International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy

ISSN: 2146-4553

available at http: www.econjournals.com

International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy, 2024, 14(6), 287-294.

Load Capacity Factor and Environmental Quality: Unveiling the Role of Economic Growth, Green Innovations, and Environmental Policies in G20 Economies

Ivan A. Duran, Najia Saqib*

Department of Finance, College of Business Administration, Prince Sultan University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.
*Email: nsaqib@psu.edu.sa

Received: 01 August 2024 **Accepted:** 02 October 2024 **DOI:** https://doi.org/10.32479/ijeep.17413

ABSTRACT

The study analyzes the impact of economic growth, green innovations in Information and Communication Technology (ICT), and environmental legislation on the Load Capacity Factor (LCF) in G20 countries, employing data from 1993 to 2021. A comprehensive econometric analysis emphasizes the essential function of strong environmental legislation and green ICT developments in improving LCF, hence promoting a sustainable harmony between economic activities and environmental well-being. The study indicates that the integration of green ICT solutions and the enhancement of environmental regulations are essential for promoting sustainable development. Policy recommendations encompass the augmentation of environmental tax measures, the promotion of renewable energy investments, and the application of thorough environmental assessments. These techniques are crucial for the G20 countries in order to attain enduring environmental sustainability with economic growth.

Keywords: Load Capacity Factor, Environmental Sustainability, Green ICT, Environmental Policies
JEL Classifications: F64, F43, Q55, Q58

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the span of the last few decades, climate change has emerged as a severe global concern, pushing governments, both developed and developing, to review their energy strategy and environmental regulations. A considerable shift toward renewable energy sources has been accelerated by the urgency of lowering carbon dioxide (CO_2) emissions. This transition is considered necessary for both mitigating the repercussions on the environment and increasing energy independence. This endeavor is rooted in the overarching goal of attaining sustainable development, which is the production of energy that is not detrimental to the health of the environment or the well-being of future generations.

The empirical evidence emphasizes the essential significance of the energy sector in global decarbonization initiatives. Shirizadeh and Quirion (2021) assert that the energy sector offers more viable options for greenhouse gas reduction than the transportation and industrial sectors, which encounter more intricate obstacles. Research conducted by Hu et al. (2018) and Adams and Acheampong (2019) reinforces the implementation of renewable energy technologies, emphasizing their efficacy in mitigating CO_2 emissions across diverse geographical and economic settings. These sources, such as wind, solar, and hydroelectric power, provide feasible alternatives to fossil fuels, which are both environmentally detrimental and limited in availability. The shift to renewable energy is not without of debate. Menyah and Wolde-Rufael (2010) and Yazdi and Shakouri (2018) contend that renewable energy's effect on overall environmental degradation is minimal. They assert that renewable energy sources, although advantageous in mitigating emissions, fail to tackle all aspects of environmental deterioration, including resource depletion and habitat destruction. This disparity in empirical evidence highlights the intricacy of environmental sustainability and the necessity for an integrated approach to evaluating the effects on the environment.

The conventional dependence on CO_2 emissions as an indicator of environmental effect has come under scrutiny. Nathaniel et al. (2021) critiques this statistic for its failure to encompass the wider environmental degradation, including aspects such as biodiversity loss and water pollution. The ecological footprint has emerged as a comprehensive metric, assessing human demand on Earth's ecosystems. It indicates the extent of land and water necessary for a human population to generate the resources it utilizes and to assimilate its waste, given current technological capabilities. Notwithstanding its benefits, the ecological footprint inadequately encompasses the whole of human influence on the environment, especially on the capacity of ecosystems to regenerate and sustainably furnish resources. Siche et al. (2010) proposed the load capacity factor (LCF) to address this deficiency. The LCF is a ratio of biocapacity to ecological footprint, providing a detailed perspective on sustainability. The LCF amount beyond one signifies a sustainable condition in which biocapacity surpasses the ecological footprint, whereas values below one denotes unsustainable ecological practices that could end in protracted environmental degradation (Saqib and Shahzad, 2024).

The significance of economic mechanisms in environmental governance is paramount. Pigou's (1920) foundational work established the theoretical basis for environmental taxes, contending that these levies could efficiently internalize the negative externalities linked to environmental damage. In accordance with this philosophy, environmental levies and regulations have been established to encourage the mitigation of environmental damage and facilitate the use of clean technologies. In fact, environmental taxes have demonstrated significant efficacy in incentivizing firms to adopt more sustainable practices by increasing the cost of pollution. Recent research, including studies by Doğan et al. (2022) and Shayanmehr et al. (2023), empirically demonstrates the effectiveness of these levies in diminishing pollution levels across various economies. Simultaneously, environmental laws, encompassing both prescriptive "command-and-control" policies and market-based tools such as carbon trading, have proven effective in establishing and enforcing pollution norms (Stavins, 2003; Coskun and Bozatli, 2022).

This paper presents an extensive structure that synthesizes economic growth, environmental ICT advancements, renewable energy use, and effective environmental legislation. The study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the interplay between these parameters and their aggregate impact on the LCF, thereby balancing economic progress with environmental sustainability. Our conceptual model asserts that technology improvements in environmental ICT and proactive policy frameworks can substantially increase the load capacity of regions, promoting a sustainable equilibrium between human demands and ecological supplies. This paradigm is essential for politicians, corporations, and communities seeking to address the intricacies of sustainable development.

2. REVIEW LITERATURE

The correlation between economic growth and environmental quality has been thoroughly examined, particularly following the identification of an inverted U-shaped relationship termed the environmental Kuznets curve (EKC) by Grossman and Krueger (1991). This hypothesis asserts that environmental degradation initially intensifies with rising per capita income during the early stages of economic development but thereafter improves upon reaching a specific income threshold. The use of income squared in EKC models results in multicollinearity problems. Narayan and Narayan (2010) proposed comparing short- and long-run elasticities to validate the EKC theory, indicating that if long-run elasticity is less than short-run elasticity, environmental degradation is expected to diminish with time, hence corroborating the EKC hypothesis. Subsequently, numerous research has evaluated this concept with disparate outcomes. Certain studies (e.g., Saboori et al., 2016; Dong et al., 2018, Mahmood et al. 2021, Gao et al., 2023) corroborate the EKC concept, whilst others yield contradictory results, underscoring the intricacy and persistent discourse regarding this economic-environmental nexus.

The relationship between Information and Communication Technology (ICT) and pollution has been a focal point of research due to the integral role of technology in development (Sharif et al., 2022; Saqib et al., 2023; Saqib et al., 2024). In a study using the Generalized Method of Moments (GMM) for 60 countries, Chatti and Majeed (2022) discovered that while ICT adoption in urban areas contributes to reducing CO_2 emissions, its beneficial environmental impacts are relatively limited in developing countries. Similarly, Shobande and Asongu (2022) utilized the panel Vector Autoregression (VAR) method, concluding that ICT facilitates CO_2 reduction through enhanced resource access and improved carbon monitoring in 18 African nations. In another study, Sun (2022) employed spatial and time-fixed effects models, demonstrating that ICT lowers carbon intensity at the city level across China. Zafar et al. (2022) utilized the Continuously Updated Fully Modified (CUP-FM) estimator in their research on 16 Asian countries, finding that ICT lowers CO_2 emissions and suggesting that ICT-enabled economic policies should be designed to bolster environmental quality.

Additional investigations into the impact of ICT on the ecological footprint have been undertaken with diverse econometric methodologies. Caglar et al. (2021) utilized the panel Autoregressive Distributed Lag (ARDL) model, demonstrating that ICT decreases the ecological footprint in the world's ten most polluting nations. Kahouli et al. (2022) employed Johansen cointegration and Vector Error Correction Model (VECM) methodologies, concluding that ICT reduces the ecological footprint in Saudi Arabia. Özpolat (2022) additionally observed a decline in the EF in G7 nations due to internet usage, examined by the Augmented Mean Group (AMG) estimator. Nonetheless, not all research corroborates these results. Raheem et al. (2020) employed the Pooled Mean Group (PMG) methodology and identified a rise in CO_2 emissions associated with ICT in G7 nations. Kongbuamai et al. (2022) employed the Feasible General

Least Squares (FGLS) method for N11 countries and discovered that ICT enhances the ecological footprint. Likewise, Rout et al. (2022) utilized PMG for BRICS nations, whereas Awad (2022) applied FGLS and Panel-Corrected Standard Errors (PCSE) for 47 Sub-Saharan African countries, concluding that ICT either enhances the ecological footprint or exerts no substantial influence on it. Kazemzadeh et al. (2022) similarly discovered no substantial impact of ICT on the ecological footprint in 19 emerging nations by panel quantile regression analysis.

In depth investigations have established that renewable energy sources are advantageous for the environment, capable of mitigating fossil fuel pollution, and successful in reducing both ecological footprints (EF) and CO_2 emissions (Yu et al. 2022; Khan et al., 2022; Duran et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024; Abbas et al., 2024). Significant findings from Zafar et al. (2020) underscore this beneficial effect in 27 OECD nations, while analogous outcomes were noted by Khan et al. (2022) in the G7 countries and by Xie et al. (2022) in China, where renewable energy sources have demonstrably mitigated CO_2 emissions in an ecologically sustainable manner. Furthermore, research conducted by Altıntaş and Kassouri (2020) across 14 European Union (EU) nations, Caglar et al. (2021) in the ten most polluted countries, and Huang et al. (2022) in 14 varied countries has continually shown that renewable energy substantially reduces the ecological footprint. In contrast, certain studies have yielded alternative conclusions. Bölük and Mert (2014) noted that although renewable energy can diminish CO_2 emissions, its effectiveness is only fifty percent of the pollution generated by fossil fuels. Correspondingly, research conducted by Pata and Samour (2022) in France indicates that renewable energy does not substantially influence the mitigation of CO_2, environmental footprint (EF), and LCF. These studies indicate that renewable resources are not being employed in a sufficiently efficient and appropriate approach.

Numerous studies highlight the essential importance of governmental efficacy in the successful execution of environmental programs. Government effectiveness is a strong indication that demonstrates the ability to formulate policies free from political influences, the quality of policy implementation, and the government's dedication to these objectives. Empirical studies consistently demonstrate a positive correlation between elevated government effectiveness and environmental sustainability, as evidenced by the research of Al-Mulali et al. (2022), Ali et al. (2022), Zakari et al. (2022), Yasmeen et al. (2022), Jianguo et al. (2022), and Muoneke et al. (2023). Bildirici (2022) and Khan et al. (2023) assert that in areas such as the Middle East and sub-Saharan Africa, characterized by low governmental efficacy, programs frequently do not substantially mitigate pollution. Kartal et al. (2024) discovered that in the Netherlands, political stability, which serves as an indicator of institutional quality, is linked to less environmental pollution. Gholipour and Farzanegan (2018) investigated whether countries with better government performance may utilize their institutional qualities to more efficiently mitigate air pollution. Their findings verified that government efficacy results in reduced air pollution levels, dependent on the robustness of institutional quality. Government effectiveness includes the official and informal laws, norms, and structures that delineate and govern a nation's social, economic, and political relationships, rendering it essential for attaining environmental sustainability.

3. DATA AND METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1. Data Sources

This study utilizes a diverse set of variables to examine the interplay between environmental sustainability and economic factors focusing specifically on the G20 economies since 1993 until 2021. The LCF, which measures the ratio of biocapacity to ecological footprints in global hectares, is sourced from the Global Footprint Network (GFN). Economic growth is represented by GDP per capita in constant 2015 U.S. dollars, data for which is obtained from the World Development Indicators (WDI). Environmental ICT innovations, indicated by the percentage of environment-related technologies aimed at climate change mitigation within the ICT sector, are documented by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). The use of renewable energy, expressed as a percentage of the total primary energy supply, is also reported by the OECD. Lastly, the quality of environmental policies, assessed through the regulatory quality index, is derived from the World Governance Indicators (WGI). Each of these data sources provides robust and specialized measurements that contribute to a comprehensive analysis of the variables influencing environmental sustainability across various contexts. The variables utilized in this study are presented in Table 1, which emphasizes the reputable sources recognized for their precision and dependability. This serves to strengthen the credibility of the study results.

3.2. Econometric Model

The model of this study is presented below:

Model:

$$\mathrm{L}OF_{\mathrm{it}} = f\left(\mathrm{GDP}_{i,t},\ GDP^2_{i,t}, \mathrm{GICT}_{i,t},\ \mathrm{REU}_{i,t}, EPOL_{i,t}\right) \quad (1)$$

Load capacity factor = f (Economic growth, Green ICT innovations, Renewable energy use, Environmental policies)

Table 2 presents descriptive statistics for variables used in analyzing the relationships between economic growth, green ICT innovations, renewable energy use, environmental policies, and the LCF. The mean values indicate an average LCF of 4.832, suggesting a relatively high ability of regions to sustain their population with current lifestyles to climate change mitigation. The standard deviations show moderate variability across all variables, with LCF and GDP exhibiting less spread (0.421 and 0.389, respectively) compared to renewable energy use (0.845). The range of values from minimum to maximum highlights significant differences in each variable's extent across observed regions. Notably, all variables passed the Jarque-Bera test for normality with a probability of 0.000, indicating that the distributions significantly deviate from normality. This statistical profile sets the stage for deeper

Table 1: Variables' description

Variables	Symbol	Measurement	Resources
Load capacity factor	LCF	$\left(\frac{\text{Biocapacity}}{\text{Ecological footprints}}, \text{global hectares}\right)$	GFN
Economic growth	GDP	per capita (USD Constant 2015)	WDI
Environmental ICT innovations	GICT	Percentage of environment-related technologies by climate change mitigation in ICT.	OECD
Renewable energy use	REU	Total, % of primary energy supply	OECD
Environmental policies	EPOL	Government policies and adherence are measured by the regulatory quality index.	WGI

WDI, GFN, OECD and WGI stand for World Development Indicators, Global Footprint Network, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and World Governance Indicator respectively

Table 2: Descriptive statistics

Statistics	LOCF	GDP	GICT	REU	EPOL
Mean	4.832	3.651	5.219	8.210	6.518
Std. Dev.	0.421	0.389	0.537	0.845	0.610
Minimum	3.851	1.231	4.210	2.051	1.484
Maximum	5.552	4.12	6.974	5.791	4.174
Jarque-Bera	2.610	2.370	3.824	3.061	3.364
Jarque-Bera Prob.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

econometric analysis into how these factors interact to influence environmental sustainability.

3.3. Econometric Modelling Approach

The econometric methodology commences with the Cross-sectional Dependence (CSD) test to evaluate the interdependence of variables, succeeded by the unit-root test to ascertain the stationarity of the panel data. The subsequent stage entails conducting a panel cointegration test to ascertain long-term correlations among the variables. The Cross-Sectionally Augmented Distributed Lag (CS-ARDL) approach subsequently assesses the impacts of these variables. The robustness of the findings is ultimately assessed by Augmented Mean Group (AMG) and Common Correlated Effects Mean Group (CCEMG) investigations.

3.3.1. CSD test

In large N panel data models, disturbances are often assumed to be independent across sections. However, Cross-sectional Dependence (CSD) is common, as evidenced in numerous studies, and can significantly compromise the accuracy and validity of statistical estimates. For testing CSD, a combination of bias-corrected scaled LM and scaled LM tests are employed. Equation 2 introduces a modified version of the CSD test, while Equation 3 presents an enhanced LM statistic, the CSD--LM version, which, according to Pesaran (2021), can effectively address this issue.

$$CSD_P = \sqrt{\frac{2T}{N(N-1)}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N-1}\sum_{j=i+1}^{N}\rho_{ij}\right) \sim N(0,1)\text{i, j} \quad (2)$$

$$CSD_{LM} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N(N-1)}}\sum_{i=1}^{N-1}\sum_{j=i+1}\sum_{ij}\left(T_{ij}\hat{\rho}_{ij}^2 - 1\right) \to N(0,1) \quad (3)$$

3.3.2. Unit-root test

In this study, panel data affected by Cross-sectional Dependence (CSD) is evaluated using second-generation stationarity tests. Specifically, the results from the CIPS and CADF tests, refined by Pesaran (2007), remain robust despite the presence of CSD. The methodology incorporates the CIPS stationarity test as outlined in Equation 4, while the CADF test statistics are detailed in Equation 5.

$$CIPS = N^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\omega_i\left(N,T\right) \quad (4)$$

$$CIPS = N^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{N}CADF_i \quad (5)$$

3.3.3. Cointegration test

The study employs cointegration analysis, specifically using techniques developed by Westerlund (2007), to examine the long-term relationships among the variables in the framework. Equations 6 and 7 outline the group-oriented measures (G_τ and G_a) utilized in the Westerlund approach, while Equations 8 and 9 detail the panel-oriented metrics (P_τ and P_a).

$$G_\tau = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{\Psi_i}{\text{SE}\left(\hat{\Psi}_i\right)} \quad (6)$$

$$G_a = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{T\Psi_i}{\Psi_i^{'}(1)} \quad (7)$$

$$P_\tau = \frac{\hat{\Psi}_i}{SE\left(\hat{\Psi}_i\right)} \quad (8)$$

$$P_a = T\hat{\Psi} \quad (9)$$

3.3.4. CS-ARDL test

The Cross-Sectionally Augmented Autoregressive Distributed Lag (CS-ARDL) framework is utilized as the primary method to analyze long-term relationships in this study. This approach facilitates a comprehensive examination of temporal changes, variations across different groups at specific times, and the interconnectedness of errors among groups, as outlined by Yao et al. (2019). The enduring coefficients in the CS-ARDL analysis are calculated from the temporary coefficients. Equation-10 details the constant coefficient of the mean group estimator.

$$\hat{\vartheta}_{CS-ARDL,i} = \frac{\sum_{I=0}^{P_v} \hat{\delta}_{Ii}}{1 = \Sigma_{I=0}} \hat{\alpha}_{I,t} \tag{10}$$

3.3.5. Robustness analysis

The Augmented Mean Group (AMG) estimator, developed by Eberhardt and Bond (2009), Eberhardt et al. (2010), and Eberhardt (2012), is a sophisticated method used to analyze the results of the CS-ARDL framework. This estimator incorporates the synthesis of cross-sectional averages to mitigate the impact of observable common factors, facilitating detailed analysis of both dependent and independent variables as discussed by Kapetanios et al. (2011). It employs the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) method for precise parameter estimation and uses a two-step process to address cross-sectional dependence (CSD) by estimating unobserved common dynamic effects. Equation-11 explains the AMG estimation process, which parallels the procedural approach of Equation-12 used in the Common Correlated Effects Mean Group (CCEMG) framework.

$$AMG = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \tilde{\beta}_i \tag{11}$$

$$CCEMG = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \hat{\beta}_i \tag{12}$$

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Table 3 displays the outcomes of the Cross-Sectional Dependence (CSD) test, underlining the importance of addressing cross-sectional dependency within the dataset. By employing CSD diagnostic methods developed by Breusch and Pagan (1980) and Pesaran (2021), the tests yielded statistically significant results at a 1% significance level. These significant findings led to the rejection of the null hypothesis (H_0), which posited no cross-sectional dependency among the variables such as GDP, GDP^2, GICT, REU and EPOL in G20 countries. The alignment of these results with the findings of Duran et al. (2023) corroborates this study's conclusions and reinforces the necessity of a detailed examination of cross-sectional dependency and data heterogeneity.

The study incorporates second-generation unit root tests to assess the integrative properties of the dataset, with the objective of determining the order of integration of the series, as outlined in Table 4. Utilizing Cross-sectional Im, Pesaran, and Shin (CIPS) and Cross-sectional Augmented Dickey-Fuller (CADF) tests—both recommended under conditions of heterogeneity and cross-sectional dependence (CSD)—the tests are conducted at both the level I(0) and first difference I(1) stages. The results from both the CADF and CIPS tests allow for the rejection of the null hypothesis (H_0), confirming the absence of unit roots in the dataset. These

Table 3: CSD test

Test	Stat.	P-value
Breusch-Pagan LM	1321.621*	0.0002
Pesaran-CD	14.641*	0.0000

*P<0.01

Table 4: Unit-root tests

Parameters	CIPS		CADF	
	I (0)	I (1)	I (0)	I (1)
LCF	−1.531	−3.331*	−1.336	−3.361*
GDP	−1.246	−3.631*	−1.937	−3.851*
GICT	−0.964	−2.348*	−1.652	−3.541*
REU	−1.321	−3.064*	−1.961	−4.106*
EPOL	−1.788	−4.634*	−1.852	−3.854*

*P<0.01

results underscore the absence of unit roots at both the I(0) and I(1) levels, affirming the dynamic and static relationships among the variables relevant to G20 countries.

To address the complexities posed by Cross-sectional Dependence (CSD) in the dataset, this study utilizes a second-generation panel cointegration test as developed by Westerlund (2007), with detailed results shown in Table 5. The Westerlund test results, particularly the panel (Pτ and Pα) and group statistics (G_τ and G_α), facilitate the rejection of the null hypothesis (H_0) which assumes no cointegration among the variables. This method effectively addresses the challenges of heterogeneity and CSD, confirming the presence of cointegration and reinforcing the empirical support for the study's findings. These findings validate the cointegration among the study variables, demonstrating robustness against the analytical challenges of dataset heterogeneity and cross-sectional dependencies.

The next step in the empirical analysis involves examining the correlations between GDP, GDP^2, GICT, REU, and EPOL in G20 countries, by generating both short-term and long-term estimates. This follows the establishment of long-term relationships among these variables. Table 6 reveals that in the model, while GDP^2, GICT, REU, and EPOL show positive correlations, GDP itself is negatively correlated. This aligns with findings from Fareed et al. (2021) and Shang et al. (2022), which indicated that the green energy transition enhances environmental sustainability by boosting the LCF in Indonesia and other Asian countries. The significant ECM value confirms the presence of a stable long-term relationship among the variables GDP, GDP^2, GICT, REU, and EPOL, which means that any short-term fluctuations are temporary and the variables will adjust to maintain their equilibrium relationship. This characteristic is crucial for understanding the dynamics of the model and for making predictions about the behavior of these variables over time.

This research enhances its analytical robustness through the use of the Augmented Mean Group (AMG) and the Common Correlated Effects Mean Group (CCEMG) tests, respectively developed by Eberhardt (2012) and Pesaran (2007). Table 7 meticulously displays the results of these robustness tests, underlining the reliability of the findings across the full panel dataset. The data

Table 5: Cointegration tests

Westerlund Cointegration Test		
Statistics	Values	Prob.
G_τ	−7.852*	0.000
G_α	−8.243*	0.000
P_τ	−7.631*	0.000
P_α	−8.883*	0.000

*P<0.01

Table 6: CS-ARDL test results

Parameters	Short-run		Long-run	
	Coeff.	t-stats.	Coeff.	t-stats.
GDP	−0.068*	−3.121	−0.391*	−3.831
GDP^2	0.156*	3.685	0.204*	3.794
GICT	0.075*	3.539	0.175*	3.722
REU	0.045**	2.354	0.183**	2.164
EPOL	0.075**	2.163	0.217**	2.231
ECM (-1)	−0.410*	−5.031	-	-

*P<0.01, and **P<0.05

Table 7: Robustness test results

Parameters	AMG		CCEMG	
	Coeff.	t-stats.	Coeff.	t-stats.
GDP	−0.138*	3.531	−0.163*	3.860
GDP2	0.254**	2.552	0.631**	2.449
GICT	0.241*	3.632	0.649**	3.942
REU	0.163**	2.521	0.196*	3.637
EPOL	0.209*	3.684	0.283*	3.721
Constant	1.673*	3.974	2.971*	4.228
RMSE	0.0204		0.0296	

*P<0.01 and **P<0.05

showcases the complex interactions among GDP, GDP^2, GICT, REU, and EPOL within G20 countries, providing valuable insights into the relationship between economic indicators and environmental policies. The robust statistical significance of these findings, illustrated by strong t-statistics across both tests, underscores the critical implications for sustainable development and informs policy-making aimed at integrating economic and environmental objectives.

5. CONCLUSION AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The study suggests that environmental regulations and green innovations are essential for enhancing the LCF in G20 economies from 1993 to 2021. It underscores that proactive environmental ICT advances and rigorous policies can substantially augment these regions' ability to facilitate sustainable development. The findings emphasize the necessity for a comprehensive approach that addresses both technological and policy aspects to successfully mitigate the environmental consequences of economic activities throughout this roughly 30-year period. This cohesive strategy is essential for aligning economic growth with environmental conservation.

The paper promotes several measures to encourage environmentally sustainable economic development in G20 countries by suggesting the improved incorporation of ICT in environmental policies, using technological improvements to more effectively monitor and control environmental impacts. It advocates for the enhancement of environmental rules via more stringent standards and fees to motivate industry towards sustainable practices. Additionally, it underscores the importance of advancing renewable energy through heightened investments in alternatives that diminish reliance on fossil fuels and lessen environmental impacts. Furthermore, the implementation of multi-dimensional environmental evaluations, including the ecological footprint and LCF, is recommended to offer a more thorough evaluation of environmental sustainability. These guidelines are essential for using technical advancements and legislative reforms to guarantee that economic expansion is consistent with environmental well-being.

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to acknowledge the support of Prince Sultan University for paying the Article Processing Charges (APC) of this publication.

REFERENCES

Abbas, S., Saqib, N., Mohammed, K.S., Sahore, N., Shahzad, U. (2024), Pathways towards carbon neutrality in low carbon cities: The role of green patents, R&D and energy use for carbon emissions. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 200, 123109.

Adams, S., Acheampong, A.O. (2019), Reducing carbon emissions: The role of renewable energy and democracy. Journal of Cleaner Production, 240, 118245.

Ali, K., Jianguo, D., Kirikkaleli, D. (2022), Modeling the natural resources and financial inclusion on ecological footprint: The role of economic governance institutions. Evidence from ECOWAS economies. Resources Policy, 79, 103115.

Al-Mulali, U., Gholipour, H.F., Solarin, S.A. (2021), Investigating the environmental Kuznets curve (EKC) hypothesis: Does government effectiveness matter? Evidence from 170 countries. Environment Development and Sustainability, 24(11), 12740-12755.

Altıntaş, H., Kassouri, Y. (2020), Is the environmental Kuznets Curve in Europe related to the per-capita ecological footprint or CO_2 emissions? Ecological Indicators, 113, 106187.

Awad, A. (2022), Is there any impact from ICT on environmental quality in Africa? Evidence from second-generation panel techniques. Environmental Challenges, 7, 100520.

Bildirici, M. (2021), The impacts of governance on environmental pollution in some countries of Middle East and sub-Saharan Africa: The evidence from panel quantile regression and causality. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 29(12), 17382-17393.

Bölük, G., Mert, M. (2014), Fossil & renewable energy consumption, GHGs (greenhouse gases) and economic growth: Evidence from a panel of EU (European Union) countries. Energy, 74, 439-446.

Breusch, T.S., Pagan, A.R. (1980), The lagrange multiplier test and its applications to model specification in econometrics. The Review of Economic Studies, 47(1), 239.

Caglar, A.E., Mert, M., Boluk, G. (2021), Testing the role of information and communication technologies and renewable energy consumption in ecological footprint quality: Evidence from world top 10 pollutant footprint countries. Journal of Cleaner Production, 298, 126784.

Chatti, W., Majeed, M.T. (2022), Information communication Technology (ICT), smart urbanization, and environmental quality: Evidence from a panel of developing and developed economies. Journal of Cleaner

Production, 366, 132925.

Coskun, Ö.K., Vuillemin, A., Schubotz, F., Klein, F., Sichel, S.E., Eisenreich, W., Orsi, W.D. (2021), Correction to: Quantifying the effects of hydrogen on carbon assimilation in a seafloor microbial community associated with ultramafic rocks. The ISME Journal, 16(3), 900.

Doğan, B., Chu, L.K., Ghosh, S., Truong, H.H.D., Balsalobre-Lorente, D. (2022), How environmental taxes and carbon emissions are related in the G7 economies? Renewable Energy, 187, 645-656.

Dong, K., Sun, R., Dong, X. (2018), CO_2 emissions, natural gas and renewables, economic growth: Assessing the evidence from China. The Science of the Total Environment, 640-641, 293-302.

Duran, N.I.A., Saqib, N., Mahmood, N.H. (2023), Assessing the connection between nuclear and renewable energy on ecological footprint within the EKC framework: Implications for sustainable policy in leading nuclear energy-producing countries. International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy, 13(2), 256-264.

Eberhardt, M. (2012), Estimating panel time-series models with heterogeneous slopes. The Stata Journal Promoting Communications on Statistics and Stata, 12(1), 61-71.

Eberhardt, M., Bond, S. (2009), Cross-section Dependence in Non-Stationary Panel Models: A Novel Estimator, MPRA Paper 17692. Germany: University Library of Munich. Available from: https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/id/eprint/17692

Eberhardt, M., Teal, F., Binder, M., Bond, S., Durlauf, S., Hendry, D., Muellbauer, J., Pesaran, H., Smith, R. (2010), Productivity Analysis in Global Manufacturing Production, Department of Economics Discussion Paper Series. United Kingdom: University of Oxford.

Fareed, Z., Salem, S., Adebayo, T.S., Pata, U.K., Shahzad, F. (2021), Role of export diversification and renewable energy on the load capacity factor in Indonesia: A fourier quantile causality approach. Frontiers in Environmental Science, 9, 770152.

Gao, Y., Murshed, M., Ozturk, I., Saqib, N., Siddik, A.B., Alam, M.M. (2023), Can financing technological development programs mitigate mineral resource consumption-related environmental problems faced by Sub-Saharan African nations? Resources Policy, 87, 104343.

Gholipour, H.F., Farzanegan, M.R. (2017), Institutions and the effectiveness of expenditures on environmental protection: Evidence from Middle Eastern countries. Constitutional Political Economy, 29(1), 20-39.

Hu, H., Xie, N., Fang, D., Zhang, X. (2017), The role of renewable energy consumption and commercial services trade in carbon dioxide reduction: Evidence from 25 developing countries. Applied Energy, 211, 1229-1244.

Huang, Y., Haseeb, M., Usman, M., Ozturk, I. (2022), Dynamic association between ICT, renewable energy, economic complexity and ecological footprint: Is there any difference between E-7 (developing) and G-7 (developed) countries? Technology in Society, 68, 101853.

Jianguo, D., Ali, K., Alnori, F., Ullah, S. (2022), The nexus of financial development, technological innovation, institutional quality, and environmental quality: Evidence from OECD economies. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 29(38), 58179-58200.

Kahouli, B., Hamdi, B., Nafla, A., Chabaane, N. (2022), Investigating the relationship between ICT, green energy, total factor productivity, and ecological footprint: Empirical evidence from Saudi Arabia. Energy Strategy Reviews, 42, 100871.

Kapetanios, G., Pesaran, M.H., Yamagata, T. (2010), Panels with non-stationary multifactor error structures. Journal of Econometrics, 160(2), 326-348.

Kartal, M.T., Kirikkaleli, D., Depren, S.K. (2023), Investigating political stability effect on the environment in the Netherlands by Fourier-based approaches. International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology, 31(2), 125-136.

Kazemzadeh, E., Fuinhas, J.A., Salehnia, N., Osmani, F. (2022), The effect of economic complexity, fertility rate, and information and communication technology on ecological footprint in the emerging economies: A two-step stirpat model and panel quantile regression. Quality and Quantity, 57(1), 737-763.

Khan, A., Sampene, A.K., Ali, S. (2023), Towards environmental degradation mitigation: The role of regulatory quality, technological innovation and government effectiveness in the CEMAC countries. Heliyon, 9(6), e17029.

Khan, A.A., Khan, S.U., Ali, M.A.S., Safi, A., Gao, Y., Ali, M., Luo, J. (2022), Role of institutional quality and renewable energy consumption in achieving carbon neutrality: Case study of G-7 economies. The Science of the Total Environment, 814, 152797.

Khan, S.A.R., Yu, Z., Umar, M., Zia-ul-haq, H.M., Tanveer, M., Janjua, L.R. (2021), Renewable energy and advanced logistical infrastructure: Carbon-free economic development. Sustainable Development, 30(4), 693-702.

Kongbuamai, N., Bui, Q., Adedoyin, F.F., Bekun, F.V. (2022), Developing environmental policy framework for sustainable development in Next-11 countries: The impacts of information and communication technology and urbanization on the ecological footprint. Environment Development and Sustainability, 25(10), 11307-11335.

Li, B., Amin, A., Nureen, N., Saqib, N., Wang, L., Rehman, M.A. (2024), Assessing factors influencing renewable energy deployment and the role of natural resources in MENA countries. Resources Policy, 88, 104417.

Mahmood, H., Alkhateeb, T.T.Y., Tanveer, M., Mahmoud, D.H.I. (2021), Testing the energy-environmental Kuznets Curve hypothesis in the renewable and nonrenewable energy consumption models in Egypt. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18(14), 7334.

Menyah, K., Wolde-Rufael, Y. (2010), CO_2 emissions, nuclear energy, renewable energy and economic growth in the US. Energy Policy, 38(6), 2911-2915.

Muoneke, O.B., Okere, K.I., Alemayehu, F.K. (2023), Interplay between socio-economic challenges, environmental sustainability and the moderating role of government effectiveness in the Med-9 countries. Resources Policy, 85, 104017.

Narayan, P.K., Narayan, S. (2010), Carbon dioxide emissions and economic growth: Panel data evidence from developing countries. Energy Policy, 38(1), 661-666.

Nathaniel, S.P., Alam, M.S., Murshed, M., Mahmood, H., Ahmad, P. (2021), The roles of nuclear energy, renewable energy, and economic growth in the abatement of carbon dioxide emissions in the G7 countries. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 28(35), 47957-47972.

Özpolat, A. (2021), How does internet use affect ecological footprint?: An empirical analysis for G7 countries. Environment Development and Sustainability, 24(11), 12833-12849.

Pata, U.K., Samour, A. (2022), Do renewable and nuclear energy enhance environmental quality in France? A new EKC approach with the load capacity factor. Progress in Nuclear Energy, 149, 104249.

Pesaran, M.H. (2007), A simple panel unit root test in the presence of cross-section dependence. Journal of Applied Econometrics, 22(2), 265-312.

Pesaran, M.H. (2020), General diagnostic tests for cross-sectional dependence in panels. Empirical Economics, 60(1), 13-50.

Pigou, A.C. (1920), The Economics of Welfare. London: Macmillan.

Raheem, I.D., Tiwari, A.K., Balsalobre-Lorente, D. (2019), The role of ICT and financial development in CO_2 emissions and economic growth. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 27(2), 1912-1922.

Rout, S.K., Gupta, M., Sahoo, M. (2021), The role of technological innovation and diffusion, energy consumption and financial development in affecting ecological footprint in BRICS: An empirical analysis. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 29(17), 25318-25335.

Saboori, B., Al-Mulali, U., Baba, M.B., Mohammed, A.H. (2014), Oil-induced environmental Kuznets curve in Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC). International Journal of Green Energy, 13(4), 408-416.

Saqib, N., Abbas, S., Ozturk, I., Murshed, M., Tarczyńska-Łuniewska, M., Mahtab Alam, M., Tarczyński, W. (2024), Leveraging environmental ICT for carbon neutrality: Analyzing the impact of financial development, renewable energy and human capital in top polluting economies. Gondwana Research, 126, 305-320.

Saqib, N., Duran, I.A., Ozturk, I. (2023), Unraveling the interrelationship of digitalization, renewable energy, and ecological footprints within the EKC framework: Empirical insights from the United States. Sustainability, 15, 10663.

Saqib, N., Shahzad, U. (2024), Pathways to sustainability: Evaluating the impact of green energy, natural resources, FinTech, and environmental policies in resource-abundant countries. Resources Policy, 97, 105264.

Shang, Y., Razzaq, A., Chupradit, S., An, N.B., Abdul-Samad, Z. (2022), The role of renewable energy consumption and health expenditures in improving load capacity factor in ASEAN countries: Exploring new paradigm using advance panel models. Renewable Energy, 191, 715-722.

Sharif, A., Saqib, N., Dong, K., Khan, S.A.R. (2022), Nexus between green technology innovation, green financing, and CO_2 emissions in the G7 countries: The moderating role of social globalisation. Sustainable Development, 30(6), 1934-1946.

Shayanmehr, S., Radmehr, R., Ali, E.B., Ofori, E.K., Adebayo, T.S., Gyamfi, B.A. (2023), How do environmental tax and renewable energy contribute to ecological sustainability? New evidence from top renewable energy countries. International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology, 30(6), 650-670.

Shirizadeh, B., Quirion, P. (2020), Low-carbon options for the French power sector: What role for renewables, nuclear energy and carbon capture and storage? Energy Economics, 95, 105004.

Shobande, O.A., Asongu, S.A. (2022), The critical role of education and ICT in promoting environmental sustainability in Eastern and Southern Africa: A panel VAR approach. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 176, 121480.

Siche, R., Pereira, L., Agostinho, F., Ortega, E. (2010), Convergence of ecological footprint and emergy analysis as a sustainability indicator of countries: Peru as case study. Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation, 15(10), 3182-3192.

Stavins, R.N. (2003), Experience with market-based environmental policy instruments. In: Handbook of Environmental Economics. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science. p355-435.

Sun, H. (2022), What are the roles of green technology innovation and ICT employment in lowering carbon intensity in China? A city-level analysis of the spatial effects. Resources Conservation and Recycling, 186, 106550.

Westerlund, J. (2007), Testing for error correction in panel data. Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics, 69(6), 709-748.

Xie, Q., Adebayo, T.S., Irfan, M., Altuntaş, M. (2022), Race to environmental sustainability: Can renewable energy consumption and technological innovation sustain the strides for China? Renewable Energy, 197, 320-330.

Yao, S., Zhang, S., Zhang, X. (2019), Renewable energy, carbon emission and economic growth: A revised environmental Kuznets Curve perspective. Journal of Cleaner Production, 235, 1338-1352.

Yasmeen, R., Tao, R., Shah, W.U.H., Padda, I.U.H., Tang, C. (2022), The nexuses between carbon emissions, agriculture production efficiency, research and development, and government effectiveness: Evidence from major agriculture-producing countries. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 29(34), 52133-52146.

Yazdi, S.K., Shakouri, B. (2017), The renewable energy, CO_2 emissions, and economic growth: VAR model. Energy Sources Part B Economics Planning and Policy, 13(1), 53-59.

Yu, Z., Zia-Ul-Haq, H.M., Irshad, A.U.R., Tanveer, M., Jameel, K., Janjua, L.R. (2022), Nexuses between crude oil imports, renewable energy, transport services, and technological innovation: A fresh insight from Germany. Journal of Petroleum Exploration and Production Technology, 12(11), 2887-2897.

Zafar, M.W., Shahbaz, M., Sinha, A., Sengupta, T., Qin, Q. (2020), How renewable energy consumption contribute to environmental quality? The role of education in OECD countries. Journal of Cleaner Production, 268, 122149.

Zafar, M.W., Zaidi, S.A.H., Mansoor, S., Sinha, A., Qin, Q. (2022), ICT and education as determinants of environmental quality: The role of financial development in selected Asian countries. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 177, 121547.

Zakari, A., Khan, I., Tawiah, V., Alvarado, R. (2022), Reviewing the ecological footprints of Africa top carbon consumer: A quantile on quantile analysis. International Journal of Environmental Science and Technology, 19(11), 11475-11486.