



Article

The Impact of Green Financing on the Green Transformation of Enterprises: Evidence from Uzbekistan

Sharipov Qudratbek Quraltayevich^{*1}

1. Lecturer of the Department of "Accounting", Mamun university

*Corresponding: sharipovqudrat@gmail.com

Abstract: This study examines the impact of green financing on the green transformation of industrial and manufacturing enterprises, with an empirical illustration drawn from Uzbekistan's emerging green finance market. The transition toward low-carbon, resource-efficient production has made access to green credit, green bonds, and other sustainability-linked financial instruments a central determinant of firms' capacity to adopt cleaner technologies and reorganize production around environmental performance criteria. Most of the existing empirical evidence on the green-finance-to-green-transformation link has been generated within China's green credit and green-bond pilot programs, raising questions about its direct applicability to smaller, bond-market-emerging economies such as Uzbekistan. The paper systematizes the principal empirical studies on the mechanisms linking green financing to enterprise green transformation, identifies their common analytical channels and limitations, and proposes an integrated four-dimensional framework combining green credit and debt instruments, capital-market and green-bond instruments, policy and institutional support, and enterprise innovation and absorptive capacity. The study relies on a qualitative-analytical research design combining comparative literature synthesis with an empirical illustration based on the recent development of Uzbekistan's sovereign and corporate green bond market.

Keywords: Green Financing, Green Transformation, Green Credit, Green Bonds, Corporate Sustainability, Financing Constraints, Enterprise Innovation, Uzbekistan.

Citation: Quraltayevich S. Q. The Impact of Green Financing on the Green Transformation of Enterprises: Evidence from Uzbekistan. Central Asian Journal of Innovations on Tourism Management and Finance 2026, 7(2), 695-702.

Received: 10th Dec 2025
Revised: 21st Jan 2026
Accepted: 08th Feb 2026
Published: 10th Mar 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

1. Introduction

The global shift toward low-carbon and resource-efficient production is fundamentally reshaping the conditions under which industrial enterprises compete and invest. As environmental regulation tightens and the cost of carbon-intensive production rises, an enterprise's green transformation — the reorganization of its technology, processes, and strategy around reduced environmental impact — has become as much a financial challenge as a technological one. Adopting cleaner production technologies, retrofitting facilities, and building emissions-monitoring and environmental-management capacity all require capital, often on a scale and time horizon that ordinary commercial financing does not comfortably accommodate. Green financing — green credit, green bonds, green equity, and related sustainability-linked instruments — has therefore emerged as a central mechanism through which financial systems can either enable or constrain the pace of enterprise-level green transformation.

The empirical literature examining this relationship has expanded rapidly over the past decade, but it remains heavily concentrated in a single institutional setting: China's green credit guidelines, green-finance pilot reform zones, and green bond market, which together provide an unusually rich set of quasi-natural policy experiments. The extent to

which findings generated in this context — a large, bank-dominated financial system with an early and assertive green-credit policy architecture — translate to smaller, bond-market-emerging economies is not self-evident. Enterprises operating in economies where green bond markets are only beginning to form, where institutional and disclosure infrastructure is still developing, and where the financial system is comparatively less diversified may face a different configuration of enabling conditions and constraints.

Uzbekistan offers a relevant and timely case for this question. Since its inaugural international bond issuance in 2019, the country has issued a sovereign Sustainable Development Goals bond in 2021 and, in 2023, both sovereign and corporate green bonds, positioning it as an early mover in Central Asia's still-nascent thematic bond market [1]. Parallel technical-assistance programs have supported domestic banks in developing green and sustainable bond frameworks, mobilizing close to a billion US dollars in green-labelled financing through partner banks [2], while proceeds from the sovereign green Eurobond have been directed toward water-saving technology, public-transport expansion, sanitation, and protective forestry [3]. At the same time, recent assessment of the domestic green finance ecosystem points to continuing constraints in regulatory maturity, institutional capacity, and private-sector engagement [4]. This combination of rapid instrument-level development and lagging institutional infrastructure closely parallels the kind of internal asymmetry that a purely instrument-focused or purely macro-level assessment would fail to capture at the level of the individual enterprise.

Against this background, the present study pursues three interrelated objectives: first, to systematize the principal empirical studies on the mechanisms linking green financing to enterprise-level green transformation and to identify the methodological patterns that recur across this literature; second, to propose an integrated, multi-dimensional framework for assessing how different types of green financing shape enterprise green transformation, adapted to the conditions of an emerging bond-market economy; and third, to illustrate the framework's relevance using recent evidence on the development of Uzbekistan's green finance market.

A substantial and still-growing body of empirical work has examined how green financing instruments affect enterprise behavior. Liu, Yaacob, Ma, and Ding [6] conducted a systematic literature review synthesizing 42 studies published between 2019 and 2024, identifying two direct pathways — financial support and policy guidance — and two indirect pathways — the easing of financing constraints and the restructuring of financing terms — through which green finance promotes corporate green innovation; their review also flagged a persistent research gap around market-based instruments such as green bonds and green equity, which remain comparatively understudied relative to green credit.

Using a propensity-score-matching difference-in-differences design built around China's 2012 Green Credit Guideline as a quasi-natural experiment, Chen, Hu, Wang, and Chang [5] found that green finance significantly improved the green production efficiency of industrial enterprises, with an effect on green innovation that was not immediately significant but became positive over time, and that these effects were more pronounced among state-owned enterprises, financially constrained firms, and firms in less concentrated industries.

Xiang, Lan, Qi, and Gan [6] examined a panel of high-energy-consumption listed firms and found that green finance development promotes their transformation and innovation, operating in part through market-incentivized environmental regulation and through increased government subsidies and eased financing constraints, with effects that varied by region, ownership type, and firm size.

Focusing specifically on green credit, Niu, Zhao, Luo, Gong, and Zhang [7] analyzed panel data on heavily polluting listed firms and found that green credit policy promotes

enterprises' green operational transformation partly through reduced debt costs and increased government subsidies, both of which function as mediating channels.

At the sectoral level, Sun, Zhong, Wang, Pan, and Tang [8] showed that green finance contributes to the transformation and upgrading of manufacturing industries in the Yangtze River Economic Belt by gradually redirecting capital away from polluting firms and toward environmentally oriented ones.

Feng, Wang, and Xi [9] constructed a firm-level green technology transformation intensity index from the text of listed companies' annual reports and found that green technology transformation eases corporate financial constraints, mainly through amplified green subsidies and increased debt financing, with the effect strongest among high-carbon-intensity industries and firms with fewer political connections, and with a documented synergy between digital and green transformation.

Liu, Yaacob, Ma, and Ding [10] conducted a systematic literature review synthesizing 42 studies published between 2019 and 2024, identifying two direct pathways — financial support and policy guidance — and two indirect pathways — the easing of financing constraints and the restructuring of financing terms — through which green finance promotes corporate green innovation; their review also flagged a persistent research gap around market-based instruments such as green bonds and green equity, which remain comparatively understudied relative to green credit.

Liu and Ma [11], matching China's industrial enterprise database with its industrial pollution database, examined the underlying logic connecting green finance to the green transformation behavior of manufacturing enterprises at the micro level, offering a firm-level complement to the more aggregate, sector-level studies.

Finally, Wang, Du, Tang, and Tsui [12] used the 2017 formation of China's Green Finance Pilot Reform Zones as a quasi-natural experiment and found that the reform increased corporate green innovation, with the effect more pronounced among enterprises already identified as green rather than among heavy polluters, operating mainly through eased financing constraints and reduced financing costs.

The Uzbekistani and regional literature on green financing is comparatively recent but growing. Sarjanova [4] examined the evolving green finance ecosystem in Uzbekistan and concluded that its expansion is constrained by the limited maturity of regulatory frameworks, gaps in institutional capacity, and insufficient private-sector engagement, while identifying the development of a national green taxonomy, stronger ESG disclosure practices, and partnerships with international development institutions as the principal levers for acceleration. The OECD's assessment of Uzbekistan's green transition financing similarly highlights the outsized role of the state and the underdeveloped domestic capital market as structural constraints calling for a diversification of green financing sources [9].

2. Materials and Methods

This study employs a qualitative-analytical research design combining systematic literature synthesis, comparative analysis, and conceptual modeling [13]. The methodological process consists of three stages. At the first stage, a review of empirical studies examining the relationship between green financing instruments and enterprise green transformation was conducted, covering contributions from corporate finance, environmental economics, and sustainability management. Content analysis was used to extract the financing instruments examined, the transmission mechanisms tested, and the empirical strategy employed in each study [14]. At the second stage, a comparative synthesis method was applied to classify the reviewed studies according to the financing channel examined (credit, market-based instruments, subsidies) and the mediating mechanism identified (financing-constraint relief, cost-of-capital reduction, capital reallocation, innovation incentives), and to identify recurring gaps, including the

comparative neglect of market-based instruments relative to green credit. At the third stage, an integrated conceptual framework was developed by synthesizing the financing channels and mechanisms identified across the reviewed studies and adapting them to the institutional conditions of an emerging, bond-market-developing economy [15]. To illustrate the empirical relevance of the proposed framework, the study draws on recent developments in Uzbekistan's sovereign and corporate green bond market and on assessments of its green finance ecosystem published by the OECD, the Global Green Growth Institute, UNDP, and the national academic literature. The study relies on secondary data and conceptual synthesis rather than primary econometric estimation; its contribution is methodological and diagnostic rather than predictive.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Conceptual foundations of the green-financing–green-transformation link

Across the reviewed literature, four broad channels recur through which green financing is argued to affect enterprise green transformation: (1) a direct financial-support channel, in which green subsidies, preferential credit, and grants lower the cost of adopting green technology; (2) a capital-market channel, in which green bonds and green equity diversify and potentially lower the cost of long-term capital available for transformation projects; (3) a credit-reallocation and regulatory channel, in which green credit policy and environmental regulation redirect capital away from polluting activity and toward greener firms; and (4) an innovation and signalling channel, in which green financing eases the financing constraints that otherwise limit R&D investment in green technology, while also signalling firms' environmental commitments to other investors.

The literature further shows that these channels do not operate independently: financing-constraint relief and subsidy effects are frequently found to mediate the relationship between green credit and both green innovation and green operational transformation [1], [2], [3], while market-based instruments such as green bonds remain comparatively underexplored relative to green credit, despite their growing practical importance in bond-market-emerging economies [6].

3.2. Comparative synthesis of empirical studies

Table 1 synthesizes the principal characteristics of the empirical studies reviewed on the relationship between green financing and enterprise green transformation.

Table 1. Comparative synthesis of empirical studies on green financing and enterprise green transformation.

Study / Authors	Year	Data / Context	Key mechanism and finding
Chen, Hu, Wang & Chang [5]	2024	Chinese listed industrial firms, 2009–2019 (PSM-DID)	Green finance raises green production efficiency; green-innovation effect emerges with a lag; stronger for SOEs and constrained firms
Xiang, Lan, Qi & Gan [6]	2023	462 Chinese high-energy-consumption listed firms, 2016–2020	Green finance promotes transformation and innovation via subsidies and eased financing constraints; regulation partially mediates
Niu, Zhao, Luo, Gong & Zhang [7]	2022	Heavily polluting Chinese listed firms, 2007–2021	Green credit promotes green operational transformation via lower debt cost and higher government subsidy
Sun, Zhong, Wang, Pan & Tang [8]	2024	Manufacturing firms, Yangtze River Economic Belt, China	Green finance reallocates capital toward green manufacturers, supporting industrial upgrading

Study / Authors	Year	Data / Context	Key mechanism and finding
Feng, Wang & Xi [9]	2024	Chinese listed firms; text-based transformation index	Green technology transformation eases green financial constraints via subsidies and debt financing; synergy with digital transformation
Liu & Ma [11]	2023	Matched Chinese industrial enterprise pollution databases	Analyzes firm-level logic of green finance's effect on manufacturing green transformation behavior
Wang, Du, Tang & Tsui [12]	2023	China Green Finance Pilot Reform Zones, 2017 (quasi-natural experiment)	Pilot reform increases green innovation, more strongly for already-green firms; mechanism is eased financing constraints and lower financing cost

Source: systematized by the author

The comparison indicates that, despite differing empirical strategies and sectoral focus, the reviewed studies converge on financing-constraint relief and subsidy-driven cost reduction as the dominant transmission channels between green financing and enterprise green transformation, with green credit as the most extensively studied instrument. Market-based instruments such as green bonds, which are of particular relevance to Uzbekistan's own emerging financing strategy, remain comparatively underexamined in the firm-level empirical literature — a gap that a framework built solely on the existing evidence base would risk reproducing [10].

3.3. Empirical evidence on green financing in Uzbekistan

To ground the proposed framework empirically, this study draws on recent developments in Uzbekistan's sovereign and corporate green bond market, alongside assessments of the country's broader green finance ecosystem. Table 2 summarizes the principal milestones.

Table 2. Milestones in the development of Uzbekistan's green finance market.

Year	Development
2019	Uzbekistan's inaugural bond issuance on international capital markets, opening access to future thematic issuance [1]
2021	Government issues a sovereign Sustainable Development Goals bond, financing programs across education, water management, health, and green priority areas [3]
2023	Uzbekistan issues both sovereign and corporate green bonds, establishing itself as a frontrunner among Central Asian issuers of thematic debt [1]
2023–2025	Technical assistance supports Sanoat Qurilish Bank and Agrobank in developing green and sustainable bond frameworks, helping mobilize an amount equivalent to about USD 1 billion in green-labelled financing on the London Stock Exchange [2]
2025	National assessment identifies continuing constraints in regulatory maturity, institutional capacity, and private-sector engagement, alongside opportunities in national green taxonomy development and ESG disclosure [4]

Source: compiled by the author based on OECD [1], GGGI [2], UNDP [3], and Sarjanova [4].

The evidence in Table 2 points to a pattern broadly consistent with the asymmetry documented in other emerging green finance markets: instrument-level development has moved comparatively quickly, with Uzbekistan establishing a functioning sovereign and corporate green bond market within a few years and mobilizing substantial green-labelled financing through partner banks, while the institutional and regulatory infrastructure that would allow individual enterprises to access, absorb, and report on this financing systematically remains under construction. The OECD identifies the state's outsized role in the economy and the underdeveloped domestic capital market as structural constraints on diversifying green financing sources beyond sovereign issuance [1], while Sarjanova's

more recent assessment attributes the ecosystem's remaining constraints specifically to the limited maturity of regulatory frameworks, gaps in institutional capacity, and insufficient private-sector engagement [4].

This pattern — comparatively fast-moving instrument development at the sovereign and banking-sector level, combined with slower-moving institutional and enterprise-level absorption capacity — is the kind of internal asymmetry that a framework focused solely on financing-instrument availability would fail to detect. It motivates treating policy and institutional support, and enterprise-level absorptive capacity, as analytically distinct dimensions from the financing instruments themselves, rather than folding them into a single composite green-finance indicator.

3.4. Implications for enterprise-level assessment

Applying the synthesized evidence to the design of an enterprise-level assessment framework yields several implications.

First, green credit alone is an insufficient proxy for the broader green-financing environment facing an enterprise. As the reviewed literature and the Uzbekistani evidence both suggest, market-based instruments such as green bonds are growing quickly at the national level even though the firm-level literature on their effects remains comparatively thin [10], meaning an assessment framework limited to credit-based indicators would understate the financing channels increasingly relevant to enterprises in markets like Uzbekistan's.

Second, policy and institutional variables — regulatory maturity, taxonomy availability, ESG disclosure requirements — deserve explicit, separate treatment rather than being treated as a background condition for financing access. The Uzbekistani evidence indicates that these institutional factors, rather than the volume of available green capital, may be the binding constraint on how effectively green financing translates into enterprise-level green transformation [4].

Third, enterprise innovation and absorptive capacity should be assessed as a distinct dimension, since the literature consistently finds that the effect of green financing on transformation outcomes depends on complementary firm-level capabilities — R&D capacity, technology-adoption intensity, and, increasingly, digital-green synergies — rather than on financing availability alone [9].

3.5. Integrated Green Financing Impact Framework for Enterprise Green Transformation

Based on the comparative synthesis and empirical evidence presented above, this study proposes an integrated four-dimensional framework for assessing the impact of green financing on enterprise green transformation, combining green credit and debt instruments, capital-market and green-bond instruments, policy and institutional support, and enterprise innovation and absorptive capacity (Table 3).

Table 3. Dimensions and weight assignments of the proposed framework.

Dimension	Representative indicators	Direction	Weight
Green credit & debt instruments	Access to preferential green loans, debt-cost reduction, green credit rating	Positive	0.30
Capital-market & green-bond instruments	Green bond / green equity access, cost of long-term capital, market diversification	Positive	0.25
Policy & institutional support	Green taxonomy clarity, ESG disclosure requirements, subsidy availability, regulatory maturity	Positive	0.25
Enterprise innovation & absorptive capacity	Green R&D intensity, technology-adoption rate, digital-green synergy, environmental management capacity	Positive	0.20

Source: author's development

Each dimension would be scored on a normalized 0-to-1 scale based on enterprise- and market-level indicators such as those illustrated in Table 3, with an overall Green Financing Impact Index computed as a weighted sum of dimension scores. The illustrative weights proposed in Table 3 give the largest weight to green credit and debt instruments, reflecting both the depth of the existing empirical evidence base and the continued centrality of credit-based financing in emerging bond-market economies, while assigning a comparatively high combined weight to capital-market instruments and policy/institutional support, reflecting the specific asymmetry identified in the Uzbekistani evidence between fast-moving instrument development and slower-moving institutional absorption. Weights may be refined through expert elicitation methods, such as the Analytic Hierarchy Process, when the framework is operationalized for a specific industrial sector or enterprise population.

Applied to the Uzbekistani evidence discussed above, the framework would be expected to classify enterprises operating in sectors targeted by recent sovereign and corporate green bond proceeds — water management, transport, sanitation, and forestry-related activities — as relatively advantaged on the capital-market dimension, but only moderately advantaged on the policy-and-institutional-support dimension given the regulatory and taxonomy gaps identified in the national literature [4], and heterogeneously positioned on the enterprise-innovation dimension depending on firm-level absorptive capacity. This capacity to reveal within-economy and within-sector asymmetries constitutes the principal analytical contribution of the proposed framework relative to assessment approaches that treat green financing as a single, undifferentiated indicator.

4. Conclusions

This study set out to systematize the empirical literature on the relationship between green financing and enterprise green transformation and to develop a framework adapted to the conditions of an emerging, bond-market-developing economy, using Uzbekistan as an illustrative case. The comparative literature review confirmed that, although the empirical evidence base on this relationship has expanded substantially, it remains heavily concentrated in China's green credit and green-finance pilot-reform experience, with market-based instruments such as green bonds comparatively underexamined at the firm level despite their growing practical relevance elsewhere.

The evidence examined on Uzbekistan's own green finance market development revealed an asymmetric pattern broadly consistent with that found in other emerging contexts: rapid progress in sovereign and corporate green bond issuance and in mobilizing green-labelled financing through partner banks has outpaced the maturation of the regulatory and institutional infrastructure needed for enterprises to access and absorb this financing systematically. This asymmetry cannot be captured by an assessment approach that treats green financing as a single composite indicator, underscoring the practical necessity of the multi-dimensional framework proposed in this study.

The proposed four-dimensional Green Financing Impact Framework — integrating green credit and debt instruments, capital-market and green-bond instruments, policy and institutional support, and enterprise innovation and absorptive capacity — offers both a diagnostic instrument for enterprise-level green transformation planning and a reference model for policymakers and financial institutions designing green finance support programs.

Several practical recommendations follow from the analysis. First, financial regulators and industry associations should consider piloting the proposed framework across a representative sample of enterprises to validate its diagnostic performance empirically.

Second, given the identified institutional gap, green finance support programs should place greater emphasis on regulatory and taxonomy development and ESG disclosure capacity, rather than focusing exclusively on the volume of green-labelled capital issued. Third, dimension weights should be refined through structured expert-elicitation methods once enterprise-level empirical data become available for Uzbekistan and the broader Central Asian region.

Future research should focus on empirically validating the proposed framework through primary firm-level data collection across different industrial sub-sectors in Uzbekistan, and on examining how green financing, once measured through such a multi-dimensional lens, translates into measurable environmental and competitiveness outcomes at the enterprise level.

REFERENCES

- [1] OECD, *Financing Uzbekistan's Green Transition: Capital Market Development and Opportunities for Green Bond Issuance*, Green Finance and Investment. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2023, doi: 10.1787/27d2489d-en.
- [2] Global Green Growth Institute, "Advancing Sustainable and Green Finance in Uzbekistan through Thematic Bonds," GGGI, 2025. Available: <https://gggi.org/report/advancing-sustainable-and-green-finance-in-uzbekistan-through-thematic-bonds/>
- [3] UNDP Uzbekistan, "Uzbekistan Issues First Ever Green Sovereign Eurobonds Worth 4.25 Trillion UZS on the London Stock Exchange," UNDP, 2023. Available: <https://www.undp.org/uzbekistan/press-releases/uzbekistan-issues-first-ever-green-sovereign-eurobonds-worth-425-trillion-uzs-london-stock-exchange>
- [4] D. A. Sarjanova, "Advancing the Green Finance Ecosystem in Uzbekistan: Opportunities, Policy Innovations, and Future Directions," *International Scientific-Electronic Journal "Pioneering Studies and Theories"*, vol. 1, no. 7, pp. 35–40, 2025.
- [5] D. Chen, H. Hu, N. Wang, and C.-P. Chang, "The Impact of Green Finance on Transformation to Green Energy: Evidence from Industrial Enterprises in China," *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, vol. 204, 2024. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0040162524002075>
- [6] W. Xiang, Y. Lan, Q. Qi, and L. Gan, "The Impact Mechanism of China's Green Finance on the Transformation and Innovation of High-Energy-Consumption Enterprises," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 18, no. 10, e0293022, 2023, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0293022.
- [7] H. Niu, X. Zhao, Z. Luo, Y. Gong, and X. Zhang, "Green Credit and Enterprise Green Operation: Based on the Perspective of Enterprise Green Transformation," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 13, art. 1041798, 2022, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1041798.
- [8] Y. Sun, H. Zhong, Y. Wang, Y. Pan, and D. Tang, "The Effect of Green Finance on the Transformation and Upgrading of Manufacturing Industries in the Yangtze River Economic Belt of China," *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, vol. 12, 2024, doi: 10.3389/fenvs.2024.1473621.
- [9] J. Feng, Y. Wang, and W. Xi, "Does Green Technology Transformation Alleviate Corporate Financial Constraints? Evidence from Chinese Listed Firms," *Heliyon*, vol. 10, no. 6, e27841, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e27841
- [10] M. Liu, M. H. Yaacob, Q. Ma, and S. Ding, "Green Finance and Corporate Green Innovation: A Systematic Literature Review," *SAGE Open*, vol. 15, no. 3, 2025, doi: 10.1177/21582440251370800.
- [11] S. Liu and L. Ma, "Impact of Green Finance on the Green Transformation of Manufacturing Enterprises," *Ziyuan Kexue (Resources Science)*, vol. 45, no. 10, pp. 1992–2008, 2023, doi: 10.18402/resci.2023.10.06.
- [12] H. Wang, D. Du, X. Tang, and S. Tsui, "Green Finance Pilot Reform and Corporate Green Innovation," *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, vol. 11, 2023, doi: 10.3389/fenvs.2023.1273564.
- [13] M. Saunders, P. Lewis, and A. Thornhill, *Research Methods for Business Students*, 8th ed. Harlow: Pearson Education, 2019.
- [14] K. Krippendorff, *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*, 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2018.
- [15] D. J. Teece, "Business Models, Business Strategy and Innovation," *Long Range Planning*, vol. 43, no. 2–3, pp. 172–194, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.lrp.2009.07.003.