Carbon markets, COP21, and clubs

Nat Keohane IEA-IETA-EPRI Workshop Paris, September 2015



Starting points

- Markets can drive greater ambition in climate action
 - if they have high integrity.
- In the post-2020 world, carbon markets will increasingly involve exchange (allowance trade) rather than one-way flows of offsets.
- A common market infrastructure could help
 - ... ensure market integrity in the short run, and
 - ... facilitate convergence or linkage in the long run.
- In the absence of a UNFCCC system, is there another way forward?

Top-down or bottom-up?

Kyoto model

Top-down Centralized

Rules-based

Multilateral agreement

UNFCCC oversight

Laissez-faire

Bottom-up Decentralized Domestic systems Bilateral linkages No UNFCCC role

A middle-ground "minilateral" approach

Kyoto model

Top-down
Centralized
Rules-based
Multilateral agreement
UNFCCC oversight

Laissez-faire

Bottom-up Decentralized Domestic systems Bilateral linkages No UNFCCC role



Club approach

Decentralized
Rules-based
Plurilateral (or "minilateral") agreement
UNFCCC common accounting rules

A club of carbon markets

- Purpose: to drive greater mitigation ambition by facilitating/encouraging international use of robust, highintegrity emission trading systems
- CCM would provide "common market infrastructure"
 - Standards and guidelines for ETS design
 - MRV framework to ensure integrity
 - Tracking of allowances (common/linked registries)
 - Common accounting rules (* if not provided in UNFCCC)
- Could facilitate sharing of information, technical advice, etc.
- Technical work could potentially feed back into UNFCCC process
- Over time, standards could provide basis for mutual recognition of carbon emission units among member jurisdictions

Roles of the UNFCCC in a club approach

- 1. Send political signal that market-based mechanisms have a future
- → 2. Establish clear accounting rules to avoid "double counting/claiming" post-2020



Nat Keohane
nkeohane@edf.org
@natkeohane

