

Thomas Bourany University of Chicago

The Optimal Design of Climate Agreements Inequality, Trade, and Incentives for Climate Policy



EUROPEAN CENTRAL BANK

EUROSYSTEM

The free-riding problem of climate policy

Despite urgency, nations fail to enact strong climate policies. The cause: free-riding incentives, exacerbated by inequalities, climate change, and redistributive effects of carbon taxation – on energy markets and carbon trade leakage.

- Traditional answer: international climate agreements, e.g. UN's COP
- *Trade policy:* potential to incentivize foreign emissions reductions

- Climate Club: Nordhaus (2015), idea of clubs where members set a carbon tax and impose tariff retaliation to foster participation

Question: What is the optimal design of the climate club?

This paper: Determines the optimal taxation of carbon in the presence of inequality, trade, and endogenous participation due to free-riding strategic incentives.



Benchmark – Optimal carbon policy

Second-Best Pigouvian-Ramsey taxation problem: Absent Free-riding, the Planner chooses a uniform carbon tax t^{ε} to maximizes world welfare:

$$\mathcal{W} = \max_{\mathrm{t}^arepsilon} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \omega_i \; \mathcal{U}_i(\mathbb{I}, \mathrm{t}^arepsilon)$$

No redistributive instruments: Carbon tax differs from the Social Cost of Carbon

 $t^{\varepsilon} \neq SCC$ \Rightarrow

150

100

50

0

Carbon tax (USD/tCO2)

Climate agreement design as a "Climate Club"

Summary

I design the optimal climate agreement – or "climate club" (Nordhaus) – in the presence of inequality, trade, and free-riding incentives.

1. Trade-off between **extensive margin** – higher participation of countries in a "climate club" – and intensive margin – fewer countries with larger emission reductions and higher carbon tax.

2. The optimal climate club: (i) gathers all the countries in the world except oil producers (Russia, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Nigeria), (ii) carbon tax is \$110, which is \$20 lower than the globally optimal tax absent free-riding (iii) moderate tariffs of 50% important to incentivize participation, but not enough to encourage the whole world

Climate – Economy model (IAM) with inequality, energy, and trade

Rich quantitative model with heterogeneity across countries in:

- Income (TFP/GDP)
- Trade flows
- Energy-mix: oil-gas, coal, renewables.
- Fossil-fuel exports/imports
- Damages from climate (temperature)



Winners and losers of optimal carbon taxation

Def: A climate agreement is a set $\{\mathbb{J}, t^{\varepsilon}, t^{b}\}$ with $\mathbb{J} \subseteq \mathbb{I}$ countries s.t.:

- Countries $i \in J$ are subject to a carbon tax t^{ε} on fossil fuels e_i^J, e_i^c
- If country j exits the agreement, club members $i \in J$ impose uniform tariffs $t_{ij}^b = t^b$ on goods from *j*.
- Exit unilateral deviation of $j: \mathbb{J} \setminus \{j\} \Rightarrow \text{Nash-Equilibrium}$
- Participation constraints, indirect utility $\mathcal{U}_i(\mathbb{J}, t^{\varepsilon}, t^b) \equiv u(c_i(\mathbb{J}, t^{\varepsilon}, t^b))$

 $\mathcal{U}_i(\mathbb{J}, \mathbf{t}^{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{t}^b) \geq \mathcal{U}_i(\mathbb{J} \setminus \{i\}, \mathbf{t}^{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{t}^b)$ $\forall i \in \mathbb{J}$

Optimal Design of Climate agreements

World Social Planner searching for the optimal climate club

$$\begin{split} \max_{\mathbb{J}, t^{\varepsilon}, t^{b}} \ & \mathcal{W}(\mathbb{J}, t^{\varepsilon}, t^{b}) = \max_{t^{\varepsilon}, t^{b}} \ \max_{\mathbb{J}} \ \sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \omega_{i} \ \mathcal{U}_{i}(\mathbb{J}, t^{\varepsilon}, t^{b}) \\ s.t. \qquad & \mathbb{J} \in \mathbb{C}(t^{\varepsilon}, t^{b}) = \left\{ \mathcal{J} \ \mid \mathcal{U}_{i}(\mathbb{J}, t^{\varepsilon}, t^{b}) \geq \mathcal{U}_{i}(\mathbb{J} \setminus \{i\}, t^{\varepsilon}, t^{b}), \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{J} \right\} \end{split}$$

Current design: (i) choose taxes $\{t^{\varepsilon}, t^{b}\}$ (ii) choose the coalition \mathbb{J} s.t. participation constraints hold

Trade-off: cost of carbon tax vs. cost of tariffs

- Countries participate depending on:
 - (i) the cost of distortionary carbon taxation

(ii) the cost of tariffs (= the gains from trade)

- Russia/Middle East/South Asia do not join the club
- for high carbon tax, for any tariffs, because
- cost of taxing fossil-fuels \gg cost of tariffs / autarky

Result: need to decrease carbon tax, from \$130 to $110/tCO_2$

