

# Production data and their updating for use in allocation rules

**Hubert Fallmann** 



## **Prologue**

- This presentation discusses possible improvements of the current rules for free allocation regarding the use of historical or more recent production data
- I.e. "ex-ante" vs. "ex-post"
- It does NOT discuss other elements of the recent Ecofys paper on annually updating allocations (such as an allocation reserve or allocation for indirect emissions)



# Prologue (2)

- This presentation does not discuss whether free allocation is the tool of choice for tackling the risk of CL.
- It is noticed that free allocation does not fully implement the "polluter pays principle" enshrined in Art. 191 TFEU.
- This presentation does not deal with cap setting. It is assumed that the cap will be sufficiently strict after 2020 for leading to GHG reductions in line with the 2°C goal.
- It assumes that a significant, ex-ante decided fraction of the cap will be earmarked for auctioning, i.e. some form of correction factor will be needed for free allocation.



## Features of current allocation system

- Ex-ante system based on product benchmarks and fallback approaches
- Designed to treat all participants as equal as possible
- Original 2008 proposal: Only one ex-post correction: New entrants (defined as greenfield plants)
- Some ex-post corrections were introduced during the political process of the EU ETS review
- Some complex rules should indeed be simplified (e.g. difference between linear factor and cross-sectoral correction factor)



## Why do we discuss allocation rules?

There are claims that the current system is:

- Inviting for "optimisation" by operators (choice of baseline period, splitting installations...)
- Using historic data = data not representing actual production
- Complicated and insufficient regarding new entrant and closure rules
- Not sufficiently tackling the carbon leakage risk
- Complicated

# Different CO<sub>2</sub> price signals

### Ex-ante:

- Incentive for reducing production (same as for auctioning) benefit from reduced tonnage productions, and additional production leads to higher CO<sub>2</sub> costs per unit
- Therefore higher CO<sub>2</sub> cost pass through = desired effect for incentivizing behaviour change of consumers and innovation in downstream industries

### Ex-post:

- Constant CO<sub>2</sub> costs per unit → no price signal for reducing production ("license to produce more")
- No need to pass full costs to customers (only difference to BM)
   → good for reducing CL risk, but making ETS less efficient
- Operators may be comfortable with allocation and delay investments,
   even if financial incentive is the same as for ex-ante



## Special issue: Fall-back approaches

- Fall-backs are currently used by 75% of all sub-installations (30% of total 3<sup>rd</sup> phase allocation)
- If efficiency is improved, then in an ex-post system:
  - → Activity level for heat and other fall-back sub-installations decreases
  - Allocation would decrease
  - → Such improvement would be penalised
  - → ETS with ex-post allocation is less efficient
- Ex-ante: no such wrong incentive encourages efficiency equally for all types of sub-installations
- → Switch from an ex-ante system with few ex-post corrections to ex-post system with many ex-ante corrections desirable?



# Practical issues of ex-post allocation: High uncertainty

- For ensuring sufficient auctioning, a correction factor is needed. Because activity levels change annually, the factor needs to be calculated each year.
- Even if an installation produces the same amount every year, the allocation will be changing every year.
- An installation can't predict the amount of allocation for a year, because it depends on the activity level of all other installations in the system.
- If one sector increases production significantly, it takes away the allowances from other sectors.



# Practical issues of ex-post allocation: Timing of the "Allocation cycle"

- Activities required:
  - Operator reports activity
  - CA checks / gathers feedback or corrections where necessary
  - CA notifies data to Commission
  - Commission performs checks / gathers feedback or corrections
  - Commission approves data
  - Commission calculates final allocations
  - CA allocates (incl. formal information for operators and Registry)
- In theory possible within one year after reporting:
  - In year y+2 correction of allocation for year y
- In practice very unlikely that all MS meet this schedule
  - More likely: Final allocation only 3 years later



### NIMs experience: 33 months (expected: 18)

<b>NIMs Process - Theoretical T</b>	iming																																
Activity	Who	Dez.10	Jän.11	Feb.11	Mar.11	Apr.11 Mai.11	Jun.11	Jul.11	Aug.11	Sep.11 Okt 11	Nov.11	Dez.11	Jän.12	Feb.12	Mär.12	Apr.12	Jun.12	Jul.12	Aug.12	Sep.12	Okt.12	NOV.12	Dez. 12	Feb.13	Mär.13	Apr.13	Mai.13	Jun.13	Jul.13	Aug.13	Sep.13		Dez.13
Legislation (CIMs) in place	ссс																																
operators data collection	Operator																																
CAs assessment	CA																																
Clarification in individual cases	CA																																
Notification to Commission	CA																																
Commission assessment	сом																																
Clarification in individual cases	сом																																
Commission internal procedures	сом																															1	
Publication of decision	СОМ																																

#### NIMs Process - Reality (with some assumptions)

		107,	111	r.11	r.11	Mai.11	117	3.11 3.11	Sep.11	t.11 ,11	7.11	1	.12	r.12	Apr.12	1.12	.12	3.12	.12	t. 12	7.12	13	13	r.13	r.13	i.13	1.13	.13	5.13	t.13	7.13	1
Activity	Who	Dez	Feh	Mär.	Ар	Ma	]  -  -	Aug	Sep	Š Š	Dez	Z z	Feb	Mä	Ap	Ma	Inf Jul	Au	Sep	ð	No		Fe S	Mä	Ар	Ma	Jur	Inf	Αnβ	Seg Seg	Nov	Dez
Legislation (CIMs) in place	CCC																															
operators data collection	Operator																															
CAs assessment	CA																															
Clarification in individual cases	CA																															
Notification to Commission	CA																															
Commission assessment	СОМ																															
Clarification in individual cases	СОМ																															ı
Commission internal procedures	СОМ																															
Publication of decision	СОМ																															

10



# Practical issues of ex-post allocation: Timing

	1	1	21	1	.1	1	1	21	1	.1	1	2	2	22	2	7	2	22	7 2	7 2	2	33	3	23	2 3	<u>ر</u> د	3 5	:3	3	3	23	3	4	4	7	4
	Jän.21	Feb.21	är.2	Apr.21	Mai.21	Jun.21	.2	Aug.21	Sep.21	t:7	Nov.21 Dez.21	Jän.22	Feb.22	Mär.22	Apr.22	Mai.22 Jun.22	1.2	Aug.22	Sep. 22	OKT.22 Nov 22	7.7	Jän.23	0.2 :	Mär.2	Apr.23	Ivial. 23	101.23	8.7	Sep.23	Okt.23	Nov.23	Dez.23	Jän.24	Feb.24	Mär.24	Apr.24
Activity	Jä	Fe	Ž	ΑK	Ĩ	h	크	Αn	Se	Ď 2	NC De	Jä	Fe	Š	Ă:	<u> </u>	ηſ	Ψ	S	Ď		Jä	Fe	$\tilde{\Sigma}$	ξŽ	Ě		Au	Se	ō	ž	De	Jä	Fe	Ξ̈́	ΑŘ
Year of emissions / activity M&R (y)																																				
Allocation for year y																																				
Reporting to CA																																				
CA performing checks																																				
CA notifies to COM																																				
Commission performs checks																																				
Commission approves data																																				
Commission calculates CorrFactor																																				
								ļ																					<u> </u>					][		
More realistic scenario  Activity	Jän.21	Feb.21	Mär.21	Apr.21	Mai.21	Jun.21	Jul.21	Aug.21	Sep.21	Okt.21	Nov.21	Jän.22	Feb.22	Mär.22	Apr.22	Jun.22	Jul.22	Aug.22	Sep.22	OKt.22	Dez.22	Jän.23	Feb.23	Mär.23	Apr.23 Mai 23	Ivial.23	Jul.23	Aug.23	Sep.23	Okt.23	Nov.23	Dez.23	Jän.24	Feb.24	Mär.24	Apr.24
More realistic scenario  Activity	Jän.21	Feb.21	Mär.21	Apr.21	Mai.21	Jun.21	Jul.21	Aug.21	Sep.21	Okt.21	Dez.21	Jän.22	Feb.22	Mär.22	Apr.22	Mal.22 Jun.22	Jul.22	Aug.22	Sep.22	Nov 22	Dez.22	Jän.23	Feb.23	Mär.23	Apr.23	lvial.23	101.23	Aug.23	Sep.23	Okt.23	Nov.23	Dez.23	Jän.24	Feb.24	Mär.24	Apr.24
More realistic scenario  Activity Year of emissions / activity M&R (y)	Jän.21	Feb.21	Mär.21	Apr.21	Mai.21	Jun.21	Jul.21	Aug.21	Sep.21	Okt.21	Nov.21	Jän.22	Feb.22	Mär.22	Apr.22	Jun.22	Jul.22	Aug.22	Sep.22	Nov 22	Dez.22	Jän.23	Feb.23	Mär.23	Apr.23	Ivial.23	Jul.23	Aug.23	Sep.23	Okt.23	Nov.23	Dez.23	Jän.24	Feb.24	Mär.24	Apr.24
More realistic scenario  Activity Year of emissions / activity M&R (y) Allocation for year y	Jän.21	Feb.21	Mär.21	Apr.21	Mai.21	Jun.21	Jul.21	Aug.21	Sep.21	Okt.21	Nov.21 Dez.21	Jän.22	Feb.22	Mär.22	Apr.22	Jun.22	Jul.22	Aug.22	Sep.22	NOV 22	Dez.22	Jän.23	Feb.23	Mär.23	Apr.23	Ivial.23	Jul.23	Aug.23	Sep.23	Okt.23	Nov.23	Dez.23	Jän.24	Feb.24	Mär.24	Apr.24
More realistic scenario  Activity Year of emissions / activity M&R (y) Allocation for year y Reporting to CA	Jän.21	Feb.21	Mär.21	Apr.21	Mai.21	Jun.21	Jul.21	Aug.21	Sep.21	Okt.21	Nov.21	Jän.22	Feb.22	Mär.22	Apr.22	Jun.22	Jul.22	Aug.22	Sep.22	NOV 22	Dez.22	Jän.23	Feb.23	Mär.23	Apr.23 Mai 23	IVIAI.23	Jul.23	Aug.23	Sep.23	Okt.23	Nov.23	Dez.23	Jän.24	Feb.24	Mär.24	Apr.24
More realistic scenario  Activity Year of emissions / activity M&R (y)	Jän.21	Feb.21	Mär.21	Apr.21	Mai.21	Jun.21	Jul.21	Aug.21	Sep.21	OKt.21	Nov.21	Jän.22	Feb.22	Mär.22	Apr.22	Jun.22	Jul.22	Aug.22	Sep.22	NOV 22	Dez.22	Jän.23	Feb.23	Mar.23	Apr.23	Ivial.23	Jul.23	Aug.23	Sep.23	Okt.23	Nov.23	Dez.23	Jän.24	Feb.24	Mär.24	Apr.24
More realistic scenario  Activity Year of emissions / activity M&R (y) Allocation for year y Reporting to CA CA performing checks CA notifies to COM	Jän.21	Feb.21	Mär.21	Apr.21	Mai.21	Jun.21	Jul.21	Aug.21	Sep.21	OKt.21	Nov.21	Jän.22	Feb.22	Mär.22	Apr.22	Midi.22 Jun.22	Jul.22	Aug.22	Sep.22	ORE:22	Dez.22	Jän.23	Feb.23	Mar.23	Apr.23	Widi.23	111.23	Aug.23	Sep.23	Okt.23	Nov.23	Dez.23	Jän.24	Feb.24	Mär.24	Apr.24
More realistic scenario  Activity Year of emissions / activity M&R (y) Allocation for year y Reporting to CA CA performing checks CA notifies to COM Commission performs checks	Jän.21	Feb.21	Mär.21	Apr.21	Mai.21	Jun.21	Jul.21	Aug.21	Sep.21	OKt.21	Nov.21	Jän.22	Feb.22	Mär.22	Apr.22	Mai.22	Jul.22	Aug.22	Sep.22	OKT.22	Dez.22	Jän.23	Feb.23	Mar.23	Apr.23	Ivial.23	Jul.23	Aug.23	Sep.23	Okt.23	Nov.23	Dez.23	Jän.24	Feb.24	Mär.24	Apr.24
More realistic scenario  Activity Year of emissions / activity M&R (y) Allocation for year y Reporting to CA CA performing checks	Jän.21	Feb.21	Mär.21	Apr.21	Mai.21	Jun.21	Jul.21	Aug.21	Sep.21	OKt.21	NOV.21	Jän.22	Feb.22	Mär.22	Apr.22	Mal.22 Jun.22	Jul.22	Aug.22	Sep.22	ORI:22	Dez.22	Jän.23	Feb.23	Mär.23	Apr.23	INIAI.23	Jul. 23	Aug.23	Sep.23	Okt.23	Nov.23	Dez.23	Jän.24	Feb.24	Mär.24	Apr.24

## What can be realistically improved?

### If free allocation continues after 2020 (2027):

- Create an ex-ante system with more recent data
  - instead of up to 15 years old (2005 → 2020) use most recent data every 3 or 4 years
  - Don't allow exceptions, but the same 3 or 4 years average for everybody (also solves confidentiality issue)
- Simplify: Discard elements like
  - difference between LinF and CSCF,
  - part. cessation and capacity reduction,...
- Simplify NE&C rules:
  - only one rule for greenfields (as "fast start support")
  - only one rule for closure
  - Install a small NER
- Provide EU wide harmonised MRV rules for activity data



# Features of a good\* allocation system

- Transparent, unambiguous
- Allows no optimization / gambling
- Feasible (timing, administrative costs)
- Giving long-term certainty
- Not distorting the CO<sub>2</sub> price signal
- Allows for reasonable auctioning revenues

<sup>\*</sup> An allocation system is considered "good" if it helps achieving the ETS's goal AND has a chance to survive the political process for putting it in place



## Final remarks - What do we want?

	Ex-ante	Ex-post
ETS that delivers cost effective GHG reductions	yes	Less efficient
Reduced risk of Carbon Leakage	(yes)	(yes)
Administrative burden	manageable	burdensome
Certainty for investment decisions	high	low
Cost for MS / tax payers	(yes*)	(yes*)

→ Proposed system on the previous slide could be a good solution



# Thanks for your attention!

### **Contact & Information:**

hubert.fallmann@umweltbundesamt.at

### **Disclaimer:**

This presentation reflects the opinion of the author and not necessarily that of Umweltbundesamt.

Umweltbundesamt.at

3rd Stakeholder meeting on post-2020 CL provisions Brussels 25-09-2014