# Evaluating Commitment Period Reserve: An Experimental Approach

COP8

New Delhi, India October 25, 2002

# Takao Kusakawa and Tatsuyoshi Saijo

kusakawa@iser.osaka-u.ac.jp saijo@iser.osaka-u.ac.jp

Global Industrial and Social Progress Research Institute (GISPRI), Tokyo, Japan, ISER, Osaka University, Osaka, Japan, Research Institute of Economy, Trade and Industry (RIETI), Tokyo, Japan; and Climate Design, Tokyo, Japan

- 1. Background of CPR
- Kyoto Protocol (1997):
- Article 17 "(...) The Parties included in Annex B may participate in emissions trading (...). Any such trading shall be supplemental to domestic actions (...)." (i) Restriction on the purchase of permits (EU proposal (1999))  $\bigcup$ (ii) Restriction on the sale of permits (Marrakech Accord (2001))

## (i) Restriction on the purchase of permits: Strict restriction => Price goes down



## (ii) Restriction on the sale of permits: Strict restriction => Price goes up



# Marrakech Accord (2001): Restriction on the sale of permits

"Each party (...) shall maintain (...) a commitment period reserve which should not drop below 90 per cent of the party's assigned amount (...), or 100 per cent of five times its most recently reviewed inventory, whichever is lowest."

# CPR (a) from 2008 to 2012



### CPR (b) in 2011 (Emissions in 2010 are not known yet.)



**Emissions are constant.** 

### => Restriction is always inactive.

(= you can sell all the surplus anytime.)



**Emissions are not constant.** 

=> Restriction may be active in some years => Price  $\uparrow$ ?



# 2. Emissions Trading

## **Marginal Abatement Cost Curve**







# 3. Experimental Design

- Ten student subjects in each session
- Used realistic marginal abatement cost curves
- We paid subjects money that was proportional to the earnings in experiment.

(1) CPR vs. Non-CPR

(2) Bilateral Trading: A pair negotiates the price and quantity ((3) contract inf. open vs. closed)

VS.

Double Auction:	Buyers' Bids	Se	ellers' Asks
(* (* (*	3) \$56, 20 units 1) \$86,13 units 2) grabs (4)'s ask	(6) (4)	\$104, 15 units \$92, 20 units
-		1	

# 4. Results First Sessions



### **First Sessions**



#### **Second Sessions**



### **Second Sessions**



#### **Bubble Case**



CPR, B.T., Contract Inf. Open, 1st Session

#### **Success Case**



#### **CPR vs. Non-CPR: from the environmental viewpoint**



#### **CPR vs. Non-CPR: from the economic viewpoint**



	First Session	Second Session
Economic Efficiency	CPR > Non-CPR	CPR = Non-CPR
Enviromental Integrity	CPR = Non-CPR	CPR < Non-CPR
The Average of Price	CPR = Non-CPR	CPR =Non-CPR
Quantity Traded	CPR < Non-CPR	CPR < Non-CPR

**Does CPR disturb optimal (=profit maximizing)** transactions?

In two sessions of CPR experiment, CPR became strict restriction => Point Eq. Price ↑ (for one country in a year)

In six sessions of CPR experiment, CPR was loose restriction throughout the session.

# In all the sessions of Non-CPR experiment, hypothetically calculated CPR was loose restriction throughout the session.

=> CPR seldom prevents each country from carrying out optimal transaction.

# 5. Conclusion

(i) Once countries are accustomed to emissions trading, Non-CPR system can attain higher emissions reduction than CPR system at almost the same cost.

(ii) CPR rule seldom restricts countries' selling behavior to maximize their profit.

=> We need not dare to use ineffective CPR system, which only entails monitoring cost.