How Do Green Finance and Energy Efficiency Mitigate Carbon Emissions Without Reducing Economic Growth in G7 Countries?
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Climate change is one of the most serious threats facing the world today. Environmental pollution and depletion of natural resources have been highlighted by the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), paving the way for modern concepts such as sustainable growth to be introduced. Therefore, this research explores the relationship between green finance, energy efficiency, and CO₂ emissions in the G7 countries. The study uses panel data model technique to examine the dependence structure of green finance, energy efficiency, and CO₂ emissions. Moreover, we use DEA to construct an energy efficiency index of G7 countries. A specific interval exists between the values of the energy efficiency indexes. Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States were named the most energy-efficient countries in the world, based on results obtained for five consecutive years in this category. However, according to the comparative rankings, France and Italy are the most successful of all the G7 members, followed by the United Kingdom and Germany. Our overall findings of the econometric model confirm the negative impact of green finance and energy efficiency on CO₂ emissions; however, this relationship varies across the different quantiles of the two variables. The findings in the study confirm that green finance is the best financial strategy for reducing CO₂ emissions.
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INTRODUCTION

The burning of fossil fuels, according to environmental scientists, is the primary reason for greenhouse effect (Ahmad et al., 2021; Abbasi et al., 2022). Greenhouse effect is the buildup of heat in the atmosphere (Ali et al., 2021; Hao Y. et al., 2021; Iqbal et al., 2021b). An important consideration in making any decision is a country’s economic growth is the amount of energy it uses (Islam et al., 2021; Ahmad et al., 2022; Irfan and Ahmad, 2022; Irfan et al., 2022). Excessive use of energy, on the other hand, leads to atmospheric emissions of CO₂, SO₂, and CH₄ that degrade the environment (Khan I. et al., 2021; Rauf et al., 2021; Nuvvula et al., 2022). To strike a balance between environmental damage and energy security, restrictions imposed by both the economy and the environment have a role (Tanveer et al., 2021; Wu et al., 2021; Wen et al., 2022). Rapidly rising power demand and prices, resource scarcity, and the social and political consequences of global warming have all contributed to a significant increase in energy security (Razzaq et al., 2020, 2021; Shi et al., 2022). Similarly, rapid economic growth is one of many factors driving up global energy consumption, which has in turn created significant environmental concerns around the world (Yang et al., 2020; Irfan et al., 2021b,c; Xiang et al., 2022). To put it another way, G7 countries...
account for a disproportionate amount of global warming and climate change. A small number of countries have made only the bare minimum effort to reduce global average temperatures, despite their small size (Tang et al., 2022). Many countries lack the financial resources to generate electricity from renewable sources of energy because of their massive economies’ ever-increasing demand for energy (Irfan and Ahmad, 2021; Irfan et al., 2021a). Because of this, rising temperatures are impacting the environment in a bad way.

With the glaciers disappearing and the level of sea rising due to climate change, the hands of time seem to be counting down (Irfan et al., 2020; Elavarasan et al., 2022a,b). More and more people are dying as a result of floods, droughts, heat strokes, and other natural disasters (Elavarasan et al., 2021; Yan et al., 2021). Arctic A threefold increase in heat has been observed in Canada, while temperatures have risen by more than two degrees Celsius over the global average (Li et al., 2021; Hou et al., 2022). People’s homes are being destroyed, food is becoming scarcer, and ravenous animals such as bears are on the loose because of the melting of the glaciers. A total of 200 people lost their lives in Japan in 2018 due to landslides and floods caused by the country’s record-breaking rainfall. Unimaginable heat waves also threatened the region’s most vulnerable species. Extreme weather events will become more frequent and more severe as a result of climate change, and the region’s energy consumption will more than double from its current level (Jin et al., 2021; Wang and Luo, 2022). Japanese continuing construction of coal-fired power stations is regrettable. Japan’s megabanks have spent $186 billion on fossil fuels since the Paris Agreement was signed, showing that the country’s approach to climate change and global warming is worrying. It is possible that 143 million people who have been affected by the effects of climate change will seek refuge in developed countries.

G7 recent progress in creating green financial markets and a green financial system has raised some questions about the role of green finance development in promoting green productivity. Green finance has emerged as a key tool in the green economy transformation. This year’s total green bond issuance was US$55.8 billion, accounting for 22% of world issuance, according to the Climate Bond Initiative (CBI) (Abbas et al., 2020, 2021; Iqbal et al., 2021a; Zeng et al., 2022). Interest in green finance and its impact on economic and environmental sustainability has grown in recent years, as green finance has become more widely available (Zhou et al., 2020; Dmuchowski et al., 2021; Saeed Meo and Karim, 2021; Wang et al., 2022). The impact of green finance development on green productivity research cannot be understated, as it is a major source of green bonds issuance around the world. Using green finance’s capital support function to expedite adjustment of the economic structure and enhance the quality of supply-side investments can help stabilize the growth of the economy from a purely economic standpoint. Sustainable economic and environmental development can be achieved by utilizing the “going green” feature to direct businesses green innovation, environmental protection, and corporate social responsibility and environmental performance (Ahukaemere et al., 2020; Yu et al., 2022).

The current study’s contributions are summarized as follows: In the first place, we fill a void in academic report by examining the link between green finance, energy efficiency, and environmental degradation. The development of green finance is a significant influencer. Energy efficiency in contrast to the green productivity is typically measured in terms of scale, technology, and structure; this is a common approach to measuring green productivity. As a result, a better understanding of the factors influencing green productivity can be gleaned from the financial as well as the real estate industries. For a clearer picture of the impact of green finance in the green economy, we introduce comprehensive low-carbon financial flows and investment in environmentally friendly products and services are just two of the many ways to measure the impact on climate change from a more holistic perspective. In terms of green finance, the use of a multidimensional index could result in a more comprehensive evaluation of its development. Third, we use them to address the potential omission of energy and environmental constraints, a super-SBM model with undesirable output has been developed, in contrast to previous productivity studies that primarily focused on good output.

The rest of the document is organized as follows: To begin, section “Introduction” provides an overview; section “Literature Review” details the data and methodology; section “Methodology and Data” provides an overview of the findings; and section “Results and Discussion” concludes the study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Concept of Green Finance
Finance for, on the other hand, climate change adaptation and mitigation are important provided. However, green finance encompasses not only climate finance, but also a wider range of financial services and products that are focused on a wide objective for the environment such as pollution control, conservation of biodiversity, and natural recourses preservation. However, since its inception in 2010, the Green Climate Fund (GCF) has provided financial assistance to developing nations so that they can better prepare for and cope with the effects of climate change (Pan and Chen, 2021; Zhang et al., 2021a). It was also identified that green finance is essential to financing climate change action following the adoption in 2015 of the Paris Agreement and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRRR) (Truby et al., 2022). Various public and private financial institutions are a part of this, along with a variety of asset classes such as “green bonds,” “green loans,” “green funds,” “green banks,” and “green credits,” as well as “climate finance,” “environmentalism,” “carbon finance,” “sustainable finance,” and “sustainable bonds (Wang and Dong, 2022).” Green financing is clearly as a climate change mitigation strategy for green buildings strategy in the building sector. GF-in-GBs will be discussed in depth in the sections that follow, as well as suggestions for how it can be applied better in the future in terms of research, policy, and clinical practice (Huang et al., 2021; Latif et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2021; Mohsin et al., 2021).
Green Finance and Environmental Performance

Effects of financial assistance, resource allocation, and technological advancement, and so on are just a few of the ways that green finance can influence environmental performance. The capital support effect shows that it is possible to achieve better environmental performance by using low-energy, low-pollution, and low-carbon emissions are the goals of green finance while also discouraging high-pollution and high-emission production behavior. According to Srivastava et al. (2021), the creation of a green credit policy in the People’s Republic of China affects the financing costs of enterprises. For high-emission and high-pollution businesses, green credit raises the cost of financing, while it lowers the cost of financing for environmentally friendly businesses, according to their empirical findings. van Veelen (2021) examines the macro-mechanistic role of development of green finance and the effects of green finance on the eco-system is examined. According to the researchers, the impact of green finance varies by region on ecological efficiency.

For example, green finance has the ability to increase capital efficiency and redirect the redirection of financial resources from inefficient and polluting operations industries toward more efficient ones, thereby promoting industrial upgrading, optimizing the energy structure of the economy, and improving the quality of life in the surrounding area. On the basis of micro-mechanics discovered, Zhang et al. (2021b) investigate the impact of a green-credit policy on the loan performance of enterprises. Findings suggest that refusal businesses are credible to pay higher interest rates and have a more difficult time securing loan because of this. In order to improve environmental quality at the macroeconomic level, a well-developed financial system can help alleviate financial constraints on environmentally friendly businesses and promote green upgrading.

This innovation effect in technology means that green finance can help companies that are pursuing green technology innovation obtain external credit, thereby reducing energy consumption while simultaneously promoting growth in the green industry and reducing environmental damage and pollution. Toward this end, Khan M. A. et al. (2021) developed a green loan theory that incorporates the interests of businesses, banks, and the government. It is concluded that government subsidies can lower the cost of financing for businesses, increasing the likelihood that they will implement technological innovation. For high-polluting enterprises, Iqbal et al. (2021a) investigate the influence of a green credit policy on green innovation. A statistically significant increase in green patents was found to be a result of the implementation of the “Green Credit Guidelines” in 2012.

METHODOLOGY AND DATA

Energy Efficiency

Both the energy economics and environmental index have been used to build the model, which was first introduced by Lozano and Gutiérrez (2008) and later developed further by Mostafa (2011). Slack-based models are being used broadly in a wide range of energy and environmental studies today. Frequently, corporations prioritize beneficial output maximization over model efficiency maximization, while they are equally concerned with minimizing nasty output minimization. At the same time, the manufacturing process is unavoidably enriched by a wide range of contaminants and wastes, including greenhouse gases and other forms of contamination. Maintaining a healthy balance between environmental performance and growth in the economy are linked is essential. Let n be the number of components of the energy vector, economic and environmental variable with entity. A common practice in developing the EVI to rank environmental performance of numerous entities, each underlying entity is ranked according to an environmental index, which can be differentiated from one another by the choice of ordering based on Rn. EVI can also be developed using the mapping function I = Rn→R, which may meet the following condition:

\[ V_k \succ V_l \iff I(V_k) \geq I(V_l) \forall k, l \in [1, \ldots, K] \]  

Conversion functions are used to show how the basic units n-factored evaluation can be changed as:

\[ F : (V_{k1}, \ldots, V_{kn}) \rightarrow (f_1(V_{k1}), \ldots, f_n(V_{kn})) \]  

When it comes to the extension, the acceptable transformation is involved in this manner as stated by Galvão et al. (2011) and Son et al. (2014) that satisfies, according to EVI, a series of numerous fundamental entities, each of which is expected to elect invariant, is used to evaluate the acceptable transformation of the underlying indicators in order to construct an EVI index for economic, energy, and environmental indicators in each of the three categories.

\[ V_k \succ V_l \iff F(V_k) \geq F(V_l) \forall k, l \in [1, \ldots, K] \]  

Using a ratio scale and only positive variables, this study (Rasoulinezhad and Taghizadeh-Hesary, 2022) found that the geometric mean produced an important index, proving the geometric mean’s significance. In order to quantify alternative aggregation procedures for the development of energy and environmental indices, Ye et al. (2022) developed criteria for estimating information loss. It was also described in detail how Liu et al. (2021) developed the non-compensatory aggregation method, including its use in energy and environmental studies. In addition to the normalization and aggregation of data, a variety of other studies are conducted using composite indicators and weighting.

The DMU0, on the other hand, is efficient if pollution-free environmental efficiency is the primary goal of the study. When it comes to creating an environmentally friendly DMU0, model number 4 is used, primarily for assessing economic efficiency using the SBM model, which utilizes DMUs’ common input and output variables. DMU0 is only efficient when slacks are equal to zero, and only in this case does model 3 meet this requirement. It generates environmental efficiency values when model no 2 is used, while model no 3 generates economic...
efficiency values when an optimal adverse output from model no 2 is used as a fixative level. According to the findings of Chen et al. (2021), the combined index developed by the researchers can be used for both environmental and economic efficiency modeling. Even though these efficiency values were replicated, the process of obtaining this score has been lengthy. A non-parametric approach in conjunction with linear programming was used in this study to create an index of energy efficiency (EEE) by calculating the average sum of the binary efficiency values. With this, we can classify the most effective frontier practices and assess the relative performance of each of the underlying indicators in light of inputs and outputs from comparable and quantifiable sources (Nawaz et al., 2021).

To demonstrate the systematic productivity and performance of various objects or decision-making units, researchers have turned to data envelopment analysis (DEA), also known as DEA assessment (Bhuiyan et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2022). It is used to evaluate energy and environmental performance by taking into account the difference between desirable and undesirable outcomes. Zhou et al. (2022), laid the groundwork for the acceptance of a non-parametric DEA frontier practice to measure the undesirable outputs of energy and environmental performance. To distinguish between certain output and input variables, the underlying vectors of variable are exchanged through another set of underlying variables X and outputs in that order. On the contrary, it treats each and every one of its inputs as if they were all identical.

$$\text{max} \frac{1}{\lambda} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{S_i^k}{R_i^k} \right)$$

$$S_i = \sum_{k=1}^{K} y_{ik} z_k - S_r^i = y_{0i}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m$$

$$S = \sum_{k=1}^{K} y_{rk} z_k = y_{0r}, \quad r = 1, \ldots, S$$

$$S = \sum_{k=1}^{K} z_k = 0, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m$$

$$z_k > 0, \quad S_i^k > 0, \quad S_r^i > 0$$ (5)

**Econometric Estimation**

The estimations are made using a panel country fixed-effects model. Countries’ fixed effects (i.e., unobservable factors) are shown in Eq. (1). All the time-invariant variations between countries are accounted for by the country fixed effects (such as cultural factors). To be clear, panel fixed-effect models are frequently employed in studies examining the causes of air pollution. The first model is written as:

$$\text{CO}_2_{it} = \beta_1 G F_{it} + \beta_2 E E_{it} + \beta_3 X_{it} + v_{it} + u_{it}$$ (6)

where is $\text{CO}_2$ emissions of country $i$ at year $t$; $G F$ represents green finance index and includes the current as well as one lag of this index; is the energy efficiency of country $i$ at year $t$ and $X$ is a vector of control variables; $v_{it}$ is the country-fixed effects; $i = 1, \ldots, n$ denotes the country; and $u_{it}$ is the error term.

All variables, with the exception of the energy efficiency index, renewable energy consumption, and urbanization rate, are transformed into logarithmic values for the purposes of estimation and forecasting. Detailed descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) for the variables are provided in Table 1.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Energy Efficiency**

Although the specific trend of German $\text{CO}_2$ emissions has become significantly higher than the common trend over the past

| Variable | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min. | Max. |
|----------|------|-----------|------|------|
| EE       | 0.52 | 0.698     | 0.446 | 1    |
| GF       | 0.302 | 0.0746   | 0.199 | 0.621 |
| PGDP     | 10.13 | 0.576     | 8.528 | 11.53 |
| RE       | 94.98 | 40.65     | 3.8  | 242.3 |
| URB      | 54.11 | 13.65     | 27   | 90   |
| IND      | 38.74 | 8.484     | 11.84 | 53.04 |
| TRADE    | 30.34 | 36.54     | 1.69 | 172.2 |
| FDI      | 2.258 | 1.728     | 0.01 | 8.19 |
| EDU      | 8.829 | 0.985     | 6.59 | 12.68 |
| R&D      | 1.47  | 1.061     | 0.2  | 6.01 |
few decades, it follows the common trend. Finally, average trends are increasing and emissions in Italy are trending horizontally. For instance, most developed countries seem to converge at the highest peaks, except for Canada and France, which seem to have a different path to efficiency, even though they started to be the most energy-consuming countries during this period. Fossil energy processes, which produce large amounts of carbon dioxide emissions, were largely responsible for the majority of global economic growth in the twentieth century. According to policymakers, any reduction in carbon dioxide emissions will have an adverse effect on the economy. The economies of major countries continue to struggle even with reduced emissions. Like the United States can grow their GDP and their economic output, but pollution does not have to rise at the same time. This is based on new subjective evidence, however. That’s because industries and economies are moving away from large energy-intensive technologies and toward smaller ones. Between 0.65 and 0.70 is a structural shift, efficiency, and the typical intensity of energy index Structural reallocation has resulted in an increase in energy intensity and a decrease in their energy efficiency.

This study employs the DEA models to assess the efficiency of energy consumption, environment-economy and CO₂ emissions for the G7 economies, the efficiency of energy use and CO₂ emission efficiency, separately, and economic efficiency and environmental efficiency. These pursue an equilibrium between the economic development and environmental performance of a country. However, the comparative rankings indicate that France and Italy are the best amongst all considered members.

Energy concentration cannot be used to assess the efficiency of any country’s energy consumption, as can be seen from a comparison of the two concepts’ relative effectiveness in terms of energy consumption and concentration. Consequently, France and Italy were recognized as equally competent and well-performing countries during the periods, whereas Japan, Canada, and the United States are the last three economies among all G7 members for almost every year with respect to CO₂ emission efficiency. For all G7 countries, the efficiency scores are less than 0.50 for emission efficiency of CO₂, enlightening greatly significant variances among G7 economies in emission efficiency of CO₂. Additionally, the majority of G7 countries’ research studies have greater points in environmental economic efficiency as compared to CO₂ emission efficiency, where Canada and France are the two milestones and benchmarking markets. Japan and France are the two milestones and benchmarking markets that were recognized as efficient in both CO₂ emissions and energy consumption. Considering a greater extent of economic and environmental efficiency, it is concluded that the majority of the G7 countries demonstrated better economic efficiency as compared to environmental efficiency. When studying the relationships between energy consumption efficiency and emission efficiency of CO₂, the study concluded that energy consumption efficiency and emission efficiency of CO₂ can help to decrease environmental condition.

This was achieved by assessing the environmental and energy equity. The energy intensity and environmental index analysis shows the best score, where the United Kingdom and the United States are the two countries with the worst results. For countries, maintaining economic development without affecting energy utilization is quite challenging - the development of energy-related efficiency in the world’s major economies, while reducing energy waste and pollution Taghizadeh-Hesary et al. (2021) concluded that energy consumption and economic growth are directly related to energy and environmental efficiency.

Table 2 shows energy intensity and energy efficiency scores. In this study, energy, economy, and environmental indicators are used to measure energy, economic, and environmental efficiency and CO₂ emissions. The G7 countries’ economic and environmental efficiency scores show the best undesirable output should be fixed to generate an economic efficiency score for environmental efficiency. In general countries with greater economic and environmental efficiency, according to the findings scores have a more efficient economy and environment than countries with lower economic or environmental efficiency scores. There are two countries in the world that are less efficient than France and Canada.

### Econometric Estimation

The fixed effects are shown in Table 3. It appears that green finance development can increase the level of green productivity at the 5% level, based on GF coefficients as the primary explanatory variable. There is strong evidence it is possible to achieve a win-win situation with green investment and credit for both the environment and the economy, which in turn can lead to increased green economic development. As a result, in order to alleviate China’s financial constraints, the country’s central government should focus on this issue alone by businesses while undertaking environmental-friendly activities, which necessitates the development of an operating green financial system. Companies are more likely to do so to get actively involved in green economic development activities if they did this.

Evidence shows that most control variables are statistically significant in terms of their influence. The positive correlation between GDP per capita and R&D shows that the more economic progress and technological advancement there is, the greater the

| TABLE 2 | Energy efficiency of G7 countries. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| Canada | 0.51 | 0.45 | 0.49 | 0.41 | 0.55 | 0.59 | 0.55 | 0.68 | 0.49 | 0.63 |
| France | 0.88 | 0.87 | 0.94 | 0.88 | 0.97 | 0.93 | 0.88 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Germany | 0.47 | 0.45 | 0.41 | 0.51 | 0.37 | 0.44 | 0.26 | 0.34 | 0.33 | 0.38 |
| Italy | 0.88 | 0.82 | 0.86 | 0.77 | 0.69 | 0.77 | 0.72 | 0.66 | 0.74 | 0.76 |
| Japan | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.61 | 0.45 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.21 | 0.24 | 0.19 | 0.22 |
| United Kingdom | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.99 | 1 | 1 | 0.98 | 1 | 0.95 | 0.98 |
| United States | 0.46 | 0.45 | 0.41 | 0.46 | 0.34 | 0.35 | 0.37 | 0.39 | 0.37 | 0.39 |
TABLE 3 | Results of fixed-effects regressions.

| Variable | OLS     | Fixed effect |
|----------|---------|--------------|
| GF       | -0.002  | -0.001       |
|          | (-0.31) | (-0.029)     |
| EE       | -0.019***| -0.133***    |
|          | (-7.52) | (-9.31)      |
| RE       | 0.028** | 0.031*       |
|          | (-2.49) | (-1.327)     |
| GDPpc    | -0.007**| -0.111*      |
|          | (-2.018)| (-1.327)     |
| Trade    | -0.003***| -0.054       |
|          | (-4.052)| (-1.342)     |
| Education| 0.021***| 0.0132       |
|          | (-3.933)| -0.895       |
| R&D      | 0.012   | 0.236        |
|          | (-0.342)| (-1.358)     |
| Urbanization | -0.007** | -0.009*    |
|          | (-2.269)| (-1.843)     |
| Constant | 1.022***| 1.321***     |
|          | (-18.55)| (-19.31)     |
| Observations | 1.044 | 698        |
| Firms   | 98      | 72           |
| Likelihood | 477.22 | 423.62      |
| Wald chi | 543.82  | 488.42       |

Significance levels: * = 0.1, ** = 0.05, *** = 0.01.

potential for increasing green productivity. The findings of Sun et al. (2022) are supported by these findings. However, R&D return the local scientific and technological capabilities that have a positive effect on economic growth Zhang and Vigne (2021). Research and development, on the other hand, can improve the quality of the environment (Huang et al., 2021). The coefficients of trade indicate that the amount of green output decreases with time the structure of how much and how much energy is used in industrialization. We had expected these results, and they confirm our suspicions about China’s excessive urbanization and reliance on coal consumption (Chien et al., 2021; Lee and Lee, 2022; Ning et al., 2022). According to the EDU coefficient, a high degree of traditional education is associated with low green productivity. The wealth effect in emerging economies is to blame for this. To put it another way, a higher level of education tends to lead to an increased demand for energy, which has a negative impact on the environment (Sun et al., 2022).

In addition, 27 percent of coal was used, and there was a noticeable change in 2009. As a result, in 2009, OECD countries reduced their use by around 4.7%, which is on par with the rate in 2000. Sustainable development requires that energy demand be met without compromising the need for environmental protection (Usman et al., 2022). In most cases, the political economy provides a financial foundation for evaluating the degree of energy efficiency in relation to power output per unit. A developing various study are settled in Germany, which have added to activity efficiency of energy by specializing in the analysis of efficiency of total-factor. Whereas, our findings are supported by the study of Hassan et al. (2022). According to these studies, a combination of energy inputs and resources such as greenhouse emissions are used during the combined production process. Zhao S. et al. (2022) evaluated electricity based on a rank-based system. Analysis of energy efficiency in the G7 countries was conducted by Zhang et al. (2022) using Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) to evaluate the total-factor structure. Economical models require the factors that lead to higher energy performance measures to be taken into account. When Zhao X. et al. (2022) conducted their research to provide environmental upgrading submissions, they relied solely on the investigation of energy potency and the environmental Kuznets curve.

The empirical evidence of this lies beyond the scope of the present study. Therefore, the proposed research study comprises GHG releases; i.e., emissions only for the purpose to unearth the real image of eco-friendly degradation. Renewable energy reduces the environmental deterioration and climate vulnerability (Zahoor et al., 2022). Furthermore, Canada has its energy security and has massive reserves of crude oil, and has vital and effective policies.

Sensitivity Analysis With Another Measure for Green Finance

The results of sensitivity analysis are shown in Table 4. Equation 1 is re-estimated by replacing the green finance index substituting other proxies for green financing. The total each country’s Climate Bond issue from 2010 to 2019 is known as Climate Bonds. The Climate Bonds Initiative database serves as the source of this variable’s data. An important relationship between GDP growth and greenhouse gas emissions has been found (it caused increase of GHG releases, i.e., emissions with the perspective of Canada due to growth in GDP). GHG emissions, i.e., emissions were positively impacted by the gross domestic product growth that matches, i.e., GDP. When it comes to per capita emissions of greenhouse gases and energy security, countries that use more energy face similar issues as other countries that use more energy (Hao L. N. et al., 2021; Tawiah et al., 2021). Fossil fuel subsidies have been linked to higher GHG emissions and decreased energy security in both developed and less developed countries, according to numerous studies. Furthermore, a number of in both developed and welfare

TABLE 4 | Sensitivity analysis.

| Independent variables | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|-----------------------|----|----|----|----|
| Climate bonds         | -0.2702***| -0.1319*| -0.1284*| -0.1933*** |
|                       | (0.0658) | (0.0769) | (0.0737) | (0.0600) |
| GDP                   | 1.3807***| 0.9317***| 0.8345***| 1.2642*** |
|                       | (0.1133) | (0.1866) | (0.2447) | (0.1110) |
| Population            | 0.3698** | 0.4568** | (0.1231) | (0.1810) |
| Urbanization          | 0.6599   | (0.3966) |        |        |
| RE                    | -1.5191  | -0.5514 | (2.112)  | (1.0316) |
| R²                    | 0.7356   | 0.7720  | 58.77    | 45.12   |
| F-statistic           | 83.62*** | 79.19   | 0.7780   | 0.7767  |
| Observations          | 61        | 61      | 61       | 61      |

Significance levels: * = 0.1, ** = 0.05, *** = 0.01.
In order to the environment and a clear production process must be maintained at all times process and the use of renewable energy are necessary (Dong et al., 2022). Carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere are expected to rise as a result of an increase in the amount of energy used by industries, according to the study by Dong et al. (2022). This year, CO₂ concentrations in the atmosphere reached 400 ppm on an annual basis, which is 40% higher than the level in 2016. Emissions of carbon dioxide (CO₂) have decreased by nearly half since 1980, according to Debrah et al. (2022) and Khan H. et al. (2022).

The United Nations (UN) eco-friendly program is reflected in the energy policies of European countries. A wide range of options are available thanks to new warning technologies and intelligent monitoring. Different and specific methods are recommended to ensure sustainable, environmentally friendly, and crystal-clear production. It is only possible to maintain a clean production through continuous application of a mutually cautious recyclable strategy, which maintains because of its environmental friendliness. Due to the fact that immaculate creation's application in a wide range of industries, as it necessitates the consumption of the atmosphere's natural resources (Hu et al., 2022). For example, Proper waste management would be ensured by an efficient environmental management system through investment in research and development. It's impossible to know how technological advancements will affect carbon emissions without evidence. Because of a rise in economic growth and greater openness to trade, research and development may have an impact on environmental quality, given the positive impact on the expansion and trade of R&D. Energy and environmental efficiency may be enhanced by new technologies, but increased production may still necessitate greater use of natural resources, resulting in higher emissions of CO₂. As existing knowledge reserves grow, it becomes more difficult to achieve new developments, resulting in lower levels of R&D over time. Economic expansion, on the other hand, necessitates a greater use of natural resources.

Historically, the G7 countries have been larger energy consumers. Various studies on these countries assess their economic growth, energy efficiency, and resilience by considering poor output, energy input, and non-discrimination. However, the contribution of developed countries toward global energy consumption has declined over time. Generally, over the past three decades, the G7 countries have been considered and characterized like the countries with a large industrial volume of production, international gas releases, i.e., emissions, energy utilization, and trade. The goal of this study is to determine how much energy is being used intensity, energy efficiency, and environmental index of these nations, as they contribute entirely a huge volume of releases, i.e., emissions and that is equal to the total worlds' emissions. Thus, energy consumption is a major concern because of an increase in foreign-imported energy prices. In the meantime, the extensive use of imported oil increases the CO₂ emission level, which ultimately causes global warming and climate change, decreases farming yield, and threatens human life. In this situation, a new philosophy is a necessity for energy consumption and sustainable economic growth. The logical reason behind selecting the G7 countries is that it shows the divergent results and contains the alarming figure of energy consumption and CO₂ emission (Hao et al., 2022; Khan I. et al., 2022). Trends in the United States, Canada, and France are usually much higher than the average trends, although CO₂ emissions in France have converged into a common trend over the past three decades. Japan and the United Kingdom are clearly below the average trend, although UK carbon dioxide emissions have been closer to the average trend in recent decades.

CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATION

Eco-friendly index estimation and alternative methods when it comes to evaluating the effectiveness of energy use and environmental impact are the consequences of the proposed research. With less GHG emissions and renewable energy releases metrics, the lack of efficient environmental performance suggests an overview of GHG's releases (toxic emissions). Measuring energy concentration and energy efficiency was a perplexing issue that is being faced around the globe to resolve this, an environmental, i.e., eco-friendly index was developed. Keeping in view to construct an eco-friendly index of all G7 nations, applied both arithmetic mean aggregation and DEA, i.e., Data Envelopment Analysis to develop a mathematical aggregation tool. To support the methodology of this study, the standardized EVI was developed by adopting a non-parametric frontier approach. Therefore, in future, further assessment on decision-makers' preferred weight and rank information may be incorporated. Results of the proposed research work suggest implementing the below recommendations. The main factor of global warming is the utilization of energy; therefore, it must be reduced. Research and development expenditures increase by 1% for every 1% increase costs, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and the United States reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 0.18, 0.27, 0.22, 0.09, 0.31, and 0.32%, respectively. In the United Kingdom, a 1% An increase in R&D spending will result in a 0.62 percent increase in emissions, but after accounting for this discrepancy, the effect will be negative. The turning point for valid environmental situations in all countries, except Japan was between $6933 and $36,255.
We Proposed the Following Policy Framework

- In the short term, these countries may continue to operate at a relatively high level of inefficiency unless their governments change their management style or alter their policies. In another way, short-term policies in these economies will increase energy security and carbon emissions. Even though developing countries are making steady progress, developed economies are reluctant to follow suit until their own performance improves.
- It has also been found that by focusing on the economies of each country in the proposed G7 group and comparing their environmental performance, convergence appears to be greater or stronger than it would have been otherwise.
- It is imperative that developing countries take steps to encourage the growth of renewable energy use. Reducing the use of fossil fuels, for example, is an important step toward reducing energy-related carbon dioxide emissions and fostering a green economy. In addition, the growth of fossil fuels should be regulated to ensure sufficient growth. Developing low-carbon energy requires space. The most appropriate and cost-effective way to reduce the environmental impact of energy production is to improve energy efficiency.
- As a result of extreme weather conditions, disasters, and natural disasters, policymakers must increase their ability to resist energy shortages; this would improve energy equity. Oil import risks could be reduced and outdoor oil dependence reduced if energy prices are fixed and not affected by supply and demand or by the use of renewable energy sources.

Thus, G7 countries should continue to implement innovation-driven approaches and move toward a more enhanced ability to innovate; this can help improve performance by commercializing research and development from G7 nations. Consequently,

- G7 countries play a supporting role for the region's ecological environment, but the province is the most polluted G7 region. In order to protect their natural environments, countries in South Asia must enforce strict environmental protection legislation and implement shared avoidance, control, and law measures. This would improve environmental quality to the point where it would be more robust to support and guarantee superior economic growth.
- With regard to those who live in cities ranging from small to large have the potential to improve environmental efficiency, although it is expected that industrial transfer demonstration zones will positively contribute.
- In order to reap the benefits of policy-making connected to the industrial transfer demonstration zone, the zone's policy welfare should be continually improved.
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