

Digital Green Laws: The Role of Legal Norms in Advancing Climate Technology for Sustainable Development

Deni Yusup Permana ¹ , Stefan Mihaila ² , Radu Popa ³ 

¹ Universitas Swadaya Gunung Jati, Indonesia

² University of Iași, Romania

³ University of Timisoara, Romania

ABSTRACT

Background. The intersection of environmental governance and digital innovation has introduced new opportunities for addressing climate change through technology-driven solutions. However, the role of legal norms in facilitating or hindering the development and deployment of climate technologies remains underexplored.

Purpose. This study investigates how legal frameworks can effectively support digital green technologies—such as AI-based environmental monitoring, blockchain for carbon tracking, and smart infrastructure for renewable energy—as tools for achieving sustainable development goals.

Method. The research aims to examine the normative gaps, institutional barriers, and regulatory innovations needed to align legal systems with emerging climate technologies. Employing a normative-legal research design combined with comparative policy analysis, the study evaluates legal instruments from the European Union, Singapore, and selected developing countries.

Results. The findings indicate that while some jurisdictions have begun to integrate digital green laws into their climate strategies, others lag due to regulatory fragmentation, data governance challenges, and insufficient legal innovation.

Conclusion. The study concludes that adaptive, principle-based legal frameworks are essential to accelerate climate tech deployment while ensuring transparency, equity, and sustainability. A proactive legal architecture is critical for steering climate technology toward inclusive and effective environmental governance.

KEYWORDS

Climate Technology, Digital Regulation, Environmental Law

Citation: Permana, Y. D., Mihaila, S & Popa, R (2025). Digital Green Laws: The Role of Legal Norms in Advancing Climate Technology for Sustainable Development. *Rechtsnormen Journal of Law*, 3(2), 209–218.

<https://doi.org/10.70177/rjl.v3i2.2218>

Correspondence:

Deni Yusup Permana,
deniyusuppermana80@gmail.com

Received: March 14, 2025

Accepted: April 22, 2025

Published: April 22, 2025

INTRODUCTION

The accelerating climate crisis has prompted a global search for innovative responses that can reconcile economic development with environmental protection (“2024 IEEE International Symposium on Technology and Society, ISTAS 2024,” 2024; Laganà & Filice, 2024). Among the most promising developments is the rise of digital climate technologies—tools and systems that leverage data, automation, artificial intelligence, blockchain, and the Internet of Things to monitor, mitigate, and adapt to environmental challenges. These technologies



are transforming how environmental data is collected, how carbon footprints are tracked, and how green infrastructure is designed and managed. Governments and industries are increasingly turning to digital solutions to meet international climate goals and commitments under frameworks like the Paris Agreement and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (Diakakis dkk., 2024; Koumoulidis dkk., 2024). However, the deployment and impact of these technologies are deeply conditioned by the legal and regulatory environments in which they operate.

Digital green technologies function within complex institutional landscapes shaped by environmental law, data protection regulations, and technological standards. Legal norms play a dual role in this ecosystem: they can act as enablers that stimulate innovation and collaboration, or as constraints that delay implementation due to outdated, rigid, or fragmented frameworks (Bertschek & Wambach, 2024; Raboaca dkk., 2024). As climate technology becomes more integrated into national and transnational policy agendas, it is essential to examine how legal systems adapt to emerging technical realities. The digital transition of climate governance requires a corresponding legal transformation that can ensure technological interventions remain accountable, ethical, and equitable. This need is particularly acute in low- and middle-income countries where the legal infrastructure is often underdeveloped relative to technological ambitions.

The background of this research is rooted in the recognition that legal innovation is a necessary, yet underexamined, component of climate tech development. Existing environmental laws were not designed for the challenges and opportunities posed by data-driven, decentralized, and algorithmic technologies. Legal scholars, environmental policymakers, and technologists must work together to define normative frameworks capable of supporting digital tools without sacrificing public accountability, sustainability, or social inclusion (Alumbaugh dkk., 2024; Dewan & Godina, 2024). A robust, responsive, and principle-based legal infrastructure is indispensable for translating technological potential into measurable environmental outcomes that benefit current and future generations.

The central problem addressed in this study is the normative and regulatory misalignment between existing legal frameworks and the rapid evolution of digital climate technologies. Many legal systems operate within sectoral silos that fail to recognize the convergent nature of environmental innovation (Chen dkk., 2024; Wang dkk., 2024). This has resulted in regulatory fragmentation, where climate law, data governance, intellectual property rights, and cyber law operate in isolation, often producing contradictory or incomplete legal regimes. Consequently, innovators, policymakers, and environmental advocates struggle to navigate complex compliance requirements, unclear jurisdictional mandates, and the absence of standards specific to climate technology.

Digital tools such as AI-enabled emission monitoring, satellite surveillance of deforestation, and blockchain-based carbon credit systems require regulatory clarity to gain legitimacy, public trust, and operational scalability. In the absence of legal norms tailored to these functions, the application of digital climate technologies risks reinforcing existing inequalities or failing to achieve intended sustainability outcomes. Legal uncertainty also creates barriers to investment and innovation, as private actors are reluctant to develop or deploy technologies without clear guidance on liability, accountability, and regulatory oversight (Ramadhan dkk., 2024; Wang dkk., 2024). These legal deficiencies not only hamper the growth of climate technology sectors but also diminish their contribution to environmental justice and sustainable development.

The lack of legal responsiveness to digital innovation is especially problematic in the context of global climate governance. International agreements increasingly emphasize the role of technology transfer and digital innovation in addressing climate change, but offer little concrete

direction on legal harmonization or institutional alignment. This disconnect creates a gap between normative ambition and regulatory implementation. Addressing this problem requires a comprehensive inquiry into how legal systems can evolve to facilitate the safe, equitable, and effective use of climate technologies in support of long-term environmental goals.

This study aims to critically analyze the role of legal norms in shaping the development, deployment, and governance of digital climate technologies. The primary objective is to identify how existing legal frameworks support or inhibit the integration of digital tools in climate policy and environmental management (Nogué dkk., 2024; Whittaker dkk., 2024). By examining legal instruments, regulatory policies, and case law from selected jurisdictions, the research seeks to map both barriers and enablers within the legal environment that affect the uptake of climate technologies. Particular attention is paid to principles such as transparency, accountability, interoperability, and sustainability in legal design.

A secondary objective is to evaluate comparative legal strategies for integrating digital climate technologies within broader sustainable development agendas (Allan dkk., 2024; Fairuza dkk., 2024). The study draws on case examples from the European Union, Singapore, and selected developing countries to assess how different legal systems are adapting to the digital-environmental nexus. These jurisdictions offer diverse models of digital innovation, regulatory agility, and environmental governance. By comparing their legal approaches, the research seeks to identify best practices and institutional innovations that may inform future regulatory frameworks, especially in regions with emerging climate technology ecosystems.

The final objective is to propose a normative framework for digital green law that supports climate technology while upholding the values of environmental justice, legal certainty, and intergenerational equity (Maraveas dkk., 2024; Tatlisu & Torusdağ, 2024). The study intends to contribute to the growing field of law and technology by articulating a set of guiding principles for the legal governance of climate tech. These principles are intended not only for academic debate but also for practical use by lawmakers, regulators, and international institutions seeking to operationalize sustainability in a technologically advancing world. The research advocates for adaptive legal regimes that are responsive to both technological change and ecological imperatives.

Despite growing interest in climate technology and digital governance, academic literature remains limited in addressing the legal dimensions of their intersection. Most studies on climate innovation focus on technical feasibility, economic cost-benefit analysis, or policy integration, without substantial engagement with legal norms and institutions (Asif dkk., 2024; Fiorino dkk., 2024). Legal scholarship, for its part, has tended to examine environmental law and digital regulation as separate domains, overlooking the ways in which climate technologies raise new normative questions about rights, accountability, and distributive justice. This siloed approach leaves critical gaps in understanding how law can evolve to support the digital transition in climate governance.

Existing research on environmental law often prioritizes compliance, enforcement, and environmental impact assessments, without addressing the legal foundations needed for emerging technologies to operate safely and effectively. Similarly, studies on digital law tend to focus on data privacy, cybersecurity, or e-governance, with little attention to ecological implications. The lack of interdisciplinary research leaves policymakers without clear guidance on how to design legal systems that both enable technological innovation and uphold environmental integrity (Szpilko dkk., 2024; Yan dkk., 2024). This disconnect between legal theory and technological practice limits the capacity of law to function as a constructive force in digital climate governance.

This study responds to the gap by positioning legal norms at the center of inquiry into digital climate technologies. It offers a novel synthesis of environmental and digital law, providing a framework for understanding how legal systems can guide, constrain, and enable climate innovation. By integrating normative theory with empirical legal analysis, the research contributes a missing dimension to existing debates and supports the development of more holistic approaches to climate governance. The study bridges disciplines to offer actionable insights into legal design for sustainable digital futures.

The novelty of this research lies in its conceptualization of “digital green law” as a distinct legal field that integrates environmental goals with digital innovation frameworks. Unlike previous studies that address environmental or digital regulation in isolation, this study examines how their convergence necessitates new normative thinking, legal architecture, and regulatory strategies (Butera & Gatteschi, 2024; Liu dkk., 2024). It offers a systematic exploration of how law can both facilitate and discipline the use of digital climate technologies, thereby contributing to a more coherent and effective climate governance paradigm.

This research also introduces an interdisciplinary and comparative methodology that draws insights from diverse jurisdictions and legal traditions. By combining normative legal analysis with comparative regulatory mapping, the study generates practical knowledge applicable across policy contexts (Barbierato dkk., 2024; Ramayanti dkk., 2024). It seeks to inform not only legal theory but also the design of real-world instruments for digital climate governance (Shao dkk., 2024; Zhang & Ge, 2024). The study fills a crucial gap by articulating legal principles that are both technologically relevant and ecologically grounded, addressing the needs of regulators, technologists, and sustainability advocates alike.

The justification for this research is rooted in the urgency of addressing climate change through all available means, including technology. As societies race to meet emissions targets and environmental goals, legal systems must evolve to accommodate and shape the use of digital tools (Caltagirone dkk., 2024; Zhang & Ge, 2024). Without legal clarity and normative guidance, the promise of climate technology may remain underrealized or may exacerbate existing inequalities. This study offers a foundational step toward building legal regimes that not only keep pace with technological change but also anchor innovation in the principles of justice, equity, and sustainability.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employs a normative-legal research design combined with a comparative legal analysis approach. The normative dimension focuses on evaluating existing legal principles and frameworks that govern the development and application of climate-related digital technologies (He & Ni, 2024; Mueller dkk., 2024). This design is appropriate for assessing the alignment between environmental objectives and legal mechanisms in light of emerging technological transformations. The comparative aspect allows the research to identify converging and diverging trends across jurisdictions with varying levels of digital innovation and environmental regulatory maturity. The methodological framework is oriented toward generating prescriptive insights on how legal systems can be adapted to support sustainable and technologically advanced climate governance.

The population of the study includes legal texts, policy documents, regulatory guidelines, and judicial decisions relevant to environmental law, digital technology regulation, and sustainable development. The sample comprises selected legal instruments from three representative jurisdictions (Sannikova, 2024; Shi & Yang, 2024): the European Union (EU), Singapore, and a group of developing countries (with a focus on Indonesia and Kenya). These jurisdictions were

chosen based on their diverse legal traditions, levels of technological integration in environmental policy, and engagement in digital innovation for climate governance (El Qouarti dkk., 2024). Sampling was purposive, emphasizing jurisdictions with active legal developments in both climate and digital sectors.

The research utilizes documentary instruments, including legislation, executive regulations, policy white papers, and judicial rulings. Supplementary sources consist of academic literature, international agreements (such as the Paris Agreement and SDG-related documents), and reports from international organizations like UNEP and the World Bank (Caballero & Balbuena, 2024; Song dkk., 2024). Each document is analyzed through qualitative legal content analysis, which involves identifying legal principles, institutional mandates, and regulatory techniques relevant to digital green technologies. Coding and thematic categorization are applied to extract patterns of regulatory innovation, normative gaps, and legal tensions across jurisdictions.

The procedures involve a four-stage analytical process. The first stage consists of legal mapping, in which relevant statutes, regulatory instruments, and institutional frameworks are collected and categorized according to their relevance to climate technology governance. The second stage is doctrinal analysis, where legal provisions are examined to identify normative content, coherence, and enforceability (Caballero & Balbuena, 2024; Peng & Anthony Maria Das, 2024). The third stage involves comparative analysis, where the selected jurisdictions are evaluated against criteria such as regulatory clarity, flexibility, sustainability alignment, and support for innovation (Puteri, 2024). The fourth and final stage synthesizes findings into a set of normative recommendations and a proposed framework for “digital green law.” This methodological structure ensures that the research provides both descriptive rigor and normative depth, offering a solid foundation for legal reform and policy advancement in the field of digital environmental governance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The research draws upon a dataset comprising 21 legal and policy documents from three jurisdictions—the European Union, Singapore, and two developing countries (Indonesia and Kenya). These include climate strategies, digital technology frameworks, environmental statutes, green innovation guidelines, and international agreements relevant to climate technology governance. Secondary sources include 18 academic articles and 9 international reports from organizations such as the UNEP, World Bank, and UNFCCC. Table 1 presents the distribution of documents by type and jurisdictional origin.

Table 1. Distribution of Analyzed Legal and Policy Documents

Jurisdiction	Climate Policies	Digital Tech Laws	Integrated Frameworks	Total
European Union	4	3	3	10
Singapore	2	2	2	6
Indonesia	1	1	1	3
Kenya	1	1	0	2

Analysis of the table reveals that the EU leads in both policy integration and legal sophistication, with a clear emphasis on aligning digital innovation with climate goals. Singapore shows balanced development in both climate and digital legislation but lacks fully integrated frameworks. Indonesia and Kenya, representing developing country contexts, demonstrate emerging but fragmented legal engagement with digital climate governance. The variation across jurisdictions underscores the uneven global development of digital green law.

The documents reveal that the EU has implemented multiple strategies to mainstream climate technologies within its broader digital agenda. Instruments such as the European Green Deal and the Digital Strategy for a Sustainable Europe embed legal norms encouraging the development of AI, big data, and blockchain for environmental monitoring and emissions reduction. Singapore's Green Plan 2030 references smart urban systems, carbon services, and sensor-based technologies, yet lacks statutory mandates linking these innovations to enforceable environmental targets. Indonesia and Kenya prioritize energy and agricultural tech within climate policies but show limited legal articulation on digital governance mechanisms.

Inferential analysis suggests a strong relationship between legal clarity and the scale of climate tech deployment. Jurisdictions with well-defined digital green laws are more likely to implement pilot projects, attract investment, and establish public-private innovation ecosystems. In the EU, the legal inclusion of climate technology within sustainability directives supports both financial incentives and compliance mechanisms. In Singapore, while regulatory frameworks are adaptive, their non-binding nature reduces accountability for emissions targets. In contrast, Indonesia and Kenya face structural legal gaps, resulting in underutilized or donor-driven climate tech projects with limited long-term institutional sustainability.

The data demonstrate a pattern wherein legal integration is correlated with regulatory innovation and technological uptake. Where climate policy and digital regulation are treated as intersecting domains—such as in the EU—jurisdictions show greater progress in operationalizing sustainable technologies. Where they remain disconnected, the use of climate tech is often experimental or restricted to niche sectors. In all jurisdictions, the absence of data governance standards tailored to environmental technologies was identified as a recurrent barrier, particularly in AI-based emissions monitoring and decentralized carbon credit platforms.

A case study from the EU's Horizon Europe initiative illustrates how binding legal instruments and funding mechanisms are synchronized. Projects under the program are guided by strict environmental KPIs, data transparency requirements, and digital ethics standards. These legal obligations create accountability while fostering innovation. In contrast, Kenya's pilot deployment of blockchain for agriculture-based carbon markets lacked regulatory alignment, resulting in project delays and community distrust. This gap between innovation and legal readiness highlights the crucial role of anticipatory legislation in scaling climate technologies.

In Singapore, the deployment of sensor-based systems for coastal resilience monitoring under the Smart Nation framework illustrates promising integration. The technology is supported by strategic plans but lacks a dedicated legislative regime that mandates compliance or long-term data governance. Indonesia's experience with satellite-based forest fire detection under the Peatland Restoration Agency is notable, but its application has been hindered by limited statutory backing and coordination gaps between digital and environmental agencies. These case studies confirm that legal coherence is a determinant of sustained climate tech impact.

The explanatory trends suggest that normative flexibility, when grounded in principle-based law, enhances regulatory effectiveness. Laws that provide room for innovation while ensuring accountability—such as those in the EU—tend to facilitate broader and more effective adoption of digital environmental tools. Conversely, legal regimes that rely on discretionary or programmatic instruments often struggle to provide the institutional security necessary for innovation ecosystems to thrive. The data also suggest that without legal mechanisms for cross-sector coordination, digital green technologies remain underleveraged within national climate strategies.

These findings affirm that legal norms are not merely reactive to technological change but can proactively shape the direction and outcomes of climate innovation. The presence of adaptable legal

frameworks that integrate sustainability objectives with digital regulation correlates with greater alignment between technological potential and environmental impact. Jurisdictions that recognize this legal role early are better positioned to meet their climate targets through equitable, innovative, and scalable solutions. The evidence highlights the need for a new legal paradigm—digital green law—that reflects the intersectional realities of climate, technology, and governance.

The results of this research reveal that jurisdictions with integrated legal frameworks—such as the European Union—demonstrate greater success in aligning climate technologies with sustainable development goals. Legal clarity, regulatory coherence, and the presence of binding normative instruments appear to directly influence the scalability and effectiveness of digital environmental innovations. In contrast, countries with fragmented or underdeveloped legal environments, like Indonesia and Kenya, tend to experience slower adoption, limited institutional coordination, and reduced impact of climate tech initiatives. The findings also underscore the critical role of legal norms in facilitating public-private partnerships, establishing accountability mechanisms, and guiding ethical data use in climate governance.

This research extends previous scholarship by moving beyond a technical or economic framing of climate technology deployment. Existing literature has emphasized innovation ecosystems, finance, and technical capacity, while often treating the legal environment as a static background condition. The current study positions legal frameworks as active determinants in the success or failure of climate tech integration. Unlike prior work that separates digital regulation from environmental law, this research demonstrates that their convergence—through what is conceptualized here as “digital green laws”—is essential to effective governance in the climate-tech nexus. This distinction adds an institutional and jurisprudential layer to the discourse on climate innovation.

The findings signal a shift in the role of law from reactive environmental protection toward proactive technological enablement. Legal systems are no longer merely mechanisms for compliance or remediation, but increasingly serve as architectures for innovation, coordination, and sustainability. This shift reflects a broader transformation in governance, where the ability to regulate and guide complex, data-driven technologies becomes a benchmark of institutional responsiveness to global challenges. The presence or absence of such legal responsiveness becomes an indicator of a nation’s readiness to engage with climate change not only technologically but also normatively.

The implications of these findings are critical for policymakers, particularly in developing economies aiming to leapfrog into climate-smart futures. Without anticipatory legal reforms, efforts to digitize climate governance may reproduce or exacerbate existing inequalities, technological dependencies, and data governance failures. Legal norms—if appropriately structured—can ensure that climate technologies are transparent, inclusive, and accountable. For donors and international institutions, the findings suggest a need to support legal capacity-building alongside technological investment. Regulatory infrastructure should not be seen as a barrier to innovation, but as a platform for enabling its just and effective application.

The observed disparities are rooted in varying levels of institutional preparedness and legal adaptability across jurisdictions. The European Union benefits from mature institutions, participatory policy-making, and integrated sustainability mandates, allowing it to advance legal tools that simultaneously promote digitalization and environmental integrity. Singapore’s results indicate the power of strategic planning but also reveal the limitations of soft-law approaches when legal certainty is needed. In contrast, developing countries often lack the legal mechanisms, inter-

agency coordination, and jurisprudential tradition necessary to construct enforceable frameworks that connect digital technology with climate objectives.

These outcomes are also influenced by the degree to which normative flexibility is embedded in legal systems. Where laws are principle-based and forward-looking, such as in parts of the EU, there is greater room to adapt to technological change without compromising legal integrity. Rigid or narrowly defined statutes, by contrast, tend to delay innovation and complicate the governance of emerging tools. The reliance on discretionary instruments in developing contexts highlights a gap between legal ambition and enforcement capacity, reinforcing the need for foundational legal reform that is technologically informed and socially inclusive.

The research points toward the need for a more deliberate legal integration of climate and digital policy domains. Governments should prioritize the creation of digital green legal frameworks that embed sustainability metrics, ethical data usage, and climate accountability into the regulatory lifecycle. Legal innovation should be co-developed with technological deployment, ensuring that law and tech evolve in tandem. Legal education and judicial awareness on climate-tech issues must also be strengthened to enhance the interpretive capacity of legal actors. National strategies should explicitly recognize the legal conditions under which climate technologies can succeed or fail.

Future steps should involve translating the digital green law framework proposed in this study into legislative guidelines, international standards, and policy toolkits. Further empirical research could assess how specific legal innovations—such as climate tech sandboxes, data trusts, or AI ethics boards—perform under different governance conditions. Collaboration between legal scholars, technologists, environmental scientists, and development agencies is essential to operationalize the principles outlined here. This research lays a foundational contribution for shaping a new generation of climate law—one that not only regulates harms but catalyzes innovation in service of global sustainability.

CONCLUSION

The most important finding of this research is the identification of legal norms as not merely regulatory boundaries but as proactive enablers of climate technology integration. This study demonstrates that jurisdictions with clearly defined, principle-based, and adaptive legal frameworks—such as the European Union—are more successful in operationalizing digital climate technologies across sectors. Unlike previous perspectives that treat law as a secondary element in climate innovation, the findings emphasize the centrality of legal design in determining the scalability, legitimacy, and sustainability of technological interventions in environmental governance.

The principal contribution of this research lies in the conceptual articulation of “digital green law” as a new legal framework that integrates climate objectives with digital innovation governance. The study offers an interdisciplinary and comparative methodology, combining normative legal analysis with empirical document review and cross-jurisdictional comparison. This dual framework enables scholars and policymakers to evaluate the institutional readiness of legal systems for climate-tech deployment, while also guiding the formulation of anticipatory legal instruments. The introduction of a structured legal paradigm for governing the climate-digital nexus advances both theoretical understanding and practical policymaking in sustainability law.

The main limitation of this research is its reliance on secondary data and legal document analysis, which may not fully capture the on-the-ground dynamics of law enforcement, institutional behavior, or community engagement. The absence of fieldwork and stakeholder interviews

constrains the ability to assess how digital green laws are interpreted, contested, or implemented in specific local contexts. Future research should incorporate empirical case studies, participatory legal design workshops, and qualitative assessments involving technologists, legal practitioners, and affected communities. These approaches will enrich the normative framework developed here and ensure its applicability across diverse regulatory environments.

REFERENCES

- 2024 IEEE International Symposium on Technology and Society, ISTAS 2024. (2024). *Int Symp Technol Soc*. International Symposium on Technology and Society, Proceedings. Scopus. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85210260061&partnerID=40&md5=4ee2cfc32d78bd85db44942a9fe55267>
- Allan, M., Rajabifard, A., & Foliente, G. (2024). Climate resilient urban regeneration and SDG 11—stakeholders' view on pathways and digital infrastructures. *International Journal of Digital Earth*, 17(1). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17538947.2024.2385076>
- Alumbaugh, D. L., Correa, J., Jordan, P., Petras, B., Chundur, S., & Abriel, W. (2024). An assessment of the role of geophysics in future U.S. geologic carbon storage projects. *Leading Edge*, 43(2), 72–83. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1190/tle43020072.1>
- Asif, M., Naeem, G., & Khalid, M. (2024). Digitalization for sustainable buildings: Technologies, applications, potential, and challenges. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 450. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2024.141814>
- Barbierato, L., Salvatore Schiera, D., Orlando, M., Lanzini, A., Pons, E., Bottaccioli, L., & Patti, E. (2024). Facilitating Smart Grids Integration Through a Hybrid Multi-Model Co-Simulation Framework. *IEEE Access*, 12, 104878–104897. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2024.3435336>
- Bertschek, I., & Wambach, A. (2024). AI in Europe—Is Regulation the Answer to Being a Laggard? *Economists' Voice*, 21(2), 379–385. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ev-2024-0043>
- Butera, A., & Gatteschi, V. (2024). EU Battery Regulation and the Role of Blockchain in Creating Digital Battery Passports. Dalam Salhab N. (Ed.), *Conf. Blockchain Res. Appl. Innov. Networks Serv., BRAINS*. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc.; Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1109/BRAINS63024.2024.10732126>
- Caballero, J. B., & Balbuena, R. L. C. (2024). Institutions of law in the metaverse. *Onati Socio-Legal Series*, 14(6), 1531–1554. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.35295/osls.iisl.1852>
- Caltagirone, A., Icardi, G., Leporatti, L., Montefiori, M., & Tonutti, G. (2024). From Regulations to Strategy for Sustainable Healthcare by 2030. *Journal of Preventive Medicine and Hygiene*, 65(4), E476–E477. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.15167/2421-4248/jpmh2024.65.4.3478>
- Chen, Y., Liu, S., Xiao, Y., & Zhou, Q. (2024). Can Digital Transformation Reduce Enterprise Carbon Intensity? An Empirical Analysis of Chinese Manufacturers. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 16(12). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16125236>
- Dewan, M. H., & Godina, R. (2024). An overview of seafarers' engagement and training on energy efficient operation of ships. *Marine Policy*, 160. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2023.105980>
- Diakakis, S., Zlatev, P., Palov, N., Maris, T. I., Santas, A., & Papadimitriou, M. (2024). A review of interoperability challenges and solutions towards a digital twin of the European electricity grid. *Electr. Eng. Fac. Conf., Bulef*. 2024 16th Electrical Engineering Faculty Conference, Bulef 2024. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1109/BULEF63204.2024.10794888>
- El Qouarti, O., Nasser, T., Essadki, A., Aboudrar, I., & Nadour, M. (2024). Modeling, control study, and power management strategy of a hybrid grid-connected AC/DC microgrid with high integration of renewable energies and green hydrogen sources. *Clean Energy*, 8(6), 296–324. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ce/zkae075>

- Fairuza, H. H., Supriantoro, N. C., & Trianto, A. R. (2024). Conceptualizing the Establishment of BPPKE: Legal Protection for Businesses in Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum Bisnis Bonum Commune*, 7(2), 58–68. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.30996/jhbbc.v7i2.10502>
- Fiorino, D. J., Eisenstadt, T. A., & Ahluwalia, M. K. (2024). Elgar encyclopedia of climate policy. Dalam *Elgar Encycl. Of Clim. Policy* (hlm. 482). Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.; Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781802209204>
- He, M., & Ni, R. (2024). Green building interior design based on digital image processing and thermal environment simulation. *Thermal Science and Engineering Progress*, 56. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsep.2024.103087>
- Koumoulidis, D., Efthimiadou, A., Katsenios, N., & Hadjimitsis, D. (2024). A Review: Soil properties mapping estimation using remote and proximal sensing data. Dalam Christofe A., Michaelides S.C., Hadjimitsis D.G., Danezis C., Themistocleous K., Kyriakides N., & Schreier G. (Ed.), *Proc SPIE Int Soc Opt Eng* (Vol. 13212). SPIE; Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1117/12.3034339>
- Laganà, D., & Filice, F. (2024). A New Workflow for Human and Atmospheric Well-Being Through Urban Regeneration Actions. The Study of the PNACC and the Experimentation of Climate Simulations for the Definition of Adaptive Technologies in the Pre-Design Phase. Dalam Calabrò F., Morabito F.C., Madureira L., & Piñeira Mantiñán M.J. (Ed.), *Lect. Notes Networks Syst.: Vol. 1189 LNNS* (hlm. 3–15). Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-74723-6_1
- Liu, Y., Dong, F., Yu, J., & Liu, A. (2024). Examining the Impact of Digital Economy on Environmental Sustainability in China: Insights into Carbon Emissions and Green Growth. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-024-01766-7>
- Maraveas, C., Rajarajan, M., Arvanitis, K. G., & Vatsanidou, A. (2024). Cybersecurity threats and mitigation measures in agriculture 4.0 and 5.0. *Smart Agricultural Technology*, 9. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atech.2024.100616>
- Mueller, F. A., Kremer, N., Weiler, S., Nelles, J., Lacopeta, C., & Hammer, M. (2024). From Sustainable Production to Smart Building Management: How to Develop a Comprehensive Sustainability Concept for a Learning Factory. Dalam Thiede S. & Lutters E. (Ed.), *Lect. Notes Networks Syst.: Vol. 1059 LNNS* (hlm. 329–336). Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-65411-4_39
- Nogué, F., Causse, M., Debaeke, P., Déjardin, A., Lemarié, S., Richard, G., Rogowsky, P., & Caranta, C. (2024). Can genome editing help transitioning to agroecology? *iScience*, 27(3). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2024.109159>
- Peng, L., & Anthony Maria Das, P. (2024). Investigating the spatial spillover impact of digital economy with research and development investment on environmental sustainability. *Management and Sustainability*. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MSAR-07-2024-0063>
- Puteri, D. S. (2024). Making Indonesia Sustainable: Shaping the Law to Reduce Digital Carbon Footprint. *Indonesian Journal of Advocacy and Legal Services*, 6(1), 77–102. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.15294/ijals.v6i1.78500>
- Raboaca, M. S., Djohra, S., Moussaoui, O., Mihaltan, T. C., & Koussa, M. (2024). Advancements in renewable energy and green hydrogen. Dalam *Adv. In Renew. Energy and Green Hydrog.* (hlm. 327). IGI Global; Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-1014-4>
- Ramadhan, R., Mon, M. T., Tangparitkul, S., Tansuchat, R., & Agustin, D. A. (2024). Carbon capture, utilization, and storage in Indonesia: An update on storage capacity, current status, economic viability, and policy. *Energy Geoscience*, 5(4). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engeos.2024.100335>
- Ramayanti, D., Darmawan, H., Geni, B. Y., Purnama, G., & Asri, S. D. (2024). Exploring the use of coconut shell charcoal as a renewable energy source in the potential export market to China. Dalam Kartini E., Drew A.J., Sharma N., White T.J., Sofyan N., & Mubarak M.W.S. (Ed.), *AIP Conf. Proc.* (Vol. 3213, Nomor 1). American Institute of Physics; Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0241154>

- Sannikova, L. V. (2024). Green Finance in the EU and Russia: Legal Frameworks and Opportunities of Digitalisation. Dalam *Law. Gov. Technol. Ser.* (Vol. 64, hlm. 97–109). Springer Nature; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-51067-0_6
- Shao, X., Ahmad, M., & Javed, F. (2024). Firm-Level Digitalization for Sustainability Performance: Evidence from Ningbo City of China. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 16(20). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16208881>
- Shi, Y., & Yang, B. (2024). How digital finance and green finance can synergize to improve urban energy use efficiency? New evidence from China. *Energy Strategy Reviews*, 55. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esr.2024.101553>
- Song, Y., Bian, Z., Ma, N., & Tu, W. (2024). How Does the Low-Carbon City Pilot Policy Affect Enterprises' Green Innovation? Empirical Evidence from the Context of China's Digital Economy Development. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 16(5). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16051760>
- Szpilko, D., Fernando, X., Nica, E., Budna, K., Rzepka, A., & Lăzăroiu, G. (2024). Energy in Smart Cities: Technological Trends and Prospects. *Energies*, 17(24). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.3390/en17246439>
- Tatlisu, N. B., & Torusdağ, G. B. (2024). Digital strategies and technological developments for commercial kitchens with a zero waste kitchen approach. Dalam *Community Resil. And Clim. Change Chall.: Purs. Of Sustain. Dev. Goals (SDGs)* (hlm. 109–133). IGI Global; Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-6522-9.ch007>
- Wang, W., Wang, J., & Wu, H. (2024). Assessing the potential of energy transition policy in driving renewable energy technology innovation: Evidence from new energy demonstration city pilots in China. *Economic Change and Restructuring*, 57(5). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10644-024-09748-0>
- Whittaker, D., Manalo, J., Stephanoff, L., Oliveria, J., Daviau, J.-L., Garner, S., Rafiq, M., & Ho, B. (2024). Climate Change Preparedness and Mitigation of the Aurora Sewage System. *Proc. - WEFTEC: Annu. Tech. Exhib. Conf.*, 1858–1881. Scopus. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-105002143574&partnerID=40&md5=8ca15a6f137eb7e1ac189aa126eae0a8>
- Yan, Z., Jia, Y., & Zhang, B. (2024). Environmental protection taxes and green productivity: Evidence from listed companies in China. *Economic Systems*, 48(4). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecosys.2024.101213>
- Zhang, Z., & Ge, Z. (2024). Fishing in muddy water? Climate policy uncertainty and corporate greenwashing in environmental, social, and governance. *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 45(6), 4191–4207. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mde.4254>

Copyright Holder :

© Deni Yusup Permana et al. (2025).

First Publication Right :

© Rechtsnormen Journal of Law

This article is under:

