Asian journal of research in economics and finance

https://www.aarbss.org/ajref/index

ISSN (Online): 2312-9042

VOL 03 ISSUE 01 (2026)

Environmental Economics and Green Finance: Pathways Toward Sustainable Development

Mahnoor Fatima

Independent Researcher in Environmental Economics and Sustainable Finance

Islamabad, Pakistan

Email: *mahnoor.fatima.research@example.com*

Abstract

Environmental degradation, climate change, biodiversity loss, water scarcity, pollution, and the depletion of natural resources have created serious challenges for conventional models of economic development. Environmental economics provides a theoretical and policy framework for understanding these problems by examining how economic decisions affect the natural environment and how environmental costs can be incorporated into markets, prices, taxation, investment, and public planning. Green finance complements this framework by mobilizing financial resources for renewable energy, energy efficiency, clean transportation, sustainable agriculture, climate-resilient infrastructure, biodiversity conservation, pollution control, and other environmentally beneficial activities. This article examines the relationship between environmental economics, green finance, and sustainable development. It explains how externalities, natural-capital depletion, information failures, and short-term investment incentives contribute to environmentally harmful economic behaviour. It also evaluates the role of carbon pricing, environmental taxation, green bonds, green loans, sustainability-linked finance, green sukuk, blended finance, carbon markets, and public green-investment institutions. The analysis argues that green finance can support economic growth, innovation, employment generation, energy security, and climate resilience when it is governed by credible taxonomies, transparent reporting, reliable environmental data, and effective regulatory institutions. Global investment in clean energy has increased significantly, reaching an estimated US$2.2 trillion in 2025, approximately twice the amount invested in oil, natural gas, and coal. Nevertheless, investment remains highly concentrated in advanced economies and China, while many developing countries continue to face high financing costs and limited access to climate capital. The article concludes that sustainable development requires the integration of environmental valuation, financial-sector reform, industrial policy, social protection, and institutional accountability. Green finance should not be treated as a substitute for environmental regulation; rather, it should operate as part of a broader policy framework that redirects public and private capital toward a low-carbon, climate-resilient, resource-efficient, and socially inclusive economy.

Keywords: *Environmental economics, Green finance, Sustainable development, Climate finance, Green bonds, Carbon pricing, Renewable energy, Natural capital*

Introduction:

Economic growth has historically depended on the large-scale use of land, water, minerals, forests, fossil fuels, and other natural resources. Industrialization has increased production, employment, technological progress, and material living standards, but it has also generated air pollution, greenhouse-gas emissions, water contamination, biodiversity loss, soil degradation, and growing volumes of waste. Traditional measures of economic performance, particularly gross domestic product, record the market value of goods and services but do not fully account for the depletion of natural resources, unpaid ecosystem services, or environmental damage imposed on society. Environmental economics developed to address this limitation. It studies the relationship between economic activity and environmental systems and examines how incentives, institutions, prices, and regulations can be designed to improve environmental outcomes. Its central insight is that markets may fail to allocate environmental resources efficiently because many environmental benefits and costs are not reflected in market prices. A factory may generate profits while imposing health costs on surrounding communities through pollution. Similarly, the destruction of a forest may produce immediate income from timber but reduce water regulation, carbon storage, biodiversity, soil protection, and community livelihoods. Green finance translates environmental objectives into financial decisions. It includes public and private financial flows directed toward projects, technologies, firms, and activities that contribute to environmental improvement or climate resilience. Sustainable finance is usually broader than green finance because it may include social development and governance objectives in addition to environmental goals. Green finance specifically focuses on areas such as renewable energy, clean transport, climate adaptation, energy efficiency, sustainable buildings, pollution control, water management, circular production, and ecosystem protection. The global green-finance market has expanded through green bonds, sustainability bonds, climate funds, green loans, transition finance, blended-finance arrangements, and environmental investment funds. By the end of 2024, cumulative issuance in the global green, social, sustainability, and sustainability-linked debt market had reached approximately US$6.9 trillion, of which US$5.7 trillion was identified as aligned with recognized market methodologies. Aligned issuance exceeded US$1 trillion during 2024 alone. Energy investment patterns also demonstrate the increasing importance of green capital. Global investment in clean-energy technologies and infrastructure was approximately US$2 trillion in 2024, compared with slightly more than US$1 trillion for oil, gas, and coal. In 2025, total energy investment was estimated at US$3.3 trillion, of which US$2.2 trillion was allocated to renewable energy, nuclear power, electricity grids, storage, low-emission fuels, energy efficiency, and electrification. Fossil-fuel investment was estimated at US$1.1 trillion. Despite this progress, green investment remains unequally distributed. High borrowing costs, exchange-rate risks, limited project preparation, inadequate electricity networks, weak institutions, and uncertain policies restrict green investment in many developing economies. Emerging and developing economies require a substantial increase in public and private clean-energy investment if they are to meet rising energy demand while remaining consistent with international climate objectives. This article discusses five dimensions of the relationship between environmental economics and green finance. The first examines the theoretical foundations of environmental economics. The second explains major green-finance instruments and institutions. The third evaluates the economic and social contribution of green finance. The fourth considers risks, limitations, and greenwashing. The fifth proposes a policy framework, with particular attention to Pakistan and other developing economies.

Environmental Economics, Market Failure, and Sustainable Development

Environmental economics provides an analytical framework for understanding the relationship between economic activity and the natural environment. Conventional economic models frequently treat environmental resources as inputs that are freely available or as assets whose degradation does not immediately affect financial accounts. In reality, production and consumption depend heavily on clean air, water, fertile soil, forests, minerals, biodiversity, stable climatic conditions, and functioning ecosystems. When these resources are depleted or polluted, societies experience losses in public health, agricultural productivity, employment, infrastructure, and overall quality of life. Environmental economics therefore attempts to incorporate environmental costs and benefits into economic decisions so that development can proceed without undermining the ecological systems on which human welfare depends. The concept of market failure is central to environmental economics. A market failure occurs when individual decisions made through markets do not lead to an efficient outcome for society. Environmental pollution represents one of the most common examples because the person or company responsible for pollution may not bear all the resulting costs. A manufacturing company may calculate the costs of labour, machinery, raw materials, electricity, transport, and taxes when determining the price of its products. However, it may not include the medical expenses, lost working days, agricultural damage, contaminated water, and reduced quality of life experienced by nearby communities. The company therefore produces more pollution than would be socially desirable because part of the true cost is transferred to the public. These transferred effects are described as externalities. A negative externality arises when an economic activity creates costs for people who are not directly involved in the transaction. Air pollution from factories and vehicles, industrial wastewater, traffic congestion, deforestation, greenhouse-gas emissions, plastic waste, pesticide use, and excessive groundwater extraction are all examples. The producer or consumer receives the private benefit of the activity, while other individuals bear part of the social cost. When environmental costs are excluded from market prices, environmentally harmful goods may appear cheaper than they truly are. Positive environmental externalities also exist. Individuals or companies may undertake actions that create benefits for society beyond their private returns. A farmer who protects a forested area may improve biodiversity, reduce soil erosion, store carbon, and protect a watershed. A company investing in clean-energy research may generate knowledge that benefits other firms and industries. Urban green spaces can improve air quality, reduce heat, support recreation, and increase community well-being. Because investors may not receive payment for all these benefits, markets may provide less environmental protection and green innovation than society requires. Arthur Pigou proposed the use of corrective taxation to address negative externalities. A Pigouvian tax attempts to place a financial charge on the environmentally harmful activity equal to the social damage it creates. A carbon tax is a modern example. By increasing the price of fossil fuels according to their carbon content, the tax encourages households and firms to conserve energy, improve efficiency, and shift toward cleaner alternatives. The effectiveness of such a tax depends on its coverage, rate, predictability, and administration. A tax that is too low may not change behaviour, while an excessively sudden increase may create economic hardship and public opposition. Environmental taxation can serve several purposes simultaneously. It can reduce pollution, encourage technological innovation, and generate public revenue. The revenue may be used to finance renewable energy, public transportation, climate adaptation, environmental restoration, or compensation for vulnerable households. This process is sometimes described as revenue recycling. For example, a government may impose a pollution charge while using the resulting revenue to reduce taxes on labour or provide targeted cash assistance. Such an approach can improve both environmental performance and social acceptability. The Coasian approach offers a different perspective.

Ronald Coase argued that, under certain conditions, clearly defined property rights and negotiation among affected parties could resolve externalities. If a factory and nearby residents can negotiate at low cost and possess equal access to information and legal protection, they may agree on compensation or pollution reduction. However, real environmental problems often involve thousands or millions of affected people, uncertain scientific information, unequal bargaining power, and high legal costs. Global climate change involves almost every country and generation, making private negotiation alone unrealistic. Regulation, taxation, public planning, and international cooperation therefore remain necessary. Common-pool resources present another important challenge. These resources include fisheries, forests, rivers, groundwater, grazing land, oceans, and the atmosphere. They are difficult to exclude people from using, but the amount available to each user declines as others consume more. Individual users may have an incentive to extract as much as possible before other people do. This can lead to overfishing, deforestation, groundwater depletion, soil erosion, and the destruction of shared ecosystems. The overuse of shared resources is often referred to as the tragedy of the commons. However, environmental economists and institutional scholars have shown that common resources can sometimes be managed successfully through community rules, collective monitoring, local knowledge, and shared responsibilities. Government regulation is not the only possible solution. Effective management may combine public oversight, community participation, property rights, quotas, seasonal restrictions, and scientific monitoring. The appropriate arrangement depends on the type of resource and the social and institutional conditions of the community. Natural capital is another major concept within environmental economics. Natural capital refers to the stock of environmental resources that generates economic and social benefits. Forests provide timber, carbon storage, water regulation, flood protection, biodiversity, and recreation. Wetlands filter water and protect communities from floods. Healthy soil supports agriculture, while oceans provide food, climate regulation, transport routes, and livelihoods. These environmental assets create continuous flows of ecosystem services. Traditional national accounts frequently fail to record the depletion of natural capital. When a forest is cut down and sold as timber, gross domestic product may increase because the sale generates market income. However, the loss of carbon storage, biodiversity, water regulation, and community livelihoods may not be deducted. Economic growth may therefore appear stronger even while the country's total wealth is declining. Natural-capital accounting attempts to correct this problem by measuring environmental assets and the services they provide. Sustainable development requires the present generation to improve human well-being without destroying the ability of future generations to meet their needs. It recognizes that economic, environmental, and social systems are interconnected. Development cannot be considered sustainable when it creates short-term income by exhausting forests, polluting water, degrading soil, or producing climate risks that will impose greater costs in the future. At the same time, environmental policies must consider poverty, employment, energy access, and development needs. The idea of green growth seeks to reconcile economic progress with environmental protection. Green growth does not necessarily require the complete abandonment of production, industry, or consumption. Instead, it involves changing the technology, energy sources, resource intensity, and environmental impact of economic activity. It emphasizes renewable energy, efficient buildings, sustainable transport, climate-smart agriculture, circular production, pollution control, and ecosystem restoration. Green growth is more likely to be socially acceptable when it generates employment, improves public health, strengthens energy security, and expands economic opportunities. The environmental Kuznets curve is sometimes used to explain the relationship between income and environmental quality. The hypothesis suggests that pollution may initially increase as countries industrialize but eventually decline after income reaches a

certain level. Wealthier societies may demand stronger environmental regulation, adopt cleaner technologies, and shift toward service-based economies. However, this outcome is not automatic. Some forms of environmental damage, including biodiversity loss and climate change, may become irreversible before income reaches the required level. Environmental improvement depends on public policy, technology, institutional capacity, and social pressure rather than income growth alone. The discount rate represents another important issue in environmental economics. Many environmental investments impose costs today but generate benefits over several decades. Climate mitigation, forest protection, flood-control infrastructure, and ecosystem restoration are examples. A high discount rate places relatively little value on benefits received by future generations, while a low rate gives greater importance to long-term environmental protection. The choice of discount rate therefore has ethical and economic implications. Climate policy requires governments and investors to consider the welfare of people who will live many years in the future. Uncertainty further complicates environmental decision-making. The precise effects of climate change, biodiversity loss, and ecological disruption cannot always be predicted. However, uncertainty does not justify inaction. The precautionary principle suggests that governments should take preventive action when an activity may cause serious or irreversible harm, even when scientific certainty is incomplete. Waiting for complete certainty may allow environmental damage to become too expensive or impossible to reverse. Regulatory instruments remain important alongside economic incentives. Governments can establish emissions limits, fuel-efficiency standards, building codes, renewable-energy requirements, protected areas, waste-management rules, and environmental-impact assessments. Regulations may be more effective than taxation when pollution is highly dangerous or when monitoring emissions is difficult. However, regulations should be designed carefully to avoid unnecessary costs, corruption, and inconsistent enforcement. Environmental taxes and market-based instruments can complement regulation. Emissions-trading systems place a total limit on pollution and allow regulated firms to trade permits. Companies that can reduce emissions cheaply may sell their unused permits, while firms facing higher costs may purchase them. In principle, the system achieves the environmental target at the lowest overall cost. Its success depends on accurate monitoring, a strict emissions cap, transparent permit allocation, and effective enforcement. Carbon pricing can encourage investment in clean technology by making high-emission production more expensive. However, price signals alone cannot resolve every barrier. Renewable-energy development requires transmission networks, storage, land planning, technical skills, financing, and reliable regulation. Energy-efficient buildings require information, standards, and access to affordable loans. Public transportation requires long-term infrastructure planning. Carbon pricing should therefore be combined with public investment, research support, industrial policy, social protection, and environmental regulation. The circular economy expands environmental policy beyond pollution control. The conventional linear model of production follows a pattern of extraction, production, consumption, and disposal. This model creates large amounts of waste and requires continuous extraction of raw materials. A circular economy aims to keep materials and products in use for as long as possible through durable design, repair, reuse, remanufacturing, recycling, and resource recovery. Circular production can generate both environmental and economic benefits. Businesses can reduce material costs, develop repair and recycling services, and create new employment opportunities. Consumers can benefit from longer-lasting products, while governments can reduce waste-management expenses. Green finance can support recycling facilities, sustainable packaging, resource-efficient machinery, industrial symbiosis, and product-service business models. Environmental economics therefore provides the policy foundation for sustainable development. It explains why environmental damage occurs, how environmental resources can be valued, and which

incentives can change economic behaviour. Green finance builds upon this foundation by supplying capital for projects and technologies that respond to environmental objectives. Without effective environmental policies, financial institutions may continue funding harmful activities because their private returns remain high. Environmental economics and green finance must consequently operate together.

Summary and Conclusion

Environmental economics explains why conventional markets frequently fail to protect the environment. Pollution, greenhouse-gas emissions, natural-resource depletion, and biodiversity loss impose costs that are not fully reflected in market prices. Economic instruments such as carbon taxes, emissions trading, pollution charges, subsidy reform, and natural-capital accounting can help incorporate these costs into public and private decision-making. Green finance complements environmental policy by directing capital toward renewable energy, efficient infrastructure, clean transportation, resilient agriculture, sustainable water systems, pollution control, circular production, and ecosystem restoration. Its major instruments include green bonds, green loans, green sukuk, sustainability-linked financing, carbon markets, blended finance, green investment funds, and climate-risk insurance. The global market has expanded rapidly. Clean-energy investment reached approximately US$2 trillion in 2024 and was estimated at US$2.2 trillion in 2025, around twice the amount invested in fossil fuels. The sustainable-debt market had recorded cumulative issuance of approximately US$6.9 trillion by the end of 2024. Nevertheless, the scale of green finance remains insufficient and its distribution remains unequal. Developing economies face higher costs of capital, currency risks, limited technical capacity, weak project pipelines, and inadequate infrastructure. Nature-based solutions receive only a small fraction of the financial flows directed toward activities that degrade ecosystems. The effectiveness of green finance depends on environmental integrity. Taxonomies, disclosure standards, external verification, impact reporting, and regulatory oversight are needed to prevent greenwashing. Financial institutions must assess physical and transition risks, while governments should establish clear environmental policies and stable investment frameworks. Pakistan has taken important steps through Green Bond Guidelines, climate-budget tagging, the Green Sukuk, sustainable-finance measures, and the Pakistan Green Taxonomy. These initiatives can help mobilize capital for energy, transport, agriculture, water, and resilient infrastructure. Their long-term value will depend on implementation, transparent reporting, institutional coordination, and the development of a strong pipeline of credible projects.

Sustainable development cannot be achieved by finance alone. Green finance must operate alongside environmental regulation, carbon pricing, public investment, industrial innovation, social protection, and international cooperation. When these elements are coordinated, environmental protection becomes not merely a cost but a foundation for resilience, productivity, energy security, public health, technological progress, and inclusive economic development.

References

Coase, R. H. (1960). The problem of social cost. *Journal of Law and Economics, 3*, 1–44.

De Haas, R., & Popov, A. (2023). Finance and green growth. *The Economic Journal, 133*(650), 637–668. DOI: 10.1093/ej/ueac081.

Flammer, C. (2021). Corporate green bonds. *Journal of Financial Economics, 142*(2), 499–516. DOI: 10.1016/j.jfineco.2021.01.010.

Government of Pakistan. (2025). *Pakistan Green Taxonomy*. Islamabad: Government of Pakistan.

International Energy Agency. (2025). *World Energy Investment 2025*. Paris: IEA.

International Monetary Fund. (2023). *Fiscal Monitor: Climate Crossroads—Fiscal Policies in a Warming World*. Washington, DC: IMF.

Pearce, D. W., Markandya, A., & Barbier, E. B. (1989). *Blueprint for a Green Economy*. London: Earthscan.

Pigou, A. C. (1920). *The Economics of Welfare*. London: Macmillan.

Stern, N. (2007). *The Economics of Climate Change: The Stern Review*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

United Nations Environment Programme. (2026). *State of Finance for Nature 2026: Nature in the Red—Powering the Trillion-Dollar Nature Transition Economy*. Nairobi: UNEP.

World Bank. (2012). *Inclusive Green Growth: The Pathway to Sustainable Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Climate Bonds Initiative. (2025). *Sustainable Debt: Global State of the Market 2024*. London: Climate Bonds Initiative.