

Can Path Dependency Analysis Help Climate Finance 'Ratchet down' Emissions in Time? Brainstorming Distributional Approaches for Triggering a Low Carbon Economy



Benjamin Cashore, Graeme Auld, Steven Bernstein &
Kelly Levin

Presentation to "Signaling Policy Predictability for
Long-Term Investment in Clean Innovation" panel

March 2, 2018

Outline

- Review climate as a “super wicked problem” identified by Levin, Cashore, Bernstein and Auld (2007, 2012)
- Identify “path dependency analysis” is one way to proceed
- Illustrate how path dependency has explained past policy trajectories
- Reflect on how it might be applied forward
 - Climate finance
 - Distributional allocation of climate finance resources
- NOTE:
 - Paper focuses on only one part of the broader review Daniel led
 - This will also inform a Saturday morning workshop for further brainstorming

Context: Reversing Commitments

- Last 30 years has witnessed vacillating Canadian approaches to the global climate crisis
 - Chretien signs Kyoto, Harper removes support, Trudeau promotes Paris
- Today, there is now a national intergovernmental consensus that:
 - Canada has a responsibility for addressing global climate emissions
 - Climate finance mechanisms are emerging as a central component
- Two (of three) elephants in the room:
 - What is stopping this latest trend from being **reversed**?
 - Will climate finance be enough to achieve 1.5/2 degrees targets?

What are 'Super Wicked' Problems?

- Time is running out – irreversibility
- No central authority
- Those seeking to end the problem are also causing it
 - Texting, smoking, web surfing
- Policies discount the future irrationally

A tragedy



- Even though we collectively recognize the need to act now to avoid future catastrophic impacts
- the immediate implications of required behavioral changes overwhelm the ability of the political and policy systems at multiple levels to respond.
- The battles we are waging is against ourselves

Traditional Policy Analysis Techniques Insufficient

- **“Single step” linear analysis**
- **“Set it and Forget it”: Daniel Rosenbloom**
 - “Often lead to policy solutions that either
 - fail in the political system
 - succeed, but are weak and subject to reversal
- **Cost-Benefit Analysis**
 - Useful information
 - But can’t address factors that must be included
 - Norm changes, coalition building
 - Changing preferences

Durability Assumed or Ignore

- ◆ **•Yet many solutions are short lived**
 - Effects of NGO Boycott of Home Depot 25 years ago
 - Boreal forest accord among Canadian forest products industry and NGOs appears to be losing momentum
 - Tasmania Forestry Accord among NGOs and industry reversed by newly elected government
- ◆ **•However some are durable**
 - BC's protected area designations of 25 years ago
- ◆ **•Need to better theorize to uncover policy solutions that have potential for durability**
 - Can't wait 25 years for the "evidence based approach"
 - Too late for super wicked problems

Path Dependency Analysis

- **Lock-in**
 - Immediate stickiness
- **Self-reinforcing**
 - costs of reversing rise over time
- **Increasing returns**
 - benefits increase over time
- **Positive feedbacks**
 - expanding populations and reinforcing original support
 - (avoids niche approaches)

Three Diagnostic questions



- DQ1: What can be done to create stickiness making reversibility immediately difficult?
- DQ2: What can be done to entrench support over time?
- DQ3: What can be done to expand the population that supports the policy?

Recent evidence: Obamacare

- **Provision that health plans must cover all children ages 26 and under**
 - Initiated as 'easy to pull lever' inside legislative committees
 - Hard to change owing to threat of political mobilization
- **Two distinct steps with different logics**
 - Cause of the the lever: ability to tinker with policy settings
 - Cause of durability is different: threat of political mobilization

Resource allocation tinkering: Washington State

- **Logging on State Forest Lands**
 - Revenues from harvesting are allocated to **public education** creating a “Bootleggers and Baptists” coalition.
 - Reinforces production over conservation goals, since well funded education relies on maintaining logging.

Brainstorming Tools: Coalitions



•Can strategic interests be harnessed towards collective outcomes?

- Bootleggers and Baptists coalitions
- California effect: “relatively highly regulated companies see it in their strategic self interest to align with environmental groups to focus on increasing regulations on less regulated competitors”

Brainstorming Tools: Norm generation

- **Norm generation key**
 - Slavery, gay marriage, smoking all durable because of norm changes, not just rules
- **Leigh's work all on this is central**
 - Leigh has worked on this significantly including: Raymond, Weldon, Daniel Kelly, Arriaga, Clark "Making Change Norm-Based Strategies for Institutional Change to Address Intractable Problems Political Research Quarterly
- **Hard to do but lessons emerge for strategic intervention**
 - Routinization
 - Policy learning among stakeholders

Examples of Climate Policy Triggers in Practice?

- **Carbon tax British Columbia**
 - Broad coalitions of support were generated by distributing resources to municipalities and tax payers
 - Fostered norm generation elsewhere?
- **Feed-in Tariffs in Europe**
 - Created long-term self interest for participants
 - Expanded to new communities as more wanted to participate for normative and strategic reasons

Implications for Climate Finance

Distributional Tinkering

- Not just about policy design
- Need to reflect on durability and norm change
- Are there undiscovered ideas that might triggering one or more path dependent sequences?
 - Similar to the Washington state teacher's examples?
- Answering this questions requires collective brainstorming
 - the purpose of Saturday's workshop
- Must be linked back to the super wicked problem in question
 - Must be done in a way that does not lock-in 5 degrees, but 1.5/2 degrees