Given the important role of fiscal policy reforms in supporting climate change objectives, this has been a topic of focus for the Green Fiscal Policy Network. In the lead-up to the COP21, the Network issued a series of newsletters on fiscal approaches to support climate change. This note brings together key issues discussed in this special series of newsletters and reflections from Network members on how fiscal policy reforms can support action on climate change.

Reforming perverse subsidies

Globally consumer subsidies to fossil fuels stood at USD 493 billion in 2014 (IEA, 2015). When undercharging for the negative externalities from energy consumption, most importantly air pollution, but also other costs like traffic congestion and accidents, are taken into account, these subsidies are much higher – amounting to USD 5.3 trillion in 2015 (Coady et al., 2015). At the same time, the low oil price has pushed producers and state-owned companies to seek further subsidies in addition to generous tax breaks and other benefits many already enjoy. For example, governments across the G20 countries are estimated to spend USD 88 billion every year subsidizing the exploration of fossil fuels (ODI and OCI, 2014).

There is growing recognition that fossil fuel subsidies have a negative impact on the environment, absorb substantial fiscal resources, are poorly targeted for helping low-income households, and encourage excessive energy consumption (UNEP, 2014). For example, it has been estimated that global carbon emissions over the 1980-2010 period would have been 20.7 per cent lower if countries had not subsidized fossil fuels (Stefanski, 2014). Calls for reform are growing and a number of countries are taking steps in this area. In 2013-2014, around 30 countries underwent some form of fossil fuel subsidy reform, taking advantage of low oil prices (see Figure 1). Notable recent examples of reforms include Egypt, India, Indonesia and Morocco. Whilst some countries have made progress, many others such as countries in the Middle East and North Africa have far to go.

Perverse incentives through subsidies in other sectors also undermine action to address climate change. For example, forests perform key ecological services such as protecting biodiversity, soils and watersheds, and absorbing carbon from the atmosphere, while also providing sources of employment and livelihood in many countries. In recognition of this role, significant amounts of international public financing have been mobilized through the Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+I) initiative. However, agriculture subsidies...
in some countries continue to drive the expansion of agricultural commodities such as palm oil and timber that are associated with deforestation, and thus undermine the efficiency and coherence of public financing for forests (ODI, 2015).

Reforming environmentally harmful subsidies is by no means an easy task and often faces numerous obstacles and political challenges. Reform requires a comprehensive, integrated and consultative approach, which helps to get the prices right, builds support and mitigates negative impacts on vulnerable groups (IISD, 2013). Concerns of economic and social impacts should not hold up reform though as they can be addressed through careful design and targeted compensation measures (Withana, 2015). Moreover, subsidy reform can produce substantial fiscal, environmental and health benefits (UNEP, 2011). For example, according to Coady et al. (2015), eliminating energy subsidies (which arise from undercharging for supply and broader environmental costs of fossil fuel energy) would raise government revenue by USD 2.9 trillion, reduce global CO2 emissions by more than 20 per cent, and reduce premature air pollution related deaths by 55 per cent (see Figure 2).

Figure 1 Countries partially increasing subsidized fossil fuel prices in 2013–2014


Figure 2 Environment and health gains from removing energy subsidies for 2013

Source: Coady et al. (2015).
Notes: Per cent reductions in CO2 emissions on top axis; per cent reductions in air pollution deaths on bottom axis. CIS = Commonwealth of Independent States; ED Asia = Emerging and Developing Asia, LAC = Latin America and the Caribbean; MENAP = Middle East, North Africa, Afghanistan, and Pakistan.
Pricing carbon

Carbon pricing instruments are among the most efficient approaches to reducing CO₂ emissions as they exploit, and strike the right balance between, the full range of mitigation opportunities, while raising substantial new revenues. Carbon pricing can be implemented through carbon taxes or emissions trading systems (ETS). A growing number of countries and regions are adopting such pricing mechanisms (see Figure 3). In principle, either instrument is fine so long as it is well-designed, establishes a stable emissions price in line with environmental objectives (e.g. INDC mitigation targets), exploits fiscal opportunities from revenues generated, comprehensively prices all sources of CO₂ emissions (insofar as practical), and is administratively simple. In practice, achieving these objectives is somewhat more convoluted under ETS, for example, allowances must be auctioned, price stability measures are needed, and trading systems usually exclude small-scale emission sources such as vehicles and buildings.

Despite efforts to date, only 12 per cent of annual global GHG emissions are formally priced and typically at levels below USD10 per ton (World Bank and Ecofys, 2015). While new carbon pricing measures, such as those planned in China, will help to improve this situation, there is still a long way to go. Concerns about impacts on competitiveness and distribution can be addressed through careful design and targeted compensation measures. Other multilateral approaches should also be explored including the possibility of an international carbon price floor arrangement among high emitters which would provide some degree of protection against tax competition, while allowing individual countries flexibility to go beyond the floor depending on national circumstances (Farid et al., 2016). Finally, multiple benefits of carbon pricing must be communicated to legislators and the public. Domestic co-benefits for human health (e.g. from reductions in air pollution-related deaths) is a particularly compelling argument which indicates how carbon pricing is in many countries own national interest (Parry et al., 2014).

The time for action on fiscal policies

The time for action is now. The 60 per cent decline in oil prices over the last three years, continuing fiscal pressures to reduce high debt-to-GDP ratios, and the need for countries to take forward domestic actions to support global climate change commitments, provide a particularly favourable environment to launch carbon pricing mechanisms and reform fossil fuel subsidies. Support for the use of such instruments is galvanizing with calls for action from key actors including international institutions, national governments, private actors and academics to name a few.

A number of countries have introduced initiatives in this area and included references to specific fiscal instruments in their INDCs. This growing momentum needs to be translated into further action. Countries should consider adopting more ambitious green fiscal policies and other instruments as they start to review and update their INDCs. A key challenge going forward is to ensure that these instruments are well-designed to reflect good governance principles, with regular monitoring and review mechanisms to ensure commitments are fulfilled even when times change (i.e. oil prices start to rise). Such concerted efforts will help to ensure that fiscal measures are an integral element of actions to take forward the Paris Climate Agreement and can better contribute towards ambitions for a low-carbon, climate-resilient future.

Figure 3 Overview of existing, emerging and potential carbon pricing instruments in 2015
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Notes

1 For instance, through the Carbon Pricing Leadership Coalition which brings together governments, private sector actors and civil society to share experiences and expand the use of carbon pricing systems and policies.