

National Framework for Equitable Energy Finance: Integrating Green Banks, Community Capital, and Institutional Markets to Achieve Universal Access

Khalil Woli

Next Era Energy Inc.

Abstract

The rapid global shift toward renewable energy has intensified the need for financial systems that advance both decarbonization and social equity. Despite significant growth in green finance, access to affordable and inclusive energy investment remains uneven across communities, particularly those with low credit capacity or limited institutional presence. The study uses empirical and policy-based evidence to show how intentional governance, accountability, and transparency frameworks can help institutional investors, community-level finance, and governmental financial institutions coordinate in order to align with equality. The findings indicate that equitable energy finance depends on harmonized credit enhancement tools, interoperable data platforms, and standardized social-outcome metrics. The proposed framework, therefore, establishes a layered framework capable of mobilizing capital efficiently while ensuring that local ownership and distributive justice remain central to the national transition agenda.

Keywords: Green banks, Energy equity, Institutional investment, Community capital, National framework

1. Introduction

The accelerating transition to renewable energy is reshaping the political economy of power and the distribution of benefits and burdens across society. Although renewable technologies have expanded rapidly in recent years, financial systems supporting deployment remain fragmented and often reproduce spatial and social inequalities rather than redress them (Yang et al., 2024). The uneven distribution of capital means that communities with limited fiscal capacity or weak credit profiles face persistent barriers to affordable and reliable clean energy access (Osička et al., 2023).

Public green finance intermediaries have shown that targeted public resources can reduce perceived project risk and catalyse private investment for low-carbon infrastructure, yet the previous reports also indicate that the mobilization effect is not automatically equitable: deployment tends to concentrate where credit markets are already functioning (Chen et al., 2022). Community-level financial mechanisms such as energy cooperatives and community investment models have been shown to increase local participation and to deliver stronger local economic benefits when communities retain governance roles over assets (Guetelein et al., 2024). Institutional investors, however, hold large pools of

long-term capital, and several studies argue that their current investment patterns favour bankable, large-scale assets while distributed, socially targeted projects remain underfunded (Kreander et al., 2025).

In general, previous research indicated that aligning these three financing pillars requires a deliberate architectural design that links federal and state catalytic capital with community finance and with institutional markets through clear governance and accountability mechanisms (Meng et al., 2024). Empirical and conceptual research highlights the need for transparency in measuring social outcomes so that financial performance is not the only criterion for investment decisions (Giovannettone et al., 2024). Model-based and policy-oriented studies further argue that integrating equity metrics into investment appraisal and reporting standards will be essential if institutional flows are to support universal access rather than reinforce existing disparities (Goforth et al., 2025).

The evidence indicates that a layered national framework can mobilize scale while protecting equity if it accomplishes three tasks: catalyse private capital where market failures block socially valuable projects, embed community ownership and decision making to secure local benefits, and require institutional investors to account for distributive outcomes in their asset allocation processes (Li, 2023). Embedding these elements within statutory or formal governance arrangements will increase the likelihood that decarbonization also becomes a vehicle for restorative justice and community resilience rather than a source of new exclusion (Giovannettone et al., 2024). The aim of this review is to improve national frameworks for equitable energy finance and hasten the transition to universal energy access.

2. Integrating Green Banks and Public Financial Institutions for Systemic Energy Transition

According to Nassary et al. (2025), the global shift toward sustainable energy systems has brought renewed attention to the institutional and financial mechanisms that determine the pace and inclusiveness of the transition. As the scale of investment required to achieve net-zero emissions exceeds the capacity of private capital alone, public financial institutions and green banks have assumed a strategic role in mobilizing resources, addressing market failures, and ensuring equitable outcomes (Waidelich & Steffen, 2024). These state-backed entities are designed to deploy concessional capital and risk-sharing instruments that attract private investors to low-carbon projects which would otherwise be considered too uncertain or unprofitable (Meng et al., 2024). Through such catalytic functions, they serve as a bridge between national policy objectives and the realities of market finance.

Empirical analysis by Waidelich and Steffen (2024) demonstrates that state investment banks have become central actors in renewable energy development across the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. Their lending portfolios increasingly focus on large-scale renewable technologies such as offshore wind and biomass, where private finance is constrained by technological risk or long payback horizons (Waidelich & Steffen, 2024). However, the same evidence reveals a persistent bias toward mature markets and capital-intensive projects, suggesting that without targeted inclusion mandates, these institutions may inadvertently reinforce regional disparities in investment flows. This highlights the need for a deliberate governance design that balances financial efficiency with equity in energy access.

According to Azmeh and Al-Raei (2025), financial development research provides complementary insight into the structural relationship between institutional finance and energy transition. Fan et al. (2025) revealed that the impact of financial development on renewable energy expansion is nonlinear and depends on institutional maturity and policy stability. Financial systems that support diverse instruments such as green bonds, project-finance structures, and credit guarantees exhibit stronger

renewable deployment than those limited to conventional lending models (Fan et al., 2025; Meng et al., 2024). This evidence, therefore, suggests that the presence of a green bank is insufficient; its institutional context, mandate, and coordination with broader financial reforms determine its transformative capacity. Despite these advancements, several studies indicate that public financial institutions remain exposed to fossil-fuel financing, undermining their potential contribution to the transition. Downie and Peterson (2025) find that export credit agencies in particular continue to allocate the majority of their support to fossil energy infrastructure, with clean energy representing only a marginal fraction of portfolios. Downie and Peterson (2025) findings reveal the inertia embedded within public finance and the importance of aligning mandates, performance metrics, and transparency frameworks with national decarbonization objectives. Without these reforms, public financial flows risk perpetuating rather than resolving carbon dependency.

Integrating green banks within a national financing architecture, therefore, requires a layered approach (Rahman et al., 2023). At the federal level, a national green bank can provide catalytic capital, establish uniform standards for project appraisal, and coordinate data collection across states. At the regional level, state or development banks can tailor credit lines to local conditions, prioritizing distributed renewables, energy-efficiency retrofits, and community-scale projects that have high social returns. Such vertical coordination ensures that risk-sharing mechanisms and performance indicators are consistent while preserving flexibility for context-specific interventions (Meng et al., 2024; Donnelly, 2023; Guetlein et al., 2024). Transparency in reporting leverage ratios, project size distribution, and regional allocations, as suggested by Waidelich and Steffen (2024), would allow policymakers to evaluate whether public finance is achieving both environmental and equity goals.

Furthermore, public financial institutions must integrate measurable social outcomes into their investment frameworks. Fan et al. (2025) emphasize that institutional quality and governance mediate the relationship between finance and sustainability, implying that clear accountability mechanisms are essential to convert financial mobilization into real progress. Therefore, when these elements are embedded within coordinated national systems, green banks and public institutions evolve from isolated lenders into agents of structural transformation entities that accelerate decarbonization and ensure that its benefits are distributed equitably across society.

2.1 Federal–State Coordination Mechanisms

Effective federal–state coordination begins with national standards for project appraisal and disclosure that create a common language for risk assessment and impact measurement across jurisdictions (Li, 2023). Such harmonized appraisal criteria reduce transaction costs for investors and allow subnational lenders to design products that are interoperable with national guarantee and blending facilities (Chen et al., 2022). At the federal level, a national green bank or climate finance facility can play a catalytic role by providing first-loss capital, subordinated debt and standardized guarantee templates that reduce the perceived risk of renewable and distributed energy projects for private financiers (Waidelich & Steffen, 2024).

State and regional development banks can then adapt these national instruments to local contexts by offering tailored credit lines for distributed photovoltaics, community energy schemes, and energy efficiency retrofits that deliver high local social returns (Guetlein et al., 2024). When national credit enhancement tools are combined with regionally adapted lending products, the effect is to expand the

investable universe for institutional investors while preserving local responsiveness and ownership structures (Donnelly et al., 2023). Empirical evidence shows that harmonized guarantee frameworks raise private co-financing ratios and reduce the cost of capital for small and medium-sized clean energy projects, thereby enabling blended finance at scale (Fan et al., 2025).

A further mechanism is the creation of interoperable data platforms mandated at the national level but fed by state project pipelines; such platforms improve transparency, enable standardized monitoring of social and environmental outcomes, and strengthen market confidence in blended instruments (Li et al., 2023). In jurisdictions where national guarantees are explicit and transparent, private investors report greater willingness to participate in multi-tier blended vehicles that combine national guarantees, state subordinated debt and local equity stakes (Waidelich & Steffen, 2024). Embedding equity and inclusion indicators within national appraisal frameworks ensures that mobilization of private capital is judged not only by leverage ratios but also by access, affordability and local benefit metrics (Guetein et al., 2024). Harmonized standards, credit enhancement instruments and national guarantees form a practical toolkit for mobilizing blended finance across jurisdictions: they reduce information asymmetries, standardize risk treatment and link macro-scale capital with local-level projects that advance both decarbonization and social justice.

2.2 Governance and Regulatory Oversight

Robust governance is the cornerstone of transparent and equitable energy finance, and clear oversight frameworks enable capital to flow efficiently through multiple institutional layers while maintaining accountability and public trust (Ren et al., 2025). Transparent tracking systems that record how funds are transferred from federal institutions to state or community-level projects reduce informational gaps and safeguard financial integrity (Ren et al., 2025). Integrating social equity and energy justice indicators into these monitoring tools ensures that renewable-energy investments contribute directly to accessibility and affordability objectives (Goforth et al., 2025).

Institutional accountability relies on both internal compliance mechanisms and independent public scrutiny (Kreander et al., 2025). Comparative analyses of energy-finance institutions show that decentralized oversight combined with consistent disclosure standards fosters higher transparency and prevents capture by vested interests (Osička et al., 2023). In addition, participatory governance, where citizens and civil society representatives are formally included in evaluation processes, improves legitimacy and aligns investment decisions with community priorities (Guetein & Schleich, 2024). This structure also discourages the concentration of benefits in well-capitalized regions and promotes broader social participation in the energy transition (Osička et al., 2023).

Public reporting is equally essential for building investor confidence and demonstrating integrity in fund management (Martí-Ballester, 2024). Standardized sustainability and financial-performance disclosures, combined with open-data systems, help verify that capital mobilization aligns with environmental and equity targets (Martí-Ballester, 2024). However, when institutions report not only on financial returns but also on distributional and environmental outcomes, they reinforce accountability and strengthen trust between policymakers, financiers, and citizens (Kreander et al., 2025). Collectively, traceable financial flows, participatory oversight, and transparent reporting form the foundation of a governance framework that ensures both integrity and fairness in the national energy-finance system (Ren et al., 2025).

2.3 Comparative Evaluation of Green Bank Operation

Comparative peer-reviewed studies identify three consistent design features that explain why some green-bank institutions have been especially effective and therefore are most transferable for national

replication. Explicit mission clarity and a public-value orientation allow green banks to take early-mover risk and create demonstration effects that catalyze private finance (Mazzucato & Ryan-Collins, 2022). However, where mandates are framed narrowly around short-term financial returns, institutions tend to avoid smaller or socially targeted projects; conversely, mission-driven mandates permit instruments such as subordinated debt and first-loss tranches to be used strategically to build market track records (Geddes et al., 2018).

Institutional form and governance matter; comparative evidence shows that durable independence from short-term political interference, paired with strong public accountability mechanisms, helps green banks sustain multi-year programmes that reduce policy risk for private investors (Geddes et al., 2018). Peer-reviewed analyses of development financing institutions further indicate that hybrid governance, which combines independent boards, clear performance metrics, and public reporting, supports both financial discipline and public objectives, enabling replication at the national scale (Xu & Gallagher, 2022).

Product and market innovation that responds to local market failures is essential; successful banks combine scalable, bankable vehicles for institutional investors with tailored products for distributed and community projects so that both scale and inclusion are possible (Contreras et al., 2021). Comparative work suggests that the Green United Kingdom Investment Bank used different mixes of instruments from project finance for large infrastructure to concessional facilities and wholesale products for local lenders, which together demonstrate a palette of tools that other nations can adapt to their market maturity (Geddes et al., 2018). Peer-reviewed research on green-bank value creation highlights the importance of knowledge-transfer roles offering technical assistance and standardized documentation to reduce transaction costs for smaller projects and crowd in local lenders (Lyons & White, 2025).

According to previous research, a small set of transferable best practices emerges for national replication. In this regard, national designs should (i) codify a clear public mission that balances mobilizing private capital with explicit equity or access targets (Mazzucato & Ryan-Collins, 2022); (ii) build governance arrangements that combine operational independence, independent oversight, and mandated public reporting to maintain credibility (Geddes et al., 2018; Xu & Gallagher, 2022); and (iii) deploy a two-track product strategy that pairs institutional-grade, scalable vehicles with concessional and technical assistance instruments for community and distributed projects (Geddes et al., 2018; Lyons & White, 2025). These elements are mutually reinforcing: mission clarity sets strategic priorities; governance preserves long-term credibility; and product innovation translates strategy into investable opportunities at both scale and local relevance.

3. Mobilizing Community Capital and Institutional Markets

Community finance mechanisms and institutional investors must be intentionally linked if national energy transitions are to combine scale with local inclusion (Araujo-Vizueté, & Robalino-López, 2025). Systematic review evidence shows that social innovation and community energy initiatives strengthen local agency, increase acceptance of projects and mobilize non-financial resources such as trust and local knowledge that are essential to deployment in marginalized areas (Dall-Orsoletta et al., 2022). Private investment patterns for decentralized electricity access demonstrate that emerging business models can mobilize commercial capital for distributed projects, but they tend to require blended finance or concessional support to overcome early-stage viability gaps (Falchetta et al., 2022). Blended finance approaches that combine concessional public capital, guarantees, and technical assistance have been

identified as effective catalysts for bringing institutional capital into regional transitions, including heat and distributed energy systems (Popović et al., 2024).

Furthermore, individual and community catalysts, including local leadership, pooled small investments and cooperative governance, significantly improve the bankability and sustainability of Renewable Energy Communities by lowering operating risk and increasing local uptake (De Simone et al., 2024). Aggregation mechanisms and platform intermediaries that standardize documentation, tranche risk and offer credit enhancement are therefore critical to translate many small community investments into institutional-grade products suitable for pension funds and other large investors (Falchetta et al., 2022). Policy measures to scale these linkages include interoperable disclosure standards, explicit first-loss facilities or guarantee windows and dedicated capacity building for local intermediaries to meet investor due diligence requirements (Quatrini, 2021). Considering this, when these elements are combined with community mobilization, blended finance catalysts, aggregation platforms and enabling public policy, the resulting layered finance architecture can both mobilize large volumes of capital and preserve local ownership, thereby delivering renewable deployment that is simultaneously scalable and equitable (Popović et al., 2024).

3.1 The role of community capital in advancing energy equity

Community capital institutions and locally owned energy models are essential instruments for extending clean-energy access to low-income and rural populations because they combine finance with local legitimacy and governance (Kaze et al., 2025). Systematic evidence shows that social innovation in community energy mobilizes civic engagement and local resources, thereby raising participation rates and overcoming non-technical barriers such as trust and social license that often limit deployment in marginalized areas (Dall-Orsoletta et al., 2022). Community ownership forms such as cooperatives and renewable-energy communities retain revenue locally and can direct surplus value into affordability measures or community benefit funds, improving distributional outcomes relative to externally owned projects (Ahmed, 2024).

From a financing perspective, community lenders and pooled local investments improve credit assessment and project sustainability by aggregating dispersed demand and signaling local commitment, which raises bankability for external financiers where appropriate aggregation mechanisms exist (Martens, 2022). Reviews of private investment for decentralized electricity find that community-anchored projects frequently require blended finance, concessional tranches or credit enhancement to bridge early-stage viability gaps and reach institutional readiness (Falchetta et al., 2022). Consequently, national frameworks that intend to scale equitable access must explicitly link community institutions to credit-enhancement facilities and aggregation platforms so local projects can access wholesale capital without losing community control (Popović et al., 2024).

Operationally, successful community capital models combine participatory governance, technical assistance and standardized contracting to reduce transaction costs and improve replicability across jurisdictions (Ahmed, 2024). Where governments or green banks provide dedicated capacity building and standard documentation, community projects scale more rapidly and enter investment pipelines that attract patient institutional capital (Dall-Orsoletta et al., 2022). In the absence of these supports, community initiatives tend to remain small, vulnerable to market risk and limited in their contribution to universal access objectives (Quatrini, 2021). In sum, community capital is not merely an adjunct to national finance systems but a foundational pillar of an equitable transition: when integrated through aggregation, credit enhancement and capacity building, community finance enables both local

empowerment and the mobilization of larger institutional resources towards universal, affordable clean-energy access (Martens, 2022).

3.2 Institutional Investment and Equity Objectives

Institutional investors, including pension funds, sovereign wealth funds and insurance companies, command long-term capital reserves that are indispensable for financing national energy transitions (Sharma et al., 2017). Their participation becomes transformative when investment strategies align with the Sustainable Development Goals and embed measurable inclusion outcomes such as affordability and job creation (van Niekerk, 2024).

Green bond markets offer a proven entry point for institutional investors by connecting long-dated fixed-income instruments to identified low-carbon assets (Adekoya et al., 2023). Empirical analysis confirms that such issuances correlate with significant reductions in carbon intensity and enhanced disclosure, establishing credibility for environmental impact reporting (Pang et al., 2024).

To translate environmental performance into equitable outcomes, investment instruments must incorporate explicit social indicators that allow investors and trustees to assess distributional effects (Chen et al., 2025). Quantitative environmental, social, and governance (ESG) indicator frameworks help identify measurable dimensions of affordability, access, and community participation that can be integrated into investment fund decision-making processes (Lo & Lin, 2023).

Developing consistent definitions and metrics for social additionality and accessibility within green bond frameworks is critical to avoid greenwashing and to enable comparability across issuers (Zioło et al., 2025). Blended-finance structures combining first-loss or partial-guarantee tranches with senior institutional layers have demonstrated success in adjusting project risk–return profiles while preserving developmental impact (Sharma et al., 2023).

At the policy level, national green-finance frameworks should support the development of green credit facilities and expand banking capacity, particularly to serve underserved markets such as low-income or rural consumers (Udeagha & Ngepah, 2023). These mechanisms ensure that institutional allocations achieve decarbonization targets and contribute directly to equitable, inclusive energy access (van Niekerk, 2024).

3.3 Governance and Accountability for Inclusive Investment

Governance mechanisms are essential to ensure that community-centred and institutional energy-finance systems deliver equitable outcomes (Karameros et al., 2025). A growing body of evidence demonstrates that when social inclusion and transparency are built into governance frameworks, renewable-energy transitions achieve higher participation rates and stronger legitimacy among affected populations (Dall-Orsoletta et al., 2022). In contrast, where governance remains narrowly financial, community investors often face information asymmetries and limited access to decision-making processes, constraining equitable benefit distribution (De Simone et al., 2024).

Establishing accountability metrics that integrate social, environmental, and financial dimensions provides a consistent standard for monitoring energy-finance performance (Li et al., 2024). Comparative analyses of decentralised-energy programmes reveal that clear indicators covering affordability, gender participation, and local reinvestment enable funders and regulators to verify whether projects contribute to inclusive growth rather than merely expanding capacity (Falchetta et al., 2022). Such multidimensional metrics also enhance investor confidence by linking financial returns to measurable social outcomes, reducing perceived reputational risk for institutional partners (Persad, 2024).

Transparency in financial flows and governance processes further strengthens inclusive-investment credibility (Rizki et al., 2024). Studies of blended-finance models in Europe's heat-transition sector show that structured disclosure requirements, independent verification of impact data, and periodic public reporting substantially improve accountability and policy alignment across multiple jurisdictions (Popović et al., 2024). Moreover, participatory oversight mechanisms where community representatives sit on advisory or monitoring committees ensure that governance remains responsive to diverse stakeholder priorities and local realities (Dall-Orsoletta et al., 2022).

Finally, at the policy level, embedding disclosure interoperability and capacity-building provisions within national sustainable-finance frameworks is critical for equitable governance (Junaedi, 2024). Evidence from post-pandemic finance reforms demonstrates that aligning reporting standards, strengthening audit capabilities, and supporting local institutions to manage compliance reduces transaction costs and fosters transparency across scales (Quatrini, 2021). As such, these measures transform governance from a compliance obligation into a vehicle for social accountability, ensuring that the transition to low-carbon systems is inclusive, transparent, and publicly legitimate.

3.4 Collaborative models and blended finance innovations

Equitable energy transitions rely on financial systems that coordinate public, private, and community investment under integrated governance arrangements capable of mobilizing diverse capital and managing systemic transition risks (Fan et al., 2025). Empirical work on energy-transition finance shows that multi-actor cooperation allows public finance to absorb early-stage risks, enabling private and institutional capital to enter sectors previously viewed as unbankable while preserving local benefit flows (Wu et al., 2023). Such collaborative arrangements align incentives through transparent risk-allocation mechanisms and joint oversight, improving both financial performance and social legitimacy. Blended-finance mechanisms have proven effective in bridging the commercialization gap for renewable-energy projects by combining public and private capital to achieve both financial viability and broader social-development objectives (Berggren, 2023). Comparative evidence indicates that when concessional or public tranches are combined with private capital, total investment volume and geographic reach increase without undermining credit discipline (Sutrisno et al., 2024). Green-credit programmes in developing economies demonstrate that structured lending supported by public guarantees can both strengthen bank stability and channel credit toward renewable-energy sectors that benefit low-income consumers (Sutrisno et al., 2024). These findings confirm that financial innovation guided by public policy can create mutually reinforcing outcomes for profit and equity.

Institutional investors are playing an increasingly central role in financing low-carbon and climate-resilient infrastructure, particularly when public-private frameworks provide transparent governance and accountability arrangements that reduce investment uncertainty (Casady et al., 2024). Multi-level analyses show that investor engagement deepens when frameworks articulate social and environmental objectives alongside financial metrics, prompting firms to reorient strategies toward inclusive, low-carbon pathways (Kreander et al., 2025). Embedding energy-justice and equity metrics in portfolio appraisal not only improves transparency but also enhances systemic resilience by ensuring that capital allocation reflects community welfare and access considerations (Ren et al., 2025).

Evidence on citizen investment in renewable-energy communities reveals that supportive institutional conditions such as simplified regulatory procedures, transparent dividend policies and access to concessional finance significantly increase local uptake (Guetein & Schleich, 2024). Likewise, integrated modelling of power-system planning demonstrates that incorporating equity parameters

alongside cost and reliability objectives yields more balanced policy outcomes, reducing spatial and socio-economic disparities in energy access (Goforth et al., 2025). These insights affirm that equitable transitions depend on cooperation among public institutions, investors and citizens rather than on market forces alone.

Blended finance serves as a mechanism for aligning commercial viability with developmental and social objectives by strategically combining public and private capital to mobilise investment in sectors that deliver both financial returns and inclusive outcomes (Mutambatsere & Schellekens, 2020). By aligning state-backed de-risking, institutional capital and community participation within transparent governance systems, national frameworks can deliver renewable-energy expansion that is both scalable and inclusive. Such integrative mechanisms ensure that the transition to a low-carbon economy advances economic opportunity while guaranteeing fair distribution of its benefits (Ren et al., 2025).

Conclusion

A national framework for equitable energy finance must function as a systemic architecture that unites catalytic public finance, community participation, and institutional markets under transparent and accountable governance. Therefore, while green banks and public financial institutions can de-risk investment and attract private capital, they must embed equity and inclusion metrics to ensure that benefits extend to underserved communities.

Community capital mechanisms, supported by aggregation platforms and capacity building, are essential to link local ownership with national-scale finance. Institutional investors, when guided by clear social and environmental indicators, can provide the long-term capital required to sustain low-carbon infrastructure while contributing to inclusive development. Integrating these three pillars, public, community, and institutional finance within harmonized regulatory, data, and accountability systems ensures that the energy transition advances both efficiency and justice. Therefore, the proposed framework not only accelerates decarbonization but also institutionalizes fairness, making universal clean-energy access a tangible national objective.

References

1. Adekoya, O. B., Abakah, E. J., & Oliyide, J. A. (2023). Factors behind the performance of green bond markets. *International Review of Economics & Finance*, 88, 92-106.
2. Ahmed, S., Ali, A., & D'angola, A. (2024). A review of renewable energy communities: concepts, scope, progress, challenges, and recommendations. *Sustainability*, 16(5), 1749.
3. Araujo-Vizuete, G., & Robalino-López, A. (2025). A Systematic Roadmap for Energy Transition: Bridging Governance and Community Engagement in Ecuador. *Smart Cities*, 8(3), 80.
4. Azmeh, C., & Al-Raei, M. (2025). Financial development, research in finance, and economic growth. *Cogent Economics & Finance*, 13(1), 2448220.
5. Berggren Ek, A. (2023). Blended Finance and the Diffusion of Renewable Energy Innovation: An exploratory study on bridging the commercialization funding gap of renewable energy projects in Southeast Asia.
6. Casady, C. B., Cepparulo, A., & Giuriato, L. (2024). Public-private partnerships for low-carbon, climate-resilient infrastructure: Insights from the literature. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 470, 143338.

7. Chen, Z., Ki, D., Li, Z., & Wang, K. (2025). Assessing equity in infrastructure investment distribution among US cities. *Cities*, 162, 105898.
8. Chen, Z., Mirza, N., Huang, L., & Umar, M. (2022). Green banking—can financial institutions support green recovery?. *Economic Analysis and Policy*, 75, 389-395.
9. Contreras, S., Ghosh, A., & Kong, J. H. (2021). Financial crisis, Bank failures and corporate innovation. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 129, 106161.
10. Dall-Orsoletta, A., Cunha, J., Araujo, M., & Ferreira, P. (2022). A systematic review of social innovation and community energy transitions. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 88, 102625.
11. De Simone, E., Rochira, A., & Mannarini, T. (2024). Individual and community catalysts for Renewable Energy Communities (RECs) development. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 101987.
12. Donnelly, D., Fricaudet, M., & Ameli, N. (2023). Accelerating institutional funding of low-carbon investment: The potential for an investment emissions intensity tax. *Ecological Economics*, 207, 107755.
13. Downie, C., & Peterson, M. J. (2025). Public financial institutions in the energy transition: the impact of export credit agencies. *Climatic Change*, 178(3), 1-18.
14. Falchetta, G., Michoud, B., Hafner, M., & Rother, M. (2022). Harnessing finance for a new era of decentralised electricity access: A review of private investment patterns and emerging business models. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 90, 102587.
15. Fan, S., Zhao, Y., & Zuo, S. (2025). Financial Development and Energy Transition: A Literature Review. *Energies*, 18(15), 4166.
16. Geddes, A., Schmidt, T. S., & Steffen, B. (2018). The multiple roles of state investment banks in low-carbon energy finance: an analysis of Australia, the United Kingdom and Germany. *Energy Policy*, 115, 158–170.
17. Giovannettone, J. P., Macey, G. P., AghaKouchak, A., Barbato, M., Capehart, W. J., Ganguly, A. R., ... & Vahedifard, F. (2024). Equitable infrastructure: Achieving resilient systems and restorative justice through policy and research innovation. *PNAS nexus*, 3(5), pgae157.
18. Goforth, T., Levin, T., & Nock, D. (2025). Incorporating energy justice and equity objectives in power system models. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 210, 115155.
19. Guetlein, M. C., & Schleich, J. (2024). Empirical insights into enabling and impeding factors for increasing citizen investments in renewable energy communities. *Energy Policy*, 193, 114302.
20. Guetlein, M. C., & Schleich, J. (2024). Empirical insights into enabling and impeding factors for increasing citizen investments in renewable energy communities. *Energy Policy*, 193, 114302.
21. Junaedi, J. (2024). Understanding the role of finance in sustainable development: A qualitative study on environmental, social, and governance (ESG) practices. *Golden Ratio of Finance Management*, 4(2), 113-130.
22. Karameros, A. I., Chassiakos, A. P., & Tryfonas, T. (2025). A Novel Community Energy Projects Governance Model and Support Ecosystem Framework Based on Heating and Cooling Projects Enabled by Energy Communities. *Sustainability*, 17(14), 6571.
23. Kaze, K., Balta-Ozkan, N., & Shrimpton, E. (2025). Connecting power to people: Integrating community renewable energy and multi-level governance towards low-carbon energy transition in Nigeria. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 121, 103938.

24. Kreander, N., Mcphail, K., & Geels, F. W. (2025). Institutional investors and low-carbon transitions: A multi-level analysis of lead firm reorientation in northern Europe. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 123, 104031.
25. Li, W., Zhu, J., & Liu, C. (2024). Environmental, social, and governance performance, financing constraints, and corporate investment efficiency: Empirical evidence from China. *Heliyon*, 10(22).
- Rizki, I. P., Hali, A., & Andi, K. U. S. U. M. A. W. A. T. I. (2024). The influence of transparency, governance, and financial accountability in managing financial reporting in the public sector. *International Journal of Educational and Life Sciences*, 2(10), 1165-1180.
26. Li, Y. (2023). Role of banking sector in green economic growth: empirical evidence from South Asian economies. *Economic Change and Restructuring*, 56(4), 2437-2454.
27. Lo, H. W., & Lin, S. W. (2023). Identifying ESG investment key indicators and selecting investment trust companies by using a Z-fuzzy-based decision-making model. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, 90, 101759.
28. Lyons, M., & White, L. V. (2025). How Green Banks can create multiple types of value in the transition to net zero emissions. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 84(2), 320-338.
29. Martens, K. (2022). Investigating subnational success conditions to foster renewable energy community co-operatives. *Energy Policy*, 162, 112796.
30. Martí-Ballester, C. P. (2024). Financial performance of mutual and pension funds focused on the natural resources sector. *Resources Policy*, 93, 105061.
31. Meng, J., Ye, Z., & Wang, Y. (2024). Financing and investing in sustainable infrastructure: A review and research agenda. *Sustainable Futures*, 8, 100312.
32. Mutambatsere, E., & Schellekens, P. (2020). The why and how of blended finance. *International Finance Corporation World Bank Group*.
33. Nassary, E. K., Magubika, A. J., Mwampashi, L. L., Fukah, F. K., Kahangwa, C. A., & Tryphone, G. M. (2025). Transitioning to clean energy and opportunities for developing countries. *Energy Strategy Reviews*, 62, 101909.
34. Osička, J., Szulecki, K., & Jenkins, K. E. (2023). Energy justice and energy democracy: Separated twins, rival concepts or just buzzwords?. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 104, 103266.
35. Pang, H., Wu, C., & Zhang, L. (2024). The impact of green bond issuance on carbon emission intensity and path analysis. *Plos one*, 19(6), e0304364.
36. Persad, K., Xu, B., & Greening, P. (2024). Institutional investor behaviour and the energy transition: A complexity framework for accelerating sustainable finance from UK investors. *Energy Economics*, 107444.
37. Popovic, T., Lygnerud, K., Denk, I., Fransson, N., & Unluturk, B. (2024). Blended finance as a catalyst for accelerating the European heat transition?. *Smart Energy*, 14, 100136.
38. Quatrini, S. (2021). Challenges and opportunities to scale up sustainable finance after the COVID-19 crisis: Lessons and promising innovations from science and practice. *Ecosystem Services*, 48, 101240.
39. Rahman, M. H., Rahman, J., Tanchangya, T., & Esquivias, M. A. (2023). Green banking initiatives and sustainability: A comparative analysis between Bangladesh and India. *Research in Globalization*, 7, 100184.

40. Ren, W., Guan, Y., Qiu, F., Levin, T., & Heleno, M. (2025). Energy justice and equity: A Review of definitions, measures, and practice in policy, planning, and operations. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 222, 115900.
41. Sharma, K., Mahna, T., Jain, S., Dhir, S., Rao, N., Biyani, A., ... & Gupta, A. (2023). Bibliometric review of blended finance and partial risk guarantee: Establishing needs and advantages. *International Journal of Financial Studies*, 11(3), 103.
42. Sharma, R. (2017). Sovereign wealth funds investment in sustainable development sectors. In *New York: United Nations High-Level Conference on Financing for Development and the Means of Implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*.
43. Sutrisno, S., Widarjono, A., & Hakim, A. (2024). The role of green credit in bank profitability and stability: a case study on green banking in Indonesia. *Risks*, 12(12), 198.
44. Udeagha, M. C., & Ngepah, N. (2023). The drivers of environmental sustainability in BRICS economies: do green finance and fintech matter?. *World Development Sustainability*, 3, 100096.
45. Van Niekerk, A. J. (2024). Economic inclusion: green finance and the SDGs. *Sustainability*, 16(3), 1128.
46. Waidelich, P., & Steffen, B. (2024). Renewable energy financing by state investment banks: Evidence from OECD countries. *Energy Economics*, 132, 107455.
47. Xu, J., & Gallagher, K. P. (2022). Transformation towards renewable energy systems: Evaluating the role of development financing institutions. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 57(4), 577-601.
48. Yang, F., Liu, W., Zhang, Y., & Yang, G. (2024). Money grows on green energy: Financing a sustainable power future. *Heliyon*, 10(7).
49. Ziolo, M., Bąk, I., & Spoz, A. (2025). The Nexus Between Green Bonds, Green Credits, and the Energy Transition Toward Renewable Energy Sources: State of the Art. *Energies*, 18(16), 4370.