INTERNATIONAL MULTI DISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT
eISSN 2394-6334 Impact factor: 8.854 Volume 13, issue 04 (2026)

THE ECONOMIC COST OF THE DIGITAL CARBON FOOTPRINT: EVALUATING THE ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY OF THE DIGITAL ECONOMY

Nurmatov Samandar
The student of Andijan state university

Annotation

The rapid expansion of digital infrastructure has fundamentally reshaped the global economy, yet its environmental consequences remain insufficiently priced and incompletely understood. This scientific article investigates the economic cost of the digital carbon footprint, examining the greenhouse gas emissions generated by data centers, network infrastructure, consumer devices, blockchain operations, and artificial intelligence workloads. Drawing on energy consumption data, social cost of carbon estimates, and regional regulatory frameworks, we develop a structured economic valuation of ICT-sector emissions and analyze the conditions under which markets fail to internalize these costs. We find that the true economic burden of digital emissions — accounting for externalities, stranded asset risks, and transition costs — substantially exceeds current market prices. Additionally, it also further evaluates the cost-effectiveness of emerging policy instruments and argues that a credible green digital transition requires both regulatory coherence and targeted investment incentives. Our analysis contributes to the broader literature on environmental economics by providing sector-specific cost estimates and a comparative policy assessment applicable to both developed and emerging digital economies.

Keywords

digital carbon footprint, ICT emissions, green digital economy, sustainable computing, environmental externalities, carbon pricing.

The digitalization of economic activity has been among the most consequential structural transformations of the past three decades. From cloud computing and e-commerce to remote work infrastructure and algorithmic finance, digital technologies now underpin virtually every sector of the modern economy. Yet this transformation has carried an environmental price that has largely been deferred, obscured by the intangible nature of digital services and the misperception that a “paperless” economy is inherently a clean one.

Global information and communications technology (ICT) currently accounts for an estimated 2 to 4 percent of worldwide greenhouse gas emissions — a share comparable to civil aviation and steadily rising. More importantly, projections indicate that as artificial intelligence, distributed computing, and high-bandwidth communications continue to scale, the sector’s emissions could reach 8 percent of global totals by 2030 if current efficiency trends fail to keep pace with demand growth. These are not abstract environmental statistics; they translate into measurable economic costs in the form of carbon pricing exposure, regulatory compliance burdens, physical climate risks to digital infrastructure, and the macroeconomic costs of accelerated warming.

Despite this growing materiality, the economics of digital emissions have received far less rigorous treatment than, say, the carbon costs of energy generation or heavy manufacturing. The literature on corporate environmental accounting has only recently begun to grapple with Scope 3 emissions in digital supply chains. Regulatory frameworks remain fragmented, with no globally consistent taxonomy for measuring or pricing digital carbon. Meanwhile, investment in sustainable digital infrastructure, while growing, has been episodic and frequently driven by reputational rather than compliance incentives.

This article addresses that gap by constructing a systematic economic analysis of the digital carbon footprint. We begin by defining the concept and mapping its principal emission sources. We then estimate the economic costs associated with those emissions using a social cost of carbon framework and regional exposure analysis. We examine the market failures that allow these costs to be externalized, and we assess the cost-effectiveness of a range of policy instruments currently under consideration or deployment in major digital economies. We conclude with recommendations for a coherent policy architecture that can support a green digital transition without sacrificing the productivity benefits that digitalization delivers.

The concept of a digital carbon footprint encompasses all greenhouse gas emissions directly or indirectly attributable to the design, manufacturing, operation, and disposal of digital infrastructure and devices. It is useful to think of this footprint in three layers: embodied emissions arising from hardware production and logistics; operational emissions from energy use during device and infrastructure lifecycles; and systemic emissions generated by the economic activities that digitalization enables or accelerates.

Operational emissions from data centers represent the most visible and directly measurable component. Hyperscale facilities operated by major cloud providers can consume between 100 and 1,000 megawatts of power continuously, and even modest enterprise data centers typically account for energy bills exceeding tens of millions of dollars annually. Power Usage Effectiveness (PUE) — the ratio of total facility energy consumption to IT equipment energy consumption — has improved significantly among leading operators, with some hyperscale facilities achieving PUEs approaching 1.1. However, industry averages remain considerably higher, particularly in regions with older infrastructure and limited access to renewable energy.

Network infrastructure, including the base stations, routers, switches, and undersea cables that form the backbone of digital connectivity, represents the second largest operational source of ICT emissions. The global rollout of 5G networks, while designed to be more energy-efficient per unit of data transmitted, is expected to generate substantial additional absolute emissions as traffic volumes surge. The relationship between network energy intensity and data volume is not linear: video streaming, in particular, accounts for a disproportionate share of network traffic and thus energy consumption.

End-user devices — smartphones, laptops, desktop computers, smart televisions, and connected appliances — collectively produce more emissions than any single infrastructure category, though their dispersed nature makes measurement and regulatory targeting more difficult. Embodied carbon in consumer electronics is increasingly recognized as a significant lifecycle cost; a typical laptop may generate more CO_2 in its manufacture than in its entire operational lifetime, yet this upstream footprint is rarely disclosed to consumers or factored into corporate sustainability reporting.

Emerging workloads introduce new dimensions of uncertainty into carbon accounting. Proof-of-work cryptocurrency mining, most prominently Bitcoin, requires vast computational effort and has at various points consumed more electricity annually than entire medium-sized nations. The energy intensity of large-scale artificial intelligence training runs has grown with model size; estimates for training a single large language model range from hundreds to several thousand tonnes of CO_2 equivalent, depending on the energy mix of the facility used. As AI adoption accelerates across industries, the aggregate emissions associated with model training and inference are on track to become a significant and growing fraction of total ICT emissions.

Table 1. Estimated ICT Sector Emissions by Subsector (2023 Baseline)

Sectors	**Global CO_2e (Mt/yr)**	**Share of ICT total (%)**	**Projected growth by 2030**
Data Centers	200	19%	+65%
Network Infrastructure	250	24%	+55%
End-User Devices	400	38%	+30%
Crypto & Blockchain	110	10%	+120%
AI & HPC Workloads	90	9%	+180%
Total ICT Sector	1,050	100%	+62% (aug)

Sources: IEA (2023), Freitag et al. (2021), authors' estimates. CO_2e = carbon dioxide equivalent. HPC = High-Performance Computing.

Converting emissions data into economic costs requires grappling with one of the most contested constructs in environmental economics: the social cost of carbon (SCC). The SCC represents the net present value of damages caused by one additional metric tonne of CO_2 released into the atmosphere, incorporating impacts on agricultural productivity, human health, sea level rise, extreme weather frequency, and ecosystem services. Estimates of the SCC vary widely depending on the discount rate applied to future damages, the sectoral coverage of the damage function, and assumptions about feedback loops and tipping points in the climate system.

Official SCC estimates used in policy analysis have risen markedly in recent years. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's 2022 revision updated its central estimate from approximately \$51 to \$190 per tonne of CO_2 under a 2.5 percent discount rate, with the fullrange extending well above \$300 per tonne under low-discount-rate scenarios. The European Union's shadow carbon price, used in public investment appraisal, has similarly increased. Applying an SCC of \$190 per tonne to the estimated 1,050 megatonnes of CO_2 equivalent emitted annually by the global ICT sector produces an economic damage valuation of approximately \$199 billion per year — and this figure does not account for the sector's projected emissions growth.

This economic cost is not uniformly distributed. It falls disproportionately on populations and ecosystems least responsible for digital emissions, creating a distributional dimension that conventional market analysis tends to overlook. Low-income countries in tropical and coastal regions bear the heaviest physical impacts of climate change while contributing minimally to digital-sector emissions. This geographic asymmetry poses significant challenges for international climate negotiations and highlights the equity dimensions of digital environmental governance.

From a financial markets perspective, digital-sector emissions also generate material asset risks. Carbon pricing regimes — whether through cap-and-trade mechanisms or carbon taxes — can significantly affect the operating costs of energy-intensive digital infrastructure. Data centers operating in the European Union are already exposed to rising EU ETS prices, which have exceeded €60 per tonne. Companies with large owned-infrastructure footprints face growing pressure from institutional investors to disclose and manage carbon risk, and credit rating agencies have begun incorporating climate risk assessments into sovereign and corporate ratings. The transition to lower-emission digital infrastructure thus carries both compliance costs and competitive risk implications.

Table 2. Regional Carbon Cost Exposure of Digital Infrastructure

Region	**Data center PUE (avg.)**	**Renewable energy share (%)**	**Carbon cost exposure (USD)**
North America	1.58	42%	$18.4
European Union	1.46	67%	$9.1
China	1.72	28%	$34.7
Southeast Asia	1.81	15%	$12.9
Rest of World	1.90	11%	$22.3

Sources: Uptime Institute (2023), IRENA (2023), authors' calculations. PUE = Power Usage Effectiveness (lower is better). Carbon cost exposure estimated at SCC = \$190/tCO₂e.

Market Failures and Environmental Externalities The persistence of large, unpriced digital carbon emissions reflects a constellation of market failures that prevent efficient environmental outcomes. The most fundamental of these is the classical negative externality: digital service providers do not bear the full social cost of their energy consumption and emissions, so they have inadequate incentives to reduce them. This externality is compounded by informational asymmetries — consumers, investors, and regulators frequently lack the data needed to assess the environmental performance of digital products and services — and by the absence of comprehensive, comparable, and mandatory emissions disclosure standards.

The public good nature of atmospheric stability creates a collective action problem at the global level. No single nation or firm has a sufficient individual incentive to bear the transition costs of decarbonizing its digital infrastructure if competitors face no equivalent obligation. This dynamic is particularly acute in regions where low electricity prices — often reflecting implicit energy subsidies or underdeveloped carbon pricing — provide a competitive advantage to emissions-intensive digital operations. The resulting "carbon havens" can attract data center investment while undermining global emissions reduction efforts, a digital analog to the broader concern about carbon leakage in trade policy.

Supply chain opacity further complicates economic analysis. Cloud computing customers typically have limited visibility into the energy mix and carbon intensity of the specific infrastructure hosting their workloads. While major cloud providers have made voluntary commitments to renewable energy procurement and carbon neutrality, the accounting methods underlying these commitments vary significantly, and there remains no standardized methodology for attributing cloud emissions to end users. This opacity limits the ability of downstream firms to manage their own Scope 3 emissions and reduces market pressure for upstream decarbonization.

A further market failure arises from the short time horizons prevalent in technology investment. The rapid depreciation of digital assets and the intense competitive pressure in the technology sector tend to prioritize near-term performance over long-run sustainability. Data center construction decisions made today will lock in energy consumption patterns for fifteen to twenty years, yet the carbon costs of those decisions — particularly under tightening climate policy — are rarely fully internalized at the point of investment. This temporal mismatch between private and social time preferences generates systematic under-investment in energy efficiency and clean energy procurement.

Policy responses to digital emissions span a wide spectrum, from voluntary frameworks and disclosure mandates to hard regulatory caps and fiscal instruments. Their relative effectiveness depends on the tightness of the regulatory environment, the availability of clean energy alternatives, and the degree to which policy is designed to account for the distinctive characteristics of digital infrastructure.

Carbon pricing is broadly regarded by economists as the most efficient instrument for reducing emissions across all sectors, including ICT. By placing a price on CO_2 emissions, cap-and-trade systems and carbon taxes create a continuous incentive for operators to improve energy efficiency and shift to cleaner energy sources, without requiring regulators to specify the precise technologies or operational changes that firms should adopt. The inclusion of data centers and digital infrastructure operators within existing carbon pricing regimes — where they are frequently exempt or lightly regulated — would substantially increase the financial incentive for decarbonization.

Mandatory renewable energy procurement standards represent a more targeted instrument that can complement carbon pricing. Several European jurisdictions have begun establishing requirements for data centers to source a minimum share of their electricity from renewables on an hourly matching basis, addressing the shortcoming of annual matching approaches that allow operators to claim renewable credentials while drawing heavily on fossil fuel generation during peak demand periods. Hourly matching, while more demanding, provides stronger guarantees of additionality and is increasingly technically feasible thanks to the maturation of power purchase agreement (PPA) markets and grid monitoring technology.

Hardware energy efficiency standards offer another lever, particularly for consumer devices and network equipment where end-of-life recycling and embodied carbon considerations are significant. The European Union’s Ecodesign Regulation and the United States' Energy Star program have established precedents, though coverage remains incomplete and enforcement mechanisms vary. Extending minimum energy performance standards to a broader range of ICT equipment, combined with mandatory disclosure of embodied carbon in procurement documentation, would help address the lifecycle dimension of digital emissions.

Emerging policy discussions around artificial intelligence and high-performance computing represent a frontier area. Proposals for compute taxation, mandatory environmental impact assessments for large AI training runs, and reporting obligations tied to compute thresholds have been advanced in academic and policy forums. These instruments face significant design challenges, particularly around defining appropriate thresholds and managing regulatory arbitrage across jurisdictions, but the rapid growth of AI-related emissions makes their exploration urgent.

Table 3. Cost-Effectiveness of Selected Green Digital Policy Instruments

Policy instrument	**Avg. Abatement cost (USD/tCO_2e)**	**Implementation horizon**	**Effectiveness rating**
Carbon Pricing on Data Centers	\$48–72	Near-term (1–3 yrs)	High
Renewable PPA Mandates	\$12–35	Near-term (1–3 yrs)	High
Green Hardware Standards	\$5–18	Medium-term (3–5 yrs)	Moderate
Network Energy Efficiency Rules	\$8–22	Medium-term (3–5 yrs)	Moderate
Crypto Energy Disclosure Laws	\$0–10	Near-term (1–2 yrs)	Moderate
AI Compute Tax / Levy	\$30–90	Long-term (5+ yrs)	High (if enforced)

Sources: European Commission (2023), OECD (202

3), authors' synthesis. Abatement costs reflect implementation and compliance costs per tonne of CO_2e reduced; excludes co-benefits.

The economic case for investing in sustainable digital infrastructure is strengthening, though it remains unevenly distributed across firm sizes, geographies, and regulatory environments. At the facility level, improvements in energy efficiency — through better cooling systems, server virtualization, workload optimization, and waste heat recovery — typically generate positive returns over investment horizons of three to seven years, even in the absence of a carbon price. The challenge is not so much the economics of individual measures as the organizational and informational barriers to adopting them consistently across the industry.

Renewable energy procurement has become an increasingly mainstream component of large technology firms' sustainability strategies. Hyperscale operators such as Microsoft, Google, and Amazon have collectively signed power purchase agreements exceeding hundreds of terawatt-hours of renewable capacity globally, driving down the cost of clean electricity in numerous markets and accelerating utility-scale renewable deployment. For smaller operators and enterprises, aggregated procurement through green tariff programs and virtual PPAs has begun to offer comparable opportunities, though transaction costs remain higher and market access more limited.

The economic rationale for investment in sustainable digital infrastructure extends beyond operational cost savings. Carbon pricing risk — the exposure to future costs arising from tightening regulatory requirements — is increasingly reflected in the discount rates applied to digital infrastructure assets by institutional investors and development finance institutions. Assets with poor carbon performance may face stranded asset risks as policies tighten, reducing their terminal value and increasing financing costs. Conversely, assets demonstrating strong sustainability credentials can access green financing instruments at lower cost of capital, a differential that will widen as sustainable finance markets mature.

Public investment also plays a critical enabling role that private markets alone cannot fulfil. The development of renewable energy grids in regions currently dominated by coal or gas electricity — particularly across Southeast Asia, South Asia, and Sub-Saharan Africa — requires substantial upfront capital that may not be commercially viable without concessional public financing. Similarly, the development of digital infrastructure in low-income countries with leapfrog potential — moving directly to energy-efficient, renewably powered systems rather than replicating the high-carbon infrastructure pathways of early industrializers — presents both an opportunity and a challenge for multilateral development institutions.

The trajectory of digital emissions over the next decade will be determined by the interaction of three forces: demand growth driven by AI, video, and connectivity expansion; efficiency improvements in hardware and software; and the pace of decarbonization of electricity grids. Optimistic scenarios in which efficiency gains keep pace with demand growth depend on continued technological progress and on policy environments that reward efficiency improvements. More pessimistic projections, which assume that demand growth outstrips efficiency gains, imply emissions trajectories incompatible with 1.5 or 2-degree climate targets.

Several priority areas emerge from this analysis. First, emissions measurement and disclosure must be substantially improved. The absence of mandatory, standardized reporting of digital emissions — including Scope 3 and value chain emissions — prevents markets and regulators from functioning effectively. International standard-setting bodies, working in coordination with national securities regulators, should develop and mandate digital-specific carbon accounting frameworks applicable across firm sizes and jurisdictions.

Second, carbon pricing coverage must be extended to digital infrastructure. Current exemptions and exclusions in existing carbon pricing regimes create competitive distortions and allow a growing share of economic activity to escape carbon cost signals. The progressive inclusion of data centers, network infrastructure operators, and eventually large-scale computing workloads within carbon pricing frameworks is both economically efficient and increasingly politically feasible as awareness of digital emissions grows.

Third, international coordination is essential to prevent regulatory arbitrage and carbon leakage. The EU's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism provides a precedent for using trade policy to level the playing field between jurisdictions with different carbon prices. Analogous mechanisms applicable to cloud services — for instance, through procurement requirements or import duties on high-carbon digital services — merit serious consideration, though their design must navigate complex jurisdictional and definitional challenges.

Fourth, the financing of sustainable digital infrastructure in emerging markets requires dedicated attention. The digital and energy transitions are mutually reinforcing: expanding renewable capacity to power growing digital infrastructure in developing economies can simultaneously address energy access and digital inclusion goals. Multilateral development bank frameworks, concessional finance instruments, and South-South technology transfer programs should be aligned to support this dual objective.

The digital economy has delivered extraordinary economic and social value, but it has done so in part by externalizing substantial environmental costs onto society. The digital carbon footprint — encompassing the full lifecycle emissions of data centers, networks, devices, and emerging computation-intensive workloads — represents an economic liability that is growing in absolute terms and increasingly material to investors, regulators, and society at large.

This article has argued that the true economic cost of digital emissions, evaluated through the social cost of carbon and augmented by regulatory risk and stranded asset considerations, substantially exceeds current market prices. The persistent underpricing of these costs reflects a combination of regulatory gaps, informational asymmetries, and collective action problems that markets alone cannot resolve. Addressing them requires a policy architecture that combines robust emissions disclosure, extended carbon pricing, targeted efficiency standards, and coordinated international action.

The economic stakes are high in both directions. Failing to price digital carbon adequately will accelerate emissions trajectories that impose growing macroeconomic costs through climate-driven damages, stranded assets, and transition disruption. But an incoherent, fragmented policy approach could impose unnecessary costs on digital innovation and access, particularly in regions where the digital economy represents a primary pathway to productivity growth and economic inclusion. Getting the policy design right — credible, predictable, and internationally coordinated — is thus a first-order economic priority, not merely an environmental nicety.

Future research should focus on three areas in particular: developing robust bottom-up emissions accounting methodologies for AI and high-performance computing workloads; assessing the distributional impacts of digital carbon policies across firm sizes and geographies; and evaluating the general equilibrium effects of a green digital transition on sectoral productivity and trade patterns. As the digital economy continues to expand, the environmental economics of digitalization will become an increasingly central preoccupation for economists, policymakers, and the firms that depend on digital infrastructure for their competitive success.

References

1. Andrae, A. S. G., & Edler, T. (2015). On global electricity usage of communication technology: Trends to 2030. Challenges, 6(1), 117–157.

2. Belkhir, L., & Elmeligi, A. (2018). Assessing ICT global emissions footprint: Trends to 2040 & recommendations. Journal of Cleaner Production, 177, 448–463.
3. European Commission. (2023). Green Deal Industrial Plan: State of the Green Deal transition. Publications Office of the EU.
4. Freitag, C., Berners-Lee, M., Widdicks, K., Knowles, B., Blair, G. S., & Friday, A. (2021). The real climate and transformative impact of ICT: A critique of commonly accepted assumptions. Patterns, 2(9), 100340.
5. IEA. (2023). Electricity 2024: Analysis and forecast to 2026. International Energy Agency.
6. IPCC. (2022). Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press.
7. IRENA. (2023). Renewable Power Generation Costs in 2022. International Renewable Energy Agency.
8. Jones, N. (2018). How to stop data centres from gobbling up the world's electricity. Nature, 561(7722), 163–166.
9. Masanet, E., Shehabi, A., Lei, N., Smith, S., & Koomey, J. (2020). Recalibrating global data center energy-use estimates. Science, 367(6481), 984–986.
10. OECD. (2023). Digital Economy Outlook 2024: Shaping Innovation in the Digital Era. OECD Publishing.
11. Rempel, A. R., & Gupta, J. (2021). Fossil fuels, stranded assets and the energy transition: Anatomy of a crisis. Energy Research & Social Science, 79, 102–132.
12. Strubell, E., Ganesh, A., & McCallum, A. (2019). Energy and policy considerations for deep learning in NLP. Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, 3645–3650.