

Alternatives and complements to BCAs

08-06-2020 ERCST Event - Brussels

Oliver Sartor, Senior Advisor oliver.sartor@agora-energiewende.de



The current anti-carbon leakage system is not sustainable under higher EU climate ambition (1): we need to transition to a new anti-leakage system by ~2030/35





The current anti-carbon leakage system is not sustainable under higher EU climate ambition (2)





BCAs could solve these problems...However, a unilaterally imposed EU BCA faces numerous obstacles.

- The « export rebate problem »
- EU can't agree on sectoral scope (intersectoral competition)
- EU can't agree on product benchmarks
- Downstream product purchasers object
- Ineffective policy design (scope, resource shuffling, indirect emissions)
- International opposition/retaliation
- Unfavourable WTO ruling
- High stakes: Failure could kill EU ambition discussion; partial implementation prolongs investment uncertainty / leakage risk
- ⇒ High uncertainty: Complementary / fallback solutions needed.



Proposed alternatives to BCAs (1) Carbon Contracts for Difference

Pros	Cons
 → Covers incremental cost of utlra low CO2 production vs. conventional competition → Option to replace free allocation via cash subsidy for innovative low CO2 producers → Easily compatible with BCAs if introduced 	 → Doesn't protect conventional assets → Not financially sustainable in long run → Depends on national funding capacity (EU wide
Conclusion: Only for innovative low CO2 producers: partial and temporary solution.	



Proposed alternatives to BCAs (2) Output-based allocation + « Consumption Charge »

Pros	Cons
 Reduces BCA legal risks related to export rebate question Simplifies administration by placing a weight-based charge on consumption of basic materials in the internal market Raises funds from consumers for innovation 	 → How would one reconcile output-based free allocation at conventional benchmark with ETS cap? With/ auction revenue allocations? → Weight-based charge disadvantages green products → Would require unanomous support in Council.
Conclusion: good for raising funds, less desirable for long-term leakage protetion.	



How might carbon product standards work as a carbon leakage policy?



- → Build on examples of EU Timber and Fisheries policies, Montreal Protocol
- → From a certain « sunset » date, EU internal market would only accept EII products produced according to given ultra-low-CO2 standard.
- This would apply to imports and domestic production equally
- Green product quotas and public procurement used to implement gradually
- In parallel, free allocation to conventional tech is reduced gradually as share of green market (and thus production sites) increases.



Proposed alternatives to BCAs (3) Low carbon production standards

Pros	Cons
 → Precedents under WTO & EU law → An internal market (not a border) measure → Could be introduced gradually via progressive scaling of other policies to create markets → Helps to provide clarify for investment in Low CO2 options → No regret if BCA works: also helpful for transition 	 → Technological uncertainty → Agreeing on long term standards across EU → Similar admin requirements to BCA (third party certification of foreign production tech.)
Conclusion: Could not be implemented immediately. Potential back up LT strategy if BCAs not possible	



Summary

- \rightarrow To aim for higher ambition, the EU's current anti-leakage system must begin to change radically
- \rightarrow In the short term, the EU has two/three main tools:
 - CfD payments for low-CO2 projects (replacing free alloc.);
 - temporary, **output-based free allocation** for conventional assets
 - **BCAs** for small no. of sectors (if feasible)
- \rightarrow In long term, two main options:
 - **BCAs** (theoretically possible, but high uncertainty)
 - **Carbon product standards** (can only be implemented gradually)
- → CfDs and CPS are desirable for the transition anyway, therefore « no regret » options.



Thank you!

oliver.sartor@agora-energiewende.de

