

Economic Analysis of the Kyoto Protocol

**Jeffrey A. Frankel, Member
Council of Economic Advisers**

After Kyoto: Are There Rational Pathways to a Sustainable Global Energy System?

1998 Aspen Energy Forum

Aspen, Colorado

July 6, 1998

The President has said that we can work to avert the grave dangers of climate change, while at the same time maintaining the strength of our economy. This paper elaborates on the Administration's views on these issues. (It is a condensed version of earlier Congressional testimony.)

Effects of Climate Change

Before discussing the likely cost of U.S. efforts to avert climate change, it is important to recognize the costs and risks facing our nation should we fail to act. Current concentrations of greenhouse gases have reached levels well above those of preindustrial times. As a consequence, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change estimates that global temperatures will increase by between 2 to 6 degrees Fahrenheit in the next 100 years, with a best guess of about 3.5 degrees Fahrenheit. The IPCC reports that a doubling of carbon dioxide levels would lead to approximately 10,000 additional deaths per year for the current U.S. population from higher summer temperatures, even after netting out the effects of warmer winters and acclimatization. The IPCC also predicts sea level increases of about 20 inches by 2100, with greater increases in subsequent years. Despite the difficulties of deriving quantitative assessments of the damages from climate change, researchers have nonetheless developed monetary estimates of damages that prompt substantial concern, and range in the tens of billions of dollars per year for temperature changes projected to occur in the next century. If left uncontrolled, disruption of the Earth's climate may thus pose substantial costs in terms of harm to commerce and the environment alike. These costs--and they are significant--provide the primary motivation for actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Moreover, these estimates do not, and cannot, accurately reflect the value of reducing the unknown risk of large-scale and potentially irreversible events with potentially catastrophic consequences. There is a strong argument for the Kyoto Protocol as a form of insurance against a serious environmental threat.

Minimizing the Economic Costs of Action

In taking action to reduce emissions, economic analysis suggests that two elements are absolutely essential: the effort must be flexible and market-based, to ensure that we reduce emissions in the most efficient way; and the effort must be global, for without global emissions reductions the effort would be ineffective. The nature of the climate change problem--that greenhouse gas emissions have

the same effect on the climate regardless of how, where, and, within limits, when they occur--suggests three basic approaches to lower the cost of achieving given levels of environmental protection. We term these “when”, “what”, and “where” flexibility.

As a result of U.S. diplomatic efforts, all three forms of flexibility are broadly reflected in the Kyoto Protocol. The choice of a multi-year budget period, ending later than many countries proposed, with allowance for “banking” of emissions reductions, constitute key elements of “when flexibility.” These provisions mitigate costs by permitting reductions at times when they are less rather than more costly. The inclusion of all six greenhouse gases and certain sink activities that promote removal of carbon from the atmosphere provide substantial “what flexibility”. The U.S. succeeded in having the Kyoto Protocol stipulate that countries with binding targets are to reduce total greenhouse gas emissions by certain percentages, but the Protocol does not require specific reductions for specific gases. Moreover, sinks can be used to offset emissions targets. The inclusion of international emissions trading among countries that take on binding targets, coupled with an agreement allowing industrial countries to receive emissions reduction credit for certified investments in “clean development” projects in the developing world, are the critical forms of “where” flexibility incorporated in the Kyoto Protocol. Although details of these provisions need to be finalized in negotiations in Buenos Aires later this year, we believe that these mechanisms can produce substantial reductions in the costs of attaining our environmental objectives.

Economic analysis also points to the need for a global solution to a problem that is global. Around 2015, under a continuation of business as usual, a majority of world emissions are projected to come from developing countries. Without developing country participation we cannot achieve adequate climate protection. In addition, developing country participation would permit relatively low-cost emissions reductions to be internationally recognized as a substitute for more expensive reductions in many industrial countries. The President has made clear that he will not submit the Kyoto Protocol to the Senate without meaningful participation from key developing countries (who are not included in Annex I).

Analyzing Economic Effects

An economic analysis of climate change faces three broad categories of difficulties. First are the uncertainties that still remain over the terms of the ultimate treaty. Second are the inherent limitations of available models to analyze even short-term costs and benefits. And finally is the impossibility of putting a single monetary figure on the long-term benefits of climate change mitigation.

Mindful of the limitations of any single model as a tool for evaluating the economic impact of the Kyoto Protocol, we have employed a broad array of techniques to assess the various possible costs and non-climate benefits of the Administration’s emissions reduction policy. To give away the punchline: Ignoring the benefits of mitigating climate change itself, our conclusion is that the net costs of our policies to reduce emissions are likely to be small if those reductions are undertaken in an efficient

manner and we are successful in securing meaningful developing country participation as well as effective international trading and clean-development mechanisms in future negotiations. This conclusion is not entirely dependent on, but is fully consistent with, formal model results.

Assessing the Kyoto Protocol

Because the results from any model must be treated with caution, the Administration has employed a broad set of economic tools to assess the Kyoto Protocol. We have drawn on the insights of a wide range of models of the energy sector and economy over the next 25 years, including but not limited to the results of the Stanford Energy Modeling Forum exercises, the IPCC's review of the economic and social dimensions of climate change, the work of the OECD on Economic Dimensions and Policy Responses to Global Warming, and the staff-level Interagency Analytical Team analysis produced last year. Other tools include simple relevant statistics, "meta-analyses" such as work by the World Resources Institute, models, and basic economic reasoning. Drawing on this broad array of analytical tools is crucial to an intelligent evaluation of the policy alternatives.

To our knowledge, no model -- whether used inside the government or not -- has yet been set up to analyze fully the implications of the Kyoto Protocol, since this agreement is only six months old and remains unfinished. In particular, no model is currently designed to assess Kyoto's treatment of sinks, or all six greenhouse gases. Some model-builders outside the government tend to take as long as several years to incorporate changes in policy parameters into their models.

Our thinking has been informed, however, by simulations conducted with the Second Generation Model of Battelle Laboratories, one of the leading models in the field. The SGM is one of the models best positioned to analyze the role of international trade in emission permits, which we consider to be a critical element of the Kyoto Treaty. However, the SGM does not cover all six gases included in the Kyoto Protocol or include a role for sinks. We have used the SGM model as one input into our overall assessment of the Kyoto treaty, but have attempted to supplement its results with additional analysis to account for such special features of the agreement as the inclusion of six gases, a possible trading arrangement that could include a subset of the Annex I countries and the Clean Development Mechanism. I will present here some preliminary results of this analysis.

Mindful of the limitations of any single model, we are eager to see features of the Kyoto Protocol assessed by other models to obtain a better feel for the range of possible effects. For example, the Energy Modeling Forum, based at Stanford University, a long-running model comparison exercise involving many of the leading climate models, is currently studying how to incorporate features of the Kyoto Protocol.

Assessing the Potential Costs of Emissions Reductions

We have said that we can do this smart or we can do this dumb. This refers to the point that the costs of cutting emissions can be much reduced if flexible, market-based mechanisms are used. Our economic analysis highlighted the importance of such flexible, market-based mechanisms -- which are therefore reflected, at the President's insistence, in the Kyoto Protocol and our ongoing diplomatic strategy. Claims that Kyoto implies high estimated economic costs usually derive from a failure to incorporate these flexibility features, rather than from a more fundamental failure of the model in question.

Within the Kyoto Protocol, this means an insistence on international trading, Joint Implementation, the Clean Development Mechanism, and, ultimately, on meaningful developing country participation. Domestically, this means that we implement any emissions reductions through a market-based system of *tradeable* emissions permits, which ensures that we achieve reductions wherever they are least expensive. But this also means taking serious and responsible steps in the short run to prepare us to meet our obligations in the longer term.

**

A comprehensive economic evaluation of the Administration's climate change policies must take into account the potential payoffs from the full package of proposed Administration climate change initiatives. The President's FY 1999 budget includes a \$6.3 billion package of tax cuts and R&D over the next 5 years; this package makes sense in terms of energy policy even ignoring any payoff for climate change. Another component of the President's climate change policy is his support for electricity restructuring in a manner that will offer approximately \$20 billion in cost savings to electricity consumers..

Estimated Reduction in Costs from Annex I Trading

In the language of the treaty, "Annex I" is the set of countries that have agreed to take on binding limitations in emissions of greenhouse gases. Even without meaningful developing country participation -- which, again, the President has emphasized is essential before the treaty would be submitted for ratification -- costs could be reduced substantially by emission trading among the Annex I countries. To provide some indication of the possible efficiency improvements, Russia and Ukraine consume six times as much energy per dollar of output as does the United States. Such large international differences in energy efficiency suggest that adoption of existing U.S. technology would yield very large emissions reductions in these countries.

Estimates derived from the SGM model confirm that emissions trading among Annex I countries can reduce the cost to the United States of achieving its targets for 2008-2012 emissions by about half relative to a situation in which such trading was not available. This concept of costs is meant to capture aggregate resource costs to the US economy, including the cost to domestic firms of purchasing emission permits from other countries where emission reductions may be cheaper than in the United States. Although these estimates reflect idealized international trading in efficient markets, the overall conclusion is clear. The dramatic reduction in costs potentially available from Annex I trading within the

SGM model -- cutting the costs involved by half -- highlights why the President insisted that international trading be part of the Kyoto Protocol; and why its achievement by our negotiators in Kyoto was such an important accomplishment.

Estimated reduction in costs from umbrella trading

One possibility that emerged in Kyoto, which none of us foresaw, was the idea developed there by the U.S. delegation, that the United States might undertake trading with a subset of Annex I countries, dubbed the “umbrella”. Countries that have expressed interest in the umbrella include the United States, Australia, Canada, New Zealand and Russia, with strong indications of interest from some others. This subset of Annex I countries shares a common interest in promoting market-based mechanisms, most specifically, fully flexible rules for international trading of emissions permits.

It is too early to state the precise form the umbrella might take. But we can envision a number of potential benefits. The umbrella could, for example greatly reduce costs to the U.S. Results that we have derived from various SGM simulations of efficient international trading suggest that, relative to the situation in which there is no trading at all, the umbrella can reduce costs by an estimated 60-75 percent, depending on whether the former Warsaw Pact countries fall within the umbrella. The Kyoto Protocol classifies these countries outside of the EU bubble for the first budget period 2008-2012.

Estimated reduction in costs from developing country participation

The next consideration is participation by developing countries. The President has said that he will not submit the treaty for ratification without meaningful participation by key developing countries. Such participation would further reduce the costs involved.

The substantial potential gains from meaningful developing country participation are illustrated by the benefits that will likely accrue from the limited role that the developing countries have already agreed to: the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), modeled after the U.S. joint implementation concept. The CDM cannot realistically be expected to yield all the gains of binding targets for developing countries, but it might shave costs by roughly another 20 to 25 percent from the reduced costs that result from trading among Annex I countries.

Another possibility is that we persuade some of the key developing countries that are the largest emitters to commit to targets, and allow us to buy emission reductions from those paths. Simulations with the SGM model suggest that full participation by non Annex I countries could cut roughly 55 percent off the reduced costs that result from Annex I trading. The actual cost reduction would depend on the extent of developing country participation that is ultimately obtained, as well as the effectiveness of international trading arrangements. The more developing countries that take on modest binding targets and trade in international permit markets, the lower will be costs.

These cost-saving opportunities are fundamental tenets of the U.S. position. The promise of Kyoto cannot be achieved without effective emissions trading. Moreover, if we do not get meaningful participation by key developing countries, we won't submit the treaty for ratification to the Senate. So, while our analysis may be predicated on some ambitious conditions concerning trading and developing country participation, it is exactly those conditions that form the foundation of the U.S. position in international negotiations including those at Buenos Aires.

Accounting for Carbon Sinks

The preceding discussion has emphasized the importance of trading arrangements and the CDM. In reaching an overall economic assessment, it is also important to factor in the potential role of carbon sinks. Again, the U.S. delegation obtained a novel concept, that carbon absorbing activities called sinks could be used to offset emissions. The arrangements concerning carbon sinks in the Kyoto Protocol have received less attention than they merit. The Kyoto Protocol specifies that removals of CO₂ by sinks count toward meeting the target. The Kyoto Protocol counts the net emissions effects of three sink activities --afforestation, reforestation, and deforestation. Very preliminary estimates of the implications for the United States of the Kyoto provision on sinks indicate that carbon sinks could comprise a significant portion of the total required emissions reductions. Moreover, decreasing the required emissions reduction by, for example, 10% would likely result in cost-savings greater than 10%.

Even this estimate of the effect of sinks is conservative in one respect: it is based on an assumption for sink activity in the U.S. over the 2008-2012 period, and no assumed benefits from sinks elsewhere in the world. Very preliminary estimates suggest that incorporating the gains from sinks *throughout the world* can substantially reduce the costs of meeting the Kyoto target, on top of the gains from trading among Annex I countries. (Furthermore, no model has yet even tried to take into account that government policies can help increase the activities qualifying as allowable sinks, like some tree-planting.) Because the quantitative uncertainty is so large, we do not yet have an estimate with which we are comfortable. But we expect that complete modelling of the Kyoto provision pertaining to sinks will likely have favorable and potentially large effects on projected costs.

Accounting for the role of improvements in energy efficiency

Another issue in analyzing the Kyoto protocol concerns future improvements in energy efficiency due to innovation and diffusion of existing technology. The parameter that figures most prominently in analysis of energy efficiency is the rate of improvement in the so-called Autonomous Energy Efficiency Index (AEEI), that is the rate at which the total use of energy falls relative to GDP. A plausible assumption on the AEEI is an improvement of 1.0 percent per year. Reflecting a conservative interpretation of the 15-year impact of various climate change initiatives, this is only a small increase above the 0.9 percent number in the Energy Information Administration's Annual Energy Outlook. That assumption is not the most optimistic outcome that might occur. Some authorities in the field of energy policy forecast more rapid technological progress.

The President's FY 1999 budget, as I have noted, includes a \$6.3 billion package of tax cuts and R&D investments intended to spur the discovery and adoption of new technologies. If the Administration is successful in this effort, the rate of improvement in energy efficiency could rise and such improvements would lower the cost of meeting our Kyoto target.

Our justification for incorporating into our assessment a small assumed impact of Administration technology policies is somewhat analogous to the Administration's rationale for employing mainstream economic assumptions in our budget forecasts: in the presence of uncertainty, we are conservative in our estimates of the speed with which the economy will grow, tax receipts will rise, and the budget will improve. That way, any revisions or surprises that occur are likely to be in the pleasant direction. In this instance, we prudently and conservatively assume that there will be substantial delays between investments in new technology or the diffusion of existing technology, and the returns to such investments.

Non-Climate Benefits

A final factor that should be included in any comprehensive assessment of the economic implications of the Kyoto protocol are the benefits of the agreement. The literature has emphasized that any relative price shifts that prove necessary to reduce emissions should produce non-climate benefits in three areas: traffic congestion, highway accidents, and air pollution unrelated to climate change. These benefits are hard to quantify precisely but are potentially significant: our rough estimates suggest that these three benefits could offset approximately a quarter of the resource cost of the climate change policy.

Synthesis

Assuming that effective mechanisms for international trading, Joint Implementation and the Clean Development Mechanism are established, and assuming also that the U.S. achieves meaningful developing country participation, our overall assessment is that the economic cost to the United States in aggregate and to typical households of attaining the targets and timetables specified in the Kyoto Protocol, will be modest.

This conclusion that the impact will be modest is not entirely dependent upon, but is fully consistent with, formal model results. Under the assumptions of either trading under the umbrella or within Annex I, the CDM and permit trading with developing countries, estimates derived using the SGM model, which adjust for the inclusion of six gases and assume little banking of credits beyond 2012, suggest that the resource costs of attaining the Kyoto targets for emission reductions might amount to \$7 to \$12 billion per year in 2008 to 2012. This implies that overall costs, excluding not only climate and non-climate benefits, but also such cost mitigating factors as sinks and payoffs from the President's electricity restructuring and climate change initiatives, would reach roughly one tenth of one

percent of projected GDP in 2010.

A more tangible measure of costs is the estimated effects on energy prices. Excluding the impact of electricity restructuring and the ancillary benefits of mitigation and better forest management, the SGM-based estimate, corresponding to the gross resource cost estimate cited above, is an emissions price in the range of \$14 to \$23 per ton of carbon equivalent. This translates into an increase in energy prices between 2008 and 2012 of between 3 and 5 percent at the household level, an increase in fuel oil prices of about 5 to 9 percent, natural gas prices of 3 to 5 percent, gasoline prices of 3 to 4 percent (or around 4 to 6 cents per gallon), and electricity prices of 3 to 4 percent. This increase in energy prices at the household level would raise the average household's energy bill in ten years by between \$70 and \$110 per year, although such effects may not be observable because they would be small relative to typical energy price changes, and nearly fully offset by electricity price declines from Federal electricity restructuring. In particular, this increase in energy prices is small relative to the average of *year to year* real energy price changes experienced by U.S. consumers since 1960: such *annual* changes have averaged 3.8 percent. In addition, by 2008-2012, the anticipated 10 percent decline in electricity prices from the restructuring that is part of our climate change agenda is projected to lead to expenditure reductions of about \$90 per year for the average household. (An appendix will spell out these results in a bit more detail.)

**

As highlighted earlier, there are substantial but unavoidable uncertainties surrounding estimates like these. For example, the estimate just discussed is predicated, among other things, on the developing country participation that we are insisting upon as a condition for our ratifying the Kyoto Protocol, but which is not yet part of that Protocol, and on effective international trading. Moreover, other models will yield other answers and much work remains to be done by the modeling community to test the robustness of these results. Preliminary comparisons of the SGM model to the few other models that have attempted to evaluate the Kyoto accord, suggest that its predictions concerning the impact of the Kyoto Protocol on carbon permit prices are neither the most conservative nor the most optimistic of the models that have been developed. The predictions of the SGM model are robust in the sense that virtually all energy models reveal the potency of effective, flexible, domestic and international trading mechanisms to reduce substantially the cost and energy price impact of meeting the Kyoto targets.

Of course, the most important factor that has been left out of the above assessment is the benefit of mitigating climate change itself. A full cost-benefit analysis would include mitigation in the benefits column. The only reason we have not done so, explained above, is the difficulty in coming up with a number to capture the monetary benefits. But nobody should lose sight of our ultimate objective -- keeping our planet the hospitable home that we enjoy today.

Effects on employment and aggregate output

So far we have said nothing about job losses resulting from climate change policy. Although there may be job gains in some sectors and job losses in others, we do not anticipate any significant aggregate employment effect if we achieve the conditions we have discussed. The effects on energy prices described above will occur only 10 to 14 years in the future. Not only are these effects small relative to historical variations in energy prices, and offset by other policies like electricity restructuring, but they would occur sufficiently far in the future to enable monetary policy to keep the economy operating at its potential. In energy-intensive sectors some employment reduction could occur, although given the very small predicted change in energy prices, impacts in most such sectors are apt to be minimal. Furthermore, jobs will be created in other sectors -- many of them high-tech jobs paying high wages. The President is firmly committed to assisting any workers who are adversely affected during the transition to a climate-friendly economy.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the Kyoto Protocol and the President's general approach to climate change reflect the insight of economic analysis. The Kyoto Protocol includes key provisions on international trading and Clean Development projects. The President's approach relies on market incentives -- first, with a system of tax cuts and R&D investments, and then later with a market-based system of tradeable permits -- to ensure that our objectives are achieved as efficiently as possible. Our overall conclusion is that the economic impact of the Protocol will be modest under the conditions we have identified.