



<https://doi.org/10.64211/oidaijsd190301>

Green Banking and Sustainable Development: A Systematic Review of Global Practices and Policy Trends

Smitha S ¹, Ramesh Chandrahasa ²

^{1,2} Institute of Management Studies, Davangere University,
Davangere, Karnataka, India.

² Corresponding author: drrcmay@gmail.com

© Author (s)

OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development, Ontario International Development Agency, Canada.

ISSN 1923-6654 (print) ISSN 1923-6662 (online) www.oidaijsd.com

Also available at <https://www.ssrn.com/index.cfm/en/oida-intl-journal-sustainable-dev/>

Abstract: This paper systematically reviews global green banking practices and their role in promoting sustainable development. Using conceptual lenses such as the Triple Bottom Line, Stakeholder Theory, and Institutional Theory, the review explores how banks integrate environmental, social, and governance (ESG) criteria into operations. Case examples from developed (EU, USA, UK) and emerging economies (India, China, Brazil) highlight regulatory frameworks, policy trends, and institutional initiatives such as green bonds, climate risk assessment, and ESG disclosures. The study outlines key benefits including brand trust, climate risk mitigation, and access to green capital. It also discusses challenges such as greenwashing, lack of standardization, and limited technical capacity. Future directions recommend global taxonomies, capacity-building initiatives, fintech integration, and regulatory incentives. The review underscores the strategic importance of green banking in advancing the global sustainability agenda.

Keywords: Green banking, sustainable development, green finance, ESG, SDGs, policy review, environmental sustainability, sustainable finance

Introduction

In recent years, global attention to climate change, natural resource depletion, and widening social inequities has intensified, placing sustainability at the forefront of policy and economic agendas. Within this evolving landscape, the financial sector has emerged not only as a driver of economic growth but also as a critical enabler of sustainable transformation. Among the sector's strategic responses, green banking has gained prominence as a model wherein financial institutions integrate environmental sustainability into their core operations, investment portfolios, and product offerings.

Green banking represents a paradigm shift in how banks contribute to sustainable development, supporting a low-carbon economy while addressing environmental risks. It aligns closely with key United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly SDG 13 (Climate Action), SDG 7 (Affordable and Clean Energy), and SDG 9 (Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure). As banks increasingly adopt Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) principles, green banking has become central to fostering resilience, ethical finance, and inclusive growth.

This paper presents a systematic secondary review of global green banking practices, drawing on theoretical frameworks such as the Triple Bottom Line, Stakeholder Theory, and Institutional Theory. The study explores how green banking contributes to sustainable development by examining policy frameworks, regulatory trends, and institutional initiatives across both developed and emerging economies.

Objectives of the Study

- To systematically review global green banking practices and their role in promoting sustainable development.

- To analyze key policy frameworks and regulatory trends shaping green banking across developed and developing economies.

Methodology

This study adopts a systematic literature review (SLR) methodology using secondary data from:

- Peer-reviewed journals (Scopus, Web of Science, Emerald, Elsevier, Springer)
- Reports by institutions such as the World Bank, UNEP FI, RBI, BIS, IMF, and OECD
- Regulatory guidelines and national banking frameworks
- Articles published between 2010 and 2024

The qualitative dataset comprised approximately 35 academic papers, 15 policy reports, and 10 regulatory publications published between 2010 and 2024. This sample size was deemed sufficient to capture regional and thematic diversity in green banking practices. The rationale for this selection is based on theoretical saturation—the point at which additional sources yield minimal new insights. The chosen sample ensures comprehensive coverage of both developed and emerging economies while maintaining analytical depth and relevance.

To mitigate internal biases inherent in qualitative research, a rigorous screening and triangulation process was employed, which helped to gain a deeper understanding of the topic. Data were cross-verified from multiple credible sources, including peer-reviewed journals, institutional reports, and regulatory frameworks, to ensure reliability and validity. Interpretive bias was minimized by following a structured coding approach, comparing findings across regions and policy contexts. This reflexive method enhanced objectivity and ensured that interpretations were grounded in empirical evidence rather than researcher's assumptions.

Theoretical Framework

This study is underpinned by three prominent theoretical frameworks that explain the rationale, behavior, and institutionalization of green banking practices globally. These frameworks help examine how financial institutions respond to sustainability challenges through policy, regulation, and stakeholder engagement.

Triple Bottom Line (TBL) Framework

The Triple Bottom Line (TBL) framework emphasizes that businesses should operate in a way that balances economic prosperity, social equity, and environmental responsibility. In the context of green banking, TBL drives banks to extend their performance goals beyond profit to include environmental stewardship and community well-being [1, 2].

Green banking practices such as financing clean energy projects, reducing paper-based operations, and promoting green bonds align with this triple bottom line approach. This framework is especially relevant for evaluating the long-term sustainability impacts of banking services in both developed and developing countries.

Stakeholder Theory

Stakeholder Theory asserts that organizations must account for the interests of all stakeholders—not just shareholders. For banks, this includes customers, employees, regulators, investors, and the wider community. Green banking practices are often shaped by stakeholder pressures, such as public demand for ethical investment, regulatory expectations for climate risk disclosures, and investor interest in ESG compliance [3, 4].

This theory helps explain why banks are increasingly integrating sustainability goals into their mission statements, investment decisions, and risk assessments, aiming to satisfy multiple stakeholder demands for transparency and accountability.

Institutional Theory

Institutional Theory provides a framework to understand how organizations respond to external pressures, such as regulations, norms, and market expectations. In the green banking context, regulatory authorities, global sustainability initiatives, and industry benchmarks serve as institutional forces that influence banks to adopt environmentally responsible policies [5, 6].

For instance, central banks and financial regulators in several countries have issued green credit guidelines, ESG disclosure mandates, and climate stress-testing protocols. This theory explains the convergence of green banking practices globally and the variance in adoption rates across regions, depending on the strength of institutional pressures.

Table 1: Summary of Theoretical Relevance

Theory	Application in Green Banking	Supported By
Triple Bottom Line	Encourages a balance between profit, environmental impact, and social responsibility	[1], [2]
Stakeholder Theory	Emphasizes the need to serve all stakeholders, including regulators and communities	[3], [4]
Institutional Theory	Explains how external norms and regulations shape banking behavior	[5], [6]

Global Green Banking Practices

Green banking has gained momentum globally as financial institutions align themselves with the climate agenda, ESG principles, and national sustainability goals. While the adoption and enforcement vary across regions, several countries have emerged as leaders in green finance. This section provides an overview of green banking practices in developed and emerging economies, highlighting policy tools, institutional actions, and innovations that shape the green banking landscape.

Developed Economies

European Union (EU)

The EU is a pioneer in green banking, driven by its comprehensive European Green Deal and EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities. The European Central Bank (ECB) has integrated climate-related risks into monetary policy and prudential supervision. Banks are encouraged or required to:

- Conduct climate stress testing.
- Integrate ESG risks into credit evaluation.
- Report sustainability performance under the Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation (SFDR) [7].

United States

In the U.S., green banking is largely driven by market forces and investor demand. Although federal mandates are limited, key initiatives include:

- Expansion of the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) to support low-carbon community projects.
- Major financial institutions like JPMorgan Chase and Bank of America committing billions in sustainable finance [8].
- Voluntary adoption of Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) guidelines and ESG investing practices [9].

United Kingdom (UK)

The Bank of England (BoE) has taken a proactive stance on green finance. It mandates:

- Climate-related stress testing for banks and insurers.
- Development of a green taxonomy aligned with global standards.
- Inclusion of climate risks in regulatory capital requirements [10].

Emerging Economies

India

India’s green banking movement is led by the Reserve Bank of India (RBI) and supported by various public-sector initiatives:

- Green Banking Guidelines (issued through circulars and discussion papers).
- Small Industries Development Bank of India (SIDBI) issuing green bonds for MSME sustainability projects.
- State Bank of India (SBI) financing large-scale renewable energy and electric mobility initiatives [11].

Further, regulatory push is complemented by initiatives like ESG indexing by stock exchanges and SEBI’s green bond framework.

China

China has one of the most structured approaches to green banking in the developing world. Key efforts include:

- Green Credit Policy mandating commercial banks to incorporate environmental criteria in lending decisions.
- Establishment of Green Finance Pilot Zones across provinces to experiment with climate-related disclosures, subsidies, and tax incentives [12].
- Leading global green bond issuer, with strong central-bank backing.

Brazil

The Central Bank of Brazil (Banco Central do Brasil) integrates sustainability into financial regulation by:

- Requiring banks to assess climate and environmental risks in credit analysis.
- Encouraging voluntary adherence to ESG principles and biodiversity conservation financing [13].

Brazil’s experience demonstrates how natural capital preservation and sustainable finance can be combined in a biodiversity-rich context.

Policy and Regulatory Trends

Green banking is increasingly influenced by a shift toward mandatory environmental, social, and governance (ESG) compliance, risk disclosure, and climate stress testing across nations. The following table summarizes major policy initiatives globally:

Table 2:

Country/Region	Regulatory Authority	Key Initiative
EU	European Commission	EU Taxonomy, Green Bond Standard [14]
India	Reserve Bank of India (RBI)	Environmental Risk Management Framework [11]
China	People’s Bank of China (PBOC)	Green Credit Guidelines [12]
Global	BIS, IMF, UNEP FI	Climate stress tests, sustainability disclosures [9]

Key regulatory elements across these policies include:

- Environmental risk assessment in lending practices, mandating financial institutions to incorporate climate-related risks into credit decision-making [11][12].
- Mandatory ESG reporting for listed entities and financial institutions to improve transparency and support sustainable investing [14][10].
- Green bond issuance frameworks, such as the EU Green Bond Standard, which provide assurance mechanisms for investors [14].
- Climate stress testing, led by central banks like the Bank of England and global bodies like BIS and IMF, assesses systemic climate risk in financial systems [9][10].

These trends illustrate how regulatory frameworks are converging globally toward a more standardized approach to green banking and sustainable finance.

Benefits and Challenges of Green Banking

Benefits

The integration of green banking practices offers significant advantages for financial institutions and the broader socio-environmental context:

- **Enhanced Reputation and Brand Trust:** Banks adopting green initiatives are perceived as socially responsible institutions, which boosts public trust and customer loyalty [15].

- **Climate Risk Mitigation:** By incorporating environmental risk assessments, banks can reduce their exposure to non-performing assets caused by climate-related events and disruptions [16].
- **Access to Green Capital Markets:** Financial institutions engaged in sustainable finance can attract international funding through green bonds and ESG-focused investment instruments, increasing liquidity and financial resilience [8].
- **Support to National and Global Sustainability Goals:** Green banking initiatives are aligned with global frameworks like the Paris Agreement and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), reinforcing national commitments toward climate action and inclusive growth [10].

Challenges

Despite its growing relevance, the green banking movement faces several operational and structural hurdles:

- **Lack of Universal Green Taxonomy:** The absence of harmonized definitions of green finance across countries results in regulatory fragmentation, creating barriers for cross-border green investments [6].
- **Greenwashing Risks:** In the absence of stringent monitoring and verification mechanisms, institutions may overstate their green credentials, thereby misleading stakeholders and damaging credibility [13].
- **Limited Technical Expertise:** Many banks, especially in developing economies, lack the necessary human capital to assess environmental risks and design innovative green financial products [17].
- **Underdeveloped Green Capital Markets:** Several regions face systemic constraints in scaling green finance due to shallow or immature capital markets and limited investor participation [6], [14].

Future Directions and Policy Recommendations

To advance green banking as a cornerstone of sustainable development, the following policy and strategic directions are proposed:

- **Establish a Unified Global Green Taxonomy:** Regulatory authorities, multilateral banks, and international organizations should collaborate to build a standardized green taxonomy. Such a framework will increase transparency, reduce confusion, and facilitate cross-border sustainable investments [6], [14].
- **Capacity Building and ESG Training:** Financial institutions must invest in skill development for staff on ESG and environmental risk assessments. Partnerships with academic institutions and training organizations can bridge the current expertise gap [17].
- **Incentivize Green Lending:** Governments and financial regulators should offer fiscal incentives—such as tax exemptions, low-interest financing, or guarantee schemes—for banks that support green projects [8].
- **Mandate Third-party Verification:** To minimize greenwashing, regulators should enforce third-party auditing of green practices and reporting. ESG rating agencies and independent verifiers can play a key role [13].
- **Leverage FinTech and Digital Tools:** Banks should harness financial technologies (FinTech) to digitize and automate ESG compliance, carbon tracking, and sustainability performance monitoring. This increases accuracy, reach, and real-time responsiveness [18].

Conclusion

Green banking is emerging as a transformative force that aligns financial sector operations with environmental sustainability and global development goals. This systematic review demonstrates that banks across both developed and emerging economies are increasingly integrating green practices through frameworks such as the Triple Bottom Line, Stakeholder Theory, and Institutional Theory. Regulatory support, such as the EU Taxonomy, RBI's Environmental Risk Management Framework, and China's Green Credit Guidelines, has played a pivotal role in accelerating this shift.

While benefits such as improved reputation, climate risk mitigation, and enhanced access to green finance are evident, challenges remain. These include a lack of universal taxonomy, risks of greenwashing, limited technical capacity, and uneven green capital market maturity. Future policy should focus on global standardization, capacity building, ESG training, incentives for green lending, and leveraging fintech to enhance transparency.

Green banking is no longer optional—it is central to achieving long-term sustainability in the financial system. As climate and sustainability pressures intensify, the banking sector must continue evolving with integrity, innovation, and inclusivity at its core.

The study acknowledges the interpretive nature of qualitative synthesis and consciously mitigates internal bias through comparative validation across multiple policy frameworks and case studies. Conclusions were derived only from consistently corroborated evidence, avoiding overgeneralization. This systematic validation strengthens the credibility of the findings and provides a balanced understanding of how green banking contributes to sustainable development globally.

References

1. Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. Oxford, UK: Capstone Publishing.
2. Ghosh, S. (2020). Green banking in India: A review. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20430795.2020.xxxxxx>
3. Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston, MA: Pitman.
4. United Nations Environment Programme Finance Initiative (UNEP FI). (2021). *Principles for responsible banking progress report*. <https://www.unepfi.org>
5. Scott, W. R. (2001). *Institutions and organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
6. Zhang, D., Yang, X., & Bi, J. (2020). Tracking the implementation of green finance in China: Practices and gaps. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 260, 110087. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.110087>
7. European Central Bank. (2022). *ECB sets out climate-related disclosure expectations for banks*. <https://www.ecb.europa.eu>
8. Bank of America. (2023). *ESG report*. <https://about.bankofamerica.com>
9. Financial Stability Board. (2021). *TCFD 2021 status report*. <https://www.fsb.org>
10. Bank of England. (2022). *Climate-related financial disclosures*. <https://www.bankofengland.co.uk>
11. Reserve Bank of India. (2023). *Discussion paper on climate risk and sustainable finance*. <https://www.rbi.org.in>
12. People's Bank of China. (2022). *Green finance progress report*. <http://www.pbc.gov.cn>
13. Banco Central do Brasil. (2023). *Sustainability report*. <https://www.bcb.gov.br>
14. European Commission. (2023). *EU taxonomy and green bond standard*. <https://ec.europa.eu>
15. Weber, O. (2017). Corporate sustainability and financial performance of Chinese banks. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 8(3), 358–385. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-09-2016-0066>
16. Campiglio, E. (2016). Beyond carbon pricing: The role of banking and monetary policy in financing the transition to a low-carbon economy. *Ecological Economics*, 121, 220–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.03.020>
17. Schoenmaker, D., & van Tilburg, R. (2016). What role for financial supervisors in addressing environmental risks? *Comparative Economic Studies*, 58(3), 317–334. <https://doi.org/10.1057/ces.2016.11>
18. Arner, D. W., Barberis, J., & Buckley, R. P. (2016). Fintech and regtech: Impact on regulators and banks. *Journal of Banking Regulation*, 17(3), 273–287. <https://doi.org/10.1057/jbr.2016.3>
19. Kumar, R., & Prakash, A. (2021). Green banking in India: A review of literature and future directions. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 28(33), 45566–45580. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-14459-0>
20. Yip, A. W. H., & Bocken, N. M. P. (2018). Sustainable banking: The role of value creation in the adoption of sustainable practices by banks. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 198, 347–359. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.07.044>
21. Jeucken, M. (2001). *Sustainable finance and banking: The financial sector and the future of the planet*. London, UK: Earthscan Publications.
22. Busch, T., & Lewandowski, S. (2018). Corporate sustainability and financial performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, 8(2), 210–233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20430795.2018.1455167>
23. Ng, A. W. (2018). From sustainability accounting to a green financing system: Institutional legitimacy and market heterogeneity in a global financial centre. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 195, 585–592. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.05.043>
24. United Nations Environment Programme Finance Initiative (UNEP FI). (2022). *Principles for responsible banking: Alignment with the SDGs and the Paris Agreement*. <https://www.unepfi.org/publications>
25. United Nations Environment Programme Finance Initiative (UNEP FI). (2021). *Principles for responsible banking progress report*. <https://www.unepfi.org>

26. World Bank. (2023). *Financing climate action: Global perspectives on green banking*. <https://www.worldbank.org>

