

Comments to Dr. A. Michaelowa's Presentation

Mitsutsune YAMAGUCHI
Professor of Economics,
Keio University

Informative proposals

- Kyoto Protocol as second best (not optimal)
 - Take 550 ppm CO₂e as an indicative target then,
 - Keeping and strengthening the Kyoto, 2013-2017
 - Core group
 - ex. **Russia -42%**, EU-28 -12%, **US -6%**, Japan -3%
 - baseline: 1st commitment period or BAU
 - Graduation Index, per capita GDP and emissions
 - 6% , -3% , 0% Base year 2012
 - Intensity target with ET or Countrywide CDM (ex. China)
 - Carbon sequestration
- (den Elsen et al., “Simplified Multi-Stage and Per Capita Convergence”)

Fundamental Issues

Why “keeping Kyoto”?

In view of four criteria

Environmental effectiveness

Economic efficiency

Equity

Political and Administrative feasibility

Environmental Effectiveness

- Will the United States (and Russia) join the scheme? -6% (-42%) target for 2nd period

Without US participation, no major developing countries will assume any obligation

- May not be on the trajectory path toward 550 ppm

How to assure? Especially when China, India etc. will not assume “cap”

How about 3rd commitment period?

Economic Efficiency

- What are the costs (and benefits)?

Compatibility of Economy and Environment

Why the Montreal Protocol succeeded? (S. Barrett)

- What about the price of tradable permits?

How to deal with new entrants with loose targets?

- Climate change priority

Copenhagen Consensus

Limited Resources towards urgent global issues,
such as poverty, disease etc.

Equity

- Allocation under 2nd commitment period is largely depending on the initial allocation
(allocation of money with no scientific basis for Annex B), (Comparable effort)
- Graduation formula does not take into consideration of past and future emissions
(Responsibility)
- Must show costs for implementation to see if targets are equitably allocated among Annex B countries (Comparable effort)

Political and Administrative Feasibility

- What, if US (and Russia) will not join?
- IET is efficient. Whether a country transfer money to other countries because of unjustifiable initial allocation, however, is a different issue
- Is negotiation of target at every five years feasible?
- No indication for 3rd commitment period

Alternative ideas What we can commit?

- Kyoto plus safety valve (Hybrid)
Uniform ceiling price may be unrealistic
- **Pledge and Review**
Total outcome of pledges should be reviewed
With long term goal in mind
- **Sector specific intensity targets**
Need to have industry cooperation for database
- **Non binding target for Developing Cs**
- **International cooperation of technology development** “Princeton Wedge” and cost
- **Stalemate of COP (Institutional issues)**

CO2 Emission Reduction Effects of Technological Options under a 550 ppmv Limit

