Sustainable Finance Within Planetary Boundaries: Policy, Markets, and Governance

Nicholas S.P. Tay, Sun-Young Park[1]

School of Management, University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA 94117, USA

Draft V2.1: October, 2025

[See p.25 for Declaration of the use of Generative AI and AI-Assisted Technologies in the manuscript preparation process]

[1] Nicholas S.P.Tay: tay@usfca.edu & Sun-Young Park: sypark5@usfca.edu

Sustainable Finance Within Planetary Boundaries: Policy, Markets, and Governance

Abstract

The core challenge of this century is achieving a sustainable future amid pressing risks—climate change, biodiversity loss, social inequality, and economic instability. Governance and financial systems are currently misaligned with the objective of maintaining planetary boundaries and shared prosperity. It is contended that sustainable and green finance is pivotal for transitioning to a just and resilient economy. By leveraging financial capital, fiscal policy, and market design, green finance can accelerate low-carbon growth, protect ecosystems, and promote social inclusion. Drawing on multiple disciplines, we propose an integrated framework to mobilize resources, upgrade corporate governance, standardize ESG reporting, and support equitable tax policies. In each section of the paper, we examine a key dimension of finance's role, culminating in policy recommendations and a future research agenda. We conclude that reformed financial systems can internalize environmental costs, reduce systemic risks, and enable equitable development within planetary limits.

Keywords
sustainability · green finance · climate finance · carbon pricing · ESG investing · double materiality · sovereign green bonds · circular economy · stakeholder governance · prudential supervision · NGFS

1 Introduction

Humanity is at a critical crossroads. The consensus from the scientific community is that anthropogenic greenhouse-gas emissions have already warmed the planet by about 1 °C (IPCC, 2023). Without rapid reductions, global temperatures are likely to exceed the 1.5 °C Paris Agreement threshold by mid-century. As a consequence of climate change, we are witnessing biodiversity declining at an unprecedented rate—up to one million species are at risk of extinction—undermining ecosystems that sustain food production, water purification, and carbon sequestration (IPBES, 2019). Inequality has also intensified in recent decades: the top 1 percent control nearly half of global wealth, while billions remain excluded from decent livelihoods and basic services (Piketty, 2014; UBS & Credit Suisse, 2023). These crises are causally related. Environmental degradation worsens economic insecurity, while inequality fosters political polarization and erodes support for climate action (Raworth, 2017; Stiglitz, 2012). It is imperative that we take corrective actions now, without reform, "business as usual" risks ecological collapse and social unrest.

We, along with many colleagues in neoclassical economics, finance, and business, are both culprit and catalyst. The flawed theoretical analyses we taught and continue to teach play a role in perpetuating the shareholder-value paradigm, which first gained traction in the 1970s. This paradigm encourages firms to externalize environmental and social costs for short-term gains (Friedman, 1970; Stout, 2012). As a result, markets often prioritize quarterly earnings over long-term resilience. Practices like fossil-fuel subsidies, tax avoidance, and regulatory capture further sustain these unsustainable patterns (Parry et al., 2023). Yet, finance can also drive change. Green and sustainable finance can channel capital toward renewables, adaptation, and inclusive prosperity (IEA, 2021; IMF, 2023). Public fiscal policy funds infrastructure, innovation, and social protection. Private markets can design products that align returns with sustainability goals. To ensure finance serves the common good, we need transparency, accountability, and inclusive governance (Carney, 2015; NGFS, 2019). This paper explores practical ways financial systems can help secure a sustainable and equitable future.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews environmental challenges and introduces climate finance and green investment. Section 3 covers green economy strategies and fiscal policies for the low-carbon transition, such as green bonds, climate funding, and carbon taxes. Section 4 examines ESG investment strategies, green bonds, and the implications for performance and risk. Section 5 discusses carbon pricing, environmental risk management, and financial regulation, with emphasis on central banks and supervisors. Section 6 analyzes legal frameworks and reporting standards for sustainable finance, focusing on unified ESG reporting and double materiality. Section 7 explores stakeholder engagement and corporate governance, calling for fiduciary reforms. Section 8 considers international tax policy for sustainability. Section 9 discusses innovative technologies for transparency and efficiency. Section 10 distills policy recommendations and outlines a research agenda. Section 11 concludes with reflections on integrating sustainable and green finance for a resilient, equitable world.

2 Environmental Sustainability and Climate Finance

2.1 The urgency of climate mitigation

Climate change is the most urgent environmental challenge. The IPCC warns that to limit warming to 1.5 °C, emissions must fall by 45 percent from 2010 levels by 2030 and reach net zero by mid-century (IPCC, 2023). Despite decades of negotiations, emissions continue to rise. Coal, oil, and gas continue to dominate the energy sector, with a significant portion of investment flowing into fossil fuel infrastructure (IEA, 2021). To reverse this, rapid decarbonization of the energy sector is needed. Renewable technologies—solar, wind, hydro, and geothermal—must expand to supply the majority of global electricity by 2050 (IEA, 2021). The IMF estimates that fossil-fuel subsidies, including environmental and health costs, amount to approximately US$7 trillion per year (Parry et al., 2023).

Sustainable finance mechanisms can speed up decarbonization. Carbon pricing—via cap-and-trade or direct taxes—internalizes fossil fuel externalities (Stiglitz & Stern, 2017). The EU ETS and Sweden's carbon tax show that pricing carbon cuts emissions and generates climate funding (World Bank, 2023). However, carbon pricing remains fragmented, and prices are well below the Paris targets (World Bank, 2023). Global coordination on carbon pricing, with predictable prices and fairness among countries, could accelerate the transition and raise funds for adaptation and a just transition (Stiglitz & Stern, 2017). Green stimulus, energy efficiency investments, and renewable subsidies should support low-income households and workers in high-carbon sectors as they transition (ILO, 2018; IMF, 2023).

2.2 Biodiversity, ecosystem services, and natural capital

Biodiversity underpins ecosystem services vital for survival, such as pollination, water filtration, carbon storage, and soil fertility (IPBES, 2019). Species are disappearing at rates unseen in human history; up to one million face extinction in coming decades (IPBES, 2019). The loss of biodiversity weakens ecological resilience and economic stability. The World Economic Forum ranks nature loss as one of the top risks to markets (World Economic Forum, 2023). Expanding protected areas, as in the "30 × 30" target to conserve 30 percent of ecosystems by 2030, is key (Convention on Biological Diversity, 2022). Protected areas enhance climate resilience, but they must involve Indigenous and local communities. "Paper parks" with weak enforcement should be avoided (IPBES, 2019). Natural capital accounting frameworks, like the United Nations' System of Environmental-Economic Accounting, help policymakers compare trade-offs (United Nations, 2021). Although concerns about commodification persist, well-designed valuations can effectively incentivize conservation.

Financial instruments can aid biodiversity. Green bonds can fund conservation, reforestation, and sustainable agriculture (Climate Bonds Initiative, 2024). Debt-for-nature swaps restructure sovereign debt for conservation goals. Biodiversity credits and payments for ecosystem services create markets for outcomes. Philanthropic funds and blended finance can mitigate the risk associated with private conservation investments (Green Climate Fund, 2023). However, clear standards are vital so biodiversity finance leads to real ecological gains, not greenwashing. Transparency about impacts and strong community involvement are critical for legitimacy (IPBES, 2019).

2.3 Circular economy transitions

The dominant linear "take–make–dispose" model of production and consumption continues to drive unsustainable resource extraction and waste generation. In contrast, the circular economy (CE) seeks to close material loops through reuse, repair, recycling, and regenerative design. This transition reduces pressure on ecosystems while unlocking new economic opportunities. The Ellen MacArthur Foundation (2019) estimates that adopting circular practices in sectors such as cement, steel, plastics, and aluminum could reduce global emissions by up to 40 percent by 2050. Achieving such outcomes requires rethinking product design for durability, modularity, and recyclability. Sectors like electronics and textiles exemplify the challenge: planned obsolescence and fast fashion generate vast quantities of premature waste. Policy instruments such as extended producer responsibility, repairability standards, and right-to-repair legislation can catalyze the systemic change needed to address these failures.

Cities, which consume over 70 percent of the world's resources, represent critical arenas for implementing circular strategies. Amsterdam's city-level CE plan, for example, demonstrates how industrial symbiosis and circular urban design can minimize waste and optimize resource flows (Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2019). At the same time, demand-side measures—including reducing meat consumption, embracing shared mobility, and prioritizing second-hand goods—complement supply-side reforms to create a holistic transformation.

A comprehensive review by Kalmykova, Sadagopan, and Rosado (2018) synthesizes major circular-economy theories and introduces two implementation tools: the CE Strategies Database, cataloging 45 strategies across the value chain, and the CE Implementation Database, compiling more than 100 case studies classified by scope, strategy, and implementation level. Their meta-analysis reveals that current CE practices are overly concentrated on end-of-life and consumption stages, while manufacturing and distribution remain underrepresented despite the availability of market-ready solutions. They emphasize the need for system-level change, improved monitoring methods, and robust indicators to evaluate progress beyond isolated pilot projects.

Building on this, Geissdoerfer, Morioka, de Carvalho, and Evans (2018) integrate circular business models (CBMs) with circular supply chain management (CSCM) to propose an analytical framework linking business-model design with supply-chain function. Drawing on four case studies, they identify five interrelated loops—closing, slowing, intensifying, narrowing, and dematerializing—that describe how CBMs influence material and value flows. The framework underscores that different CBMs vary in their value propositions and supply-chain complexity, involving elements such as reverse logistics, remanufacturing, and product-service systems. Successful implementation therefore depends on aligning business-model innovation with supply-chain capabilities. Empirical evidence suggests that integrating CBMs and CSCM can significantly advance sustainability performance at the organizational level.

Finance is pivotal to enabling circular transitions. Banks and investors can provide the long-term capital needed for recycling infrastructure, repair hubs, and product-as-a-service models. Public procurement policies that prioritize circular products can further stimulate market demand and incentivize redesign across supply chains. Blended finance mechanisms can mitigate the risks associated with innovative circular ventures, while corporate disclosure frameworks should require reporting on material flows and resource efficiency to inform

investors. Regulatory tools such as the EU Sustainable Finance Taxonomy establish clear criteria for identifying credible circular activities and channeling capital toward them (European Commission, 2021). Ultimately, scaling the circular economy depends on realigning financial incentives with goals of resource efficiency and waste reduction (Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2019).

Finally, these insights point to the need for targeted financing and procurement strategies that address underfunded segments of the value chain—particularly manufacturing and distribution—and support systemic portfolios rather than isolated recycling projects (Kalmykova et al., 2018). Addressing loop-specific bottlenecks—for example, funding take-back and repair networks to slow or close loops, or data infrastructure to enable dematerialization—can translate high-level circular ambitions into functioning, resilient supply chains (Geissdoerfer et al., 2018).

2.4 Climate adaptation and resilience

Even under optimistic mitigation scenarios, significant climate impacts are unavoidable. Rising temperatures will increase the frequency and severity of extreme weather events, sea-level rise and droughts. Climate adaptation and resilience measures are therefore essential. Adaptation encompasses infrastructure upgrades (e.g., flood defenses, resilient transport networks), ecosystem-based approaches (e.g., mangrove restoration to buffer storms), and social protection mechanisms that enhance community capacity to cope with shocks (IPCC, 2023). Financing adaptation has been underemphasized relative to mitigation; the United Nations Environment Programme estimates that adaptation costs in developing countries could reach US $340 billion per year by 2030 (United Nations Environment Programme [UNEP], 2023). International climate finance mechanisms, such as the Green Climate Fund, need to expand their support for adaptation and prioritize vulnerable countries and communities (Green Climate Fund, 2023).

Resilience investment also includes insurance and risk transfer mechanisms. Parametric insurance, catastrophe bonds and resilience bonds can provide payouts based on predefined triggers, enabling rapid recovery after disasters (Ehlers et al., 2021). However, insurance markets in many developing countries are underdeveloped, and premiums may be unaffordable for vulnerable populations. Public–private partnerships and premium subsidies can broaden coverage. Incorporating climate risk into financial regulation – for example, through climate stress tests and prudential requirements – encourages banks and insurers to manage exposure to climate-related losses, reducing systemic risk (NGFS, 2019). Advanced data analytics and modeling can improve risk assessment and allocate capital more efficiently across adaptation projects. In sum, adaptation finance must become a central pillar of sustainable and green finance strategies (UNEP, 2023).

Collectively, these environmental challenges and circular economy transitions require integrated climate and biodiversity finance aligned with social equity (Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2019; IPBES, 2019; IPCC, 2023).

3 Green Economy Strategies and Fiscal Policy for Sustainability

3.1 Public spending and green stimulus

Government fiscal policy is a powerful lever for steering economies toward sustainability. During economic downturns or transitions, targeted public spending can accelerate decarbonization and job creation. Green stimulus packages – investments in renewable energy, energy-efficient buildings, clean transportation and ecosystem restoration – deliver economic multipliers while reducing emissions (IMF, 2023). After the COVID-19 pandemic, some countries adopted green recovery plans; for example, the European Union's NextGenerationEU package and its €250 billion green component aim to accelerate the bloc's climate goals while revitalizing the economy (European Commission, 2021). Evidence from past crises shows that green stimulus can generate more jobs per dollar than fossil-fuel-intensive spending, though outcomes depend on program design and implementation (IMF, 2023).

Fiscal measures must be aligned with just transition principles. Workers and communities dependent on high-carbon industries face significant disruption, and without adequate support may resist climate policies. Public investment should therefore include retraining programs, income support and local economic diversification (ILO, 2018). Community participation in investment planning ensures that funds meet local needs and build social license. Furthermore, the fiscal space for green investment depends on robust tax systems, as discussed in Section 8. Governments should also phase out environmentally harmful subsidies, such as those for fossil fuels and intensive agriculture, and redirect savings toward clean technologies and ecosystem conservation (Parry et al., 2023).

3.2 Sovereign green bonds and public finance instruments

Sovereign green bonds have become a central instrument of public finance for sustainability. These bonds are debt securities issued by governments with proceeds earmarked for environmentally beneficial projects, such as renewable energy, low-carbon transport and wastewater treatment. By 2025, annual issuance of sovereign green bonds exceeded US $50 billion (Climate Bonds Initiative, 2024). They provide governments with access to capital markets at favorable interest rates, signal policy commitment to sustainability and catalyze private investment. To ensure credibility, issuers must adhere to principles such as those developed by the International Capital Market Association (ICMA) and meet the criteria set by sustainable finance taxonomies, including the EU Taxonomy (ICMA, 2021; European Commission, 2021). Transparent reporting on the use of proceeds and environmental impact is vital to maintain investor confidence and avoid greenwashing (ICMA, 2021).

Other public finance instruments include climate resilience bonds, which finance adaptation infrastructure, and sustainability-linked bonds, whose interest rates vary depending on the achievement of predetermined sustainability targets. Public development banks and multilateral development banks have also launched green finance programs and guarantee schemes that crowd in private capital. Fiscal authorities should integrate climate and biodiversity considerations into budgeting processes through practices such as green budgeting, environmental performance indicators and ex-ante impact assessment (IMF, 2023). Environmental fiscal reforms, including environmental taxes and subsidy swaps, can raise revenue and shift behavior while maintaining social equity through targeted transfers (Stiglitz & Stern, 2017).

3.3 Carbon taxation, green subsidies and tax incentives

Carbon taxes and emissions trading systems are key tools for internalizing environmental externalities and influencing consumer and producer behavior. As noted earlier, the EU ETS and Sweden's carbon tax have demonstrated emissions reductions (World Bank, 2023). However, coverage remains uneven and the average carbon price is around US $30 per tonne of CO_2, far below the estimated US $75–150 required by mid-century (World Bank, 2023). Carbon taxes should be gradually increased and broadened across sectors and jurisdictions, with border adjustment mechanisms to prevent carbon leakage and maintain competitiveness (Stiglitz & Stern, 2017; European Union, 2023). Revenues should finance climate investment and compensate low-income households; indeed, recycling carbon tax revenues through lump-sum transfers can make carbon taxes progressive (IMF, 2023). Alternatively, a share of revenues can support research and development in clean technologies and subsidies for energy-efficiency upgrades.

Green subsidies and tax incentives complement carbon pricing by reducing the cost of adopting clean technologies. For example, feed-in tariffs, investment tax credits and production tax credits have spurred the rapid growth of renewable energy, particularly in the solar and wind sectors (IEA, 2021). However, subsidies must be designed to avoid windfall profits and ensure that benefits accrue to consumers and local communities. De-risking instruments, such as loan guarantees and co-investment by public entities, can mobilize private finance for nascent technologies like green hydrogen or carbon capture and storage. Policies should include sunset clauses and regular reviews to adjust support as technologies mature and become competitive (IMF, 2023).

3.4 National sustainability strategies and budgeting

Fiscal policies should be embedded within comprehensive national sustainability strategies. Such strategies articulate long-term decarbonization pathways, biodiversity goals and social outcomes, aligning public spending and taxation with these objectives. For example, Denmark's Climate Act mandates climate neutrality by 2050 and requires the government to propose annual climate action plans and report progress to parliament. Kenya's Climate Change Act integrates climate goals into budgeting and requires a National Climate Change Action Plan. National sustainability strategies must be participatory, transparent and evidence-based; they should integrate scientific assessments, stakeholder input and scenario analysis (European Commission, 2021; IMF, 2023). At the heart of these strategies is the recognition that fiscal policy is not merely about balancing budgets but about shaping the development trajectory toward a greener and fairer future.

3.5 Public–private partnerships and blended finance

Mobilizing the trillions of dollars required for sustainable infrastructure and technology far exceeds the fiscal capacity of public budgets alone. Public–private partnerships (PPPs) enable governments to leverage private-sector expertise and capital while maintaining public oversight and accountability. In the renewable-energy sector, PPPs have financed large-scale solar parks, offshore wind farms, and grid-modernization projects. Likewise, infrastructure investment funds can pool pension and insurance assets to support sustainable transport, waste-management, and water systems.

The effectiveness of PPPs depends on their institutional design. To ensure value for money, equitable risk sharing, and social and environmental safeguards, contracts should embed

explicit clauses on environmental performance, labor standards, and community engagement. Transparent procurement procedures are essential to minimize corruption and political patronage (International Monetary Fund [IMF], 2023).

Complementing PPPs, blended finance combines concessional public or philanthropic funds with commercial capital to de-risk investments in emerging markets and high-impact sectors. Instruments such as first-loss guarantees or subordinated debt can attract private investors to clean-energy and circular-economy projects that might otherwise appear too risky. Climate funds such as the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) provide grants and concessional loans that crowd in private capital (Green Climate Fund, 2023). Development finance institutions, multilateral development banks, and national development banks play pivotal roles in structuring these mechanisms and aligning investment portfolios with sustainability objectives.

The main challenge lies in scaling blended finance without undermining domestic resource mobilization or privatizing essential public goods. To strengthen effectiveness, greater donor coordination, standardized metrics for measuring leverage and impact, and clearly defined exit strategies are needed (IMF, 2023).

Taken together, green fiscal measures—including public spending, sovereign green bonds, carbon pricing, national sustainability strategies, and blended-finance instruments—demonstrate how coordinated policy can mobilize capital for a low-carbon transition while safeguarding vulnerable communities (International Energy Agency [IEA], 2021; IMF, 2023; Green Climate Fund, 2023).

Applying strategy–implementation mapping tools such as those developed by Kalmykova, Sadagopan, and Rosado (2018) can help prioritize PPPs and blended-finance pipelines toward underfunded stages of circular-economy implementation—such as manufacturing redesign, logistics, and distribution—where capital remains scarce despite market-ready solutions. Pipeline design can further align circular business models (CBMs) with specific supply-chain loop needs: for example, closing loops through investment in collection and processing infrastructure, slowing loops via repair and refurbishment hubs, or dematerializing loops through digital delivery and product-service systems. By explicitly targeting these bottlenecks, PPPs and blended-finance structures can channel resources where systemic value is highest and private-capital participation is weakest (Geissdoerfer, Morioka, de Carvalho, & Evans, 2018).

4 ESG Investment Strategies and Sustainable Capital Markets

4.1 Growth of ESG investing and green capital markets

Environmental, social, and governance (ESG) investing has evolved from a niche practice into a mainstream pillar of global capital markets. Investment strategies that integrate ESG criteria aim to manage long-term risks associated with climate change, labor practices, corruption, and community relations, while still delivering competitive financial returns. Assets under management in ESG-oriented funds have grown into the trillions of dollars, reflecting widespread adoption among institutional investors, including pension funds, sovereign wealth funds, and insurance companies. The green bond market—which channels

capital toward projects with clear environmental benefits—has expanded rapidly, surpassing US $500 billion in annual issuance, with active participation from corporations, municipalities, and development banks (Climate Bonds Initiative, 2024).

Despite this progress, significant challenges persist. Definitions and methodologies for assessing ESG performance vary widely across rating agencies and data providers, resulting in inconsistent evaluations and investor confusion. A study by Berg, Kölbel, and Rigobon (2022) found correlations among major ESG ratings ranging only from 0.38 to 0.71, highlighting considerable divergence that undermines market trust. Moreover, many ESG funds remain concentrated in low-carbon sectors such as technology and healthcare, thereby exerting limited influence on global emissions. The growing prevalence of greenwashing—the misrepresentation of environmental or social credentials—further threatens the credibility and integrity of ESG investing.

In response, regulators and standard setters are advancing efforts to clarify sustainability definitions and improve disclosure standards. The European Commission's Sustainable Finance Taxonomy (2021) establishes classification criteria for environmentally sustainable economic activities, while the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB, 2023) is developing global baseline standards for corporate sustainability reporting. Together, these initiatives aim to enhance transparency, comparability, and accountability in ESG markets.

Cross-country research also reveals that ESG and corporate social responsibility (CSR) performance are shaped not only by firm-level incentives but by institutional and legal foundations. Using CSR data for approximately 23,000 companies across 114 countries, Liang and Renneboog (2017) show that firms headquartered in stakeholder-oriented civil-law systems tend to score higher on CSR and respond more strongly to CSR-related shocks (such as scandals or environmental disasters) than firms in shareholder-oriented common-law systems. These findings suggest that national governance traditions and stakeholder institutions play a pivotal role in shaping observed ESG and CSR outcomes.

4.2 Financial performance and risk-return profiles

The financial performance of ESG investments is a subject of intense debate and research. Meta-analyses of ESG funds suggest that integrating sustainability considerations does not necessarily compromise returns and can even improve risk-adjusted performance, particularly in times of market stress (Friede et al., 2015). Companies with higher ESG scores may have lower cost of capital, higher employee satisfaction and better risk management, all of which contribute to long-term profitability. Conversely, poor governance and environmental practices can lead to regulatory fines, litigation and reputational damage. The increasing frequency of extreme weather events and climate-related litigation amplifies the materiality of environmental risks for investors (Carney, 2015). However, ESG investing is not a panacea for systemic sustainability challenges. The market currently represents a fraction of total capital markets, and flows often rely on existing financial structures rather than transformative long-term investments. To increase impact, sustainable investment strategies must expand beyond exclusionary screening and integrate active ownership, impact investing and thematic portfolios that target renewable energy, circular economy solutions and social inclusion. Stewardship codes and shareholder engagement initiatives can encourage companies to set science-based targets, improve labor practices and adopt credible transition plans. Impact

measurement frameworks should evolve to capture real-world outcomes, not merely risk exposure (Berg et al., 2022; Friede et al., 2015).

4.3 Investor motivations and stewardship

Investor interest in ESG arises from multiple motivations: risk management, regulatory compliance, value alignment and reputational considerations. Long-term investors such as pension funds seek to hedge climate and social risks that could undermine portfolio value over decades. Faith-based institutions and mission-driven funds align portfolios with ethical principles. Corporate disclosures and regulatory guidance, such as the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD), encourage investors to consider climate risks (Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures, 2017). Social movements and public pressure also influence investor behavior; divestment campaigns targeting fossil fuels, tobacco and weapons manufacturers have led many institutions to reduce exposure to these industries. Stewardship and engagement are essential to translate investor intent into corporate change. Institutional investors can exercise voting rights on shareholder proposals, engage in dialogue with management and collaborate through initiatives such as Climate Action 100+ to push for ambitious climate strategies. Proxy advisors and service providers play an important role in shaping voting outcomes but must avoid conflicts of interest and ensure independence. Disclosure of voting records and engagement outcomes enhances accountability (Sullivan & Mackenzie, 2016).

4.4 Green bonds, sustainability-linked loans and emerging instruments

Green bonds have become a flagship product of sustainable finance, channeling capital toward projects that deliver verifiable environmental benefits. Investor demand has been robust, allowing issuers to access funding at competitive rates while signaling their commitment to sustainability. To qualify as green, bond proceeds must be allocated to eligible projects—such as renewable energy, energy efficiency, or sustainable transport—and verified through clear frameworks. However, several challenges persist, including defining eligibility criteria, demonstrating additionality (i.e., ensuring projects would not have been financed otherwise), and monitoring outcomes to ensure genuine impact.

Social and sustainability bonds expand the use of proceeds to encompass social objectives such as affordable housing, education, and healthcare. A further innovation, the sustainability-linked bond (SLB), ties coupon rates to the issuer's achievement of pre-defined sustainability performance targets. Failure to meet these targets triggers higher interest payments, thereby embedding financial incentives for improved environmental or social outcomes. Similarly, sustainability-linked loans (SLLs) adjust interest-rate margins according to borrowers' ESG performance. Both SLBs and SLLs encourage firms to integrate sustainability metrics into corporate strategy, yet they also require credible target setting, independent verification, and transparent reporting to prevent greenwashing (International Capital Market Association [ICMA], 2021).

New and emerging instruments further diversify the sustainable-finance landscape. Transition bonds fund incremental emissions-reduction efforts within hard-to-abate industries, while nature-performance bonds link debt-service terms to biodiversity outcomes. Meanwhile, voluntary carbon markets facilitate the trade of carbon credits that finance emissions reductions or removals, though credibility concerns remain. The World Bank (2023)

emphasizes that high-quality carbon credits must align with science-based decarbonization pathways to ensure environmental integrity. Similarly, blended-finance structures—which combine public or concessional capital with private investment—play a crucial role in mobilizing funding for high-risk sectors and developing regions (Green Climate Fund, 2023).

Overall, financial innovation is expanding the toolkit for sustainable investment, but its effectiveness ultimately depends on clear standards, transparency, and accountability (Berg, Kölbel, & Rigobon, 2022). The rise of ESG investing, ongoing debates over financial performance, active stewardship initiatives, and the proliferation of green and sustainability-linked instruments illustrate a growing investor appetite for sustainability, while underscoring the need for harmonized taxonomies, rigorous impact measurement, and meaningful engagement (Berg et al., 2022; Friede, Busch, & Bassen, 2015).

For circular-economy models, use-of-proceeds and KPI-based instruments can be tailored to loop-specific outcomes—for example, remanufacturing rates, reverse-logistics coverage, or material-intensity reductions—thereby aligning financing structures with the Circular Business Model–Circular Supply Chain Management (CBM–CSCM) framework (Geissdoerfer, Morioka, de Carvalho, & Evans, 2018).

5 Carbon Pricing, Environmental Risk and Financial Regulation

5.1 Carbon pricing mechanisms

Carbon pricing is a cornerstone of sustainable finance because it creates an economy-wide incentive to reduce emissions. The two primary mechanisms are emissions trading systems (ETS) and carbon taxes. Under an ETS, regulators cap total emissions and allocate allowances that can be traded among firms. The EU ETS is the largest such system, covering power and industrial sectors and gradually reducing the emissions cap over time. Several countries, including China, Canada and parts of the United States, have launched regional or national ETS programs (World Bank, 2023). Carbon taxes, by contrast, impose a price per tonne of CO_2, providing certainty about costs but not emissions volumes. Hybrid systems and complementary measures may combine the strengths of both approaches. Effective carbon pricing requires broad coverage, rising price trajectories and provisions to prevent emissions leakage and protect vulnerable households. Revenues should support climate investments and just transitions (Stiglitz & Stern, 2017).

5.2 Managing environmental and climate risks

Financial institutions increasingly recognize that environmental and climate risks pose material threats to portfolios and financial stability. Physical risks include damage from extreme weather and chronic climate effects; transition risks arise from policy changes, technological disruption and shifting consumer preferences; liability risks stem from litigation and regulatory penalties. Central banks and financial regulators, such as those participating in the Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS), are integrating climate considerations into supervisory frameworks (NGFS, 2019). Climate stress tests examine how banks and insurers would fare under adverse climate scenarios. Disclosure of climate risks, as recommended by the TCFD, enables investors to price these risks and allocate capital accordingly (Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures, 2017). In some

jurisdictions, regulators are exploring capital charges for exposures to high-carbon assets (Ehlers et al., 2020).

Prudential policies should ensure that financial institutions internalize environmental risks. For example, requiring banks to assess environmental and social impacts of loans, disclosing financed emissions and setting sectoral exposure limits to high-carbon industries can reduce systemic risk. At the same time, regulators should avoid unintended consequences such as credit withdrawal from developing countries. International coordination is important to prevent regulatory arbitrage. The integration of biodiversity and nature-related risks into financial supervision, supported by initiatives like the Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD), represents the next frontier (Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures, 2023).

5.3 Financial regulation and sustainable market conduct

Beyond risk management, financial regulation can shape market conduct and allocate capital toward sustainable outcomes. Disclosure mandates for climate and sustainability information help level the playing field, reducing information asymmetries and discouraging misleading claims. The European Union's Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR) requires financial institutions to disclose how they integrate sustainability risks and consider adverse impacts, while the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission has proposed rules requiring public companies to disclose climate-related risks and greenhouse gas emissions (European Union, 2019; SEC, 2022). Taxonomies, such as the EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities, classify economic activities based on their environmental performance; they guide investors and lenders and serve as benchmarks for green bonds and loans (European Commission, 2021). However, taxonomies must strike a balance between ambition and usability, and should be updated as science evolves.

Market conduct rules can also address greenwashing and protect consumers. Regulators should enforce standards on fund naming and marketing, requiring that products labelled as "green" or "sustainable" meet objective criteria and that any sustainability claims are substantiated. Securities laws provide mechanisms to pursue misleading sustainability claims as securities fraud. Consumer protection authorities can regulate claims in retail financial products. In addition, supervisory agencies can incorporate sustainability into fiduciary duty guidance, clarifying that considering long-term environmental and social factors is compatible with – and may be required by – duties of loyalty and prudence (Carney, 2015). Finally, financial regulation must remain adaptive, as rapid innovation creates new products and risks; regulators should collaborate with academia, industry and civil society to monitor developments and adjust rules accordingly (NGFS, 2019).

Taken together, robust carbon pricing, effective management of environmental risks and adaptive market conduct rules are essential to realign financial systems with sustainability goals (European Commission, 2021; NGFS, 2019; Stiglitz & Stern, 2017).

6 Legal Frameworks and Disclosure Standards for Sustainable Finance

6.1 The ESG reporting conundrum

ESG reporting was initially heralded as a transformative tool for aligning financial markets with sustainability. In theory, ESG disclosures allow investors, regulators and stakeholders to

evaluate corporate impacts on society and the environment and assess risks and opportunities associated with sustainability transitions. In practice, however, ESG reporting is fragmented and inconsistent. The proliferation of competing frameworks – including the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB), the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) and national regulations such as the EU Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) – creates confusion and undermines comparability (European Commission, 2021; GRI, 2020; Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures, 2017). Companies often cherry-pick metrics that portray them favorably, resulting in selective disclosure rather than comprehensive accountability. Investors and regulators therefore lack confidence in ESG data, and greenwashing becomes more difficult to detect (Berg et al., 2022).

6.2 Standardization and harmonization of metrics

The first priority is harmonization of ESG reporting standards. The creation of the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB) in 2021 represents a major step toward a unified global baseline. The ISSB consolidates the SASB and TCFD frameworks and aims to deliver investor-focused standards (ISSB, 2023). Meanwhile, the EU's CSRD mandates comprehensive sustainability disclosures, including double materiality, and applies to tens of thousands of companies (European Commission, 2021). Policymakers must ensure interoperability between these systems, enabling companies operating globally to comply with a core set of universal metrics – such as Scope 1–3 greenhouse gas emissions, water use, gender pay equity and board diversity – while allowing sector-specific add-ons. Development of social and biodiversity metrics lags behind climate metrics; closing these gaps is essential for holistic sustainability (ISSB, 2023).

6.3 Mandatory, audited reporting and double materiality

Voluntary disclosure has proven insufficient. To ensure credibility, ESG reporting should be subject to regulatory requirements and independent assurance. Third-party audits enhance reliability and reduce incentives for selective disclosure. Regulators should impose penalties for misleading ESG claims, akin to securities fraud enforcement (SEC, 2022). Beyond financial materiality – how environmental or social factors affect company performance – sustainability reporting should embrace double materiality, considering how corporate activities impact society and the environment. The EU CSRD mandates double materiality, and similar concepts are emerging in other jurisdictions (European Commission, 2021). Regulators must provide guidance on identifying relevant impacts, and companies should engage stakeholders to determine material issues (GRI, 2020).

6.4 Leveraging technology and independent oversight

Digital technologies can enhance the credibility of ESG reporting. Blockchain can trace supply chains and provide verifiable data on sourcing, labor practices and carbon footprints, reducing the reliance on company-issued reports (Tapscott & Tapscott, 2016). Artificial intelligence and satellite imagery can validate deforestation and emissions claims, and open-access data platforms can allow stakeholders to verify corporate disclosures in real time (O'Neil, 2016). To further enhance credibility, ESG performance should be assessed by independent public or multilateral institutions rather than private rating agencies with potential conflicts of interest (Sullivan & Mackenzie, 2016). A global ESG oversight authority, analogous to the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO),

could coordinate standards, accredit auditors and monitor compliance. Regional bodies can play similar roles, ensuring accountability across jurisdictions.

6.5 Broader implications

Improving ESG measurement and reporting is far more than a technical refinement—it represents a foundational reform of corporate governance and market accountability. Reliable, comparable ESG data underpins investor confidence, directs capital toward genuinely sustainable enterprises, and empowers regulators and stakeholders to enforce obligations. In the absence of credible reporting, sustainability risks becoming a rhetorical veneer that conceals business-as-usual practices.

When implemented effectively—with harmonized standards, mandatory audits, double materiality, technological verification, and independent oversight—ESG reporting can evolve into a powerful governance mechanism that aligns corporate behavior with long-term sustainability objectives (European Commission, 2021; International Sustainability Standards Board [ISSB], 2023; Sullivan & Mackenzie, 2016). The ultimate objective is not data collection for its own sake, but a reorientation of markets toward long-term value creation and planetary stewardship, consistent with regenerative economic principles (Raworth, 2017).

In this context, ESG disclosure reform has the potential to transform sustainability reporting from a marketing exercise into a systemic accountability framework for firms (European Commission, 2021; Sullivan & Mackenzie, 2016; Tapscott & Tapscott, 2016). However, institutional architectures shape firms' incentives to invest in corporate social responsibility (CSR). Thus, convergence in disclosure quality must be accompanied by governance reforms that strengthen stakeholder rights and accountability mechanisms. Without such reforms, even standardized metrics may obscure persistent cross-country differences in CSR foundations and institutional orientation (Liang & Renneboog, 2017).

7 Stakeholder Engagement and Sustainable Corporate Governance

7.1 Critique of shareholder primacy

The prevailing corporate governance paradigm of shareholder wealth maximization has proven incompatible with sustainability. Neoclassical economics assumes that markets efficiently allocate resources if left to voluntary exchange and that externalities can be corrected through regulation. In reality, environmental and social externalities – carbon emissions, biodiversity loss, labor exploitation – are routinely excluded from market transactions, encouraging firms to externalize costs. Financial markets reward short-term earnings, and managerial compensation tied to stock prices reinforces speculative behavior rather than long-term investment. Shareholder interests are heterogeneous, and many investors care about ethical, environmental or long-term concerns that shareholder primacy obscures. Moreover, corporations are not merely private contracts; they are creatures of the state, granted privileges like limited liability and perpetual existence. As such, they owe responsibilities to society, not only to shareholders (Hansmann & Kraakman, 2001; Stout, 2012). The dominance of shareholder primacy has contributed to a race to the bottom in corporate tax rates, labor standards and environmental protections, eroding social trust and destabilizing democracy (Stout, 2012).

7.2 Alternative governance frameworks

To align corporate governance with sustainability, alternative frameworks challenge shareholder primacy and emphasize broader stakeholder obligations. Freeman's stakeholder theory posits that corporations have responsibilities to employees, customers, communities and ecosystems, and that firms oriented toward stakeholders often outperform shareholder-centric firms in long-term resilience and innovation (Freeman, 1984). Benefit corporation statutes and B-Corp certification institutionalize commitments to social and environmental goals alongside financial performance. Systems-oriented frameworks, such as Raworth's Doughnut Economics and Daly's steady-state economics, situate corporations within ecological and social systems and call for operating within planetary boundaries while meeting social foundations (Daly, 1996; Raworth, 2017). Concepts of shared value and integrated reporting encourage firms to generate financial returns while delivering social and environmental benefits. These frameworks have empirical grounding: firms in stakeholder-oriented legal regimes exhibit higher CSR and greater responsiveness to stakeholder shocks, consistent with the idea that corporate purpose is mediated by legal and cultural institutions (Liang & Renneboog, 2017).

7.3 Toward sustainable corporate governance

Moving beyond shareholder primacy requires institutional reforms. Fiduciary duties should explicitly include obligations to stakeholders, future generations and ecosystems. Boards should incorporate stakeholder representation, including workers, community representatives and environmental advocates; Germany's co-determination model offers a precedent. Executive compensation should be linked to sustainability metrics, such as emissions reductions and workforce diversity, alongside financial performance. Regulatory standards must prevent corporations from maximizing shareholder value at the expense of public goods and enforce compliance with environmental and social obligations (Carney, 2015; Stout, 2012). These reforms challenge the ideology of shareholder primacy and realign governance with the systemic requirements of sustainability. Critics may worry about diluting accountability or increasing bureaucracy, but empirical evidence suggests that stakeholder-oriented firms can be innovative, resilient and financially successful. Moreover, sustainable governance is not only an ethical imperative; it is a practical necessity in a world facing climate disruption, ecological collapse and social instability (Freeman, 1984; Raworth, 2017).

7.4 Stakeholder engagement and corporate strategy

Beyond legal reforms, day-to-day management practices must embed stakeholder engagement into corporate strategy. Effective engagement requires identifying stakeholders, understanding their interests and integrating their perspectives into decision-making. For example, engaging employees can improve working conditions and productivity; consulting local communities can mitigate conflict and inform social investment; partnering with suppliers can enhance sustainability along value chains. Stewardship codes for institutional investors should encourage engagement with investee companies on sustainability issues, while corporate reporting frameworks should require disclosure of stakeholder engagement processes and outcomes. Transparent grievance mechanisms allow stakeholders to raise concerns and hold companies accountable. When combined with strong external standards, stakeholder engagement can drive continuous improvement in sustainability performance (Sullivan & Mackenzie, 2017).

7.5 Empirical evidence: corporate failures and the costs of shareholder primacy

The consequences of shareholder primacy are not abstract; they manifest in catastrophic corporate failures and systemic crises. A stark example is Boeing's decision-making in the design, certification and marketing of the 737 MAX aircraft, which culminated in two fatal crashes – Lion Air Flight 610 in 2018 and Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302 in 2019 – killing 346 people. Analysts attribute these tragedies to a shift from an engineering-led culture to a finance-driven model that prioritized cost control, schedule compression and avoidance of pilot retraining. The Maneuvering Characteristics Augmentation System (MCAS) was inadequately disclosed to pilots and regulators and relied on data from a single sensor – a design decision driven by cost and competitive pressures rather than safety margins. In the aftermath, Boeing faced grounding of the MAX fleet, regulatory scrutiny, lawsuits and billions of dollars in compensation and penalties (House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 2020). The episode illustrates how short-term financial priorities and lax governance can produce loss of life, reputational damage and shareholder losses.

The 2008 global financial crisis offers another cautionary tale. Many financial institutions pursued high leverage and speculative trading to maximize short-term returns, encouraged by incentives tied to share prices and profits. Complex derivatives, lax regulation and conflicts of interest contributed to a systemic collapse, precipitating deep recessions and long-lasting social scars (Stiglitz, 2010). Research demonstrates that firms focused on short-term share price maximization often cut long-term investments, such as research and development and workforce training, undermining innovation and resilience (Asker et al., 2015). These empirical cases underscore that externalities generated by shareholder-driven strategies are not transient or easily reversible; they produce profound, lasting damages to ecosystems, societies and public institutions. Sustainable corporate governance is therefore essential not only for ethical reasons but also for risk management and long-term value preservation.

In sum, reforming corporate governance to prioritize stakeholders and long-term resilience is vital to prevent corporate failures and systemic crises (Freeman, 1984; Hansmann & Kraakman, 2001; Stout, 2012).

8 International Tax Policy and Wealth Distribution for Sustainability

8.1 The centrality of taxation

Achieving a sustainable future is not only an environmental challenge; it is fundamentally a matter of justice and distribution. Climate mitigation, biodiversity protection and social inclusion require massive investments in infrastructure, innovation and social safety nets. Taxation is the primary mechanism through which states mobilize collective resources to address these systemic challenges. Without fair, sufficient and coordinated tax systems, the financial means to fund a just transition are undermined. Currently, tax avoidance and evasion by wealthy individuals and multinational corporations deprive governments of hundreds of billions of dollars each year, undermining state capacity, exacerbating inequality and eroding social trust (Cobham & Janský, 2019; Zucman, 2015). Addressing these gaps requires reform of national and international tax regimes.

8.2 Flaws in the current international tax system

The international tax system, largely designed in the mid-twentieth century, has failed to keep pace with globalization and digitization. Multinational corporations shift profits to low-tax jurisdictions through transfer pricing, intellectual property licensing and intra-firm loans, eroding tax bases in both developed and developing countries. Corporate tax rates have fallen worldwide due to tax competition, undermining fiscal sovereignty and redistributive capacity. Wealth concealment through offshore trusts, shell companies and secrecy jurisdictions allows the ultra-wealthy to hide trillions of dollars, as revealed by leaks such as the Panama Papers (Alstadsæter et al., 2018; Zucman, 2015). Digital giants generate revenues across jurisdictions but pay little tax where value is created, because current rules rely on physical presence. These deficiencies not only deprive governments of revenue but also undermine democracy by shifting tax burdens onto workers and small businesses (Cobham & Janský, 2019).

8.3 Ethical and normative foundations of tax reform

The case for taxing the wealthy is grounded in ethics as well as efficiency. Wealth accumulation relies on public goods – educated workforces, stable institutions, legal systems and infrastructure – funded by society. Reciprocity requires that those who benefit disproportionately contribute proportionately more. Progressive taxation can reduce extreme inequality, enhance social cohesion and create fiscal space for climate and social investment. From a sustainability perspective, redistributive tax policies can finance adaptation, resilience and conservation while addressing intergenerational inequities (Piketty, 2014). Greater transparency and fair tax burdens are thus essential components of sustainable and green finance.

8.4 Proposals for a fair international tax regime

Several reforms can create a more equitable and efficient international tax architecture. First, a global minimum corporate tax rate could reduce incentives for profit shifting. The 2021 OECD/G20 agreement on a 15 percent minimum tax is a step forward, though many argue effectiveness would improve at higher rates (OECD/G20, 2021). Second, unitary taxation treats a multinational enterprise as a single entity and allocates global profits based on factors such as sales, employment and assets, ensuring taxation where economic activity occurs. Third, progressive wealth taxes on high-net-worth individuals, such as a 2–3 percent annual levy on fortunes above US $50 million, can reduce inequality and raise revenue. Fourth, financial transaction taxes on stock trades and derivatives could curb speculation and generate funds for public investment. Fifth, carbon border adjustment mechanisms (CBAMs) tax imports based on their carbon content, preventing carbon leakage and encouraging trading partners to adopt stronger climate policies (European Union, 2023). Sixth, automatic exchange of tax information and public wealth registries enhance transparency and enable governments to detect and deter evasion (Alstadsæter et al., 2018). Implementing these measures requires international cooperation, legal reforms and institutional capacity, but their potential benefits for sustainability and equity are substantial.

8.5 Linking tax revenues to sustainability goals

Tax reforms must be linked to spending policies that advance sustainability. Revenues from minimum taxes, wealth taxes and CBAMs should fund climate mitigation, adaptation and biodiversity conservation. For example, a portion of global minimum tax revenues could support green infrastructure in developing countries, while CBAM revenues could finance just transition programs for affected workers. Transparent earmarking increases public

support for taxes and ensures that funds reach intended beneficiaries. International institutions, such as the Green Climate Fund and the Loss and Damage Fund, can channel resources to vulnerable countries (Green Climate Fund, 2023; IMF, 2023). At national levels, progressive taxation can finance universal basic services, including health, education and social protection, which enhance resilience to climate and economic shocks (ILO, 2018). Ultimately, fair taxation and sustainable spending are mutually reinforcing pillars of a just transition.

8.6 Case studies in global tax cooperation

Concrete experiences with international tax cooperation demonstrate both progress and challenges. Several European Union member states, including France, Italy and Spain, have introduced digital services taxes (DSTs) that levy a small percentage of revenues earned by large technology firms in their jurisdictions. These DSTs aim to capture value generated by digital services that operate across borders but pay little tax where their users reside. Although controversial and subject to trade tensions, DSTs have spurred negotiations toward a comprehensive global solution. The OECD's Pillar One proposal seeks to reallocate taxing rights for multinationals based on where they have users and markets, rather than solely on physical presence, addressing some challenges posed by the digital economy (OECD/G20, 2021). At the same time, the EU's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism serves as a tax measure that aligns trade policy with climate objectives by imposing a levy on imports from countries with weaker climate policies (European Union, 2023). These examples illustrate that unilateral measures can catalyze broader cooperation but also highlight the need for coordinated international agreements to prevent fragmentation and retaliatory trade measures.

Global cooperation can also learn from regional initiatives such as the African Tax Administration Forum's work on exchange of information and capacity building, which helps African countries combat transfer pricing abuses and illicit financial flows. Latin American countries have explored a regional agreement on minimum corporate tax rates and information sharing. These efforts, though nascent, underline the importance of collaboration among developing countries to strengthen bargaining power in global tax negotiations and to adapt international rules to their needs. Ultimately, case studies show that sustained engagement among governments, international organizations, civil society and the private sector is required to craft fair and effective tax regimes.

In summary, fair international tax systems, progressive taxation and transparent cooperation are necessary to finance the sustainable transition and reduce inequality (Cobham & Janský, 2019; OECD/G20, 2021; Piketty, 2014).

9 Financial Innovation and Digital Technologies for Sustainability

9.1 Blockchain and distributed ledger technologies

Emerging technologies offer new avenues to enhance transparency, traceability and efficiency in sustainable finance. Blockchain and distributed ledger technologies (DLTs) provide tamper-resistant, decentralized records that can trace the provenance of goods, verify environmental claims and facilitate peer-to-peer transactions (Tapscott & Tapscott, 2016). For example, blockchain can be used to track renewable energy certificates or carbon credits, ensuring that each unit of electricity or emission reduction is only counted once. It can also

trace supply chains to verify responsible sourcing of raw materials, enforce labor standards and monitor deforestation, as companies and regulators demand greater supply-chain transparency. Smart contracts can automate compliance with sustainability covenants in loans or bonds, adjusting interest rates or releasing funds based on verified performance. However, blockchain's sustainability benefits depend on energy consumption and governance; greener consensus mechanisms and renewable energy sources can mitigate impacts (Tapscott & Tapscott, 2016).

9.2 Artificial intelligence and data analytics

Artificial intelligence (AI) and advanced data analytics can improve sustainability assessment, decision-making and monitoring. AI can analyze satellite imagery to detect deforestation, illegal mining or land-use change, providing real-time data for investors and regulators. Machine learning algorithms can evaluate vast amounts of financial and non-financial data to identify greenwashing, predict climate risk exposure and optimize asset allocation. Natural language processing can extract sustainability insights from corporate reports, news articles and social media, allowing investors to gauge sentiment and monitor reputational risks (O'Neil, 2016). AI-powered decision support systems can help governments design more effective climate policies, and insurers can use predictive analytics to price climate risks accurately. AI also poses risks, including algorithmic bias, data privacy and transparency; sustainable finance applications must be designed with ethical principles and robust governance (O'Neil, 2016; Zuboff, 2019).

9.3 Climate fintech and innovative business models

Climate fintech – financial technology focused on climate solutions – encompasses a range of platforms and services, including crowdfunding for renewable projects, peer-to-peer lending for energy efficiency, carbon trading platforms and digital wallets that reward sustainable behavior. Mobile banking and digital payment systems can facilitate access to finance for marginalized communities and small enterprises, enabling them to invest in clean technologies. Embedded finance models integrate sustainability incentives into everyday transactions, such as credit cards that allocate a portion of spending to tree planting or provide real-time carbon footprint feedback. These innovations can mobilize citizen participation and democratize access to sustainable investments. Policymakers should support sandbox environments and innovation hubs that allow climate fintech to develop while ensuring consumer protection and financial stability (IMF, 2023).

9.4 Data governance, privacy and cybersecurity

Digital technologies expand the scope and scale of data collection and analysis in sustainable finance. While the availability of granular data on emissions, supply chains and consumer behavior can improve decision-making, it also raises concerns about privacy, security and fairness. Data on energy consumption, travel patterns or purchasing habits can reveal intimate details about individuals and communities. If mishandled, such information could be used for discriminatory profiling or surveillance. Furthermore, cyberattacks on critical infrastructure or financial systems could undermine trust and impede the transition to digital sustainability solutions. To address these risks, governments and industry must establish robust data governance frameworks that protect privacy, ensure equitable access and prevent abuse. Data collection should adhere to principles of data minimization, consent, purpose limitation and security. Regulatory regimes, such as the EU's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR),

provide models for balancing innovation with privacy, but sector-specific guidelines may be needed for sustainable finance applications (General Data Protection Regulation, 2016). In addition, cybersecurity standards and incident response protocols should be strengthened across financial institutions and infrastructure providers. International cooperation is necessary to prevent cross-border data breaches and to harmonize standards, as supply chains and financial flows span jurisdictions. Finally, inclusive governance mechanisms should involve civil society and affected communities in decisions about data use, ensuring that digital tools empower rather than exploit (Zuboff, 2019).

In sum, digital innovations such as blockchain, AI, climate fintech and data governance can enable sustainable finance but must be governed by privacy, ethical and cybersecurity frameworks (O'Neil, 2016; Tapscott & Tapscott, 2016; Zuboff, 2019).

10 Policy Recommendations and Research Agenda

10.1 Cross-cutting policy recommendations

Align fiscal and financial policy with climate and biodiversity goals.
Governments should embed sustainability objectives into budgeting, taxation, and expenditure frameworks. Phasing out fossil-fuel subsidies and reallocating resources toward renewable energy, climate adaptation, and social protection would realign fiscal priorities with ecological imperatives. Adopting green budgeting practices—which assess the environmental impacts of fiscal measures—can ensure coherence across policy domains. Sustaining fiscal space through progressive taxation and fair international tax cooperation remains essential for long-term resilience (International Monetary Fund [IMF], 2023; Parry et al., 2023).

Establish credible carbon pricing and eliminate harmful subsidies.
A globally coordinated carbon pricing mechanism, featuring predictable price trajectories and equitable revenue distribution, would provide consistent incentives for emissions reduction. Carbon pricing should be complemented by targeted green subsidies, tax incentives for clean technologies, and support for circular economy initiatives. Governments should also phase out subsidies that perpetuate fossil fuel dependence or environmentally destructive practices (International Energy Agency [IEA], 2021; Stiglitz & Stern, 2017).

Harmonize and mandate ESG reporting.
Policymakers should promote convergence between the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB) framework and regional initiatives such as the EU Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD). Establishing universal ESG metrics, mandating independent audits, and enforcing double materiality would strengthen accountability. Regulators should also impose penalties for misleading claims, develop standards for social and biodiversity disclosures, and integrate sustainability considerations into financial supervision (European Commission, 2021; ISSB, 2023; U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission [SEC], 2022).

Reform corporate governance to embed stakeholder accountability.
Corporate law should be modernized to align fiduciary duties with environmental and social obligations. Policymakers can institutionalize stakeholder representation on boards, link

executive compensation to sustainability performance, and encourage alternative legal structures such as benefit corporations. Strengthening the regulation of externalities and ensuring compliance will enhance corporate responsibility (Carney, 2015; Freeman, 1984; Stout, 2012).

Strengthen international tax cooperation and link revenues to sustainability.
A fairer global tax architecture—anchored in higher minimum corporate tax rates, unitary taxation, and progressive wealth taxes—is vital to fund sustainability transitions. Instruments such as carbon border adjustments and financial transaction taxes can reduce leakage and speculation, while automatic information exchange and a global wealth registry would promote transparency. Revenues should be earmarked for climate mitigation, adaptation, and just-transition programs (Cobham & Janský, 2019; European Union, 2023; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD]/G20, 2021).

Leverage digital technologies responsibly.
Governments should support research and innovation in blockchain, artificial intelligence, and climate fintech to enhance traceability, disclosure, and impact measurement. At the same time, policies must address challenges related to energy consumption, data privacy, and algorithmic bias. Building open-access sustainability data platforms and digital infrastructure can improve transparency and citizen participation (General Data Protection Regulation [GDPR], 2016; O'Neil, 2016; Tapscott & Tapscott, 2016).

Integrate fiscal incentives with circular-economy implementation.
Fiscal and procurement instruments should be linked to loop-specific supply-chain capabilities—such as reverse logistics, remanufacturing capacity, and product-service systems—identified within the Circular Business Model–Circular Supply Chain Management (CBM–CSCM) framework. This approach ensures that fiscal tools support not only end-of-life recycling but also the closing, slowing, intensifying, narrowing, and dematerializing loops of the circular economy (Geissdoerfer, Morioka, de Carvalho, & Evans, 2018).

Adopt circular-economy toolkits and monitoring frameworks.
Governments can apply value-chain-based strategy and implementation databases—such as those developed by Kalmykova, Sadagopan, and Rosado (2018)—to target fiscal incentives, procurement, and blended finance toward underrepresented value-chain stages (e.g., manufacturing and distribution). Integrating robust monitoring indicators will facilitate evidence-based evaluation of circular-economy progress.

Promote inclusive and participatory governance.
Sustainability transitions must prioritize social inclusion. Governments should ensure that communities, Indigenous peoples, workers, and marginalized groups participate meaningfully in decision-making. Implementing just transition frameworks that provide education, retraining, and social protection can mitigate distributional impacts. Effective stakeholder engagement and grievance mechanisms are essential for accountability at both corporate and policy levels (International Labour Organization [ILO], 2018; Mazzucato, 2021).

Taken together, these cross-cutting reforms underscore that sustainability transitions require systemic changes across fiscal policy, market regulation, and governance institutions (Daly, 1996; Raworth, 2017; Piketty, 2014).

10.2 Research agenda

The evolution of sustainable and green finance raises numerous questions for further research:

Measuring real-world impacts. How can we develop robust metrics that capture the environmental and social outcomes of sustainable investments, beyond risk exposure? What methodologies best measure biodiversity impacts and social inclusion? How can investors and policymakers compare impact across sectors and geographies? (Friede et al., 2015; ISSB, 2023).

Just transitions and labor markets. What policies effectively support workers and communities transitioning away from fossil-fuel-dependent industries? How can public and private finance mobilize resources for retraining, social protection and economic diversification without undermining competitiveness? (ILO, 2018; IMF, 2023).

Financial stability and systemic risk. What are the implications of climate and biodiversity risks for financial stability? How do stress tests and prudential regulations interact with capital adequacy and credit allocation? What are the potential systemic risks of green asset bubbles or sudden policy shifts? (Ehlers et al., 2020; NGFS, 2019).

International coordination and governance. How can international institutions facilitate cooperation on carbon pricing, tax policy and ESG standards? What governance models ensure inclusivity, accountability and legitimacy in transnational sustainable finance initiatives? (OECD/G20, 2021; European Commission, 2021).

Technological innovation and ethics. How can blockchain, AI and fintech be harnessed for sustainability without exacerbating inequality or environmental harms? What standards and governance structures are needed to ensure that digital innovations support the public interest? (O'Neil, 2016; Tapscott & Tapscott, 2016).

Behavioral finance and culture. How do social norms, cultural factors and behavioral biases influence sustainable investment decisions? What strategies encourage households and small investors to participate in green finance? How can education and communication shape public perceptions of sustainability and finance? (Friede et al., 2015).

Addressing these questions will require interdisciplinary collaboration across economics, finance, law, political science, sociology, engineering and environmental science. Scholars should integrate qualitative and quantitative methods, engage stakeholders and leverage new data sources. Research should inform policy and practice, bridging the gap between academic insights and real-world impact.

10.3 Implementation challenges and political economy

Policy proposals for sustainable and green finance face a complex political economy. Incumbent industries, including fossil fuel producers and high-emitting sectors, have entrenched interests and often lobby aggressively to delay or dilute reforms. Financial institutions may resist stricter regulation or disclosure requirements if they perceive them as costly or constraining short-term profits. Tax reforms targeting multinational corporations and

wealthy individuals encounter opposition from powerful stakeholders and tax havens. Meanwhile, citizens in resource-dependent regions may fear job losses or rising energy prices. As a result, policymakers must navigate conflicting interests, address distributive impacts and build coalitions for change (Mazzucato, 2021; Stiglitz, 2010).

Successful implementation of sustainable finance policies requires transparent communication, stakeholder engagement and just transition frameworks. Governments should clearly articulate the rationale for reforms, emphasizing long-term benefits and fairness. Social dialogue with labor unions, businesses and civil society can identify concerns and co-design solutions. Compensation mechanisms, retraining programs and regional development initiatives can alleviate the burden on affected communities. International coordination is necessary to prevent a "race to the bottom" in environmental and tax standards and to ensure that countries taking ambitious action are not disadvantaged. Political leadership, evidence-based policymaking and public accountability are critical to sustain momentum (Carney, 2015; OECD/G20, 2021).

Overall, implementing sustainable and green finance requires political will, stakeholder engagement and mission-oriented governance to overcome incumbent resistance and deliver just transitions (Carney, 2015; Mazzucato, 2021; Stiglitz, 2010).

11 Conclusion

Securing a sustainable future requires a systemic transformation of how economies are financed, governed and regulated, not mere incremental reforms. Sustainable and green finance – encompassing climate finance, green fiscal policy, ESG investment, prudent regulation, stakeholder governance and fair taxation – offers a pathway to align private incentives with public purpose. Environmental sustainability is inseparable from social equity; decarbonization, biodiversity protection and circular economies must go hand in hand with reducing inequality and empowering communities. Finance can be a powerful catalyst for change when deployed responsibly, transparently and inclusively (Carney, 2015; IPBES, 2019; IPCC, 2023).

This paper has synthesized evidence across disciplines to propose an integrated architecture for sustainable and green finance. It has emphasized the urgency of climate action and the critical role of renewable energy, nature conservation, circular economy transitions and adaptation (Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2019; IPCC, 2023). It has explored fiscal tools, sovereign green bonds, ESG investment strategies and carbon pricing as levers to redirect capital (Climate Bonds Initiative, 2024; IMF, 2023; World Bank, 2023). It has highlighted the need for harmonized ESG reporting, stakeholder governance reforms and robust regulation to prevent greenwashing and ensure accountability (European Commission, 2021; ISSB, 2023; NGFS, 2019). It has argued for fair international tax policies to fund a just transition and discussed how digital technologies can enhance transparency and participation (General Data Protection Regulation, 2016; O'Neil, 2016; Tapscott & Tapscott, 2016). Finally, it has offered concrete policy recommendations and identified areas for future research.

The challenges ahead are formidable, but the stakes are higher still. Transforming finance is not an abstract exercise; it is instrumental to safeguarding the climate, preserving ecosystems and building societies in which all people can thrive. The transition to a sustainable and green financial system is already underway, driven by innovators, regulators, investors and citizens.

The next decade will determine whether humanity succeeds in bending the arc of development toward resilience and justice. By embracing sustainable and green finance, we can secure a future that honors the needs of both people and the planet (IEA, 2021; IPCC, 2023; OECD/G20, 2021).

Declaration Of Generative AI And AI-Assisted Technologies in The Manuscript Preparation Process.

Statement: During the preparation of this work the authors used ChatGPT & Grammarly to discover relevant literature and improve the clarity and flow of the writing. The authors subsequently reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the manuscript.

References

Alstadsæter, A., Johannesen, N., & Zucman, G. (2018). Who owns the wealth in tax havens? Macro evidence and implications for global inequality. *Journal of Public Economics*, *162*, 89–100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2018.01.008

Asker, J., Farre-Mensa, J., & Ljungqvist, A. (2015). Corporate investment and stock market listing: A puzzle? *Review of Financial Studies*, *28*(2), 342–390. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhu077

Berg, F., Kölbel, J., & Rigobon, R. (2022). Aggregate confusion: The divergence of ESG ratings. *Review of Finance*, *26*(6), 1315–1344. https://doi.org/10.1093/rof/rfac031

Carney, M. (2015, September 29). *Breaking the tragedy of the horizon—Climate change and financial stability.* Bank of England.

Climate Bonds Initiative. (2024). *Climate bonds market report 2024.* Climate Bonds Initiative. https://www.climatebonds.net/resources/reports

Climate Bonds Initiative. (2024). *Sustainable debt: Global state of the market 2023*. Climate Bonds Initiative.

Cobham, A., & Janský, P. (2018). Global distribution of revenue loss from tax avoidance: Re-estimation and country results. *Journal of International Development, 30*(2), 206-232 https://doi.org/10.1002/jid.3348

Convention on Biological Diversity. (2022). *Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.* CBD.

Daly, H. (1996). *Beyond growth: The economics of sustainable development.* Beacon Press.

Ehlers, T., Mojon, B., & Packer, F. (2020). Green bonds and carbon emissions: exploring the case for a rating system at the firm level. BIS Quarterly Review, September 2020. https://www.bis.org/publ/qtrpdf/r_qt2009c.htm

Ellen MacArthur Foundation. (2019). *Completing the picture: How the circular economy tackles climate change.* EMF.

European Commission. (2021). *Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD)* (COM/2021/189 final). https://eur-lex.europa.eu

European Commission. (2021). *EU taxonomy for sustainable activities.* Publications Office of the European Union. https://finance.ec.europa.eu/sustainable-finance/tools-and-standards/eu-taxonomy-sustainable-activities_en

European Union. (2019). *Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 on sustainability-related disclosures in the financial services sector (SFDR). Official Journal of the European Union*.

European Union. (2023). *Regulation (EU) 2023/956 establishing a Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM). Official Journal of the European Union*.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach.* Pitman.

Friedman, M. (1970, September 13). The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. *The New York Times Magazine*, 32–33, 122–126.

Friede, G., Busch, T., & Bassen, A. (2015). ESG and financial performance: Aggregated evidence from more than 2000 empirical studies. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment, 5*(4), 210–233. https://doi.org/10.1080/20430795.2015.1118917

General Data Protection Regulation. (2016). *Regulation (EU) 2016/679. Official Journal of the European Union*.

Geissdoerfer, M., Morioka, S. N., de Carvalho, M. M., & Evans, S. (2018). Business models and supply chains for the circular economy. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 190*, 712–721. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.04.159

GRI. (2020). *GRI Universal Standards: 101, 102 and 103.* Global Reporting Initiative.

Green Climate Fund. (2023). *GCF annual results report 2023.* Green Climate Fund. https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/annual-results-report-2023

Green Climate Fund. (2023). *Strategic plan 2024–2027.* GCF.

Hansmann, H., & Kraakman, R. (2001). The end of history for corporate law. *Georgetown Law Journal, 89*, 439–468.

House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. (2020). *The design, development & certification of the Boeing 737 MAX*. U.S. House of Representatives.

International Energy Agency. (2021). *Net zero by 2050: A roadmap for the global energy sector.* International Energy Agency. https://www.iea.org/reports/net-zero-by-2050

ILO. (2018). *World social protection report 2017–19: Universal social protection to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals.* International Labour Organization.

International Monetary Fund. (2023). *Fiscal monitor: Climate crossroads—Fiscal policies in a warming world.* International Monetary Fund. https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/FM/Issues/2023/04/11/fiscal-monitor-april-2023

IMF. (2023). *Fiscal Monitor: Reshaping fiscal policy for a sustainable future.* International Monetary Fund.

IPBES. (2019). *Global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services.* IPBES.

IPCC. (2023). *AR6 Synthesis Report: Climate Change 2023.* Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

International Capital Market Association. (2021). *Sustainability-linked bond principles: Voluntary process guidelines for issuing sustainability-linked bonds.* ICMA. https://www.icmagroup.org/sustainable-finance

International Sustainability Standards Board. (2023). *IFRS S1 – General requirements for disclosure of sustainability-related financial information* and *IFRS S2 – Climate-related disclosures.* IFRS Foundation. https://www.ifrs.org/issued-standards/issb-standards/ .

Kalmykova, Y., Sadagopan, M., & Rosado, L. (2018). Circular economy—from review of theories and practices to development of implementation tools. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling, 135,* 190–201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2017.10.034

Liang, H., & Renneboog, L. (2017). On the foundations of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Finance, 72*(2), 853–910. https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.12487

Mazzucato, M. (2021). *Mission economy: A moonshot guide to changing capitalism.* Penguin.

NGFS. (2019). *A call for action: Climate change as a source of financial risk.* Network for Greening the Financial System.

OECD/G20. (2021). *Statement on a two-pillar solution to address the tax challenges arising from the digitalisation of the economy.* OECD.

O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy.* Crown.

Parry, I. W. H., Black, S., & Vernon, N. (2023). *Still not getting energy prices right: A global and country update of fossil fuel subsidies* (IMF Working Paper 2023/172). International Monetary Fund.

Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century.* Harvard University Press.

Raworth, K. (2017). *Doughnut economics: Seven ways to think like a 21st-century economist.* Chelsea Green Publishing.

SEC. (2022). *The enhancement and standardization of climate-related disclosures for investors* (Release No. 33-11042). U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2010). *Freefall: America, free markets, and the sinking of the world economy.* W. W. Norton.

Stiglitz, J. E., & Stern, N. (Eds.). (2017). *Report of the High-Level Commission on Carbon Prices.* World Bank.

Stout, L. A. (2012). *The shareholder value myth: How putting shareholders first harms investors, corporations and the public.* Berrett-Koehler.

Sullivan, R., & Mackenzie, C. (2016). *Responsible investment: Guide to ESG data providers and relevant trends.* Routledge.

Tapscott, D., & Tapscott, A. (2016). *Blockchain revolution: How the technology behind Bitcoin is changing money, business, and the world.* Penguin.

Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures. (2017). *Final recommendations of the TCFD.* TCFD.

Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures. (2023). *TNFD recommendations.* TNFD.

United Nations. (2021). *System of Environmental-Economic Accounting—Ecosystem Accounting (SEEA EA).* United Nations.

United Nations Environment Programme. (2023). *Adaptation gap report 2023.* UNEP.

World Bank. (2023). *State and trends of carbon pricing 2023.* World Bank. https://carbonpricingdashboard.worldbank.org/

World Economic Forum. (2023). *The Global Risks Report 2023.* WEF.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power.* PublicAffairs.

Zucman, G. (2015). *The hidden wealth of nations: The scourge of tax havens.* University of Chicago Press.