

Development Pathways for Green Finance in the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area: A Comparative Analysis with Three Global Bay Areas

Di Liu

Abstract:

This study examines the development of green finance in the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area (GBA) through a comparative analysis with three leading international bay areas: New York, San Francisco, and Tokyo. While the GBA has achieved initial progress in green finance, it faces challenges such as cross-border policy conflicts, market structure imbalances, technological and data deficiencies, underdeveloped ESG ecosystems, weak international influence, and talent shortages. To address these issues, this study proposes a multi-dimensional strategy: establishing a rule-mutual-recognition and regulatory-coordination framework, activating a diversified green financing market, enhancing technological empowerment, fostering ESG ecosystems, and strengthening global competitiveness. These measures aim to drive sustainable green finance development, support industrial upgrading, and elevate the GBA's international standing in green finance.

Keywords: Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area, Green Finance, International Bay Area Comparison, Development Strategies

1. Research Background and Significance

Green finance serves as a core tool for sustainable development, channeling capital into green industries to facilitate economic transformation (Kochhar, 2022). Since China introduced the Guidelines for Establishing the Green Financial System in 2016, it

has built a comprehensive framework covering green credit, bonds, and carbon markets. By June 2023, China's green loan balance reached RMB 27.05 trillion, with green bonds exceeding RMB 2.5 trillion (People's Bank of China, 2023). However, regional disparities persist: the Yangtze River Delta accounts for 45% of national green bond issuance, while the

central and western regions contribute less than 15% (Research Group on China's Green Finance Development, 2020). Additional challenges include misalignment with international standards (e.g., Climate Bonds Initiative), low corporate environmental disclosure rates, and higher financing costs for private enterprises compared to state-owned firms (Tsinghua University, 2023).

As a national pilot zone for green finance reform, the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area (GBA) has achieved notable progress under policy support. In 2022, its green bond issuance reached USD 35 billion, accounting for 32% of the Asian market (Climate Bonds Initiative, 2023). Guangdong's pilot zone has implemented over 600 projects, mobilizing RMB 1.2 trillion in green investments (Guangdong Financial Regulatory Bureau, 2023). Nonetheless, the GBA faces challenges such as insufficient cross-border collaboration, limited innovation in green financial products, and low interoperability of environmental data.

Compared to three leading international bay areas—New York, San Francisco, and Tokyo—the GBA remains in the early stages of green finance development. This study conducts a comparative analysis to identify the GBA's gaps and propose targeted strategies for enhancing industrial competitiveness and global sustainability leadership.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Definition and Evolution of Green Finance

Green finance originated from the intersection of environmental economics and financial studies. Labatt & White (2002) defined it as “optimizing environmental resource allocation through financial instruments,” which was later expanded by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP, 2016) into “a systemic framework to direct capital toward low-carbon economies.” Stiglitz (2019) proposed a “dual-track pricing model,” advocating for the integration of carbon taxes and market mechanisms to address environmental externalities. Sachs (2021) links green finance to the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

China's green finance development is characterized by top-down policy design. The 2016 Guidelines established a national framework, complemented by local pilot inno-

vations such as green credit subsidies (Ma, 2020). Wang Yao (2022) identified local governments' performance incentives and financial institutions' risk appetite as critical factors influencing policy implementation.

2.2 Current Status and Core Challenges in the GBA

2.2.1 Policy Coordination and Institutional Innovation

The GBA adopts a “central coordination–local pilot–cross-border collaboration” framework (GBA Development Plan, 2019). Guangdong introduced China's first provincial green finance regulation, while Hong Kong launched a “Green Bond Grant Scheme” to reduce international financing costs (HKMA, 2022). However, cross-border policy inconsistencies persist. For example, incompatibility between the International Capital Market Association (ICMA) Green Bond Principles and China's domestic standards increases cross-border certification costs by 30% (Ma, 2020).

2.2.2 Structural Imbalances in Market Dynamics

The GBA's green finance market exhibits a “dual-core” structure: Hong Kong leverages its status as a global financial hub, contributing 35% of Asia's green bond issuance in 2022 (Climate Bonds Initiative, 2023), while Shenzhen pioneers fintech innovations like blockchain-enabled green supply chain financing. However, structural imbalances are evident—over 70% of green financing flows into solar and wind projects, while sectors such as ecological restoration face funding gaps of 58% (Guo, 2023). Additionally, SMEs struggle to access green loans, with approval rates at only 23% of those for state-owned enterprises (Chen, 2023).

2.2.3 Cross-Border Collaboration Barriers

The GBA's environmental data interoperability rate remains below 40%, raising cross-border asset valuation costs (Volz, 2022). Technical disparities exist between Hong Kong's TCFD-aligned climate disclosures and mainland China's Guidelines for Environmental Information Disclosure by Financial Institutions (People's Bank of China, 2021). Furthermore, a talent shortage—estimated at over 50,000 professionals in carbon auditing and ESG—constrains collaborative efficiency (Wang, 2022).

2.3 International Case Studies

2.3.1 New York Bay Area: Market-Driven ESG Ecosystem

The New York Bay Area has cultivated a bottom-up green finance ecosystem. Fintech innovations, such as J.P. Morgan's blockchain-based carbon tracking (BIS, 2021) and Goldman Sachs' machine learning models for climate risk assessment (IMF, 2022), enhance regulatory efficiency.

2.3.2 San Francisco Bay Area: Tech-Finance-Industry Synergy

The San Francisco Bay Area integrates Silicon Valley's innovation ecosystem with venture capital. Cleantech investments account for 45% of U.S. venture funding, spanning hydrogen energy and carbon capture (PitchBook, 2022). The California Carbon Market enables carbon credit trading, with Tesla generating USD 1.5 billion annually from credit sales (California Air Resources Board, 2023).

2.3.3 Tokyo Bay Area: Policy Precision and Industry Collaboration

The Tokyo Bay Area employs legislative mandates and industry partnerships. Japan's Green Finance Promotion Act (Ministry of the Environment, 2021) requires financial institutions to disclose carbon intensity. Additionally, a USD 12 billion catastrophe bond market mitigates natural disaster risks (ICMA, 2021).

3. Comparative Analysis Between International Bay Areas and GBA

3.1 Policy and Institutional Frameworks

3.1.1 New York Bay Area: Market Autonomy with Regtech Enablement

The New York Bay Area's green finance ecosystem prioritizes market autonomy, with its ESG investment system evolving through capital market self-organization. Regulatory technology strengthens market self-discipline: U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) climate disclosure rules have prompted institutions like BlackRock to develop AI-driven climate risk assessment models, conducting stress tests on over 90% of investment portfolios (Jamie et al., 2021). This "soft regulation" approach relies

on enabling policies such as the New York State Climate Act to guide—rather than mandate the market transformation.

3.1.2 San Francisco Bay Area: Technology Capitalization and Policy Leverage

San Francisco Bay Area's green finance thrives on the deep integration of risk capital and technological innovation, forming a closed-loop of "technology R&D-capital amplification-policy catalysis." California's AB 32 Act directs 35% of carbon quota auction proceeds to green R&D and offers green tax credits to lower innovation costs, enhancing technology-to-market efficiency.

3.1.3 Tokyo Bay Area: Legislative Precision and Industrial Transition Management

The Tokyo Bay Area implements a dual approach of statutory requirements and industrial policy, emphasizing "precision intervention". The Green Finance Promotion Law mandates financial institutions to disclose carbon intensity and provides clear the path of decarbonization of heavy industries. The Tokyo Bay Climate Adaptation Plan utilizes catastrophe bonds to transfer climate risks, ensuring post-disaster infrastructure resilience (M. Esteban et al., 2014).

3.1.4 GBA: Institutional Nestedness and Cross-Border Coordination Challenges

The GBA has established a "central coordination-local pilot" policy architecture, but cross-border regulatory conflicts impede synergy. Discrepancies between Hong Kong's common law-based "Green Loan Principles" and mainland China's Green Industry Guidance Catalogue increase cross-border green bond issuance costs. Differences between ICMA green bond standards and China's Green Bond Supporting Project Catalogue (2021 edition) create inconsistencies, complicating cross-border transactions (Qi, 2024). Non-uniform issuance standards have led to a lack of consistency and comparability in the issuance and investment of green bonds, increasing the complexity and risk of cross-border transactions.

3.2 Market Structure and Financing Efficiency

3.2.1 International Bay Areas: Specialized Division and Risk Diversification

New York Bay Area diversifies risks through "ESG+di-

versification” asset allocation, offering a range of products including carbon futures, sustainability-linked bonds (SLB), and natural capital securitization.

San Francisco Bay Area leverages its tech ecosystem to operate active carbon derivatives markets, enabling price discovery and risk hedging for clean technologies.

Tokyo Bay Area develops integrated industrial chain finance, using catastrophe bonds to transfer risks across value chains (Zhu Tiancheng, 2021).

3.2.2 GBA: Structural Rigidities and Efficiency Loss

The GBA faces pronounced financing imbalances: over 50% of green funds flow to wind and solar projects, neglecting long-term sectors like green transportation and ecological restoration due to local governments’ short-term GDP-oriented incentives.

SMEs encounter “double discrimination” in green credit: higher collateral requirements (Huang et al., 2020) and low green credit rating coverage due to fragmented regional standards. Product innovation lags, with limited applications of carbon derivatives and natural capital securitization.

3.3 Technology and Data Applications

3.3.1 International Bay Areas: Technology-Data-Regulation Convergence

New York Bay Area employs advanced tools such as Goldman Sachs’ Climate Value-at-Risk model to predict the impact of climate change in the 21st century on the current market Value of global financial assets and the market value fluctuations of companies. While JPMorgan’s CarbonX platform for granular supply chain carbon tracking.

San Francisco Bay Area uses NASA satellite data to build high-precision forest carbon sink monitoring systems, enabling real-time policy-making for sustainable resource allocation.

Tokyo Bay Area utilizes MUFG’s AI algorithms to analyze over 200,000 supply chain nodes, enhancing carbon footprint accuracy through data integration.

3.3.2 GBA: Data Silos and Technological Dependence

The GBA lags in tech-driven solutions: high disparities in environmental database interfaces create “data silos,”

while AI climate models rely heavily on open-source frameworks like TensorFlow, lacking local adaptation for the region’s unique climate risks (e.g., typhoons, high-temperature humidity). Blockchain and smart contracts have limited adoption in green bonds due to technical and regulatory challenges, with low implementation rates and interpretability issues (Chatterjee, J., & Dethlefs, N., 2020).

4. Core Bottlenecks in GBA’s Green Finance Development

4.1 Institutional Coordination Gaps

Despite a “central-local” policy framework, legal and regulatory differences between Guangdong, Hong Kong, and Macao create “policy fault line,” increasing cross-border transaction costs. Hong Kong’s common law and mainland China’s civil law systems diverge in green industry classification and disclosure rules, while Macao’s policy absence hinders unified discourse. These frictions impede capital flow and collaborative development.

4.2 Market Allocation Inefficiencies

Policies focusing on short-term outcomes driven by regional GDP competition lead to overinvestment in short-term renewable projects, neglecting complex long-term sectors. SMEs face exclusion due to risk aversion and underdeveloped green credit systems, while limited financial product innovation restricts risk diversification and financing options.

4.3 Technological and Data Deficits

Incomplete data governance with high interface standard disparities) and weak indigenous technology development limit risk assessment accuracy. Over-reliance on open-source AI frameworks and low blockchain adoption due to regulatory and technical barriers constrain fintech integration.

4.4 Underdeveloped ESG Ecosystem

The GBA lacks unified ESG disclosure standards, resulting in low corporate environmental transparency and weak green innovation incentives. Unlike international

peers, most firms view green transformation as a compliance cost rather than a strategic advantage, leading to lower R&D investment.

4.5 International Disconnect and Talent Shortages

The GBA has minimal influence in global green finance standard-setting, incurring high compliance costs under EU CBAM and U.S. SEC rules. Over 90% of green bond indices rely on external providers, while a shortage of more than 20,000 cross-disciplinary talents of green technology and cross-border finance restricts internationalization efforts.

5. Development Pathways and Strategic Proposals

5.1 Institutional Innovation: Regulatory Mutual Recognition and Coordination

5.1.1 Cross-Regional Regulatory Alignment Mechanism

Establish the “GBA Green Finance Regulatory Coordination Committee” involving mainland, Hong Kong, and Macao regulators to harmonize green industry classification, disclosure rules, and carbon accounting standards. Develop a “GBA Common Green Finance Classification Standard” to reduce cross-border bond issuance costs by over 30%, integrate Macao into the ecosystem via a “Macao Platform + Portuguese-Speaking Markets” model, and pilot cross-border carbon quota trading.

5.1.2 Regulatory Sandbox Innovation

Launch “Cross-Border Green Finance Innovation Sandboxes” in Shenzhen Qianhai and Guangzhou Nansha, allowing experimental reforms in carbon asset trading and green securitization. Implement a “negative list + risk circuit breaker” mechanism to facilitate data flow and smart contract legal recognition, generating replicable policy models.

5.2 Market Activation: Diversified and Targeted Financing Systems

5.2.1 Redressing Renewable Overconcentration

Establish a GBA Green Transition Guidance Fund to

channel investments into long-term projects (e.g., hydrogen mobility, mangrove restoration) using fiscal subsidies and risk-sharing mechanisms. Develop dynamic project valuation models incorporating long-term environmental benefits to address short-term policy biases.

5.2.2 SME Green Finance Ecosystem Development

Deploy a “GBA SME Green Credit Evaluation Model” integrating more than 10 data dimensions to increase green credit rating coverage to 60%. Establish a green finance guarantee fund to reduce collateral requirements by 30–50% and promote blockchain-based supply chain finance to address information asymmetry.

5.2.3 Product Innovation and Market Diversification

Leverage international experience to develop GBA-specific instruments: carbon-neutral linked bonds, mangrove carbon sink asset-backed securities (ABS), and typhoon catastrophe index insurance. Aim to increase carbon derivatives and transition finance products to 40% of the market within three years.

5.3 Technological Empowerment: Smart Financial Infrastructure

5.3.1 Unified Green Data Hub

Construct the “GBA Environmental Data Sharing Platform” with standardized interfaces and federated learning to integrate more than 20 data dimensions, reducing cross-border data verification time to three days and addressing “data silos.”

5.3.2 Core Technology R&D Priorities

Set up a green financial technology R&D project, focusing on three key areas:

- (1) Localized AI Climate Models: Develop the “GBA Climate Risk Prediction System” with universities to improve extreme weather simulation accuracy by 25% and reduce open-source dependency to 40%.
- (2) Blockchain Applications: Promote “smart contract + blockchain evidence” in green bonds to realize the automation of the whole process of bond issuance, interest payment, and asset penetration.
- (3) Standardized Carbon Accounting: Build a unified platform using IoT for real-time, granular carbon data collection, enabling cross-border interoperability for carbon

trading.

5.4 ESG Ecosystem Cultivation: Standardized Disclosure and Market-Driven Incentives

5.4.1 Unified ESG Disclosure and Rating System

Issue the GBA ESG Information Disclosure Guidelines mandating more than 15 core indicators for listed and bond-issuing enterprises, raising transparency to 80. Cultivate 5 local ESG rating agencies with lightweight models for SMEs, reducing financing costs by 1.5 percentage points.

5.4.2 Corporate Green Transition Incentives

Encourage leading enterprises like Tencent and Huawei to establish green supply chain certification systems, requiring 100% carbon disclosure from tier-one suppliers. Promote ESG index derivatives on HKEX and SZSE to channel capital to high-rated enterprises, integrating ESG into industrial competitiveness via export tax rebates and government procurement preferences.

5.5 Global Linkage: Standard-Setting and Talent Development

5.5.1 International Standard Participation

Leverage Hong Kong's financial center status to align GBA standards with global norms: develop a "GBA Carbon Footprint Accounting Guide" for partial EU ETS mutual recognition, reducing CBAM compliance costs by 40%. Launch the "GBA Green Bond Index" to replace external benchmarks and establish local pricing right of speech within three years.

5.5.2 Talent Pipeline Construction

Establish a "GBA Green Finance Talent Joint Training Program" in universities to cultivate interdisciplinary professionals in "green technology + cross-border finance," aiming for 10,000 new talents annually. Introduce a "GBA Green Talent Visa" with subsidies up to RMB 5 million for international experts and form a think tank alliance to contribute to global rule-making.

6. Conclusion

The GBA's green finance development, while progressing, faces profound challenges rooted in institutional disparities, market inefficiencies, technological gaps, and global

integration hurdles. To overcome these, the region must prioritize regulatory harmonization, market diversification, technological self-reliance, ESG ecosystem building, and international engagement. By leveraging its unique "one country, two systems" framework to foster institutional innovation, the GBA can transform into a global green finance hub, driving sustainable industrial upgrading and contributing to global climate governance. Continuous evaluation and adaptive policy adjustment will be critical to realizing this vision, ensuring the GBA's green finance evolution remains resilient and forward-looking.

References

- [1] Alharmoodi, F. (2022). Sustainable finance in Japan.
- [2] Bai, Q., Pei, Q., & Gu, L. (2018). Comparative study on the definition of green industries and green projects at home and abroad. *Environmental Protection*, (10).
- [3] Bank for International Settlements. (2021). *Green FinTech: Harnessing technology for sustainability*.
- [4] BIS (2021). *Green FinTech: Harnessing Technology for Sustainability*.
- [5] BlackRock. (2020). Sustainability as BlackRock's new standard for investing.
- [6] California Air Resources Board. (2023). Cap-and-trade program overview.
- [7] Central University of Finance and Economics Green Finance International Research Institute. (2023). Report on environmental information disclosure in China.
- [8] Chatterjee, J., & Dethlefs, N. (2020). Transparency, interpretability, and data availability: Key challenges in tackling climate change with AI.
- [9] Chen, S. Y. (2023). Coupling mechanism between green finance and industrial upgrading. *Finance and Economy*.
- [10] Climate Bonds Initiative. (2023). *China Green Bond Market Report*.
- [11] Climate Bonds Initiative. (2023). *Global State of the Market Report*.
- [12] Esteban, M., Mikami, T., Shibayama, T., Takagi, H., & Jonkman, S. (2014). Climate change adaptation in Tokyo Bay: The case for a storm surge barrier.
- [13] EU Technical Expert Group. (2020). *EU taxonomy for sustainable activities*.
- [14] Fan, D., & Wang, M. X. (2019). Environmental protection experience of the three major international bay areas and its implications for the Greater Bay Area. *Environmental Science and Management*, (4).
- [15] Fan, M. J. (2020). Regional coordination: Lessons from San Francisco, New York, and Tokyo bay areas (Part 2). *Urban Planning Bulletin*, (2).
- [16] Fu, J. Y., & Liu, Y. L. (2020). Practical exploration of green

bonds in promoting industrial transformation in the Greater Bay Area. *Environmental Protection*, (12).

[17] Fu, J., & Ng, A. W. (2020). Green finance reform and innovation for sustainable development of the Greater Bay Area.

[18] Guangdong Financial Regulatory Bureau. (2023). Progress report on green finance reform and innovation pilot zone of Guangdong Province.

[19] Guangdong Provincial Government. (2021). Green Finance Regulation of Guangdong Province.

[20] Guo, L. (2023). Analysis of the market structure of green finance in the Greater Bay Area. *Journal of Financial Research*.

[21] Hong Kong Monetary Authority. (2022). Green Bond Grant Scheme.

[22] Hu, Y., Diao, Z. K., & Hou, Y. T. (2022). Current status, shortcomings, and improvements of China's green finance system. *Journal of Shihezi University: Philosophy and Social Sciences*, (1).

[23] Huang, W., Wang, Y., & Chen, H. (2020). Analysis on the relationship between green finance and green development of Guangdong Province. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*.

[24] International Capital Market Association (ICMA). (2021). Green Bond Principles.

[25] International Monetary Fund (IMF). (2022). Fintech and the green transition.

[26] Kochhar, K. (2022). Green finance: An approach towards Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). *Asian Journal of Management*.

[27] Labatt, S., & White, R. (2002). *Environmental Finance*.

[28] Labe, Z., & Barnes, E. A. (2021). Climate model evaluation with explainable neural networks.

[29] Li, H., & Zhang, W. (2022). Mechanism and path of financial coordination in the Greater Bay Area. *Journal of Financial Research*.

[30] Li, J. (2022). SEC's new rules impose stricter climate disclosure on US-listed companies. *Finance and Accounting*, (7).

[31] Li, Z. Q. (2023). Evaluation of policy coordination efficiency in green finance. *Journal of Financial Research*.

[32] Ma, L. (2019). Promoting green development through green finance. *People's Forum*, (24).

[33] Ma, J. (2020). China's green finance development report. *Economic Research Journal*.

[34] Mechanisms for Regulatory Alignment in the Greater Bay Area: Typical Cases (Third Batch). (2025).

[35] Ministry of the Environment, Japan. (2021). Green Finance Promotion Law.

[36] New York State Energy Research and Development Authority. (2022). New York Climate Action Council Scoping Plan.

[37] Ng, A. (2018). From sustainability accounting to a green financing system. *Journal of Cleaner Production*.

[38] Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS). (2023). Progress report on climate scenarios.

[39] Outline Development Plan for the Guangdong-Hong Kong-

Macao Greater Bay Area. (2019).

[40] Paper Times Group. (2022). Union and Sumitomo Mitsui sign 5 billion yen green loan agreement. *Paper Times*, (17).

[41] People's Bank of China et al. (2016). Guiding opinions on building a green financial system.

[42] People's Bank of China. (2021). Guidelines on environmental information disclosure for financial institutions.

[43] People's Bank of China. (2023). Q2 2023 report on the loan direction of financial institutions.

[44] PitchBook. (2022). Clean technology investment trends.

[45] Pleune, J. G., Ruple, J. C., & Culver, N. W. (2021). Climate science in federal leasing decisions: BLM's responsibility and proposed practices. *Colorado Natural Resources, Energy & Environmental Law Review*, (2).

[46] Research Group on China's Green Finance Development. (2020). Prospects for China's green finance development. *China Finance*, (14).

[47] Sachs, J. (2021). *The Age of Sustainable Development*.

[48] Securities and Futures Commission. (2018). Strategic framework for green finance.

[49] Shanghai Environment and Energy Exchange. (2023). Annual report on national carbon market transactions.

[50] Stiglitz, J. (2019). Dual pricing model for green finance.

[51] Qi, T. (2024). Analyzing the financial impact of green bond issuance on new energy vehicle companies: Insights from BAIC Group in China.

[52] Tokyo Metropolitan Government. (2021). Low-carbon transition finance promotion plan.

[53] Tokyo Metropolitan Government. (2021). Zero Emission Tokyo Strategy.

[54] Tsinghua University Green Finance Center. (2023). Report on green financing costs of private enterprises in China.

[55] United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). (2016). *The Financial System We Need*.

[56] Volz, U. (2023). Harmonizing green finance standards in the Greater Bay Area. *ADB Working Paper*.

[57] Wang, Y. (2022). Coordinated development of green finance in the Greater Bay Area. *Southern Finance*.

[58] World Bank. (2023). State and trends of carbon pricing.

[59] Xu, D., & Ma, L. (2020). Constraints and promotion path of environmental governance coordination in the Greater Bay Area. *Geographical Research*, (9).

[60] Zhang, Z. G., & Shang, X. L. (2020). Innovation ecosystem in the San Francisco Bay Area and its implications for the Greater Bay Area. *Science and Technology Management Research*, (5).

[61] Zhou, L., Li, J. T., & Chen, J. C. (2020). Synergistic development of carbon emissions and green finance in the Greater Bay Area. *Contemporary Economy*, (11).

[62] Zhu, T. C. (2021). Pricing catastrophe bonds based on POT model and research on their issuance scale.