## THE IMPACT OF THE EUROPEAN UNION EMISSIONS TRADING SYSTEM ON CARBON EMISSIONS AND ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE

Antoine Dechezleprêtre EEPRN Research Symposium March 2018





- Running since 2005 across 31 countries
- 12,000 covered installations (~8,000 firms), 40% of European GHG emissions
- The largest carbon market in the world

  Other markets in US, Canada, NZ, Korea, China
  Plans in Japan, Chile, Mexico







- Did the EU ETS cause the emissions decline?
- If so, did it affect the performance of regulated firms?
- Empirically analyse the *causal* impact of the EU ETS on carbon emissions & firm performance
  - Using firm and installation-level data
  - Across Europe

# Evaluating the impact of EU ETS

- Establishing the policy's causal effect
  - Identify regulated installations & companies
  - Construct a control group of similar but unregulated entities and compare with regulated entities
- Control group:
  - Same country, same sector, similar pre-2005 characteristics (e.g. carbon emissions, financials) but below threshold







# ETS effect: ex. firms' fixed assets









### IMPACT ON CARBON EMISSIONS



- National Pollution Release and Transfer Registries (PRTR)
  - At installation level (pre and post ETS)
  - France, UK, Netherlands, Norway

Country	Coverage since	Reporting threshold	# installations	# installations with reported CO2 emissions
France	2003	10 kt	14,797	1,648
Netherlands	1990	< 1 kt	1,849	1,593
Norway	1997	< 1 kt	1,447	499
United Kingdom	1998	10 kt	5,500	1,024



- Nearest neighbour matching on
  - Country
  - Economic sector
  - Pre-ETS emissions
  - Pre-ETS emissions trend
- Focus on manufacturing
- Around 500 installations

































Evidence from multinational data

- Carbon Disclosure Project: firm-level carbon emissions by country
  - NGO acting on behalf of over 600 institutional investors
  - Since 2003 asked listed companies to disclose information on emissions
  - 1,041 companies, 2007-2014 (unbalanced)
- Focus on multinational companies operating both within and outside the EU

   Should be easier for them to relocate activities





# Growth of CO2 emissions in the EU vs the rest of the World





### IMPACT ON FIRM PERFORMANCE



- Orbis global financial database
   At firm level (pre and post ETS)
   All EU ETS countries
- EU ETS companies: own at least one EU ETS installation





- Matching on:
  - Country
  - Sector
  - Turnover, fixed assets, employment and profit before 2005
- Good comparators for 1,787 EU ETS firms
   Pre-2005 data not always available
  - No comparators for very large firms







Outcome variable	Effect
Employment	+2% (not significant)
Profits	+280k€ (not significant)
Revenue	+8-16%***
Fixed assets	+6-8%***



Outcome variable	Effect
Employment	+2% (not significant)
Profits	+280k€ (not significant)
Revenue	+8-16%***
Fixed assets	+6-8%***



Outcome variable	Effect
Employment	+2% (not significant)
Profits	+280k€ (not sign.)
Revenue	+8-16%***
Fixed assets	+6-8%***



Outcome variable	Effect
Employment	+2% (not significant)
Profits	+280k€ (not significant)
Revenue	+8-16%***
Fixed assets	+6-8%***



Outcome variable	Effect
Employment	+2% (not significant)
Profits	+280k€ (not significant)
Revenue	+8-16%***
Fixed assets	+6-8%***



- Revenue
  - Cost pass-through with free allowances can only explain 10-20% of the effect
  - Effect in many sectors (not only electricity)
  - Productivity improvements?
- Assets
  - Strong effect for firms that reduced emissions the most, but not only
  - Energy-efficiency investments, but other investments as well



- The EU ETS seems to have:
  - Modestly reduced emissions, with no evidence of leakage
  - While improving firms' performance
  - Incentivized investment
- The big questions
  - What are the mechanisms?
  - What if the price had been much higher?



#### For more information:

#### antoine.dechezlepretre@oecd.org

