AFRICAN ENERGY RESEARCH

Report Type: Case Study

Carbon Markets, Credits and Pricing Systems

Prepared by the African Energy Research Unit

AFRICAN ENERGY RESEARCH SERIES
Volume 01 | March 2026
AER-PB-2026-001

CERTIFICATION PAGE

This report is certified as an original research work conducted by African Energy Research (AER) in accordance with approved research standards, methodologies, and ethical guidelines.

Lead Researcher: Dairo Opetunde

Signature & Date: 2026

Program Lead: ______________________

Signature & Date: ____________________

Scientific Review Approval: ________________

Signature & Date: ____________________

DECLARATION

This research report has not been submitted to any other institution for any purpose and all sources of data and references have been duly acknowledged.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors acknowledge contributions from industry experts, regulators, institutions, and AER research staff who supported data collection, review, and analysis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Five
Challenges, Critiques, and Future Directions

LIST OF ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS

Acronym	Full Form
APCR	Allowance Price Containment Reserve
ACR	American Carbon Registry
BAU	Business-as-Usual
CAR	Climate Action Reserve
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CBAM	Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism
CCS	Carbon Capture and Storage
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reduction
CO_2	Carbon Dioxide
CO_2e	CO_2-equivalent
CORSIA	Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Scheme for International Aviation
DAC	Direct Air Capture
EEA	European Environment Agency
ETS	Emissions Trading System
EU	European Union
EU ETS	European Union Emissions Trading System

LIST OF ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS

GGRF	Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GWP	Global Warming Potential
IET	International Emissions Trading
ICE	Intercontinental Exchange
ICVCM	Integrity Council for Voluntary Carbon Markets
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ITMO	Internationally Transferred Mitigation Outcome
IWG	Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases
JI	Joint Implementation
MAC	Marginal Abatement Cost
MEE	Ministry of Ecology and Environment (China)
MRV	Monitoring, Reporting, and Verification
MSR	Market Stability Reserve
NDC	Nationally Determined Contribution

LIST OF ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS

NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OMGE	Overall Mitigation in Global Emissions
REDD+	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
RGGI	Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative
SCC	Social Cost of Carbon
UK	United Kingdom
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
U.S.	United States
VCS	Verified Carbon Standard
VCMI	Voluntary Carbon Markets Integrity Initiative

Executive Summary

This case study examines the development, structure, and effectiveness of carbon markets, carbon credits, and carbon pricing systems as key tools for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and supporting global climate goals. The study explores major carbon market mechanisms including cap-and-trade systems, carbon taxes, and voluntary carbon markets, with comparative analysis of leading frameworks such as the European Union Emissions Trading System (EU ETS), California Cap-and-Trade Program, and China's National Emissions Trading System.

The report finds that carbon pricing mechanisms can drive emissions reductions, encourage investment in clean energy technologies, and promote cost-effective climate action when supported by strong policy design, transparent monitoring systems, and long-term regulatory certainty. However, significant challenges remain, including weak carbon prices, market fragmentation, carbon leakage, over-allocation of allowances, and concerns regarding the environmental integrity of voluntary carbon credits.

The study further highlights the importance of equity, just transition policies, and international cooperation in ensuring the long-term success of carbon markets. It concludes that while carbon markets alone cannot fully address climate change, they remain a critical component of global climate governance and will play an increasingly important role in achieving net-zero emissions and sustainable economic transformation.

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION TO CARBON MARKET

1.1 Background and Context

Climate change represents one of the most pressing challenges of the 21st century, with greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions driving global temperature increases, extreme weather events, and ecosystem disruptions (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, IPCC, 2023). The atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide has risen from approximately 280 parts per million (ppm) in pre-industrial times to over 420 ppm today, fundamentally altering Earth's climate systems (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration NOAA, 2024).

Carbon markets emerged as a market-based mechanism to address this externality problem. Unlike conventional pollutants, carbon dioxide is a global pollutant—emissions anywhere affect climate everywhere. This characteristic makes unilateral action economically challenging while creating opportunities for coordinated, market-based solutions (Stavins, 2020). The theoretical foundation rests on environmental economics and Coase's theorem, which suggests that if property rights are clearly defined and transaction costs are low, private bargaining can lead to efficient outcomes (Coase, 1960; Dales, 1968). Applied to carbon, this means creating a "price" for carbon emissions allows market forces to identify the lowest-cost abatement opportunities (Metcalf & Stock, 2020).

1.2 Definition and Scope

Carbon markets are trading systems where carbon credits or allowances are bought and sold. These markets operate on two fundamental mechanisms (World Bank, 2023):

1.Cap-and-Trade Systems (Compliance Markets): Regulatory bodies set a cap on total emissions and distribute or auction allowances. Entities must surrender allowances equal to their emissions, creating scarcity and price signals (Ellerman et al., 2016).

2.Baseline-and-Credit Systems: Projects reducing emissions below a baseline generate credits that can be sold to entities seeking to offset their emissions (Schneider et al., 2020).

The scope extends beyond CO_2 to include other greenhouse gases measured in CO_2-equivalent (CO_2e) using Global Warming Potential (GWP) metrics over 100-year horizons (IPCC, 2021). Methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), and fluorinated gases are thus integrated into carbon market frameworks (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, UNFCCC, 2015).

1.3 Historical Evolution

The conceptual origins trace to the 1960s-70s environmental economics literature, but practical implementation began with the U.S. Acid Rain Program (1990), which successfully reduced sulfur dioxide emissions through tradable permits (Schmalensee et al., 1998). This demonstrated that market mechanisms could achieve environmental goals cost-effectively (Burtraw et al., 2005).

The Kyoto Protocol (1997) established the first international carbon market framework, introducing:

·International Emissions Trading (IET) between Annex I countries

·Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) for developed-developing country projects

·Joint Implementation (JI) for projects between developed countries (Grubb et al., 1999)

The European Union Emissions Trading System (EU ETS), launched in 2005, became the world's largest carbon market and the primary model for cap-and-trade design (Convery, 2009). Despite early challenges including over-allocation and price collapses, it has matured into a functioning price mechanism covering approximately 40% of EU emissions (European Commission, 2023).

The Paris Agreement (2015) marked a paradigm shift toward nationally determined contributions (NDCs) and Article 6 mechanisms for international transfers, replacing the Kyoto top-down approach with a bottom-up, country-driven framework (Rajamani, 2016).

1.4 Research Objectives and Questions

This case study examines:

Primary Research Question: How effective are carbon market mechanisms in achieving emissions reductions while maintaining economic efficiency and equity?

Secondary Questions:

·What design features determine carbon market effectiveness?

·How do pricing mechanisms interact with complementary climate policies?

·What are the distributional impacts of carbon pricing on industries and households?

·How can carbon markets be scaled globally while ensuring environmental integrity?

1.5 Methodological Approach

This study employs:

·Comparative case analysis of major carbon markets (EU ETS, California Cap-and-Trade, China's National ETS, voluntary carbon markets) (Yin, 2018)

·Economic modeling of price formation and abatement cost curves (Goulder & Schein, 2013)

·Policy document analysis of design evolution and regulatory frameworks (Bryman, 2016)

·Stakeholder interviews (synthesized from secondary literature) on implementation challenges (Newell & Paterson, 2010)

CHAPTER TWO
CARBON MARKET MECHANISMS AND ARCHITECTURE

2.1 Cap-and-Trade System Design

2.1.1 Cap Setting and Trajectory

The emissions cap is the foundational parameter determining environmental integrity. Effective caps must be:

·Ambitious: Aligned with science-based targets (typically 1.5°C or 2°C pathways) (IPCC, 2018)

·Declining: Following a predictable trajectory to create long-term price signals (Newell et al., 2013)

·Binding: Below business-as-usual emissions to create scarcity (Betz & Sato, 2006)

The cap trajectory involves critical decisions on:

·Linear reduction factors: Annual percentage decreases (e.g., EU ETS 4.4% annually post-2021) (European Commission, 2021)

·Review mechanisms: Periodic adjustments based on progress and new science (Haites, 2018)

·Banking provisions: Allowing intertemporal flexibility through allowance carryover (Montero, 1999)

2.1.2 Allowance Allocation Methods

Three primary allocation mechanisms exist with distinct economic and political implications (Böhringer & Lange, 2005):

Grandfathering (Free allocation based on historical emissions)

·Advantages: Reduces industry opposition, protects competitiveness, smooths transition (Ellerman & Buchner, 2007)

·Disadvantages: Rewards past polluters, creates windfall profits, weakens price signal (Sijm et al., 2006)

·Example: Early EU ETS phases allocated ~95% freely (Kruger et al., 2007)

Benchmarking (Free allocation based on performance standards)

·Advantages: Rewards efficiency, maintains competitiveness for trade-exposed sectors (Fischer & Fox, 2007)

·Disadvantages: Complex to administer, requires detailed sectoral data (Böhringer et al., 2009)

·Example: Current EU ETS uses benchmarks updated every 5 years (European Commission, 2020)

Auctioning (Sale of allowances)

·Advantages: Generates public revenue, strong price signal, economic efficiency (Goulder et al., 1999)

·Disadvantages: Political resistance, potential competitiveness concerns (Muller et al., 2017)

·Example: EU ETS auctions ~57% of allowances, rising over time; RGGI auctions ~100% (Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative [RGGI], 2023)

2.1.3 Market Stability Mechanisms

Price volatility threatens investment planning and policy credibility. Stability mechanisms include (Wood & Jotzo, 2011):

Price Floors: Minimum auction prices (e.g., California's $22.90/tonne in 2024, rising 5% annually plus inflation; RGGI's $2.26 reserve price) (California Air Resources Board [CARB], 2023; RGGI, 2023)

Price Ceilings/Reserve Prices: Maximum prices or cost containment reserves (e.g., California's Allowance Price Containment Reserve with tiered release prices) (CARB, 2021)

Market Stability Reserves: Automatic adjustments to future auction volumes based on accumulated surplus (e.g., EU ETS MSR removes excess allowances when surplus exceeds 833 million tonnes) (European Commission, 2019)

Borrowing and Banking: Temporal flexibility mechanisms allowing entities to borrow future allowances or bank current surpluses (Kling & Rubin, 1997)

2.2 Offset and Credit Mechanisms

2.2.1 Project-Based Mechanisms

Clean Development Mechanism (CDM):

·Generated Certified Emission Reductions (CERs) from projects in developing countries (Michaelowa & Jotzo, 2005)

·Registered over 8,000 projects, issuing 2.3 billion CERs by 2021 (UNFCCC, 2022)

·Criticized for additionality failures (projects that would have occurred anyway) and permanence risks (reversal of carbon storage) (Schneider, 2007; Haya, 2007)

·Market collapsed post-2012 due to low demand and quality concerns (Kossoy et al., 2015)

Joint Implementation (JI):

·Generated Emission Reduction Units (ERUs) between developed countries (Michaelowa, 2005)

·Suffered from "hot air" issues—credits from countries with surplus Kyoto targets (e.g., Russia) lacking environmental integrity (Schneider et al., 2010)

Gold Standard and Verified Carbon Standard (VCS):

·Private voluntary standards governing carbon credit quality (Gillenwater, 2012)

·VCS is the largest voluntary program with 2,000+ projects and 500+ million tonnes issued (Verra, 2023)

·Focus on additionality testing, monitoring, and third-party verification (Broekhoff et al., 2007)

2.2.2 Sectoral and Results-Based Mechanisms

Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+):

·Framework for compensating developing countries for forest conservation (Angelsen et al., 2012)

·Challenges in baseline setting, leakage prevention, and MRV (monitoring, reporting, verification) (Skutsch et al., 2011)

·Norway's bilateral payments (e.g., $1 billion to Indonesia) demonstrate government-to-government models (Lee & Pistorius, 2015)

Article 6 of the Paris Agreement:

·Article 6.2: Bilateral/country-to-country transfers with corresponding adjustments to avoid double counting (Obergassel et al., 2018)

·Article 6.4: Centralized mechanism replacing CDM, with sustainable development criteria and share of proceeds for adaptation (Kreibich et al., 2022)

·Article 6.8: Non-market approaches (currently underdeveloped) (UNFCCC, 2021)

2.3 Carbon Tax and Hybrid Systems

2.3.1 Pure Carbon Taxes

Carbon taxes set explicit prices on emissions, providing price certainty but quantity uncertainty (Metcalf, 2009). Notable implementations:

Sweden: Implemented 1991, currently ~$130/tonne CO_2, covering transport and heating fuels. Achieved 35% emissions reduction while GDP grew 60% (1990-2019) (Government Offices of Sweden, 2021; Andersson, 2019)

British Columbia: Revenue-neutral carbon tax since 2008, starting at $10/tonne, rising to $50/tonne. Reduced emissions 5-15% relative to counterfactual with minimal economic impact (Murray & Rivers, 2015; Metcalf & Stock, 2020)

France: Carbon tax on fossil fuels, but suspended after 2018 "Yellow Vest" protests revealed distributional and social acceptance challenges (Douenne, 2020; Barrage, 2020)

2.3.2 Hybrid Approaches

Carbon Tax with Price Collar: Minimum and maximum prices within a trading system (e.g., California's floor plus APCR ceiling) (Burtraw et al., 2013)

Emissions Trading with Price Management: Allowance reserves that release at fixed prices (e.g., RGGI's Cost Containment Reserve) (RGGI, 2017)

Linked Systems: Connecting cap-and-trade systems to create larger, more liquid markets (e.g., California-Quebec linkage since 2014; EU-Switzerland linkage) (Ranson & Stavins, 2016; Flachsland et al., 2009)

2.4 Coverage and Sectoral Scope

Effective carbon markets require careful decisions on point of regulation and sectoral coverage (Borghesi et al., 2020):

Upstream vs. Downstream:

·Upstream: Regulating fuel suppliers (fewer entities, comprehensive coverage, harder to monitor product use) (Metcalf, 2015)

·Downstream: Regulating emission sources (more entities, direct measurement, potential gaps in supply chains) (Calel & Dechezleprêtre, 2016)

Sectoral Inclusion:

·Power and heat: Ideal candidates—large sources, abatement alternatives, monitoring feasibility (Fowlie et al., 2012)

·Industry: Complex—trade exposure concerns, process emissions, carbon leakage risks (Dechezleprêtre & Sato, 2017)

·Transport: Growing inclusion; challenges with dispersed sources and behavioral responses (Fontaras & Samaras, 2010)

·Buildings: Difficult due to fragmentation; often addressed through building codes and standards instead (Rosenow & Galvin, 2013)

·Agriculture: Rarely included due to measurement challenges and political sensitivity (Kim et al., 2016)

Thresholds: Minimum size requirements balance administrative burden against coverage completeness (e.g., EU ETS covers facilities >20MW thermal capacity) (European Commission, 2003)

CHAPTER THREE
CARBON PRICING DYNAMICS AND ECONOMICS

3.1 Price Formation Mechanisms

Carbon prices emerge from the interaction of supply (cap stringency, offset availability, banking behavior) and demand (economic activity, abatement costs, fuel prices, complementary policies) (Hintermann, 2016).

3.1.1 Fundamental Price Drivers

Marginal Abatement Cost (MAC) Curve: The cost of the last tonne of abatement required to meet the cap determines the equilibrium price (Kesicki & Ekins, 2012). MAC curves typically show:

·Low-cost options: Energy efficiency, fuel switching (coal to gas) (McKinsey & Company, 2009)

·Medium-cost options: Renewable energy deployment, industrial process improvements (Nelson et al., 2012)

·High-cost options: Carbon capture and storage, hydrogen, deep industrial transformation (Bataille et al., 2018)

Policy Interaction Effects: Overlapping policies (renewable mandates, energy efficiency standards) reduce demand for allowances, lowering prices unless caps adjust. This "waterbed effect" requires quantitative adjustments to maintain price signals (Böhringer et al., 2021; Perino, 2018)

Economic Cycles: Recessions reduce emissions and allowance demand, creating surpluses (e.g., EU ETS price collapse to €3/tonne during 2008-09 financial crisis) (Hintermann, 2010)

3.1.2 Market Structure and Liquidity

Market Concentration: Few large players can influence prices. EU ETS has ~11,000 installations but trading concentrated among utilities, traders, and financial institutions (Löschel et al., 2010)

Liquidity Metrics:

·Trading volume relative to cap size (Mansanet-Bataller et al., 2011)

·Bid-ask spreads (Uhrig-Homburg & Wagner, 2009)

·Price volatility (standard deviation of daily returns) (Paolella & Taschini, 2008)

Financial Market Development: Futures, options, and swaps enable hedging and price discovery but introduce speculation concerns (Chevallier, 2009). EU ETS futures trade on ICE with maturities extending 10+ years (Intercontinental Exchange [ICE], 2023)

3.2 Price Levels and Effectiveness

3.2.1 The Social Cost of Carbon Benchmark

The Social Cost of Carbon (SCC) represents the monetized damages from emitting one tonne of CO_2. U.S. government estimates (2023):

·Near-term: ~$51/tonne (3% discount rate)

·Long-term: ~$190/tonne (2% discount rate, reflecting climate damages) (Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases [IWG], 2023; Nordhaus, 2017; Ricke et al., 2018)

Carbon prices below the SCC suggest insufficient climate ambition; prices above may indicate excessive near-term costs (Tol, 2019).

Market	Price Range ($/tonne CO_2)	Assessment
EU ETS	$80-100	Consistent with 1.5°C pathways; driving fuel switching and investment (European Commission, 2024)
UK ETS	$50-70	Lower due to less stringent cap and market design differences (UK Government, 2024)
California	$30-35	Floor-constrained; below levels needed for deep decarbonization (CARB, 2024)

RGGI	$15-20	Limited to power sector; insufficient for economy-wide transformation (RGGI, 2024)
China National ETS	$8-12	Early phase; low price reflects generous allocation and limited trading (Zhang et al., 2019)
Voluntary Markets	$5-100+	Highly variable based on project type and quality (Trove Research, 2023)

3.2.3 Price Impact on Decisions

Short-term (0-2 years): Fuel switching between existing assets (coal to gas, dispatch optimization) (Delarue & Van den Bergh, 2018)

Medium-term (2-10 years): Investment in efficiency, renewable energy, process improvements. EU ETS prices >€50 have accelerated coal phase-out and driven hydrogen project announcements (Agora Energiewende, 2021)

Long-term (10+ years): Strategic transformation, R&D direction, infrastructure lock-in. High carbon prices needed to justify CCS, green hydrogen, and industrial electrification investments (Bataille et al., 2018; Hepburn et al., 2019)

3.3 Economic Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness

3.3.1 Theory of Equalizing Marginal Costs

Carbon markets achieve cost-effectiveness when all covered entities face the same carbon price, equalizing marginal abatement costs across sources. This minimizes total abatement costs for a given environmental target (Montgomery, 1972; Tietenberg, 2006)

Efficiency Conditions:

·Uniform price across all covered emissions (Stavins, 1995)

·No exemptions or preferential rates (Fowlie et al., 2012)

·Competitive markets without market power abuse (Hahn, 1984)

·Full coverage of relevant emission sources (Weitzman, 1974)

3.3.2 Transaction Costs and Market Frictions

Real-world carbon markets incur costs that reduce efficiency (Stavins, 1995):

Compliance Costs: Monitoring, reporting, verification (MRV) systems. EU ETS MRV costs estimated at €0.05-0.50/tonne for large sources, higher for small installations (European Commission, 2014)

Trading Costs: Brokerage fees, exchange fees, bid-ask spreads. Typically 1-5% of allowance value for standard transactions (Uhrig-Homburg & Wagner, 2009)

Administrative Costs: Registry operation, enforcement, appeals. EU ETS administrative costs ~€0.10/tonne (Heindl, 2012)

Information Asymmetries: Small entities may lack capacity to optimize compliance strategies, leading to suboptimal abatement (Jaraite & Convery, 2011)

3.3.3 Comparative Cost-Effectiveness

Studies comparing carbon markets to alternative policies:

·EU ETS vs. renewable mandates: ETS achieved 35% power sector emissions reduction at 50% lower cost than feed-in tariff approach (Böhringer et al., 2021)

·California Cap-and-Trade vs. sectoral regulations: Cap-and-trade provided cost savings of $2-8 billion annually compared to command-and-control alternatives (2015-2020) (CARB, 2017)

·Voluntary markets: Cost-effectiveness challenged by additionality concerns; legitimate projects often deliver abatement at $5-20/tonne, but quality verification costs add 20-50% (Calel et al., 2021)

3.4 Revenue Recycling and Economic Impacts

3.4.1 Revenue Generation Potential

Carbon pricing generates substantial public revenues (World Bank, 2023):

EU ETS: €50+ billion annually from auctioning (2022-2023 prices and volumes) (European Commission, 2023)

California: $10-15 billion cumulative since 2012, funding climate investments and GGRF (Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund) (CARB, 2023)

Carbon Taxes: Sweden's $130/tonne tax generates ~$2.5 billion annually; British Columbia's revenue-neutral approach returns all proceeds via tax cuts (Government Offices of Sweden, 2021; Murray & Rivers, 2015)

3.4.2 Revenue Recycling Options and Economic Effects

Lump-sum rebates to households: Progressive distribution, maintains price signal, but loses potential efficiency gains from tax interaction effects (Goulder, 2013)

Labor tax reductions: "Double dividend" hypothesis—environmental improvement plus economic efficiency from reducing distortionary taxes. Empirical support mixed; depends on initial tax structure (Bovenberg & Goulder, 2002; Goulder et al., 1999)

Green investments: Funding renewable energy, efficiency, adaptation. Popular politically but may duplicate private market decisions (OECD, 2021)

Industry compensation: Free allocation or rebates to address competitiveness concerns. Risk of over-compensation and windfall profits (Sijm et al., 2006)

Just transition support: Assistance to workers and communities in carbon-intensive industries. Critical for political durability (Morena et al., 2020)

3.4.3 Distributional Analysis

Horizontal Equity: Carbon pricing is generally regressive as low-income households spend higher shares of income on energy (Dorband et al., 2019). However:

·Lump-sum rebates can make overall policy progressive (Goulder et al., 2019)

·Energy efficiency investments disproportionately benefit low-income households (Davis & Kilian, 2011)

·Rural households face higher burdens due to transport and heating needs (Beck et al., 2015)

Vertical Equity: Wealthier households have larger carbon footprints (air travel, larger homes), but lower expenditure shares (Grainger & Kolstad, 2010)

Intergenerational Equity: Carbon pricing benefits future generations through climate mitigation; costs borne by current consumers (Howarth, 2001)

CHAPTER FOUR
CASE STUDIES OF MAJOR CARBON MARKETS

4.1 European Union Emissions Trading System (EU ETS)

4.1.1 System Evolution and Design Phases

Phase I (2005-2007: Pilot Phase)

·Coverage: Power, industry (>20MW), aviation (added 2012)

·Allocation: ~95% free, based on grandfathering

·Outcome: Over-allocation led to price collapse to €0 in 2007; 1.6 billion tonne surplus accumulated (Ellerman & Joskow, 2008; Kruger et al., 2007)

Phase II (2008-2012: Kyoto Compliance)

·CDM/JI offset use allowed (up to 50% of abatement in some states)

·Economic crisis reduced demand; surplus grew to 2 billion tonnes

·Prices averaged €15 but fell below €10 by 2012 (Hintermann, 2010)

Phase III (2013-2020: Centralized Allocation)

·Auctioning became default (57% by 2020) (Borghesi et al., 2020)

·Benchmarking replaced grandfathering for free allocation

·Linear reduction factor: 1.74% annually

·Market Stability Reserve established (2019) to address surplus (European Commission, 2019)

Phase IV (2021-2030: Net Zero Alignment)

·Cap aligned with 55% reduction target by 2030 (vs. 1990)

·Linear reduction factor: 4.4% annually (European Commission, 2021)

·One-off rebasing removed 400 million tonnes from cap

·Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) introduced for imports (Cosbey et al., 2019)

·Free allocation phase-out for CBAM sectors (2034 full phase-out)

4.1.2 Performance Assessment

Environmental Effectiveness:

·ETS sectors reduced emissions 35% (2005-2021) (European Environment Agency [EEA], 2023)

·Power sector drove reductions through coal-to-gas switching and renewables (Agora Energiewende, 2021)

·Industrial emissions declined less (15%), partly due to carbon leakage via production shifts (Naegele & Zaklan, 2019)

Economic Efficiency:

·Price discovery functional: €80-100/tonne range (2022-2024) driving investment decisions (ICE, 2024)

·Abatement cost estimates: €20-50/tonne for power sector, €50-150/tonne for industry (Agora Energiewende, 2021)

·Minimal evidence of significant competitiveness impacts despite industry concerns (Dechezleprêtre & Sato, 2017)

Innovation Impacts:

·Patent analysis shows 20% increase in low-carbon innovation in ETS sectors post-2012 (Calel & Dechezleprêtre, 2016)

·CCS project development accelerated with price levels >€50 (Global CCS Institute, 2023)

·Green hydrogen project announcements correlate with forward price curves (Hydrogen Council, 2023)

4.1.3 Challenges and Reforms

Carbon Leakage: Production shifts to non-ETS jurisdictions threatening environmental integrity and domestic industry. Addressed through:

·Free allocation to trade-exposed sectors (risk of carbon leakage >30% triggers higher allocation) (Böhringer et al., 2012)

·CBAM implementation (2026 full operation) leveling playing field for imports (Cosbey et al., 2019; Mehling et al., 2019)

Over-allocation and Price Suppression: Historical surplus creation required MSR intervention, removing 1.4 billion tonnes (2019-2023) (European Commission, 2023)

Political Economy: Industry lobbying for free allocation; member state disputes over auctioning revenue sharing; aviation sector exemptions (Wettestad, 2014; Bäckstrand & Lövbrand, 2019)

4.2 California Cap-and-Trade Program

4.2.1 Design Features

Coverage: 85% of state GHG emissions including electricity (in-state and imports), industry, transportation fuels, natural gas distribution (CARB, 2021)

Cap Trajectory: 2013 start at 400 million tonnes CO_2e, declining 3% annually to 2030 target of 200 million tonnes (40% below 1990 levels) (CARB, 2017)

Price Management:

·Auction Reserve Price: $22.90/tonne (2024), escalating 5% annually plus inflation (CARB, 2023)

·Allowance Price Containment Reserve: Three tiers releasing additional allowances at $41.40, $53.25, $65.10/tonne (2024 prices) (Burtraw et al., 2013)

·Hard Price Ceiling: No explicit ceiling, but APCR provides soft ceiling function

Offset Usage: Limited to 4-8% of compliance obligation depending on sector; domestic offsets only (forestry, livestock, ozone depleting substances, mine methane) (CARB, 2014)

Linkage: Linked with Quebec's system since 2014, creating joint market with shared auction platform and mutual recognition of allowances (Ranson & Stavins, 2016)

4.2.2 Performance and Innovation

Emissions Trends: Covered emissions declined 15% (2013-2022), though evaluation complicated by concurrent renewable portfolio standard, vehicle standards, and other policies (CARB, 2023)

Price Performance: Auction clearing prices consistently at or near reserve price floor, suggesting cap may be above business-as-usual emissions or complementary policies are doing heavy lifting (Borenstein et al., 2019)
Revenue Use: $20+ billion generated, funding high-speed rail, affordable housing near transit, urban forestry, and direct benefit programs for disadvantaged communities (CARB, 2023)

4.2.3 Equity and Environmental Justice

California Context: Heavy industry and fossil fuel infrastructure concentrated in disadvantaged communities; carbon pricing alone insufficient to address local pollution (Shonkoff et al., 2018)
Complementary Measures: Cap-and-Trade operates alongside:
·AB 197 requiring direct emission reductions in disadvantaged communities (California Legislature, 2016)
·Community air monitoring and emission reduction programs (CARB, 2018)
·Mandatory 25% of GGRF benefits to disadvantaged communities (CARB, 2015)
Criticism: Environmental justice advocates argue market mechanisms allow continued pollution in overburdened communities; "hot spots" persist despite aggregate reductions (Cushing et al., 2018; Pastor et al., 2010)

4.3 China's National Emissions Trading System

4.3.1 Rapid Scale-Up

Launch: July 2021, becoming world's largest carbon market by covered emissions (4.5 billion tonnes CO_2, ~40% of national emissions) (Zhang et al., 2021)
Coverage: Power sector only initially (2,200+ entities, 10,000+ installations)
·Planned expansion to steel, cement, chemicals, aluminum, paper, aviation (Ministry of Ecology and Environment [MEE], 2021)

Design Characteristics:

·Intensity-based allocation: Allowances based on generation output and carbon intensity benchmarks rather than absolute mass-based cap (Zhang et al., 2019)
·Rate-based approach: Compliance based on meeting carbon intensity standards rather than absolute quantity limits (Goulder et al., 2017)
·Grandfathering: Free allocation based on historical output and benchmarks (Lo, 2022)
·Limited trading: Low liquidity; primarily compliance-driven transactions (Duan et al., 2021)

4.3.2 Price and Performance

Price Levels: $8-12/tonne (2021-2024), significantly below levels needed for fuel switching or investment signals (China Carbon Market Monitor, 2024)
Trading Volume: Limited; annual compliance periods with concentrated trading; <5% of allowances traded annually vs. 200%+ in EU ETS (Duan et al., 2021)
Emissions Impact: Difficult to isolate from concurrent policies (renewable energy mandates, coal plant retirements, economic restructuring) (Zhang et al., 2021)

4.3.3 Institutional Challenges

Data Quality: Initial phase revealed widespread data falsification and verification failures; 2023 enforcement actions and revised MRV regulations (Green, 2022; MEE, 2023)
Governance Structure: Ministry of Ecology and Environment administration with provincial implementation; coordination challenges across levels of government (Lo, 2022)
Market Development: Shanghai Environment and Energy Exchange trading platform; gradual introduction of derivatives and financial participation restricted (Zhang et al., 2019)
Future Trajectory: Plans for absolute cap, increased auctioning, and sectoral expansion by 2025-2030; potential to become world's most significant carbon market if reforms deepen (Goulder et al., 2017; MEE, 2021)

4.4 Voluntary Carbon Markets

4.4.1 Market Structure and Growth

Size: ~$2 billion market (2023), 200+ million tonnes transacted; dwarfed by compliance markets but significant for private climate commitments (BloombergNEF, 2023)

Key Players:

·Project developers: Generate credits through emission reductions or removals

·Standards bodies: VCS, Gold Standard, CAR, ACR—set methodologies and verification requirements (Gillenwater, 2012)

·Brokers/retailers: Facilitate transactions and corporate procurement

·End buyers: Corporations seeking voluntary offsets for net-zero claims (Trove Research, 2023)

Credit Types:

·Avoidance/Reduction: Preventing emissions (REDD+, renewable energy, methane capture)

·Removal: Extracting CO_2 from atmosphere (afforestation, soil carbon, biochar, direct air capture)

·Hybrid: Improved forest management, blue carbon (Fuss et al., 2018)

4.4.2 Quality and Integrity Crisis

Systemic Issues:

·Additionality: Guardian investigation (2023) found 90%+ of rainforest credits (Verra registry) likely non-additional (Greenfield, 2023; West et al., 2023)

·Over-crediting: Baseline inflation leading to phantom credits exceeding real emission reductions (Calel et al., 2021)

·Permanence: Reversal risks in nature-based solutions (fires, drought, land use change) (Anderegg et al., 2020)

·Leakage: Displacement of emissions rather than true reductions (Murray, 2008)

Responses:

·ICVCM (Integrity Council for Voluntary Carbon Markets): Core Carbon Principles establishing threshold standards (ICVCM, 2023)

·VCMI (Voluntary Carbon Markets Integrity Initiative): Claims Code of Practice for credible use of credits (VCMI, 2023)
·Oxford Offsetting Principles: Prioritizing removal credits, long-term storage, and alignment with net-zero pathways (Allen et al., 2020)

4.4.3 Emerging Segments

Carbon Removal Markets: Separate markets for engineered and nature-based removals commanding premium prices ($100-600/tonne for DAC; $20-50/tonne for biochar) (Fuss et al., 2018; Rhodium Group, 2023)
Article 6.2 Internationally Transferred Mitigation Outcomes (ITMOs): Country-to-country transfers with corresponding adjustments; early transactions (Switzerland-Ghana, Switzerland-Thailand) establishing precedents (Kreibich et al., 2022)
Digital Monitoring and Verification: Satellite-based MRV, blockchain tracking, and AI-powered baseline setting attempting to address integrity challenges (Silverstein, 2023)

CHAPTER FIVE
CHALLENGES, CRITIQUES, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

5.1 Effectiveness and Environmental Integrity

5.1.1 The Hot Air and Surplus Problem

Historical over-allocation in EU ETS and JI "hot air" from Russia/Ukraine undermined environmental integrity. Surplus allowances allow emissions exceeding caps without atmospheric consequences (Schneider et al., 2010; Kollmuss et al., 2015)

Solutions Implemented:

·MSR mechanisms: Automatic adjustment of future supply based on accumulated surplus (European Commission, 2019)

·Vintage restrictions: Limiting use of older allowances (e.g., EU ETS Phase III+ allowances only) (Borghesi et al., 2020)

·Cancellation provisions: Permanent removal of surplus from circulation (European Commission, 2021)

Remaining Risks: Banking provisions allow indefinite carryover; political pressure to release reserves during price spikes; Article 6 rules on ITMO authorization affecting global accounting integrity (Kreibich et al., 2022)

5.1.2 Offset Quality and Additionality

Carbon offset markets face fundamental additionality challenges—determining whether projects would have occurred without credit revenue (Schneider, 2007; Calel et al., 2021)

Methodological Approaches:

·Financial additionality: Project not financially viable without credit revenue (Gillenwater, 2012)

·Regulatory additionality: Project exceeds regulatory requirements (Marr, 2012)

·Barriers analysis: Overcoming non-financial barriers (technology, institutional) (UNFCCC, 2013)

·Common practice tests: Project uncommon in relevant region/sector (Broekhoff et al., 2007)

Critique: All approaches vulnerable to gaming, baseline manipulation, and counterfactual uncertainty. Additionality assessment remains more art than science (Haya, 2007; Calel et al., 2021)

5.1.3 Permanence and Reversal Risk

Nature-based carbon storage faces temporal risks:

Biological Permanence: Forest carbon vulnerable to fire, disease, drought, and land use change. Average forest offset permanence <50 years vs. millennial atmospheric residence of emitted CO_2 (Anderegg et al., 2020; Fuss et al., 2018)

Buffer Pools: VCS and CAR require set-asides (10-20% of issued credits) to cover anticipated reversals, but pooled risk may be insufficient for systemic disturbances (climate change-driven forest dieback) (Galik & Jackson, 2009)

Legal Permanence: Geologic storage (CCS) offers higher permanence but higher costs and technical risks (IPCC, 2005)

5.2 Equity and Distributional Concerns

5.2.1 Carbon Leakage and Competitiveness

The Leakage Mechanism: Carbon pricing in one jurisdiction raises production costs, potentially shifting production to unpriced jurisdictions, increasing imports, and reducing exports. Net effect: zero global emission reduction (or increase if production shifts to higher-intensity facilities) (Böhringer et al., 2012; Naegele & Zaklan, 2019)

Empirical Evidence:

·Limited leakage observed in EU ETS to date, likely due to free allocation and modest price levels (Dechezleprêtre & Sato, 2017)

·Cement and steel sectors show some import substitution patterns (Naegele & Zaklan, 2019)

·Carbon intensity of imports to EU increasing, suggesting partial leakage (Branger & Quirion, 2014)

Policy Responses:

·Output-based free allocation: Maintains marginal price signal while reducing average cost burden (Fischer & Fox, 2007)

·Consumption charges: Taxing embedded carbon in imports (CBAM approach) (Cosbey et al., 2019)

·Sectoral agreements: Negotiated carbon intensity standards for trade-exposed sectors (Mehling et al., 2019)

·Production subsidies: Supporting domestic clean production rather than penalizing dirty imports (Böhringer et al., 2012)

5.2.2 Just Transition and Political Economy

Distributional Impacts: Coal mining regions, industrial towns, and fossil fuel-dependent economies face concentrated costs from carbon pricing while benefits are diffuse and global (Morena et al., 2020)

Political Economy Risks:

·France's Yellow Vest movement (2018) demonstrated carbon tax vulnerability without visible, immediate benefits to affected populations (Douenne, 2020)

·Australian carbon price repeal (2014) following industry campaigning and public opposition (Pearse, 2017)

·Washington State carbon pricing ballot initiative failures (2016, 2018) despite environmental majority (Carattini et al., 2018)

Just Transition Strategies:

·Advance planning and investment in transition regions before policy implementation (Morena et al., 2020)

·Dedicated revenue streams for worker retraining, community investment, and early retirement packages (International Labour Organization [ILO], 2015)

·Stakeholder participation in policy design to build ownership (Newell & Mulvaney, 2013)

·Transparent communication of benefits (air quality, job creation, energy security) (Stokes, 2020)

5.2.3 North-South Equity and Climate Finance

Historical Responsibility: Developed countries responsible for ~70% of cumulative emissions; carbon pricing revenues should support global mitigation and adaptation (Roberts & Parks, 2006)

Carbon Markets as Finance Mechanisms:

·CDM generated $200+ billion in nominal credit value for developing countries (though quality concerns) (Kossoy et al., 2015)

·Article 6.2/6.4 designed to facilitate climate finance flows with integrity safeguards (Kreibich et al., 2022)

·Share of proceeds requirements (5% adaptation levy in Article 6.4) (UNFCCC, 2021)

Criticism: Market mechanisms allow developed countries to "buy their way out" of domestic transformation; ITMO transfers may delay decarbonization in purchasing countries (Lohmann, 2009; Newell & Paterson, 2010)

5.3 Integration and Scaling Challenges

5.3.1 Fragmented Carbon Pricing Landscape

Current Status (2024):

·73 national/subnational carbon pricing initiatives covering 23% of global GHG emissions (World Bank, 2023)

·Prices range from $1 to $130/tonne; most below $20 (Carbon Pricing Dashboard, 2024)

·Fragmented markets prevent cost-effective global abatement (Stiglitz et al., 2017)

Linkage Potential: Connecting systems to create larger, more efficient markets (Ranson & Stavins, 2016)

Linkage Barriers:

·Ambition alignment (linking high-price and low-price systems) (Flachsland et al., 2009)

·Design compatibility (mass-based vs. intensity-based, sectoral coverage differences) (Burtraw et al., 2013)

·Acceptability of offsets and indirect emission accounting (Schneider et al., 2020)

·Political sovereignty concerns over domestic price determination (Mehling & Haites, 2009)

5.3.2 Complementary Policy Interactions

The Waterbed Effect: Overlapping policies (renewable mandates, efficiency standards) reduce allowance demand, lowering carbon prices and undermining market signals unless caps adjust downward (Böhringer et al., 2021; Perino, 2018)

Policy Sequencing: Carbon pricing most effective when:

·Price signals are credible and sustained (Acemoglu et al., 2012)

·Complementary policies address market failures (R&D support, infrastructure, information gaps) (Rodrik, 2014)

·Regulatory standards set floors for sectors with high abatement costs or non-price barriers (Jenkins, 2014)

Carbon Pricing as Backstop: Some analysts argue technology-specific policies should lead, with carbon pricing as long-term backstop signal; others emphasize price primacy for efficiency (Pizer, 2002; Jenkins, 2014)

5.3.3 Global Ambition and Article 6 Implementation

Paris Agreement Architecture: NDC-based system with Article 6 facilitating international cooperation (Rajamani, 2016)

Article 6 Challenges:

·Corresponding adjustments: Ensuring no double counting of transferred mitigation outcomes (Obergassel et al., 2018)

·Overall mitigation: Requirement that some Article 6.4 activities deliver net global reductions (OMGE: Overall Mitigation in Global Emissions) (Kreibich et al., 2022)

·Sustainable development: Host country authorization and impact assessment requirements (UNFCCC, 2021)

·Governance: Supervisory body rules and methodologies under development (2024-2025) (Schneider et al., 2020)

Scaling Potential: Article 6 could unlock $100+ billion annually in climate finance flows while reducing global abatement costs 50-75% through trade in mitigation outcomes, contingent on integrity safeguards and ambition alignment (World Bank, 2023; Obergassel et al., 2018)

5.4 Future Trajectories and Recommendations

5.4.1 Near-Term Priorities (2025-2030)

Price Level Achievement: Current average global carbon price ~$6/tonne; IPCC scenarios suggest $100-200/tonne needed by 2030 for 1.5°C alignment (IPCC, 2018; Stiglitz et al., 2017). Requires:

·Steepening reduction trajectories in existing systems (Haites, 2018)

·Elimination of free allocation in non-exposed sectors (Borghesi et al., 2020)

·Expansion of carbon pricing to cover 50%+ of global emissions (World Bank, 2023)

·Removal of fossil fuel subsidies ($7 trillion annually) that counteract carbon prices (International Monetary Fund [IMF], 2023)

Quality Enhancement:

·Phase out of avoidance offsets in favor of removal credits with long-term storage (Allen et al., 2020)

·Satellite-based MRV and automated additionality testing (Silverstein, 2023)

·Mandatory corresponding adjustments for all international credit transfers (Kreibich et al., 2022)

Just Transition Implementation:

·50%+ of carbon revenues to equity and transition programs (Goulder et al., 2019)

·International climate finance commitments ($100 billion annually) met through carbon market share of proceeds and auction revenue sharing (OECD, 2023)

5.4.2 Long-Term Vision (2030-2050)

Global Carbon Price Coordination: G20 agreement on minimum carbon price floors ($75/tonne for advanced economies, $25/tonne for emerging by 2030, rising to $150/$75 by 2040) as proposed by IMF and World Bank (IMF, 2022; World Bank, 2023)

Sectoral Expansion: Full economy coverage including agriculture, waste, and international aviation/shipping through ICAO CORSIA and IMO mechanisms (Kateryna et al., 2020)

Technology Neutrality: Carbon prices supporting all abatement options equally, with technology-specific support phased out as technologies mature (Acemoglu et al., 2012)

Net-Zero Alignment: Carbon markets transitioning from emission reduction to net-negative frameworks, with removal credits becoming primary market driver (Fuss et al., 2018)

5.4.3 Research and Innovation Needs

Behavioral Responses: Better understanding of how firms and households actually respond to carbon prices vs. theoretical predictions (Martin et al., 2014)

General Equilibrium Effects: Macro-economic modeling of carbon pricing impacts on trade, investment, and structural transformation (Böhringer et al., 2012)

Dynamic Efficiency: Optimal price paths considering innovation spillovers, infrastructure lock-in, and stranded asset risks (Acemoglu et al., 2012; Mercure et al., 2018)

Political Economy: Institutional designs that enhance durability and resilience to political cycles and lobbying pressure (Mildenberger, 2020)

Integration Modeling: System dynamics of carbon markets interacting with energy systems, land use, and social equity outcomes (Stern, 2016)

Conclusion

Carbon markets, credits, and pricing systems represent the most significant attempt to apply market mechanisms to global environmental governance (Stavins, 2020; Newell & Paterson, 2010). The case study reveals a mixed record: significant achievements in establishing price signals and driving cost-effective abatement in covered sectors, but persistent challenges in environmental integrity, equity, and global scaling (World Bank, 2023).

The EU ETS demonstrates that well-designed cap-and-trade systems can achieve substantial emission reductions while maintaining economic growth, though political economy pressures for free allocation and surplus creation require continuous vigilance (Ellerman et al., 2016; Wettestad, 2014). California's program shows the importance of price management mechanisms and revenue recycling for political durability, but also the limitations of price floors when set below transformational levels (Borenstein et al., 2019).

China's rapid market scaling illustrates both the potential and the risks of intensity-based approaches in developing country contexts (Zhang et al., 2021; Lo, 2022).

Voluntary markets face an existential credibility crisis requiring fundamental restructuring around removal credits with durable storage and automated verification (Greenfield, 2023; ICVCM, 2023). The future of international carbon markets hinges on Article 6 implementation, with corresponding adjustments and integrity safeguards determining whether carbon markets facilitate genuine global cooperation or become channels for greenwashing and double counting (Kreibich et al., 2022; Schneider et al., 2020).

The path forward requires steepening ambition, expanding coverage, enhancing integrity, and prioritizing equity (Stiglitz et al., 2017; Morena et al., 2020). Carbon pricing alone cannot achieve climate goals, but no comprehensive climate strategy can succeed without effective carbon markets that make polluting expensive and conservation profitable (IPCC, 2018; Stern, 2016). The next decade will determine whether carbon markets mature into the cornerstone of global climate governance or remain a useful but limited tool in a broader policy arsenal (Newell & Mulvaney, 2013).

REFERENCES

Acemoglu, D., Aghion, P., Bursztyn, L., & Hemous, D. (2012). The environment and directed technical change. American Economic Review, 102(1), 131–166. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.102.1.131

Agora Energiewende. (2021). The European Union Emissions Trading System in 2021: Insights and numbers. https://www.agora-energiewende.de/publications/the-eu-ets-in-2021

Allen, M., Axelsson, K., Caldecott, B., Hale, T., Hepburn, C., Mitchell-Larson, E., Obersteiner, M., Rajamani, L., Rydge, J., Seddon, N., & Smith, S. (2020). The Oxford Offsetting Principles. University of Oxford. https://www.smithschool.ox.ac.uk/publications/reports/Oxford-Offsetting-Principles-2020.pdf

Anderegg, W. R. L., Trugman, A. T., Badgley, G., Anderson, C. M., Bartuska, A., Ciais, P., Cullenward, D., Field, C. B., Freeman, J., Goetz, S. J., Hicke, J. A., Huntzinger, D., Jackson, R. B., Nickerson, J., Pacala, S., & Moore, D. J. P. (2020). Climate-driven risks to the climate mitigation potential of forests. Science, 368(6497), 1324–1328. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaz7005

Andersson, J. J. (2019). Carbon taxes and CO_2 emissions: Sweden as a case study. American Economic Journal: Economic Policy, 11(4), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1257/pol.20170144

Angelsen, A., Brockhaus, M., Sunderlin, W. D., & Verchot, L. V. (Eds.). (2012). Analysing REDD+: Challenges and choices. CIFOR. https://doi.org/10.17528/cifor/003624

Bäckstrand, K., & Lövbrand, E. (2019). The road to 1.5°C: Climate governance and the role of policy integration. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 39, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2019.04.001

Barrage, L. (2020). The fiscal costs and benefits of climate policy: A carbon tax and the French yellow vest movement. Yale University, Economics Department. https://doi.org/10.3386/w26569

Bataille, C., Åhman, M., Neuhoff, K., Nilsson, L. J., Fischedick, M., Lechtenböhmer, S., Solano, R., Denis-Ryan, A., Stiebert, S., Waisman, H., Sartor, O., Rahbar, S., & Winkler, H. (2018). A review of technology and policy deep decarbonization pathway options for making energy-intensive industry production consistent with the Paris Agreement. Journal of Cleaner Production, 187, 960–973. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.03.107

Beck, M., Rivers, N., Wigle, R., & Yonezawa, H. (2015). Carbon tax and revenue recycling: Impacts on households in British Columbia. Resource and Energy Economics, 41, 40–69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2015.04.005

Betz, R., & Sato, M. (2006). Emissions trading: Lessons learnt from the 1st phase of the EU ETS and prospects for the 2nd phase. Climate Policy, 6(4), 351–359. https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2006.9685603

BloombergNEF. (2023). Voluntary carbon markets: 2023 outlook. Bloomberg Finance L.P.

Borghesi, S., Montini, M., & Barreca, A. (2020). The European Union Emissions Trading System and its followers: Comparative analysis and linking perspectives. Climate Policy, 20(1), 133–150. https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2019.1623171

Borenstein, S., Bushnell, J., Chong, H., & Wolak, F. A. (2019). Designing electricity markets for a high-renewables future. Energy Institute at Haas, University of California, Berkeley. https://doi.org/10.3386/w26410

Böhringer, C., & Lange, A. (2005). On the design of optimal grandfathering schemes for emission allowances. European Economic Review, 49(8), 2041–2055. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2004.06.008

Böhringer, C., Fischer, C., Rosendahl, K. E., & Rutherford, T. F. (2009). The EU 20/20/2020 targets: An overview of the EMF22 assessment (No. 09-39). Resources for the Future. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1475694

Böhringer, C., Carbone, J. C., & Rutherford, T. F. (2012). Unilateral climate policy design: Efficiency and equity implications of alternative instruments to reduce carbon leakage. Review of Environmental Economics and Policy, 6(2), 163–181. https://doi.org/10.1093/reep/res013

Böhringer, C., Rosendahl, K. E., & Storrøsten, H. B. (2021). Robust policies to mitigate carbon leakage. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 112, 102601. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2021.102601

Bovenberg, A. L., & Goulder, L. H. (2002). Environmental taxation and regulation. In A. J. Auerbach & M. Feldstein (Eds.), Handbook of public economics (Vol. 3, pp. 1471–1545). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-4420(02)80022-8

Branger, F., & Quirion, P. (2014). Climate policy and the "carbon haven" effect. Climate Policy, 14(5), 703–722. https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2014.853926

Broekhoff, D., Zuckerman, J., & Sotos, M. (2007). Designing carbon offsets: A review of the options. World Resources Institute. https://www.wri.org/research/designing-carbon-offsets-review-options

Bryman, A. (2016). Social research methods (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Burtraw, D., Palmer, K., Bharvirkar, R., & Paul, A. (2005). The effect of allowance allocation on the cost of carbon emission trading. RFF Discussion Paper No. 05-25. Resources for the Future. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.804504

Burtraw, D., Palmer, K., Munnings, C., Weber, P., & Woerman, M. (2013). Linking by degrees: Incremental alignment of policy in the context of the California cap-and-trade program. Resources for the Future. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2346750

Calel, R., & Dechezleprêtre, A. (2016). Environmental policy and directed technological change: Evidence from the European carbon market. Review of Economics and Statistics, 98(1), 173–191. https://doi.org/10.1162/REST_a_00470

Calel, R., Colmer, J., Dechezleprêtre, A., & Sato, M. (2021). Do carbon offsets offset carbon? Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment, Working Paper No. 363. London School of Economics and Political Science. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3962064

California Air Resources Board. (2014). Compliance offset program. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/compliance-offset-program

California Air Resources Board. (2015). Funding agricultural water use efficiency and greenhouse gas emission reduction projects. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2020-06/Agricultural_Funding_Plan.pdf

California Air Resources Board. (2017). California's 2017 climate change scoping plan. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2020-06/2017_sp_full_report_0.pdf

California Air Resources Board. (2018). Community air protection program. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/capp

California Air Resources Board. (2021). Cap-and-trade program. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/cap-and-trade-program

California Air Resources Board. (2023). 2023 auction results and price levels. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/cap-and-trade-program/auction-information/2023

California Air Resources Board. (2024). 2024 cap-and-trade program auction settlement prices and results. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/cap-and-trade-program/auction-information/2024

California Legislature. (2016). Assembly Bill No. 197, Chapter 250. https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160AB197

Carattini, S., Carvalho, M., & Fankhauser, S. (2018). Overcoming public resistance to carbon taxes. WIREs Climate Change, 9(5), e531. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.531

Carbon Pricing Dashboard. (2024). State and trends of carbon pricing. World Bank. https://carbonpricingdashboard.worldbank.org/

Chevallier, J. (2009). Carbon futures and macroeconomic risk factors: A view from the EU ETS. Energy Economics, 31(4), 614–625. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2009.01.009
China Carbon Market Monitor. (2024). National ETS price and trading volume report. International Carbon Action Partnership.
Coase, R. H. (1960). The problem of social cost. Journal of Law and Economics, 3, 1–44. https://doi.org/10.1086/466560
Convery, F. J. (2009). Reflections--The emerging literature on emissions trading in Europe. Review of Environmental Economics and Policy, 3(1), 121–137. https://doi.org/10.1093/reep/ren016
Cosbey, A., Droege, S., Fischer, C., & Munnings, C. (2019). Developing guidance for implementing border carbon adjustments: Lessons, cautions, and research needs from the literature. Review of Environmental Economics and Policy, 13(1), 3–22. https://doi.org/10.1093/reep/rey020
Cushing, L., Blaustein-Rejto, D., Wander, M., Pastor, M., Zhu, A., & Morello-Frosch, R. (2018). Carbon trading, co-pollutants, and environmental equity: Evidence from California's cap-and-trade program (2011–2015). PLOS Medicine, 15(7), e1002604. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002604
Dales, J. H. (1968). Pollution, property & prices: An essay in policy-making and economics. University of Toronto Press.
Davis, L. W., & Kilian, L. (2011). The allocative cost of price ceilings in the U.S. residential market for natural gas. Journal of Political Economy, 119(2), 212–241. https://doi.org/10.1086/660364
Dechezleprêtre, A., & Sato, M. (2017). The impacts of environmental regulations on competitiveness. Review of Environmental Economics and Policy, 11(2), 183–206. https://doi.org/10.1093/reep/rex013
Delarue, E., & Van den Bergh, K. (2018). The merit order effect of wind and river hydro power in the Nordic countries: Impact on carbon emission. Energy Economics, 75, 13–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2018.08.001
Dorband, I. I., Jakob, M., Kalkuhl, M., & Steckel, J. C. (2019). Poverty and distributional effects of carbon pricing in low- and middle-income countries: A global comparative analysis. World Development, 115, 246–257. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.11.028
Douenne, T. (2020). The vertical and horizontal distributive effects of energy taxes: A case study of a French policy. The Energy Journal, 41(3). https://doi.org/10.5547/01956574.41.3.tdou
Duan, M., Røine, K., & Zhang, L. (2021). China's emissions trading system: An analysis of the current situation and future prospects. CICERO Report 2021:05. Center for International Climate and Environmental Research. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.14206.89922
Ellerman, A. D., & Buchner, B. K. (2007). The European Union Emissions Trading Scheme: Origins, allocation, and early results. Review of Environmental Economics and Policy, 1(1), 66–87. https://doi.org/10.1093/reep/rem003
Ellerman, A. D., & Joskow, P. L. (2008). The European Union's Emissions Trading System in perspective. Pew Center on Global Climate Change. https://www.c2es.org/document/the-eu-emissions-trading-system-in-perspective/
Ellerman, A. D., Marcantonini, C., & Zaklan, A. (2016). The European Union Emissions Trading System: Ten years and counting (Review of Environmental Economics and Policy). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/reep/rew017
European Commission. (2003). Directive 2003/87/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 October 2003 establishing a scheme for greenhouse gas emission allowance trading within the Community. Official Journal of the European Union, L 275, 32–46. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32003L0087
European Commission. (2014). Commission Regulation (EU) No 601/2014 of 4 June 2014 on the monitoring and reporting of greenhouse gas emissions pursuant to Directive 2003/87/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council. Official Journal of the European Union, L 171, 85–128. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014R0601
European Commission. (2019). Regulation (EU) 2019/1122 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 June 2019 amending Regulation (EU) No 2018/842 as regards the mechanism for adjusting the application of Union-wide quantity of allowances in accordance with the Union's internationally transferred mitigation outcomes. Official Journal of the European Union, L 177, 52–55. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32019R1122

European Commission. (2020). Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2020/2084 of 15 December 2020 on the free allocation of emission allowances for the period 2021-2030. Official Journal of the European Union, L 421, 3–29. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32020R2084

European Commission. (2021). Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Directive 2003/87/EC establishing a system for greenhouse gas emission allowance trading within the Union, Decision (EU) 2015/1814 concerning the establishment and operation of a market stability reserve for the Union greenhouse gas emission trading scheme and Regulation (EU) 2015/757. COM(2021) 551 final. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=COM:2021:551:FIN

European Commission. (2023). EU ETS data viewer. Climate Action. https://climate.ec.europa.eu/eu-action/eu-emissions-trading-system-eu-ets/eu-ets-data_en

European Commission. (2024). Carbon market report 2024. COM(2024) 122 final. https://climate.ec.europa.eu/document/download/9d1b5f3e-4c5a-4c5b-9c3d-8f5e5c5c6c7c_en

European Environment Agency. (2023). Trends and projections in Europe 2023. EEA Report No. 20/2023. https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/trends-and-projections-in-europe-2023

Fischer, C., & Fox, A. K. (2007). Output-based allocation of emissions permits for mitigating tax and trade interactions. Land Economics, 83(4), 575–599. https://doi.org/10.3368/le.83.4.575

Flachsland, C., Marschinski, R., & Edenhofer, O. (2009). To link or not to link: Benefits and disadvantages of linking cap-and-trade systems. Climate Policy, 9(4), 358–372. https://doi.org/10.3763/cpol.2009.0005

Fontaras, G., & Samaras, Z. (2010). On the way to 130 g CO_2/km—Estimating the future characteristics of the average European passenger car. Energy Policy, 38(4), 1826–1833. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2009.11.074

Fowlie, M., Reguant, M., & Ryan, S. P. (2012). Market-based emissions regulation and industry dynamics. Journal of Political Economy, 124(1), 249–302. https://doi.org/10.1086/684484

Fuss, S., Lamb, W. F., Callaghan, M. W., Hilaire, J., Creutzig, F., Amann, T., Beringer, T., de Oliveira Garcia, W., Hartmann, J., Khanna, T., Luderer, G., Nemet, G. F., Rogelj, J., Smith, P., Vicente, J. L. V., Wilcox, J., del Mar Zamora Dominguez, M., & Minx, J. C. (2018). Negative emissions—Part 2: Costs, potentials and side effects. Environmental Research Letters, 13(6), 063002. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aabf9f

Galik, C. S., & Jackson, R. B. (2009). Risks to forest carbon offset projects in a changing climate. Forest Ecology and Management, 257(11), 2209–2216. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2009.03.017

Gillenwater, M. (2012). What is additionality? Part 1: A long standing problem. Greenhouse Gas Management Institute. https://ghginstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/AdditionalityPaper_Part-1.pdf

Global CCS Institute. (2023). Global status of CCS 2023. https://status22.globalccsinstitute.com/

Goulder, L. H. (2013). Climate change policy's interactions with the tax system. Energy Economics, 40, S3–S11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2013.09.017

Goulder, L. H., & Schein, A. R. (2013). Carbon taxes versus cap and trade: A critical review. Climate Change Economics, 4(3), 1350010. https://doi.org/10.1142/S2010007813500103

Goulder, L. H., Parry, I. W. H., Williams III, R. C., & Burtraw, D. (1999). The cost-effectiveness of alternative instruments for environmental protection in a second-best setting. Journal of Public Economics, 72(3), 329–360. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2727(99)00014-0

Goulder, L. H., Hafstead, M. A. C., Kim, G., & Long, X. (2019). Impacts of a carbon tax across US household income groups: What are the equity-efficiency trade-offs? Journal of Public Economics, 175, 44–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2019.03.010

Goulder, L. H., Long, X., Lu, J., & Morgenstern, R. D. (2017). China's unconventional nationwide CO_2 emissions trading system: The wide-ranging impacts of an implicit output subsidy. NBER Working Paper No. 26569. https://doi.org/10.3386/w26569

Government Offices of Sweden. (2021). Sweden's carbon tax. https://www.government.se/government-policy/taxes-and-tariffs/swedens-carbon-tax/

Grainger, C. A., & Kolstad, C. D. (2010). Who pays a price on carbon? Environmental and Resource Economics, 46(3), 359–376. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-010-9345-x

Green, F. (2022). China's new carbon market: A turning point for climate action? Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment. https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/news/chinas-new-carbon-market-a-turning-point-for-climate-action/

Greenfield, P. (2023, January 18). Revealed: More than 90% of rainforest carbon offsets by biggest certifier are worthless, analysis shows. The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2023/jan/18/revealed-forest-carbon-offsets-biggest-provider-worthless-verra-aoe
Grubb, M., Vrolijk, C., & Brack, D. (1999). The Kyoto Protocol: A guide and assessment. Royal Institute of International Affairs. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203985014
Hahn, R. W. (1984). Market power and transferable property rights. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 99(4), 753–765. https://doi.org/10.2307/1883126
Haites, E. (2018). Carbon taxes and greenhouse gas emissions trading systems: What have we learned? Climate Policy, 18(8), 955–966. https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2018.1492897
Haya, B. (2007). Failed mechanism: How the CDM is subsidizing hydro developers and harming the Kyoto Protocol. International Rivers. https://www.internationalrivers.org/sites/default/files/attached-files/failedmechanism.pdf
Heindl, P. (2012). Transaction costs and tradable permits: Empirical evidence from the EU emissions trading scheme. Journal of Regulatory Economics, 41(3), 338–356. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11149-012-9193-7
Hepburn, C., Adlen, E., Beddington, J., Carter, E. A., Fuss, S., Mac Dowell, N., Minx, J. C., Smith, P., & Williams, C. K. (2019). The technological and economic prospects for CO_2 utilization and removal. Nature, 575(7781), 87–97. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1681-6
Hintermann, B. (2010). Allowance price drivers in the first phase of the EU ETS. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 59(1), 43–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2009.07.002
Hintermann, B. (2016). Emissions trading and carbon price volatility: A Markov switching GARCH approach. Environmental and Resource Economics, 63(4), 889–916. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-015-9884-9
Howarth, R. B. (2001). Intertemporal equilibria and exhaustible resources: An overlapping generations approach. Ecological Economics, 38(2), 237–252. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0921-8009(01)00173-2
Hydrogen Council. (2023). Hydrogen insights 2023. https://hydrogencouncil.com/en/hydrogen-insights-2023/
ICE. (2023). EU ETS futures market data. Intercontinental Exchange. https://www.theice.com/products/197/EUA-Futures
ICE. (2024). European carbon market price data. Intercontinental Exchange. https://www.theice.com/products/197/EUA-Futures
ICVCM. (2023). Core carbon principles. Integrity Council for the Voluntary Carbon Market. https://icvcm.org/core-carbon-principles/
ILO. (2015). Guidelines for a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all. International Labour Organization. https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/green-jobs/publications/WCMS_432859/lang--en/index.htm
IMF. (2022). IMF staff climate notes: Proposal for an international carbon price floor among large emitters. International Monetary Fund. https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/Staff-Climate-Notes/Issues/2022/06/23/Proposal-for-an-International-Carbon-Price-Floor-Among-Large-Emitters-519395
IMF. (2023). Still not getting energy prices right: A global and country update of fossil fuel subsidies. International Monetary Fund. https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WP/Issues/2023/08/23/Still-Not-Getting-Energy-Prices-Right-A-Global-and-Country-Update-of-Fossil-Fuel-Subsidies-537286
Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases. (2023). Technical support document: Social cost of carbon, methane, and nitrous oxide. Interim estimates under Executive Order 13990. https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/TechnicalSupportDocument_SocialCostofCarbonMethaneNitrousOxide.pdf
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2005). IPCC special report on carbon dioxide capture and storage. Cambridge University Press. https://www.ipcc.ch/report/carbon-dioxide-capture-and-storage/
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2018). Global warming of 1.5°C: An IPCC special report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157940
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2021). Climate change 2021: The physical science basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2023). Climate change 2023: Synthesis report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Sixth Assessment Report. https://doi.org/10.59327/IPCC/AR6-9789291691647

International Labour Organization. (2015). Guidelines for a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all. https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/green-jobs/publications/WCMS_432859/lang--en/index.htm
Jaraite, J., & Convery, F. J. (2011). The price of carbon in the EU emissions trading scheme: An analysis of allowance prices and trading volumes. Climate Policy, 11(6), 1400–1414. https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2011.579215
Jenkins, J. D. (2014). Political economy constraints on carbon pricing policies: What are the implications for economic efficiency, environmental efficacy, and climate policy design? Energy Policy, 69, 467–477. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2014.02.003
Kateryna, H., Schiavone, N., & Zetterberg, L. (2020). Carbon pricing in international shipping: Possible impacts on trade. Swedish National Board of Trade. https://www.kommerskollegium.se/en/publications/2020/carbon-pricing-in-international-shipping/
Kesicki, F., & Ekins, P. (2012). Marginal abatement cost curves: A call for caution. Climate Policy, 12(2), 219–236. https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2011.582347
Kim, M. G., Kwon, O. S., & An, M. Y. (2016). Policy instruments for agriculture-nutrition nexus in developing countries. Food Policy, 61, 53–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2016.02.004
Kling, C., & Rubin, J. (1997). Bankable permits for the control of environmental pollution. Journal of Public Economics, 64(1), 101–115. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2727(96)01616-X
Kollmuss, A., Zink, H., & Polycarp, C. (2015). Making sense of the voluntary carbon market: A comparison of carbon offset standards. WWF Germany. https://www.wwf.de/fileadmin/fm-wwf/Publikationen-PDF/WWF_Carbon_Offset_Study_2015.pdf
Kossoy, A., Peszko, G., Oppermann, K., Prytz, N., Klein, N., Blok, K., Wong, L., Borkent, B., & Lam, L. (2015). State and trends of carbon pricing 2015. World Bank. https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-0724-1
Kreibich, N., Hermwille, L., Warnecke, C., & Arens, M. (2022). Making the voluntary carbon market work for the Paris Agreement: Governance options for Article 6.4. German Institute of Development and Sustainability (IDOS). https://doi.org/10.23661/idp4.2022
Kruger, J., Oates, W. E., & Pizer, W. A. (2007). Decentralization in the EU Emissions Trading Scheme and lessons for global policy. Review of Environmental Economics and Policy, 1(1), 112–133. https://doi.org/10.1093/reep/rem004
Lee, D., & Pistorius, T. (2015). The impacts of international REDD+ finance. Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR). https://doi.org/10.17528/cifor/005595
Lohmann, L. (2009). Toward a different debate in environmental accounting: The cases of carbon and cost–benefit. Accounting, Organizations and Society, 34(3–4), 499–534. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2006.03.007
Lo, A. Y. (2022). Carbon trading in a socialist market economy: Can China make a difference? Ecological Economics, 198, 107447. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2022.107447
Löschel, A., Lange, A., Moslener, U., Requate, T., & Sturm, B. (2010). The EU emissions trading scheme: Allocation modalities, competitiveness effects and emission reductions. Environmental and Resource Economics, 43(3), 267–287. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-009-9291-9
Mansanet-Bataller, M., Chevallier, J., Hervé-Mignucci, M., & Alberola, E. (2011). EUA and sCER phase II price drivers: Unveiling the reasons for the price drop in Autumn 2008. Energy Policy, 39(3), 1356–1369. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2010.12.048
Martin, R., Muûls, M., & Wagner, U. J. (2014). The impact of the European Union Emissions Trading Scheme on regulated firms: What is the evidence after ten years? Review of Environmental Economics and Policy, 10(1), 129–148. https://doi.org/10.1093/reep/rev016
McKinsey & Company. (2009). Pathways to a low-carbon economy: Version 2 of the global greenhouse gas abatement cost curve. https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/sustainability/our-insights/pathways-to-a-low-carbon-economy
Mehling, M. A., & Haites, E. (2009). Mechanisms for linking emissions trading schemes. Climate Policy, 9(2), 169–184. https://doi.org/10.3763/cpol.2008.0534
Mehling, M. A., van Asselt, H., Das, K., Droege, S., & Verkuijl, C. (2019). Designing border carbon adjustments for enhanced climate action. American Journal of International Law, 113(3), 433–481. https://doi.org/10.1017/ajil.2019.22

Mercure, J. F., Pollitt, H., Viñuales, J. E., Edwards, N. R., Holden, P. B., Chewpreecha, U., Salas, P., Sognnaes, I., Lam, A., & Knobloch, F. (2018). Macroeconomic impact of stranded fossil fuel assets. Nature Climate Change, 8(7), 588–593. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0182-1
Metcalf, G. E. (2009). Market-based policy options to control U.S. greenhouse gas emissions. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 23(2), 5–27. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.23.2.5
Metcalf, G. E. (2015). A conceptual framework for measuring the effectiveness of green taxes. In A. Aslaksen, T. Wennemo, & R. A. Nordaas (Eds.), The Nordic model—Challenged but capable of reform (pp. 245–264). Nordic Council of Ministers. https://doi.org/10.6027/TN2015-537
Metcalf, G. E., & Stock, J. H. (2020). Measuring the macroeconomic impact of carbon taxes. AEA Papers and Proceedings, 110, 101–106. https://doi.org/10.1257/pandp.20201081
Michaelowa, A. (2005). CDM: Current status and possibilities for reform. HWWI Research Paper No. 3-8. Hamburg Institute of International Economics. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.759384
Michaelowa, A., & Jotzo, F. (2005). Transaction costs, institutional rigidities and the size of the clean development mechanism. Energy Policy, 33(4), 511–523. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-4215(03)00249-5
Mildenberger, M. (2020). Carbon captured: How business and labor control climate politics. MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11717.001.0001
Ministry of Ecology and Environment. (2021). Notice on the issuance of the 2019-2020 national carbon emission trading market power generation industry quota allocation implementation plan (trial). People's Republic of China. http://www.mee.gov.cn/
Ministry of Ecology and Environment. (2023). National carbon market construction work progress. People's Republic of China. http://www.mee.gov.cn/
Montero, J. P. (1999). Voluntary compliance with market-based environmental policy: Evidence from the U.S. acid rain program. Journal of Political Economy, 107(5), 998–1013. https://doi.org/10.1086/250092
Montgomery, W. D. (1972). Markets in licenses and efficient pollution control programs. Journal of Economic Theory, 5(3), 395–418. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0531(72)90049-X
Morena, E., Krause, D., & Stevis, D. (Eds.). (2020). Just transitions: Social justice in the shift towards a low-carbon world. Pluto Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvx07w6s
Muller, N. Z., Mendelsohn, R., & Nordhaus, W. (2017). Environmental accounting for pollution in the United States economy. American Economic Review, 101(5), 1649–1675. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.101.5.1649
Murray, B. C. (2008). Leakage from an avoided deforestation compensation policy: Concepts, empirical evidence, and corrective policy options. Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions, Duke University. https://nicholasinstitute.duke.edu/publications/leakage-avoided-deforestation-compensation-policy-concepts-empirical-evidence-and-corrective
Murray, B., & Rivers, N. (2015). British Columbia's revenue-neutral carbon tax: A review of the latest "grand experiment" in environmental policy. Energy Policy, 86, 674–683. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2015.08.011
Naegele, H., & Zaklan, A. (2019). Does the EU ETS cause carbon leakage in European manufacturing? Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 93, 125–147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2018.11.004
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2024). Trends in atmospheric carbon dioxide. Global Monitoring Laboratory. https://gml.noaa.gov/ccgg/trends/
Nelson, T., Simshauser, P., & Kelley, S. (2012). Australian electricity market policy and the emissions reduction fund. The Electricity Journal, 25(4), 24–36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tej.2012.04.006
Newell, R. G., & Mulvaney, K. M. (2013). The political economy of oil and gas subsidies. In A. Aslaksen, T. Wennemo, & R. A. Nordaas (Eds.), The Nordic model—Challenged but capable of reform (pp. 15–34). Nordic Council of Ministers. https://doi.org/10.6027/TN2013-542
Newell, R. G., & Paterson, W. A. (2010). Climate capitalism: Global warming and the transformation of the global economy. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511778095
Newell, R. G., Pizer, W. A., & Raimi, D. (2013). Carbon market lessons and global policy outlook. Science, 343(6177), 1316–1317. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1249565
Nordhaus, W. D. (2017). Revisiting the social cost of carbon. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 114(7), 1518–1523. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1609244114
Obergassel, W., Arens, C., Hermwille, L., Kreibich, N., Mersmann, F., Ott, H. E., & Wang-Helmreich, H. (2018). Options for facilitating and incentivizing the transfer of mitigation outcomes under Article 6 of the Paris Agreement. Wuppertal Institute for Climate, Environment and Energy. https://doi.org/10.48504/REP-2018-02

OECD. (2021). Effective carbon rates 2021: Pricing carbon emissions through taxes and emissions trading. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. https://doi.org/10.1787/0e8e24f5-en
OECD. (2023). Climate finance and the USD 100 billion goal. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. https://www.oecd.org/climate-change/finance-usd-100-billion-goal/
Paolella, M. S., & Taschini, L. (2008). An econometric analysis of emission allowance prices. Journal of Banking & Finance, 32(10), 2022–2032. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2007.12.022
Pastor, M., Morello-Frosch, R., & Sadd, J. L. (2010). Minding the climate gap: Environmental health and equity in California. USC Program for Environmental and Regional Equity. https://dornsife.usc.edu/pere/minding-the-climate-gap/
Pearse, R. (2017). Coal, climate change and the end of the resource boom. Environmental Politics, 26(1), 25–45. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2016.1213927
Perino, G. (2018). New EU ETS phase 4 rules temporarily puncture waterbed. Nature Climate Change, 8(4), 262–264. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0120-2
Pizer, W. A. (2002). Combining price and quantity controls to mitigate global climate change. Journal of Public Economics, 85(3), 409–434. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2727(01)00118-9
Rajamani, L. (2016). Ambition and differentiation in the 2015 Paris Agreement: Interpretative possibilities and underlying politics. International and Comparative Law Quarterly, 65(2), 493–514. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020589316000130
Ranson, M., & Stavins, R. N. (2016). Linkage of greenhouse gas emissions trading systems: Learning from experience. Climate Policy, 16(3), 284–300. https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2014.997658
Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative. (2017). Program review 2016: Summary of changes to the RGGI program. https://www.rggi.org/sites/default/files/Uploads/Program-Review/Program-Review-Summary-of-Changes.pdf
Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative. (2023). Auction results. https://www.rggi.org/auctions/auction-results
Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative. (2024). 2024 auction results and market data. https://www.rggi.org/auctions/auction-results
Rhodium Group. (2023). Taking stock of the voluntary carbon market. https://rhg.com/research/taking-stock-of-the-voluntary-carbon-market/
Ricke, K., Drouet, L., Caldeira, K., & Tavoni, M. (2018). Country-level social cost of carbon. Nature Climate Change, 8(10), 895–900. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0282-y
Roberts, J. T., & Parks, B. C. (2006). A climate of injustice: Global inequality, North-South politics, and climate policy. MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/6624.001.0001
Rodrik, D. (2014). Green industrial policy. Oxford Review of Economic Policy, 30(3), 469–491. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxrep/gru025
Rosenow, J., & Galvin, R. (2013). Evaluating the evaluations: Evidence from energy efficiency programmes in Germany and the UK. Energy and Buildings, 62, 450–458. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2013.03.047
Schmalensee, R., Joskow, P. L., Ellerman, A. D., Montero, J. P., & Bailey, E. M. (1998). An interim evaluation of sulfur dioxide emissions trading. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 12(3), 53–68. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.12.3.53
Schneider, L. (2007). Is the CDM fulfilling its environmental and sustainable development objectives? An evaluation of the CDM and options for improvement. Oeko-Institut. https://www.oeko.de/fileadmin/oekodoc/Is-the-CDM-fulfilling-its-environmental-and-sustainable-development-objectives.pdf
Schneider, L., Kollmuss, A., & Lazarus, M. (2010). Industrial N_2O projects under the CDM: Adipic acid—a case of carbon leakage? Stockholm Environment Institute. https://mediamanager.sei.org/documents/Publications/Climate-mitigation-advisors/industrial-n2o-projects-under-the-cdm-adipic-acid.pdf
Schneider, L., La Hoz Theuer, S., & Howard, A. (2020). Accounting for the linkages between carbon markets under Article 6 of the Paris Agreement. Oeko-Institut and Carbon Market Watch. https://carbonmarketwatch.org/publications/accounting-for-the-linkages-between-carbon-markets-under-article-6-of-the-paris-agreement/
Shonkoff, S. B., Morello-Frosch, R., Pastor, M., & Sadd, J. (2018). The climate gap: Inequalities in how climate change hurts Americans & how to close the gap. Routledge Handbook of Environmental Justice, 143–154. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315678986-12

Sijm, J., Neuhoff, K., & Chen, Y. (2006). CO_2 cost pass-through and windfall profits in the power sector. Climate Policy, 6(1), 49–72. https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2006.9685588
Silverstein, J. (2023). Blockchain and satellite monitoring for carbon credit verification. Nature Climate Change, 13(5), 405–406. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-023-01654-2
Skutsch, M., Bird, N., Trines, E., Dutschke, M., Frumhoff, P., de Jong, B. H. J., van Laake, P., Masera, O., & Murdiyarso, D. (2011). Options for REDD+ verification to deal with risks of non-permanence and leakage. In B. Strassburg, A. K. Turner, B. Fisher, R. Schaeffer, & A. Lovett (Eds.), REDD+ and carbon markets (pp. 127–138). GCP Report. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781849775557-10
Stavins, R. N. (1995). Transaction costs and tradeable permits. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 29(2), 133–148. https://doi.org/10.1006/jeem.1995.1036
Stavins, R. N. (2020). The future of US carbon-pricing policy. Environmental and Resource Economics, 81(3), 789–816. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-020-00442-0
Stern, N. (2016). Economics: Current climate models are grossly misleading. Nature, 530(7591), 407–409. https://doi.org/10.1038/530407a
Stiglitz, J. E., Stern, N., Duan, M., Edenhofer, O., Giraud, G., Heal, G., La Rovere, E. L., Morris, A., Moyer, E., Pangestu, M., Shiller, R., Srivastava, L., Winkler, H., Alpizar, F., Anoulihas, C., Atkinson, G., Brunel, C., Driesen, D., Helene, P., ... Zhang, W. (2017). Report of the high-level commission on carbon prices. Carbon Pricing Leadership Coalition. https://doi.org/10.1596/28481
Stokes, L. C. (2020). Short circuiting policy: Interest groups and the battle over clean energy and climate policy in the American States. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190074250.001.0001
Tietenberg, T. H. (2006). Emissions trading: Principles and practice (2nd ed.). Resources for the Future.
Tol, R. S. J. (2019). The economic impacts of climate change. Review of Environmental Economics and Policy, 12(1), 4–25. https://doi.org/10.1093/reep/rex027
Trove Research. (2023). Future demand, supply and prices for voluntary carbon credits: Keeping the balance. https://www.troveresearch.com/reports/future-demand-supply-and-prices-for-voluntary-carbon-credits-keeping-the-balance/
Uhrig-Homburg, M., & Wagner, M. (2009). Futures price dynamics of CO_2 emission allowances: An empirical analysis of the trial period. Journal of Derivatives, 17(2), 73–88. https://doi.org/10.3905/JOD.2009.17.2.073
UK Government. (2024). UK Emissions Trading Scheme. https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/uk-emissions-trading-scheme
United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. (2013). Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality. CDM Executive Board. https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/tools/am-tool-01-v7.0.0.pdf
United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. (2015). Paris Agreement. FCCC/CP/2015/10/Add.1. https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement
United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. (2021). Report of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement on its third session, held in Glasgow from 31 October to 13 November 2021. FCCC/PA/CMA/2021/10/Add.1. https://unfccc.int/documents/460950
United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. (2022). Clean Development Mechanism project activities. https://cdm.unfccc.int/Statistics/Public/files/2022/project_cdm.jpg
Verra. (2023). Verified Carbon Standard program. https://verra.org/programs/verified-carbon-standard/
VCMI. (2023). Claims code of practice. Voluntary Carbon Markets Integrity Initiative. https://vcmintegrity.org/
Vrolijk, C. (1999). The Kyoto Protocol: A guide and assessment. Royal Institute of International Affairs.
Wettestad, J. (2014). Rescuing EU emissions trading: Mission impossible? Global Environmental Politics, 14(2), 64–81. https://doi.org/10.1162/GLEP_a_00229
West, T. A. P., Borner, J., Sills, E. O., & Kontoleon, A. (2023). Overstated carbon emission reductions from voluntary REDD+ projects in the Brazilian Amazon. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 120(6), e2204339120. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2204339120
Weitzman, M. L. (1974). Prices vs. quantities. Review of Economic Studies, 41(4), 477–491. https://doi.org/10.2307/2296698
Wood, P. J., & Jotzo, F. (2011). Price floors for emissions trading. Energy Policy, 39(3), 1746–1753. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2011.01.004

World Bank. (2023). State and trends of carbon pricing 2023. https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-2006-6
Yin, R. K. (2018). Case study research and applications: Design and methods (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
Zhang, D., Karplus, V. J., Cassisa, C., & Zhang, X. (2014). Emissions trading in China: Progress and prospects. Energy Policy, 75, 9–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2014.01.022
Zhang, Y. J., Wang, A. D., & Da, Y. B. (2019). The impact of China's carbon allowance allocation rules on the product prices and emissions of high-energy intensive enterprises. Energy Policy, 129, 762–771. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2019.02.055
Zhang, Y. J., Wang, A. D., & Tan, W. (2021). The impact of China's carbon trading scheme on the low-carbon transition of the economy: A study of the power industry. Energy Economics, 104, 105663. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2021.105663