offtaker risks make projects difficult to finance commercially. Blended finance seeks to use public or concessional resources strategically to mobilize additional private capital. Its success should be assessed by the additional investment and development outcomes it generates, not by the headline amount of private capital associated with a public commitment.

Climate-finance flows remain unevenly distributed. CPI's global landscape reports that the growth in finance has been concentrated in a limited number of geographies, while least developed countries and many climate-vulnerable economies continue to receive a small share relative to their needs (CPI, 2023, 2024). This distribution reflects differences in project pipelines, financial systems, perceived risk, institutional capacity, and investor preferences. It also raises a question of fairness: countries with limited historical emissions may face high financing costs despite having urgent development and resilience needs.

Concessional finance can lower the cost of capital, but poorly designed support can crowd out domestic finance, create dependence on temporary subsidies, or transfer excessive risk to the public sector. Guarantees should address specific risks that markets cannot efficiently absorb, and blended structures should disclose the amount and rationale of concessionality. Public support should also avoid making carbon-intensive projects artificially attractive through implicit guarantees or preferential treatment. A transition-consistent financing framework requires coherent incentives across public budgets, state-owned enterprises, development banks, and private financial institutions.

2.8 Carbon pricing and revenue recycling

Carbon pricing is often justified as a way to internalize the external cost of emissions and improve the relative competitiveness of cleaner technologies. A carbon tax provides a relatively direct price signal and may offer predictable revenue, while an ETS sets a quantity constraint and allows allowance prices to emerge through trading. The choice depends on administrative capacity, emissions coverage, market structure, and policy objectives. Hybrid systems are possible, and carbon-pricing mechanisms can coexist with standards, public investment, and targeted support.

Adoption alone does not determine effectiveness. A carbon price that is too low, covers a small share of emissions, or is undermined by exemptions may have limited effects on investment. A higher price may improve incentives but create distributional and competitiveness concerns if alternatives are unavailable. Revenue recycling is therefore central. Revenues can support low-income households, reduce other distortionary taxes, finance grid and clean-energy infrastructure, or support workers and regions affected by the transition. Transparent recycling can improve political acceptability and convert a price signal into a

broader development strategy; evidence from Indonesia's energy sector also shows that firms' capacity to adapt to carbon pricing differs by size, so complementary support matters (Supranta & Permatasari, 2025).

The World Bank's 2024 report notes that carbon-pricing revenues reached a record level in 2023 and that more than half of revenues were directed toward climate- and nature-related programs (World Bank, 2024). This demonstrates the potential fiscal role of carbon pricing, but it does not imply that all carbon-pricing systems have comparable rates, coverage, or environmental effects. Revenue levels depend on price, emissions coverage, allocation rules, and economic structure. Comparative research should therefore model the design of carbon pricing rather than use a simple indicator of policy presence alone.

2.9 Green bonds and capital-market development

Green bonds can connect institutional investors with projects that meet specified environmental criteria. In emerging markets, they may diversify funding sources, lengthen maturities, and improve the visibility of low-carbon investment. Green bonds can be issued by sovereigns, municipalities, banks, utilities, and corporations. Sustainability-linked bonds differ because their proceeds are not necessarily restricted to a specific green project; instead, financial terms are linked to the issuer's performance against sustainability targets. These instruments can be useful, but their credibility depends on clear frameworks, eligible project definitions, reporting, and external review (Quaser, 2026).

Market development is sensitive to macroeconomic conditions. High interest rates can reduce issuance by making debt more expensive and lowering investor demand for longer-duration assets. Currency volatility can complicate foreign investor participation. Weak disclosure and limited local institutional-investor capacity can increase transaction costs. Issuers may also face a greenium that is too small or uncertain to offset the costs of verification and reporting. The financial case should therefore be evaluated in terms of total funding costs, investor diversification, maturity, and the quality of funded activities rather than assuming that a green label automatically lowers borrowing costs.

Recent market evidence indicates that sustainable debt issuance in emerging markets can rebound when financial conditions improve. IFC and Amundi reported that green-bond issuance in emerging markets increased in 2023, reflecting improved sentiment after the inflationary stresses of 2022, although the market remains exposed to volatility (Amundi & IFC, 2024). This is consistent with the proposition that macroeconomic conditions affect adoption. It also highlights the importance of separating cyclical issuance fluctuations from deeper changes in market infrastructure and institutional capacity.

2.10 Carbon credits, integrity, and financial additionality

Carbon-crediting mechanisms can mobilize finance for activities such as forest conservation, restoration, methane abatement, industrial efficiency, and other emissions-reduction projects. They may create revenue streams for projects that lack sufficient income from conventional markets. However, credits are only as credible as the accounting and governance systems behind them. Additionality requires that the credited activity would not have occurred in the relevant counterfactual without the incentive. Baselines must be conservative, leakage must be considered, and long-term storage or reductions must be monitored. Double counting can arise when the same reduction is claimed by multiple actors or countries.

The integrity challenge is also a macro-financial issue. If buyers lose confidence in the quality of credits, demand and prices can fall, reducing expected project revenues and raising the cost of capital. If market rules are unclear, investors may delay projects while awaiting guidance. Conversely, robust standards and transparent registries can improve confidence and support longer-term contracts. Article 6 of the Paris Agreement has intensified attention to international cooperation, authorization, corresponding adjustments, and accounting for internationally transferred mitigation outcomes. The ability of emerging markets to participate depends on institutional readiness as well as project potential (UNFCCC, 2021; World Bank, 2024).

Carbon-credit revenue should not be treated as equivalent to the full social value of mitigation. Prices vary across project types and market segments, and revenue can be volatile. Projects may also generate co-benefits such as biodiversity protection, local employment, or improved household energy access, but these benefits require separate measurement. For policymakers, the goal should be to develop markets that

support real, additional, and durable mitigation while ensuring that local communities receive fair benefits and that credits do not delay necessary emissions reductions by buyers.

2.11 Economic growth and the energy transition

Economic growth can expand the fiscal base, improve infrastructure, increase domestic savings, and create demand for clean-energy investment. Rising income can also increase public expectations for environmental quality and support more sophisticated financial markets. Yet growth can increase energy demand and emissions if industrialization depends on fossil fuels or if urban expansion locks in carbon-intensive infrastructure. The relationship between growth and carbon finance is therefore likely to be conditional on economic structure, energy intensity, and policy orientation.

The energy-transition literature cautions against treating the shift to low-carbon energy as an automatic consequence of income growth. Structural transformation can reduce emissions intensity while absolute emissions continue to rise. Efficiency gains can be offset by increased production or consumption, and a cleaner electricity mix may not reduce emissions in sectors such as transport, heavy industry, and agriculture without complementary changes. Carbon finance can help redirect investment, but its effect depends on whether it changes capital allocation at the margin and whether the economy can absorb new technologies.

A central development challenge is to combine decarbonization with productive transformation. Emerging markets need jobs, reliable energy, affordable transport, and industrial capacity. Carbon finance is more likely to support durable development when it finances infrastructure and capabilities that improve productivity while reducing emissions. A transition strategy that raises energy costs without expanding access to cleaner alternatives may provoke resistance and undermine adoption. Conversely, well-designed finance can help reduce import dependence, improve energy security, and create new value chains in renewable equipment, services, storage, and efficiency.

2.12 Synthesis and unresolved research gap

The literature suggests that carbon finance adoption is shaped by the interaction of macroeconomic stability, financial-market development, institutional credibility, energy-system structure, trade exposure, and international support. Yet the relationship remains difficult to estimate because “adoption” is measured inconsistently. Studies may use carbon-pricing presence, green-bond issuance, climate-finance flows, renewable-energy investment, or carbon-credit volumes as proxies for related but distinct phenomena. Such proxies capture different decisions and should not be interpreted as interchangeable.

A second gap concerns the difference between adoption and effectiveness. An instrument can be formally introduced but remain weakly implemented; a green bond can be issued without delivering additional emissions reductions; and a carbon market can grow in transaction volume while the underlying credits face integrity concerns. Macroeconomic factors may influence the probability of adoption differently from the amount of finance mobilized or the environmental impact achieved. A useful empirical framework should therefore estimate these outcomes separately.

A third gap is the role of institutional quality as a moderator. Macroeconomic stability and financial depth may not be sufficient when contracts are insecure, emissions data are weak, or verification lacks credibility. Institutional capacity can strengthen the link between financial development and carbon finance by reducing transaction costs and improving confidence. Conversely, weak institutions may cause financial growth to support conventional high-carbon assets rather than low-carbon investment. This article responds by specifying a multi-outcome framework and a set of testable hypotheses that distinguish direct effects, interaction effects, and potential reverse causality.

3. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES

3.1 Overview of the proposed model

The proposed framework treats carbon finance adoption as a process with three analytically distinct stages: policy and market adoption, financial mobilization, and real-economy impact. The first stage captures whether instruments exist and are operational. The second captures the scale, cost, maturity, and allocation

of capital. The third concerns whether the finance contributes to additional low-carbon investment, energy-system transformation, and emissions reductions. This staged approach avoids assuming that the introduction of an instrument automatically leads to market depth or environmental effectiveness.

The main explanatory variables are macroeconomic stability, financial development, institutional quality, economic growth, fossil-fuel dependence, trade exposure, and international climate-finance access. Institutional quality is expected to moderate several relationships. The model also recognizes that the relevant determinants may differ by instrument. For example, financial-market depth may be especially important for green-bond issuance, whereas regulatory capacity and measurement integrity may be more important for carbon pricing and crediting. The empirical design should estimate instrument-specific models before constructing any aggregate index.

3.2 Macroeconomic stability

Macroeconomic stability can support adoption by reducing uncertainty around real returns, debt servicing, and public policy capacity. Lower inflation volatility and more predictable exchange rates can make long-term project cash flows easier to assess. Fiscal credibility can support the continuity of public investment and guarantee programs. However, stability alone may not direct capital toward low-carbon activities; it improves the general investment environment and must be combined with credible transition policy.

> **H1:** *Greater macroeconomic stability is positively associated with carbon finance adoption and the scale of finance mobilized.*

3.3 Financial development

Financial development can expand the pool of investors, improve risk assessment, support long-term debt, and reduce the transaction costs of issuing and trading financial instruments. Domestic capital markets may also reduce dependence on foreign-currency borrowing. However, the allocation effect depends on financial institutions' ability to evaluate transition risk and the availability of bankable low-carbon projects.

> **H2:** *Greater financial-market development is positively associated with carbon finance adoption, particularly for market-based instruments such as green bonds and emissions trading.*

3.4 Institutional quality

Institutional quality influences policy credibility, contract enforcement, disclosure, monitoring, and the integrity of carbon accounting. Credible institutions can reduce the perceived risk of policy reversal and improve investor confidence in the environmental attributes of financed activities. Weak enforcement may instead encourage symbolic adoption or low-quality credits.

> **H3:** *Higher institutional quality is positively associated with carbon finance adoption and implementation intensity.*

3.5 Economic growth and productive capacity

Economic growth can expand domestic savings, public revenue, energy demand, and the pipeline of investment projects. It may increase the capacity to issue sustainable debt and finance energy infrastructure. Yet growth based on carbon-intensive production may reduce the political feasibility of explicit carbon pricing. The hypothesis therefore concerns average association, with energy structure and industrial composition included as controls and potential moderators.

> **H4:** *Higher real economic growth is positively associated with carbon finance adoption, conditional on the economy's energy and production structure.*

3.6 Fossil-fuel dependence

Fossil-fuel dependence may increase the need for transition finance, but it can also create political and fiscal barriers to carbon finance adoption. Economies that depend on fossil-fuel exports or coal-based electricity may face stronger resistance to carbon pricing and transition policies. At the same time, the scale of potential mitigation may attract finance if institutions and project pipelines are credible.

> **H5:** *Greater fossil-fuel dependence is negatively associated with the adoption of restrictive carbon-pricing instruments, while its relationship with transition-finance volume is conditional on policy credibility and project readiness.*

3.7 Trade exposure

Trade exposure can increase the incentive to adopt carbon finance when exporters face buyer requirements, disclosure expectations, or carbon-related trade measures. However, exposure to energy-intensive export markets may create competitiveness concerns. The effect is expected to vary with export composition and access to green supply-chain finance.

> **H6:** *Greater exposure to international markets is positively associated with carbon finance adoption when external standards and sustainable-finance opportunities are credible.*

3.8 International climate-finance access

Concessional finance, guarantees, technical assistance, and development-bank participation can reduce project risks and support institutional capacity. Such access may facilitate adoption where domestic capital markets are shallow. Yet its effect depends on additionality, project preparation, and the ability to maintain projects after concessional support ends.

> **H7:** *Greater access to international climate finance is positively associated with carbon finance adoption and the mobilization of private capital.*

3.9 Institutional moderation

Macroeconomic stability and financial development are likely to have stronger effects when institutions can enforce contracts, maintain reliable registries, and verify environmental claims. In weak institutional settings, additional capital may not flow to low-carbon activities or may be priced to reflect high integrity and policy risks. Institutional quality should therefore be tested as a moderator, not only as a direct predictor.

> **H8:** *Institutional quality strengthens the positive relationships between macroeconomic stability, financial development, and carbon finance adoption.*
>
> **H9:** *Institutional quality strengthens the relationship between international climate-finance access and private capital mobilization by improving project governance and reducing perceived implementation risk.*

3.10 Adoption, mobilization, and environmental effectiveness

The framework predicts that adoption and financial mobilization are positively related but not identical. Formal adoption can reduce uncertainty and create demand, but implementation intensity, market depth, and project pipelines determine whether meaningful capital follows. Environmental effectiveness depends on whether financing is additional, reaches high-impact activities, and produces verified emissions reductions.

> **H10:** *Carbon finance adoption is positively associated with subsequent climate-related capital mobilization.*
>
> **H11:** *The association between carbon finance adoption and emissions-reduction outcomes is stronger where monitoring, reporting, verification, and additionality standards are robust.*
>
> **H12:** *The relationship between carbon finance volume and clean-energy investment is stronger when capital is directed toward bankable projects and complementary infrastructure is available.*

These hypotheses are intended for empirical evaluation. They do not imply that every instrument has the same effect or that a cross-sectional association establishes causality.

4. METHOD

4.1 Research design and analytical scope

A comparative country-level panel design is proposed to assess the macroeconomic determinants of carbon finance adoption in emerging markets. Panel data are useful because they capture variation across countries and over time, allowing the analysis to control for time-invariant characteristics such as geography, legal traditions, and long-standing energy endowments. A baseline sample could cover emerging and developing economies over a period such as 2010–2024, depending on the availability and consistency of instrument-level data. The final sample should be determined by data coverage rather than by an arbitrary list of countries.

The preferred unit of analysis is the country-year, but instrument-specific observations may be constructed where data permit. For example, green-bond issuance can be measured annually, carbon-pricing adoption can be coded by instrument and implementation year, and climate-finance inflows can be measured as amounts or ratios to GDP. Because these outcomes have different distributions and meanings, the study should not force them into one model without a clear justification. A staged analysis can first estimate adoption, then financial mobilization, and finally environmental or energy-transition outcomes.

The proposed design is explanatory rather than purely descriptive. It tests whether macroeconomic conditions and institutions are associated with adoption and whether institutional quality conditions those associations. It also examines the possibility that carbon finance affects macroeconomic and energy outcomes in return. Since policy adoption is not randomly assigned, the empirical strategy must address endogeneity, reverse causality, and omitted-variable bias. The results should be interpreted as causal only when the identification strategy supports such claims.

4.2 Sample definition and country classification

Emerging markets are not a homogeneous group. Country classifications differ across financial-index providers, international organizations, and development institutions. The study should select one classification rule in advance and document how it handles countries that move between income or market categories over time. A robust approach is to define the main sample using a recognized emerging-market classification, then conduct sensitivity analyses using broader emerging and developing economy groupings. Countries with limited data should not be excluded silently; their absence may create selection bias if data-poor economies are also those with weaker institutions or less developed financial systems.

The sample should include variation in income, financial development, energy structure, and policy adoption. Where feasible, regional heterogeneity can be examined across Asia, Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Eastern Europe. However, multi-group estimation should be attempted only when the number of countries and observations supports stable estimates. Regional comparisons should not be used as a substitute for directly measuring institutional, financial, and energy-system differences.

4.3 Dependent variables

The first dependent variable is an adoption indicator for each instrument family. Carbon pricing can be coded as operational when a carbon tax or ETS has entered into force, rather than merely being announced or legislated. Carbon-crediting systems should be coded separately from compliance carbon pricing, and green-bond markets should be measured using actual issuance rather than the existence of a national framework alone. Climate-finance access can be measured through committed or disbursed flows, distinguishing the two where data allow.

The second dependent variable is implementation intensity. For carbon pricing, intensity can include effective price levels, emissions coverage, sectoral coverage, and the share of emissions subject to a binding price. For green bonds, intensity can include issuance volume, number of issuers, maturity, currency, and allocation to eligible sectors. For carbon-crediting markets, measures can include issuance, retirement, prices, project types, and the proportion of credits subject to recognized integrity standards. Each indicator captures a different dimension and should be interpreted accordingly.

The third outcome is financial mobilization. Potential measures include climate-related investment as a share of GDP, green-bond issuance relative to total debt issuance, private capital mobilized per unit of public or concessional finance, and finance directed to renewable energy or energy efficiency. Researchers should distinguish commitments from actual disbursements and distinguish domestic from international finance. Double counting is a particular risk when public commitments are reported alongside private capital associated with the same transaction.

The fourth outcome is environmental or energy-transition performance. Potential indicators include renewable-energy investment, renewable capacity additions, emissions intensity, energy intensity, or verified emissions reductions. These outcomes should be analyzed separately because they respond to different mechanisms and time horizons. A country may expand renewable capacity while absolute emissions continue to rise due to economic growth. Similarly, carbon-pricing adoption may precede measurable emissions reductions by several years.

4.4 Explanatory variables and measurement

Macroeconomic stability can be operationalized through inflation volatility, exchange-rate volatility, sovereign-risk indicators, fiscal balance, and debt-service burden. Researchers should avoid combining all these measures into an opaque index unless the index is theoretically justified and validated. Financial development can be measured through domestic credit to the private sector, stock-market capitalization, bond-market depth, access to institutional investors, and financial inclusion. These indicators are correlated but not equivalent; models should avoid excessive multicollinearity by selecting measures aligned with the instrument under study.

Institutional quality may be measured using indicators of regulatory quality, rule of law, government effectiveness, control of corruption, and political stability. These measures are imperfect and often perception-based, so robustness tests using alternative sources are important. Economic growth can be measured through real GDP growth and GDP per capita, while energy structure can be represented by fossil-fuel share, carbon intensity of electricity, energy imports, and fossil-fuel rents. Trade exposure can include trade openness, export concentration, and the share of exports in emissions-intensive sectors. International climate-finance access can be measured through concessional commitments, disbursements, guarantee exposure, and development-bank project finance.

Control variables should be selected based on a causal framework rather than a search for statistical significance. Relevant controls may include population, urbanization, industrial composition, renewable-energy potential, energy demand, resource endowments, election cycles, and global interest rates. Global shocks—such as energy-price spikes, the COVID-19 pandemic, and changes in international financial conditions—should be considered through year effects or specific interaction terms. Too many controls can reduce precision and obscure the mechanism, while too few can bias the estimates.

4.5 Baseline econometric models

For a binary adoption outcome, a fixed-effects linear probability model can provide a transparent baseline, while conditional fixed-effects logit or discrete-time hazard models may be more appropriate depending on the question and data structure. A hazard model is particularly useful when the outcome is the timing of first adoption. For continuous outcomes such as issuance volume or climate-finance flows, fixed-effects panel regression may be used, with logarithmic transformations or other distributions considered where values are skewed and zeros are common. A two-part model may be appropriate when many countries have no issuance in a given year but positive values are highly dispersed.

A baseline specification can be written as:

$$Adoption_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Stability_{it} + \beta_2 FinanceDepth_{it} + \beta_3 Institutions_{it} + \beta_4 Growth_{it} + \beta_5 FossilDependence_{it} + \beta_6 TradeExposure_{it} + \beta_7 ClimateFinance_{it} + \mu_i + \tau_t + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

Here, μ_i represents country fixed effects, τ_t represents year effects, and ε_{it} is the error term. Interaction terms can be added to test whether institutional quality moderates the effects of stability, financial development, or international finance. Standard errors should be clustered at the country level where appropriate, with sensitivity checks for cross-sectional dependence and serial correlation. With a modest number of countries,

conventional clustered standard errors may be unreliable; alternative small-sample corrections or wild-cluster bootstrap procedures may be warranted.

4.6 Dynamic effects and endogeneity

Carbon finance adoption is likely to be persistent. Once a country establishes a registry, regulatory framework, or green-bond market, subsequent adoption becomes less costly. A dynamic model may therefore include a lagged dependent variable. However, dynamic panel estimators should not be applied mechanically. Difference and system GMM can be useful under specific conditions, but instrument proliferation, weak instruments, and invalid moment conditions can undermine inference. Researchers should report instrument counts, specification tests, and sensitivity to instrument reduction.

Reverse causality is a central concern. Countries with stronger institutions and deeper financial markets may adopt carbon finance more readily, but carbon finance may also stimulate institutional development, market learning, and new investment. Renewable-energy investment may influence GDP growth, while economic growth affects the demand for energy and the capacity to finance transition. Lagging explanatory variables can reduce simultaneity in some cases but does not eliminate endogeneity. Where possible, the analysis should exploit plausibly exogenous policy changes, external shocks, or staggered implementation patterns.

Difference-in-differences can be considered when a policy affects a subset of countries or sectors at different times, provided that parallel trends, anticipation, spillovers, and treatment heterogeneity are evaluated. Event-study estimates should inspect pre-treatment trends and dynamic effects. Instrumental variables require a defensible exclusion restriction; geographic or historical variables should not be treated as valid instruments merely because they predict financial development. The identification strategy must be justified substantively and empirically.

4.7 Heterogeneity and interaction analysis

The average effect of macroeconomic stability may conceal important differences between countries with strong and weak institutions. Interaction models can test whether stability matters more when regulatory credibility is high, whether financial development has a stronger association with green-bond issuance in countries with developed domestic debt markets, and whether international climate finance is more effective where project preparation and monitoring capacity are stronger. These interactions should be pre-specified and interpreted with marginal effects rather than the sign of an interaction coefficient alone.

Sectoral and instrument heterogeneity should also be considered. Carbon pricing may be more politically difficult in fossil-fuel-dependent economies, while green bonds may be more sensitive to interest rates and investor depth. Carbon-credit markets may be more sensitive to measurement and verification capacity. The study should estimate separate models before pooling instruments, and any composite index should be subjected to alternative weighting schemes and validity checks.

4.8 Robustness and validity checks

Robustness checks should include alternative country classifications, alternative definitions of adoption, alternative institutional indicators, lag structures, and exclusion of influential countries. Results should be tested with and without major global shock years and with alternative measures of energy-system structure. For finance-volume outcomes, researchers should compare absolute amounts with GDP-normalized measures and distinguish domestic from international flows. For environmental outcomes, alternative emissions and renewable-energy indicators should be used where possible.

Measurement validity requires particular attention. Green-bond issuance is not a perfect measure of carbon finance because proceeds may fund broader environmental objectives, while climate-finance datasets may include adaptation and resilience. Carbon-pricing presence does not capture the effective price or actual compliance. Carbon-credit issuance does not necessarily represent retired credits or verified additional mitigation. Each proxy should be matched to the theoretical claim it is intended to test.

4.9 Transparency, data management, and research ethics

The study should document data sources, definitions, units, transformations, missing-data decisions, and country exclusions. Where licensing permits, the country-year dataset and code should be made available in a repository. Researchers should record revisions to macroeconomic data and carbon-market databases, because historical values may change. If a composite carbon-finance index is created, the weights and aggregation procedure should be published and sensitivity-tested.

Because the proposed article does not include an assembled dataset or estimated results, it does not report coefficient estimates, p-values, or model-fit statistics. The hypotheses and econometric framework should be tested using actual country-year observations. This distinction protects the credibility of the research and prevents a methodological proposal from being mistaken for an empirical finding.

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Macroeconomic stability as an enabling condition

The conceptual synthesis indicates that macroeconomic stability is likely to support carbon finance adoption by improving the predictability of long-term returns and reducing uncertainty around project costs. Renewable-energy and efficiency investments often involve substantial upfront expenditure and long payback periods. Investors must form expectations about inflation, exchange rates, interest rates, tariffs, and regulatory continuity. When these variables are highly volatile, the risk premium can rise and projects that are technically viable may fail to reach financial close. Stable macroeconomic conditions can therefore improve the environment in which carbon finance operates.

Nevertheless, stability should be interpreted as an enabling condition rather than a sufficient cause. A country may maintain low inflation and a balanced fiscal position while continuing to direct capital toward fossil-fuel infrastructure. Without credible climate policy, a project pipeline, grid readiness, and capable financial institutions, macroeconomic stability may benefit investment generally without changing its carbon intensity. The empirical model should therefore distinguish the effect of stability on adoption from its effect on the allocation of capital to low-carbon uses.

The relationship can also be nonlinear. Moderate inflation or exchange-rate fluctuations may be manageable, while severe instability can sharply reduce long-term investment. Fiscal stress may increase the appeal of carbon-pricing revenues, but it may simultaneously weaken the capacity to support vulnerable households or finance public infrastructure. These competing mechanisms suggest that a single linear coefficient may conceal threshold effects. Future research could test whether adoption becomes substantially less likely beyond certain levels of sovereign risk or exchange-rate volatility.

5.2 Financial depth and the allocation problem

Deeper financial markets can improve the capacity to mobilize long-term capital and diversify risk. Green bonds, project finance, carbon-market transactions, and sustainability-linked instruments require investor demand, disclosure practices, legal documentation, and market intermediaries. Domestic financial development can reduce dependence on foreign funding and help match long-lived infrastructure assets with longer-duration liabilities. It may also support the growth of institutional investors capable of allocating funds to renewable energy and efficiency.

However, the allocation of capital matters more than the size of the financial system alone. Financial institutions often favor borrowers with established credit histories and collateral, while innovative low-carbon projects may have uncertain revenue streams or depend on policy arrangements. A country can therefore have high private credit relative to GDP but limited financing for transition projects. Financial depth should be complemented by measures of bond-market maturity, domestic institutional-investor capacity, climate-risk expertise, and the share of finance directed to low-carbon sectors.

The policy implication is not that financial systems should be instructed to lend indiscriminately to green projects. Rather, regulators and development institutions should improve information, risk allocation, and project preparation. Standardized disclosure, credible taxonomies, transparent procurement, and technical assistance can reduce the cost of assessing low-carbon investment. Public guarantees may be useful where

they address specific market failures, but they should not obscure weak project economics or transfer avoidable risks to taxpayers.

5.3 Institutional credibility and the integrity premium

Institutional quality is likely to shape both the quantity and quality of carbon finance. Investors need confidence in contract enforcement, policy continuity, emissions measurement, and the legitimacy of environmental claims. Weak institutions can increase due-diligence costs and create uncertainty about whether a carbon credit will be accepted, whether a green-bond framework will be applied consistently, or whether a carbon price will remain in force. Credible institutions can reduce these costs by establishing predictable rules and enforcing them transparently.

Institutional quality may also determine whether financial development translates into low-carbon investment. A sophisticated financial sector can mobilize capital, but it cannot ensure that capital supports genuine mitigation when environmental standards are weak. The result may be greenwashing, low-quality credits, or capital allocated to projects that would have occurred without the instrument. This is why the proposed model includes institutional moderation. The effect of financial depth may be stronger where institutions can verify environmental performance and enforce disclosure.

Yet institutions should not be treated as a fixed national characteristic. Capacity can improve through participation in carbon markets, international technical assistance, peer learning, and the development of domestic expertise. The empirical relationship may therefore involve feedback: credible institutions encourage adoption, while adoption creates incentives to improve registries, data systems, and regulatory coordination. Longitudinal research is better suited than a single cross-section to examine this dynamic process.

5.4 Economic growth: resource mobilization versus carbon lock-in

Economic growth can support carbon finance by expanding savings, tax revenue, infrastructure demand, and the domestic investor base. Higher income may also enable governments and firms to invest in more sophisticated measurement and disclosure systems. Emerging markets with growing electricity demand may offer large opportunities for renewable energy, storage, transmission, and efficiency. Carbon finance can help direct part of this investment toward lower-emissions pathways.

The countervailing risk is carbon lock-in. If growth relies on coal-fired electricity, fossil-fuel extraction, or emissions-intensive manufacturing, the same expansion that increases financial capacity can strengthen incumbent interests and increase the cost of transition. New infrastructure may operate for decades, creating future emissions and reducing the flexibility of energy systems. Thus, the relationship between GDP growth and carbon finance adoption should not be interpreted as a universal positive effect. Economic structure and policy orientation are essential to the analysis.

A stronger empirical approach would distinguish growth in low-carbon sectors from growth in carbon-intensive sectors, or at minimum control for industrial composition and energy intensity. It would also examine whether the relationship differs across income levels and stages of structural transformation. The policy objective is not to suppress growth, but to ensure that new investment expands productive capacity without locking economies into avoidable high-carbon assets.

5.5 Fossil-fuel dependence and political constraints

Fossil-fuel dependence creates a dual challenge. On one hand, high-emissions economies may have large opportunities for mitigation and may benefit substantially from transition finance. On the other hand, governments may depend on fossil-fuel revenue, employment, exports, or energy affordability. Carbon pricing can therefore be politically difficult, especially when households lack alternatives or when the state has limited capacity to compensate affected groups.

This suggests that the effect of fossil-fuel dependence should differ by instrument. Carbon taxes and ETSs can directly affect incumbent sectors and may face resistance. Green bonds and concessional finance can be used to build renewable capacity without immediately imposing a broad carbon price, although they may not create a sufficient incentive to retire existing high-carbon assets. Carbon credits may generate revenue for

methane reduction, forest protection, or industrial efficiency, but their contribution to structural transition depends on scale and integrity.

A transition strategy must connect finance with social and regional adjustment. Revenue recycling, worker retraining, regional development, and affordable clean-energy access can reduce resistance and improve the durability of reform. Without such measures, carbon finance may be adopted formally but implemented weakly or reversed after political change. Future studies should therefore examine social protection and distributional institutions as part of the policy environment.

5.6 Trade exposure and competitiveness

International trade can transmit both opportunities and risks. Exporters may adopt carbon accounting and invest in cleaner production to retain access to markets where buyers require emissions disclosure or where carbon-related trade policies affect product competitiveness. International investors and supply-chain partners can also introduce standards and financing practices. This can make trade exposure a driver of carbon finance adoption.

However, external requirements may be costly for firms that lack emissions data, technical expertise, or affordable clean energy. Export dependence in carbon-intensive sectors can create incentives to resist policies perceived as undermining competitiveness. The net effect of trade openness therefore depends on what a country exports, where its goods are sold, and whether it can access transition finance. Aggregate trade openness is too crude to capture these differences.

For policymakers, the implication is that carbon finance should be connected to industrial upgrading. Technical assistance for emissions measurement, finance for energy efficiency, access to renewable electricity, and common reporting standards can help exporters meet external requirements while improving productivity. A policy response focused solely on compliance may impose costs without creating domestic capability; a coordinated approach can turn trade pressure into an incentive for innovation.

5.7 International climate finance and private-capital mobilization

International climate finance can lower barriers where domestic capital is expensive or project risks are difficult to diversify. Concessional loans and grants can support early-stage project preparation, while guarantees can address specific risks such as offtaker default or political uncertainty. Development banks can also help establish standards, demonstrate project viability, and coordinate infrastructure investments. These mechanisms are particularly important where renewable projects depend on transmission expansion or where local capital markets cannot provide suitable maturities.

Yet international finance is not automatically additional or efficient. A public guarantee may support a project that private investors would have financed anyway, while concessional terms can create incentives for rent-seeking if selection criteria are weak. Headline leverage ratios can be misleading when public and private commitments overlap or when the private capital would have entered without support. Evaluation should focus on additional investment, cost reduction, emissions outcomes, and distribution of risk.

The concentration of global climate finance also raises questions of access. Countries with stronger institutions and larger project pipelines may attract more capital, while the most vulnerable economies face high transaction costs and limited administrative capacity. This can create a paradox in which finance flows most easily to countries that need it least urgently. International support should therefore include project preparation, technical assistance, local-currency solutions, and institutional strengthening rather than relying only on competitive financing windows.

5.8 Carbon pricing as fiscal and investment policy

Carbon pricing can affect public finance and private investment simultaneously. A carbon tax may generate revenue that supports infrastructure, social protection, or reductions in other taxes. An ETS may generate auction revenue where allowances are sold, although allocation rules vary. Both can improve incentives for energy efficiency and low-carbon alternatives if prices are credible and coverage is meaningful. The design of the instrument determines whether it serves mainly as a price signal, a revenue source, or both.

The political economy of carbon pricing is inseparable from revenue use. Households may oppose higher energy costs if the policy is perceived as regressive or if alternatives are unavailable. Firms may oppose carbon costs when competitors face weaker constraints. Transparent recycling can address these concerns by supporting vulnerable households, financing public transport and clean energy, or helping firms invest in lower-emissions processes. The economic impact depends on the interaction between price design, market structure, and complementary policies.

In emerging markets, carbon pricing should be assessed alongside energy subsidies, administered prices, and state-owned energy companies. A nominal carbon price can be undermined if fossil-fuel consumption is subsidized or if regulated prices prevent the signal from reaching consumers and investors. Conversely, subsidy reform without targeted support can impose disproportionate costs on lower-income households. Coherent energy and fiscal policy is therefore a prerequisite for effective carbon finance.

5.9 Green bonds and the quality of capital allocation

Green bonds can broaden access to capital and improve the visibility of climate-related investment. Their usefulness depends on whether proceeds are allocated to eligible activities, whether the issuer reports on allocation and impact, and whether the financed projects contribute to additional environmental outcomes. External review can improve confidence, but the quality of assurance varies. A green label should be treated as an information and governance mechanism, not as proof of impact.

Macroeconomic conditions affect both issuer and investor behavior. Rising interest rates increase the cost of debt and may reduce issuance; currency volatility can discourage international investors or expose issuers to mismatches. Inflation can raise project costs after financing has been arranged. Domestic market depth can support local-currency issuance, but investor concentration may limit demand. These factors imply that green-bond growth is sensitive to the macroeconomic cycle even when long-term climate objectives remain unchanged.

The strategic implication is to develop a stable and credible market infrastructure. Clear taxonomies, standardized reporting, predictable issuance calendars, reliable project pipelines, and institutional-investor participation can lower transaction costs. Issuers should disclose how proceeds are used and how impacts are measured. Policymakers should avoid creating labels that are so broad that they lose informational value, while ensuring that smaller issuers can participate without disproportionate compliance costs.

5.10 Carbon-credit markets: additionality, price volatility, and trust

Carbon-credit markets can provide revenue to projects that generate measurable emissions reductions or removals, but they face a distinctive credibility challenge. The underlying commodity is not a physical unit of energy; it is a claim about a counterfactual environmental outcome. Baseline selection, additionality, permanence, leakage, monitoring, and double counting affect the validity of that claim. If buyers doubt the integrity of credits, demand and prices can fall, weakening project finance and undermining trust in the market.

Market volatility also complicates investment decisions. Credit prices differ by project type, standard, vintage, buyer requirements, and perceived quality. Project developers may face a mismatch between the timing of investment costs and the timing of credit issuance. Forward contracts can reduce uncertainty but introduce counterparty and delivery risk. Financial institutions may be reluctant to lend against projected carbon revenue unless the project has a credible methodology, robust verification, and diversified cash flows.

For emerging markets, the opportunity is real but conditional. Forest and land-use projects, methane abatement, industrial efficiency, and clean-energy projects may attract finance, but local communities should not bear the costs while benefits accrue elsewhere. Transparent benefit-sharing, secure land rights, grievance mechanisms, and independent monitoring are important to both integrity and social legitimacy. Carbon-credit revenue should complement—not replace—direct emissions reduction and broader transition investment.

5.11 Adoption is not impact

The distinction between instrument adoption and environmental impact is central to the article. A government can establish a carbon-pricing system that covers only a small share of emissions. A company can issue a green bond to refinance an existing asset without materially changing its investment trajectory. A carbon-credit market can increase issuance while credit quality remains uncertain. These cases show why market activity cannot be used as a direct proxy for emissions reductions.

Impact evaluation requires a counterfactual. Researchers need to ask what investment, emissions trajectory, or technology deployment would have occurred without the instrument. Additionality is challenging at both project and macroeconomic levels. A rise in renewable investment after a green-bond framework is introduced may reflect falling technology costs, higher energy prices, or other policies. Econometric analysis should therefore account for global trends, energy prices, technology costs, and concurrent reforms.

Environmental outcomes also take time. Financial-market adoption can occur quickly, but transmission networks, industrial retrofits, and changes in electricity generation take years. A short observation window may capture disclosure improvements or issuance growth but miss physical emissions effects. This suggests that studies should distinguish near-term financial outcomes from longer-term environmental outcomes and should avoid interpreting an absence of immediate emissions reductions as proof that the instrument has no value.

5.12 Distributional outcomes and inclusive transition

Carbon finance can support development only if its benefits and costs are distributed in ways that remain socially and politically sustainable. Higher carbon prices can affect household energy costs, transport, and food prices. Transition investment can create jobs and improve air quality, but employment gains may not occur in the same regions or occupations that lose fossil-fuel activity. Green-bond proceeds may flow toward large urban projects while rural energy access remains underfunded. These distributional questions are not peripheral; they influence the legitimacy and durability of transition policy.

Financial inclusion is particularly important in emerging markets. Small firms may struggle to access green finance because of collateral requirements, limited reporting capacity, or high transaction costs. Communities may have limited influence over projects that affect land or natural resources. Targeted credit lines, aggregation platforms, technical assistance, and community-benefit arrangements can broaden access, although they require safeguards against elite capture and weak project quality.

The empirical framework can be extended to measure whether carbon finance is associated with employment, energy affordability, access to electricity, or regional investment. These outcomes should not be assumed to improve automatically. A project may reduce emissions while increasing costs for some groups, or it may create local benefits while displacing other activities. A credible transition assessment should report environmental, economic, and distributional outcomes together.

5.13 Implications for emerging-market policymakers

The synthesis points toward a sequenced rather than one-size-fits-all policy approach. Countries with relatively stable macroeconomic conditions but shallow financial markets may prioritize local-currency green debt, project preparation, and investor capacity. Countries with stronger markets but weak environmental governance may need to strengthen registries, verification, disclosure, and enforcement before expanding carbon-credit trading. Countries facing fiscal stress may need targeted concessional support and guarantees while maintaining transparent fiscal accounting. Countries with high fossil-fuel dependence may need transition plans that combine investment, revenue recycling, and support for affected workers and regions.

Policy coherence is crucial. Carbon pricing can be undermined by fossil-fuel subsidies, unstable electricity tariffs, or inconsistent industrial policy. Green bonds can lose credibility if eligible activities are defined too broadly. Concessional finance can distort incentives if projects are selected without transparent additionality criteria. Carbon-credit markets can damage confidence if accounting rules are unclear.

Governments should therefore align fiscal policy, energy regulation, financial supervision, climate targets, and industrial strategy.

Macroeconomic policy should also recognize the investment horizon of the transition. Stable inflation, sustainable debt, credible exchange-rate arrangements, and predictable regulation reduce uncertainty, but public investment remains necessary for grids, storage, transport, and institutional capacity. The goal is not to eliminate public risk-taking; it is to use public resources where they address identifiable market failures and mobilize additional private capital without concealing contingent liabilities.

5.14 Implications for investors and financial institutions

Investors should evaluate carbon finance through a risk-adjusted and impact-aware lens. Relevant questions include whether cash flows depend on policy support, whether foreign-exchange risks are hedged, whether the project has grid access, whether the issuer has credible governance, and whether environmental claims are independently verified. A green label is one input into due diligence, not a substitute for credit analysis or impact assessment.

Financial institutions can strengthen their role by developing expertise in transition plans, emissions data, project finance, and climate-related risk. They should distinguish between financing that supports genuine transition and financing that simply reallocates existing assets under a green label. Portfolio-level targets should be linked to financed emissions and real-economy engagement rather than relying only on divestment. In emerging markets, this may require partnerships with development banks, local financial institutions, and technical-assistance providers.

Investors should also consider the risks of overreliance on carbon-credit revenue. Credit prices and standards can change, and buyers may alter procurement policies. Projects should be assessed for their underlying economic viability and co-benefits, not solely for expected credit income. Diversified revenue streams, transparent contracts, and robust monitoring can improve resilience.

5.15 Research implications and expected empirical patterns

The proposed hypotheses imply several patterns for empirical testing. First, macroeconomic stability is expected to correlate with adoption and finance mobilization, but the relationship should be stronger for long-duration debt and private investment than for policy adoption driven by international commitments. Second, financial development is expected to matter more for green-bond markets and private capital mobilization than for the formal adoption of carbon taxes. Third, institutional quality should strengthen the relationship between finance and low-carbon allocation, particularly where verification and enforcement are important. Fourth, fossil-fuel dependence may have a negative association with restrictive carbon pricing but a more ambiguous relationship with transition-finance volume.

These expectations should not be treated as findings until the models are estimated. The empirical analysis may reveal that some relationships are weak, nonlinear, or contingent on income level and instrument design. For example, international climate finance may have a stronger effect in countries with credible project pipelines, while its apparent association with adoption may reflect donors selecting countries that were already reform-oriented. Such results would be analytically valuable because they would help distinguish financing constraints from institutional and political constraints.

Researchers should also examine whether the determinants of adoption differ from the determinants of effectiveness. Institutional quality may be strongly associated with the introduction of a market but less strongly associated with emissions outcomes if the instrument has low coverage or weak prices. Financial depth may support issuance volume but not necessarily additional investment. A multi-stage model can identify where the process breaks down and provide more actionable evidence than a single regression with a composite outcome.

6. CONCLUSION

This article has examined the macroeconomic determinants of carbon finance adoption in emerging markets and developed a framework that links macroeconomic stability, financial development, institutional quality, economic growth, fossil-fuel dependence, trade exposure, and international climate-finance access to

instrument adoption, capital mobilization, and energy-transition outcomes. The analysis emphasizes that carbon finance is not a uniform instrument. Carbon pricing, carbon crediting, green bonds, sustainability-linked debt, concessional finance, and blended-finance structures operate through different channels and should be measured separately before any composite indicator is constructed.

The central conclusion is that macroeconomic conditions matter, but they do not determine outcomes on their own. Stability can reduce uncertainty and improve the bankability of long-term projects; financial development can expand access to capital; and international climate finance can help allocate risks that private markets cannot efficiently absorb. Yet these advantages translate into effective carbon finance only when institutions can enforce rules, verify environmental claims, maintain credible data, and connect financing to viable low-carbon projects. Fossil-fuel dependence, political economy, trade exposure, and distributional concerns shape the feasibility and durability of adoption.

6.1 Policy recommendations

First, emerging-market governments should improve macroeconomic credibility while preserving strategic public investment. Predictable fiscal and monetary frameworks can reduce risk premia, but transition investment in grids, storage, clean transport, and project preparation remains essential. Fiscal rules should recognize the difference between unproductive recurrent expenditure and investments that create long-term productive and environmental value. Guarantees and concessional support should be transparently accounted for and targeted at clearly identified market failures.

Second, governments should sequence carbon-finance reforms according to institutional readiness. Carbon pricing requires credible emissions data, enforceable rules, administrative capacity, and a plan for revenue use. Carbon-credit markets require robust baselines, monitoring, independent verification, registries, and protections against double counting. Green-bond markets require clear eligibility criteria, allocation reporting, impact reporting, and proportionate external review. Market expansion without integrity can weaken investor confidence and reduce the long-run value of the instrument.

Third, policymakers should strengthen domestic financial markets and local-currency financing. Local-currency green bonds, development-bank facilities, credit guarantees, and institutional-investor participation can reduce currency mismatches and support longer maturities. Financial supervisors can improve climate-related disclosure and risk management while avoiding the assumption that all green assets are low risk. Development banks should support project preparation and demonstration projects where transaction costs prevent private investment, with transparent criteria for additionality and exit.

Fourth, international climate finance should be evaluated by additionality and development impact rather than headline leverage ratios. Concessional resources should help overcome specific risks, build institutional capacity, and mobilize capital that would not otherwise be available on reasonable terms. Support should include technical assistance, data infrastructure, local financial institutions, and project pipelines. It should also address the barriers faced by lower-income and climate-vulnerable countries that may lack the administrative capacity to compete for complex financing structures.

Fifth, carbon finance should be integrated with industrial and social policy. Carbon pricing and transition investment can create distributional pressures, especially where households depend on carbon-intensive energy or workers are concentrated in fossil-fuel sectors. Revenue recycling, targeted transfers, skills development, regional investment, and affordable access to clean alternatives can improve legitimacy. Export-oriented firms may need assistance with emissions measurement and clean production to meet international requirements without losing market access.

Sixth, governments and market participants should prioritize transparency and credible measurement. Finance commitments should be distinguished from disbursements, and private capital mobilized should be counted without duplication. Environmental outcomes should be measured against clear baselines and should account for additionality, leakage, permanence, and changes in production or organizational boundaries. Green labels and carbon credits should not be treated as substitutes for direct emissions reduction.

6.2 Managerial implications

Banks, asset managers, insurers, and institutional investors should assess transition investments using integrated financial and environmental due diligence. The analysis should include macroeconomic risk, currency exposure, regulatory credibility, project readiness, energy-market design, and the integrity of environmental claims. Institutions can build internal expertise, collaborate with development banks, and develop standardized assessment approaches that reduce the cost of evaluating projects across markets.

Investors should distinguish between the quality of the issuer and the quality of the environmental outcome. A financially strong issuer may issue a green bond for projects with limited additionality, while a high-impact project may face financing barriers because of weak collateral or unfamiliar technology. Financial innovation should therefore be complemented by transparent allocation and impact reporting. Carbon-credit revenue should be treated conservatively in project valuations, with sensitivity analysis for prices, verification costs, and rule changes.

6.3 Limitations

This papers has several limitation, first concerns the heterogeneity of emerging markets. Country classifications vary, data availability is uneven, and the same instrument can operate differently across legal and financial systems. A pooled model may conceal substantial differences in the determinants of carbon pricing, green-bond issuance, and carbon-credit market activity. Instrument-specific models and carefully designed heterogeneity tests are therefore necessary.

A third limitation is the difficulty of measuring impact. Carbon finance may be associated with renewable investment or emissions reductions without being their cause. Global technology-cost declines, energy-price shocks, industrial changes, and other policies can affect outcomes simultaneously. Strong causal claims require credible identification strategies and transparent counterfactuals. Researchers should not interpret statistical significance as evidence of additional mitigation without examining the underlying mechanism.

6.4 Future research agenda

Future research should assemble harmonized country-year datasets that distinguish instrument presence, implementation intensity, capital mobilization, and environmental impact. Researchers can use event studies to examine the timing of adoption, panel models to analyze macroeconomic determinants, and quasi-experimental methods where policy changes create credible comparison groups. Instrument-specific studies can identify whether financial development matters more for debt markets than for carbon pricing, and whether institutional quality is especially important for carbon-credit integrity.

Further work should examine the interaction between carbon finance and energy-system constraints. The impact of finance may be limited where transmission networks are inadequate, electricity markets are poorly designed, or project preparation is weak. Research could also explore local-currency finance, sovereign risk, state-owned enterprises, and the relationship between energy subsidies and carbon-pricing effectiveness. These questions are especially relevant for economies that must expand energy access while reducing emissions.

DECLARATIONS

Author contributions (CRediT). Fatma Nisa Demirel: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – original draft. İnci Yıldız: Validation, Formal analysis, Data curation. Rumesya Yaman: Investigation, Software, Writing – review & editing.

Funding. This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflict of interest. The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Data availability. No new data were created or analysed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Declaration of generative AI use. During the preparation of this work, the authors used AI-assisted tools (including large language models) solely for grammar checking, language polishing, and improving sentence readability. After using these tools, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

REFERENCES

Amundi & International Finance Corporation. (2024). Emerging market green bonds report 2023. https://www.ifc.org/en/insights-reports/2024/emerging-market-green-bonds-2023

Banga, J. (2022). The green bond market: A potential source of climate finance for developing countries. Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment. https://doi.org/10.1080/20430795.2018.1498617

Bank for International Settlements. (2021). Climate-related risk drivers and their transmission channels. https://www.bis.org/bcbs/publ/d517.htm

Bank for International Settlements. (2022). Climate-related financial risks: Measurement methodologies. https://www.bis.org/bcbs/publ/d518.htm

Buchner, B., Naran, B., Padmanabhi, R., Stout, S., Strinati, C., Wignarajah, D., Miao, G., Connolly, J., & Marini, N. (2023). Global landscape of climate finance 2023. Climate Policy Initiative. https://www.climatepolicyinitiative.org/publication/global-landscape-of-climate-finance-2023/

Buchner, B., Naran, B., Price, M., Stout, S., Taylor, M., & Zabeida, D. (2024). Global landscape of climate finance 2024. Climate Policy Initiative. https://www.climatepolicyinitiative.org/publication/global-landscape-of-climate-finance-2024/

Climate Policy Initiative. (2022). Global landscape of climate finance: A decade of data. https://www.climatepolicyinitiative.org/publication/global-landscape-of-climate-finance-a-decade-of-data/

Climate Policy Initiative. (2024). The state of climate finance in emerging markets and developing economies. https://www.climatepolicyinitiative.org/

European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. (2023). Transition report 2023–24: Transitions big and small. https://www.ebrd.com/transition-report-2023-24

Financial Stability Board. (2022). Supervisory and regulatory approaches to climate-related risks. https://www.fsb.org/2022/10/supervisory-and-regulatory-approaches-to-climate-related-risks/

International Energy Agency. (2021). World energy outlook 2021. https://www.iea.org/reports/world-energy-outlook-2021

International Energy Agency. (2022). World energy outlook 2022. https://www.iea.org/reports/world-energy-outlook-2022

International Energy Agency. (2023). Net zero roadmap: A global pathway to keep the 1.5 °C goal in reach—2023 update. https://www.iea.org/reports/net-zero-roadmap-a-global-pathway-to-keep-the-15-0c-goal-in-reach

International Energy Agency. (2023). World energy investment 2023. https://www.iea.org/reports/world-energy-investment-2023

International Energy Agency. (2024). World energy investment 2024. https://www.iea.org/reports/world-energy-investment-2024

International Finance Corporation. (2023). Emerging market green bonds. https://www.ifc.org/en/insights-reports/2023/emerging-market-green-bonds-report

International Monetary Fund. (2022). Global financial stability report: Navigating the high-inflation environment. https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/GFSR/Issues/2022/10/11/global-financial-stability-report-october-2022

International Monetary Fund. (2023). Fiscal monitor: On the path to policy normalization. https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/FM/Issues/2023/10/10/fiscal-monitor-october-2023

International Monetary Fund. (2023). Global financial stability report: Financial stability in the new high-inflation era. https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/GFSR/Issues/2023/04/11/global-financial-stability-report-april-2023

International Monetary Fund. (2024). Global financial stability report: The last mile—Financial vulnerabilities and risks. https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/GFSR/Issues/2024/04/16/global-financial-stability-report-april-2024

International Renewable Energy Agency. (2021). World energy transitions outlook: 1.5°C pathway. https://www.irena.org/Publications/2021/March/World-Energy-Transitions-Outlook

International Renewable Energy Agency. (2022). World energy transitions outlook 2022. https://www.irena.org/Publications/2022/Mar/World-Energy-Transitions-Outlook-2022

International Renewable Energy Agency. (2023). World energy transitions outlook 2023: 1.5°C pathway. https://www.irena.org/Publications/2023/Jun/World-Energy-Transitions-Outlook-2023

International Renewable Energy Agency. (2024). World energy transitions outlook 2024. https://www.irena.org/Publications/2024/Mar/World-Energy-Transitions-Outlook-2024

Mustofa, I., Rahmanda, Y., & Ramadhan, R. A. (2026). Green accounting disclosure and investor valuation: The moderating role of corporate governance in publicly listed coal sectors. Advanced Business Journal, 2(3), [pages]. [DOI]

OECD. (2021). Effective carbon rates 2021: Pricing carbon emissions through taxes and emissions trading. https://doi.org/10.1787/0e8e24f5-en

OECD. (2022). Pricing greenhouse gas emissions: Turning climate targets into climate action. https://doi.org/10.1787/e9778969-en

OECD. (2023). Climate finance provided and mobilised by developed countries in 2013–2021. https://doi.org/10.1787/e20d2bc7-en

OECD. (2023). Effective carbon rates 2023: Pricing greenhouse gas emissions through taxes and emissions trading. https://doi.org/10.1787/b84d5b36-en

OECD. (2024). Climate finance provided and mobilised by developed countries in 2013–2022. https://www.oecd.org/climate-change/finance-usd-100-billion-goal/

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2022). OECD guidance on transition finance: Ensuring credibility of corporate climate transition plans. https://doi.org/10.1787/7c68a1ee-en

Phan, Q. H. (2025). Cost-benefit analysis of renewable energy adoption in small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in Indonesia. Advanced Business Journal, 1(1), 18–24. https://advancedbusinessjournal.com/index.php/abj/article/view/4

Quaser, N. (2026). Driving market confidence: The role of ESG reporting in green finance transparency. Advanced Business Journal, 2(1), 33–44. https://doi.org/10.65875/4cr05625

Supranta, V. A., & Permatasari, R. D. (2025). Carbon pricing policy and business adaptation strategies in the energy sector in Indonesia. Advanced Business Journal, 1(1), 25–31. https://advancedbusinessjournal.com/index.php/abj/article/view/5

United Nations Environment Programme. (2022). Emissions gap report 2022: The closing window. https://www.unep.org/resources/emissions-gap-report-2022

United Nations Environment Programme. (2023). Emissions gap report 2023: Broken record—Temperatures hit new highs, yet world fails to cut emissions (again). https://www.unep.org/resources/emissions-gap-report-2023

United Nations Environment Programme. (2024). Emissions gap report 2024: No more hot air ... please! https://www.unep.org/resources/emissions-gap-report-2024

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. (2021). Glasgow Climate Pact. https://unfccc.int/documents/310475

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. (2023). Technical dialogue of the first global stocktake: Synthesis report. https://unfccc.int/documents/631600

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. (2024). Article 6 of the Paris Agreement: Cooperative approaches and market mechanisms. https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/article-6

World Bank Group. (2023). Country climate and development reports: Synthesis report. https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/country-climate-development-reports

World Bank Group. (2024). Scaling up to phase down: Financing energy transitions in developing countries. https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/climatechange

World Bank. (2022). State and trends of carbon pricing 2022. https://ppp.worldbank.org/library/state-and-trends-carbon-pricing-2022

World Bank. (2023). Global economic prospects, June 2023. https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/global-economic-prospects

World Bank. (2023). State and trends of carbon pricing 2023. https://ppp.worldbank.org/library/state-and-trends-carbon-pricing-2023

World Bank. (2024). Global economic prospects, June 2024. https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/global-economic-prospects

World Bank. (2024). International debt report 2024. https://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/debt-statistics/idr/products

World Bank. (2024). State and trends of carbon pricing 2024. https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2024/05/21/global-carbon-pricing-revenues-top-a-record-100-billion

World Bank. (2024). State and trends of international carbon markets 2024. https://blogs.worldbank.org/en/climatechange/state-and-trends-of-carbon-pricing--international-carbon-markets

Zhang, D., Mohsin, M., Rasheed, A. K., Chang, Y., & Taghizadeh-Hesary, F. (2021). Public spending and green economic growth in BRI region: Mediating role of green finance. Energy Policy, 153, 112256. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2021.112256