Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Economic Management and Green Development (ICEMGD 2026)
DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.34036

The Role of Green Finance in Supporting Low-Carbon Economic Development: Impacts, Challenges, and Countermeasures

Yurong Zhu

Social Science, Western University, London, Canada
yzhu983@uwo.ca

Abstract. With the growing worldwide emphasis on reducing carbon output, China announced its plan to hit peak emissions before 2030 and reach full carbon neutrality by 2060. This pair of objectives—commonly known as the "dual carbon" targets—has made economic restructuring around cleaner energy a national priority. Within this context, financial tools oriented toward ecological sustainability have become increasingly relevant. The present paper uses a review of existing scholarships to investigate how such tools shape progress toward a less carbon-intensive economy. Four main impact channels are identified: steering investment into cleaner sectors, pressuring traditional polluters to modernize, reshaping the energy mix, and spurring the creation of novel environmental technologies. At the same time, several obstacles limit progress. Product offerings remain poorly matched to the needs of smaller firms, public familiarity with these instruments is low, spending on breakthrough clean technologies falls short, and oversight frameworks lack teeth. Based on these findings, a set of practical recommendations is put forward to strengthen the contribution of ecologically oriented financial mechanisms to building a genuinely low-carbon economy.

Keywords: Green Finance, Low-Carbon Economy, Carbon Emission Reduction, Green Technology Innovation, Sustainable Development

1. Introduction

The threat posed by a warming climate now occupies a central place in policy debates across the globe. When nearly 200 countries signed the Paris Agreement in 2015, they committed to holding temperature increases well under two degrees Celsius relative to preindustrial benchmarks. The United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals reinforced that message by weaving ecological protection into broader aspirations for economic and social progress. Faced with these expectations, many governments have begun retooling their economies to run on less carbon. China's situation deserves special attention. As the single largest source of CO_2 worldwide, the country announced a two-part pledge: emissions should stop rising before 2030, and the economy should become carbon-neutral by 2060 [1, 2]. Translating those pledges into practice has required substantial institutional rearrangement. Over the past several years, Beijing has built out a framework of standards for

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.34036

identifying eligible projects, introduced independent verification procedures, and tightened rules around what companies must disclose—all of which give financial support for cleaner growth a firmer institutional footing.

Broadly speaking, the term "green finance" refers to lending, bond issuance, insurance, fund management, and emissions trading arrangements that steer money toward projects with tangible environmental benefits [3, 4]. What sets these instruments apart from ordinary finance is their twin purpose: they allocate capital, but they also function as a form of soft regulation by making it harder and costlier to fund polluting activities while rewarding cleaner alternatives. Because of this dual character, a wide range of observers—from central bankers to climate scientists—view such instruments as essential if countries hope to meet their stated emission targets. The scope of the concept has widened over time, too. Early discussions focused narrowly on concessional lending for renewable-energy projects; today the conversation spans carbon-linked derivatives, transition bonds for hard-to-abate industries, and digital platforms that let retail investors participate in certified offset schemes.

Researchers have already produced a substantial body of work on this topic. City-level data from China, for instance, points to measurable improvements in how efficiently carbon is managed once dedicated financial programs are in place, with local innovation capacity acting as an important transmission belt [5]. Looking beyond a single country, a cross-national study covering 44 economies found that dedicated bond instruments meaningfully boost output from wind, solar, and other non-fossil sources—particularly in places that face severe climate exposure and possess mature credit markets [6]. Separate work using game-theoretic models shows that when regulators combine compliance pressure with financial carrots, firms gradually shift toward greener production methods in a self-reinforcing pattern [7]. Useful as these studies are, most of them rely on econometric estimation rather than stepping back to appraise the full landscape of mechanisms, barriers, and policy levers. That is the gap the present paper aims to fill.

The discussion proceeds as follows. Section 2 unpacks four channels through which ecologically oriented finance shapes carbon outcomes. Section 3 catalogues the main difficulties that blunt its effectiveness. Section 4 lays out targeted recommendations. Section 5 draws conclusions and flags areas where further investigation would be worthwhile.

2. How green finance shapes low-carbon economic outcomes

2.1. Channeling investment into cleaner sectors

At its core, green finance works by redirecting where money goes. Instead of bankrolling coal-fired power plants or outdated factories, lenders and bond issuers funnel resources into solar installations, waste treatment facilities, and farms experimenting with lower-emission methods. How? Banks cut interest rates on qualifying loans, governments chip in with interest subsidies, and approval processes get streamlined for borrowers who tick the right boxes. The numbers in China tell the story: by early 2023, loans tagged as "green" had ballooned to around 25 trillion yuan—almost five times what they were ten years prior [8]. Globally, green bond issuance broke past 600 billion dollars in 2024. Research backs up the intuition that this shift in capital allocation drags investment out of old, dirty industries and into newer, cleaner ones, speeding up economic restructuring [1, 9]. Work on China's preferential lending schemes specifically finds a two-for-one payoff: GDP goes up and pollution goes down at the same time [9].

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.34036

2.2. Pressuring high-emission industries to modernize

There is a less glamorous but equally important mechanism at work: making life expensive for polluters. Banks can raise rates on steel and cement companies, shorten repayment windows, or just say no to loan applications altogether—forcing those firms to either clean up their act or face rising capital costs [10]. Some economists describe this as "forced innovation," the idea being that well-calibrated regulatory pressure can tip the balance so that upgrading equipment costs less than paying penalties. Data from China's stock-listed firms in pollution-heavy sectors bears this out: when environmental rules get stricter, bank money migrates toward greener borrowers faster [11]. A useful side effect shows up at the national level, too. As factory-floor resources move toward services and tech-driven sectors, each yuan of GDP carries a smaller carbon load. One caveat deserves mention: the mechanism only fires on all cylinders when financial regulators and environmental agencies are on the same page. Contradictory signals from different ministries can water down the whole incentive structure.

2.3. Reshaping the energy supply mix

A third route runs through the energy sector itself. Dedicated financing makes large-scale wind farms, solar arrays, and hydroelectric installations commercially viable sooner than they would be under purely market-driven conditions. China now generates roughly half its electricity from non-fossil sources, a threshold that aggressive lending and bond programs helped reach [8]. Cross-country evidence paints a similar picture: among 44 economies studied, bond proceeds channeled into alternative energy yielded especially strong results for capacity expansion, and the effect grew larger over time as recipient countries accumulated relevant technical know-how [6]. Policy architecture matters too. Research on the Paris Agreement's nationally determined contributions shows that those formal pledges acted as a catalyst for bond-market growth, creating a positive feedback loop between political commitment and capital mobilization [3].

2.4. Spurring the development of cleaner technologies

No amount of capital will decarbonize an economy without better technology. What green finance does is make the early, risky stages of R&D less daunting. Think of it as a package: banks offer longer-term loans at below-market rates, government-backed guarantees absorb part of the downside if a project flops, and tax codes let firms write off qualifying research spending. For technologies like carbon capture or next-generation batteries—where the bill is enormous upfront and returns are years away—this kind of support can be the difference between a prototype gathering dust and a product reaching the market. City-level analysis in China shows that places with stronger innovation networks squeeze more carbon-efficiency gains out of each lending dollar [5]. At the firm level, game-theory research paints a telling picture: once regulators tighten standards and banks sweeten the financial terms simultaneously, companies stop just grudgingly complying and start actively racing each other to build better solutions [7]. That competitive dynamic, once triggered, tends to feed on itself—cheaper green R&D leads to better tech, which attracts more funding, which makes the next round of R&D cheaper still. If there is one thing green finance should protect above all else, it is this self-reinforcing innovation loop.

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.34036

3. Obstacles limiting the effectiveness of green finance

3.1. A narrow product menu

For all its rapid expansion, the market for ecologically oriented financial products in China remains lopsided. Bank lending dominates; insurance, equity funds, and transitional-finance instruments occupy only marginal positions [8]. This creates a mismatch. Small and medium-sized enterprises working on clean-technology applications, or cooperatives pursuing low-emission farming, typically need smaller, more flexible funding packages—precisely the kind that standardized large-loan products are ill-suited to provide. Although institutional architecture has grown quickly since formal guidelines were issued in 2016, product innovation has lagged behind the diversifying needs of borrowers, leaving financing voids in several priority areas [4].

3.2. Low public familiarity

Many potential beneficiaries simply do not know what is available to them. Business owners, farmers, and retail investors often lack a clear picture of how dedicated environmental bonds, concessional credit lines, or carbon-offset programs work. This information gap suppresses demand and leaves available funding underutilized. The problem is compounded on the supply side by inconsistent classification criteria and patchy disclosure, which make it difficult for even motivated participants to compare offerings or verify claims [8]. Banks themselves bear part of the responsibility: marketing efforts for green products pale in comparison to the resources devoted to conventional corporate and consumer lending. International experience confirms that the disconnect between national policy ambition and grassroots engagement is not unique to China; a review of Kazakhstan's green-economy strategy found a strikingly similar awareness deficit [12]. Without deliberate and sustained outreach, ambitious targets set at the top will continue to run aground at the level of implementation.

3.3. Underfunding of breakthrough technologies

Although existing programs do channel money toward incremental process improvements, the pipeline for genuinely transformative technologies remains starved of capital. Laboratory-stage ventures in areas like direct air capture or solid-state batteries carry long gestation periods and uncertain returns, traits that make them unattractive to conventional lenders. For many smaller firms, the combination of thin margins, protracted development timelines, and the ever-present risk of technical failure means that stable, patient financing is hard to come by. The International Energy Agency has estimated that reaching net-zero emissions globally by mid-century would require roughly 5.6 trillion dollars of clean-energy spending every year through 2030—a figure that dwarfs current flows. Econometric analysis reinforces the concern by identifying threshold effects: the link between dedicated lending and emission efficiency weakens markedly in regions where economic development is still catching up [5].

3.4. Weaking oversight and perverse incentives

Regulatory gaps pose a fourth problem. Financial institutions face limited consequences for underperforming on environmental commitments, and the penalties for exaggerating the greenness of a portfolio or a bond—a practice widely referred to as "greenwashing"—remain modest. China's pilot zones for financial reform have shown that a well-designed local experiment can deter

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.34036

deceptive environmental claims among publicly traded companies, especially those in heavy industry and the private sector [13]. Yet the geographical and sectoral reach of such pilots is still narrow, and a unified, nationally enforceable taxonomy for what counts as "green" has yet to be finalized. Without clearer rules, mandatory third-party audits, and meaningful sanctions, the integrity of the entire market is at risk.

4. Recommendations for strengthening green finance

4.1. Broadening the product range

The mismatch between what borrowers need and what lenders offer will not fix itself. Banks and regulators need to sit down together and design products that actually fit the cash-flow reality of a ten-person solar installation company or a farming cooperative trying to cut methane. Micro-bonds—small enough that a mid-sized firm can actually issue one—would help. So would insurance products that protect early-stage cleantech ventures from the financial fallout of a failed pilot. Blended finance, where a government development bank takes the first hit on losses so that private money feels safer coming in, has shown promise in other development contexts and could work here. Different sectors have different needs: an agri-tech startup requires different loan terms than a building retrofit contractor or a clean-logistics fleet operator. Sustainability-linked loans, where the interest rate drops if the borrower hits agreed-upon environmental milestones, have already proven popular—global issuance topped 275 billion dollars in the first six months of 2024 alone, which suggests real demand for this kind of flexibility.

4.2. Building public understanding

Policy white papers do not change behavior; practical outreach does. Short video explainers on social media, hands-on workshops at the county level, and mobile apps that let a small business owner estimate their carbon footprint—these are the tools that actually reach people. City halls could open dedicated green-finance help desks where someone walks in, explains their project, and walks out with a shortlist of matching lenders. Trade groups have a part to play as well: nothing persuades a skeptical factory owner like hearing a competitor describe how a green loan saved them money. China's reform pilot zones, now running in several provinces, offer a readymade laboratory. Documenting what worked, what did not, and why—and then packaging those findings for regions still getting started—would be a more efficient use of public money than another round of top-down directives.

4.3. Direct more capital to early-stage clean technology

Getting more money into early-stage clean technology is partly about changing who bears the risk. If a national government seeds a venture fund with its own capital, private investors read that as a signal of confidence and are more likely to co-invest. Tax policy matters too: letting companies depreciate green-tech equipment faster or claim larger R&D deductions shifts the math in favor of long-shot, high-upside bets. Game-theory research confirms the intuition—when regulatory sticks and financial carrots move in the same direction, firms do not just comply; they compete to innovate, and the benefits compound over time [10]. Formal tie-ups between university labs, national research institutes, and commercial banks could also help. Right now, too many promising

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.34036

discoveries sit on a shelf because nobody in the room knows how to turn a lab result into a loan application.

4.4. Tightening rules and align incentives

Trust is the currency that green finance runs on, and right now the supply is thin. Mandatory environmental reporting—along the lines of what the EU is rolling out with its Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive—would arm investors with the hard numbers they need to tell real green performance from marketing spin. An independent body with the authority to audit both financial products and the institutions selling them would add a second line of defense. On the incentive side, regulators could cut reserve requirements or offer tax breaks for banks that hit verified green-lending targets. On the enforcement side, fines for slapping a "green" label on something that plainly is not need to be painful enough that the calculus of greenwashing stops making financial sense.

5. Conclusion

This paper reviewed the existing body of research on how ecologically oriented financial instruments interact with the transition to a less carbon-intensive economy. Four transmission channels stand out. First, dedicated lending and bond programs pull investment away from legacy polluters and into emerging clean sectors. Second, tighter credit terms for high-emission borrowers compel technological upgrades. Third, targeted financing accelerates the build-out of wind, solar, and hydroelectric capacity, altering the energy mix at scale. Fourth, concessional funding and risk-sharing arrangements lower the barriers to developing the next generation of clean technologies.

Set against these positive dynamics are four persistent weaknesses: a narrow and bank-dominated product menu, low public awareness of available tools, insufficient capital reaching early-stage technology ventures, and regulatory frameworks that remain too weak to deter greenwashing. The recommendations offered here—diversifying products, educating stakeholders, funding breakthrough R&D, and hardening oversight—are not novel individually, but their simultaneous pursuit is what matters. Piecemeal action on any single front is unlikely to move the needle far enough.

Several loose ends deserve attention in future work. Studies that use natural experiments or randomized pilot programs—rather than correlational data—would give policymakers a much firmer sense of which instruments cut the most carbon per dollar spent. Cross-border comparisons would be valuable too, since institutional differences between, say, China and Germany mean that a policy that works in one place may fall flat in another. Then there is the technology angle: blockchain-based carbon registries, AI-driven project screening, and app-based retail investment platforms are all expanding fast, and academics have barely started to grapple with what they mean for market transparency and access. Looking ahead, China's green-finance rulebook still needs sharpening, the product shelf needs filling out, government backing needs to keep pace with market growth, and supervision needs enough teeth to keep bad actors honest. Only if all of these pieces move together will green finance deliver on its promise to help China meet its 2030 and 2060 carbon targets—and, more broadly, to nudge the world's second-largest economy onto a path that future generations can actually live with.

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.34036

References

[1] Cui, Q., Ma, X., Zhang, S.: Does green finance drive low-carbon economic development? Evidence from China. Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja36(3), 2110138 (2023)
[2] Zhang, Z., Liu, Y., Han, Z., Liao, X.: Green finance and carbon emission reduction: A bibliometric analysis and systematic review. Frontiers in Environmental Science10, 929250 (2022)
[3] Tolliver, C., Keeley, A. R., Managi, S.: Drivers of green bond market growth: The importance of Nationally Determined Contributions to the Paris Agreement and implications for sustainability. Journal of Cleaner Production244, 118643 (2020)
[4] Feng, W., Bilivogui, P., Wu, J., Mu, X.: Green finance: Current status, development, and future course of actions in China. Environmental Research Communications5(3), 035002 (2023)
[5] Wu, G., Liu, X., Cai, Y.: The impact of green finance on carbon emission efficiency. Heliyon10(1), e23803 (2024)
[6] Alharbi, S. S., Al Mamun, M., Boubaker, S., Rizvi, S. K. A.: Green finance and renewable energy: A worldwide evidence. Energy Economics118, 106499 (2023)
[7] Li, M., Gao, X.: Implementation of enterprises' green technology innovation under market-based environmental regulation: An evolutionary game approach. Journal of Environmental Management308, 114570 (2022)
[8] Green Finance & Development Center: China green finance status and trends 2023–2024. FISF Fudan University (2024)
[9] Wang, Y., Lei, X., Zhao, D., Long, R., Wu, M.: The dual impacts of green credit on economy and environment: Evidence from China. Sustainability13(8), 4574 (2021)
[10] Bai, R., Lin, B. Q.: Green finance and green innovation: Theoretical analysis based on game theory and empirical evidence from China. International Review of Economics & Finance89, 760–774 (2024)
[11] Xu, Y., Li, S., Zhou, X., Shahzad, U., Zhao, X.: How environmental regulations affect the development of green finance: Recent evidence from polluting firms in China. Renewable Energy189, 917–926 (2022)
[12] Daniya, G., Tang, D.: Green finance and industrial low-carbon transition: A case study on green economy policy in Kazakhstan. Sustainability16(17), 7731 (2024)
[13] Ge, P., Liu, T., Huang, X.: Do pilot zones for green finance reform and innovation avoid ESG greenwashing? Evidence from China. Heliyon10(14), e34181 (2024).