



# NOTA DI LAVORO

16.2011

---

## Energy and Climate Change in China

---

By **Carlo Carraro**, University of Venice,  
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and  
Euro-Mediterranean Centre for Climate  
Change

**Emanuele Massetti**, Fondazione Eni  
Enrico Mattei, Euro-Mediterranean  
Centre for Climate Change and  
Yale School of Forestry and  
Environmental Studies

# SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT Series

Editor: Carlo Carraro

## Energy and Climate Change in China

By Carlo Carraro, University of Venice, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and Euro-Mediterranean Centre for Climate Change  
Emanuele Massetti, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Euro-Mediterranean Centre for Climate Change and Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies

### Summary

This paper examines future energy and emissions scenarios in China generated by the Integrated Assessment Model WITCH. A Business-as-Usual scenario is compared with five scenarios in which Greenhouse Gases emissions are taxed, at different levels. The elasticity of China's emissions is estimated by pooling observations from all scenarios and compared with the elasticity of emissions in OECD countries. China has a higher elasticity than the OECD for a carbon tax lower than 50\$ per ton of CO<sub>2</sub>-eq. For higher taxes, emissions in OECD economies are more elastic than in China. Our best guess indicates that China would need to introduce a tax equal to about 750\$ per ton of CO<sub>2</sub>-eq in 2050 to achieve the Major Economies Forum goal set for mid-century. In our preferred estimates, the discounted cost of following the 2°C trajectory is equal to 5.4% and to 2.7% of GDP in China and the OECD, respectively.

**Keywords:** Climate Change, China, Energy Efficiency, Energy and Development

**JEL Classification:** Q4

*This paper has been prepared for the workshop on the "Chinese Economy" organized by the Bank of Italy and Venice International University, Isola di San Servolo – Venice – 25/27 November 2010. This paper is part of the research work being carried out by the Sustainable Development Programme at the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and by the Climate Impacts and Policy Division of the Euro-Mediterranean Centre on Climate Change. Financial support from the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement n° 244766 - PASHMINA (PARadigm SHifts Modelling and INnovative Approaches) the PASHMINA project and from the EC2 Europe-China Clean Energy Centre is kindly acknowledged. The authors thank Massimo Tavoni for helpful discussions and suggestions.*

*Address for correspondence:*

Emanuele Massetti  
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei  
C.so Magenta 63  
20123 Milano  
Italy  
Phone: +390252036814  
E-mail: emanuele.massetti@feem.it

# Energy and Climate Change in China

Carlo Carraro

*University of Venice*

*Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei*

*Euro-Mediterranean Centre for Climate Change*

Emanuele Massetti

*Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei*

*Euro-Mediterranean Centre for Climate Change*

*Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies*

## Abstract

This paper examines future energy and emissions scenarios in China generated by the Integrated Assessment Model WITCH. A Business-as-Usual scenario is compared with five scenarios in which Greenhouse Gases emissions are taxed, at different levels. The elasticity of China's emissions is estimated by pooling observations from all scenarios and compared with the elasticity of emissions in OECD countries. China has a higher elasticity than the OECD for a carbon tax lower than 50\$ per ton of CO<sub>2</sub>-eq. For higher taxes, emissions in OECD economies are more elastic than in China. Our best guess indicates that China would need to introduce a tax equal to about 750\$ per ton of CO<sub>2</sub>-eq in 2050 to achieve the Major Economies Forum goal set for mid-century. In our preferred estimates, the discounted cost of following the 2°C trajectory is equal to 5.4% and to 2.7% of GDP in China and the OECD, respectively.

This paper has been prepared for the workshop on the "Chinese Economy" organized by the Bank of Italy and Venice International University, Isola di San Servolo – Venice – 25/27 November 2010. This paper is part of the research work being carried out by the Sustainable Development Programme at the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and by the Climate Impacts and Policy Division of the Euro-Mediterranean Centre on Climate Change. Financial support from the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement n° 244766 - PASHMINA (PARadigm SHifts Modelling and INnovative Approaches) the PASHMINA project and from the EC2 Europe-China Clean Energy Centre is kindly acknowledged. The authors thank Massimo Tavoni for helpful discussions and suggestions.

Correspondence address: Emanuele Massetti, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, C.so Magenta, 63, 20123, Milano, Italy. Tel. +39 02 520 36814; Fax +39 02 520 36946, Email: emanuele.massetti@feem.it .

# 1. Introduction

The economic growth of China has been impressive in recent years. This growth has been fuelled by a rapid industrial expansion and it causes an ever growing appetite for natural resources in general and energy in particular, with worldwide implications. China's share of global Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 2005 was roughly 5%. Its share of global Total Primary Energy Supply (TPES) was much higher: 17%. Its share of global emissions of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), the most important among all Greenhouse Gases (GHGs), was 22% in 2005.<sup>1</sup> This indicates that China has high energy intensity of input and even higher carbon intensity of energy with respect to the world average. This combination of forces – high economic growth with high energy and carbon intensity – has turned China into the world leading carbon dioxide emitter in 2006, five to nine years earlier than what forecasted as recently as in 2004.

Future prospects for the Chinese economy look bright. Home to one-fifth of the world population, China has the potentiality to become a global economic giant. The road to prosperity is however still very long because China's GDP per capita is only one-fourth of the world average. Such a prolonged period of high economic growth has the potential to multiply China's carbon emissions by a factor of two or three, even if we account for massive improvements of energy efficiency.

For its present and future share of global carbon dioxide emissions China must therefore be a key player of action against global warming. However – understandably – China is not willing to accept any absolute target, as many other developing and developed economies. In the United Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Conference of Parties (COP) held at Copenhagen on December 2009, China has made a step forward pledging to reduce the GHGs emissions intensity of its economy by 40/45 percent with respect to 2005 in 2020. This target leaves broad flexibility to Chinese authorities and it fits well into a renewed domestic plan of action to increase energy efficiency: domestic motivations seem still to prevail on the concerns for the protection of the global public good.

This study presents long-term scenarios of energy demand and composition, emissions and the economy, produced using the Integrated Assessment Model (IAM) WITCH ([www.witchmodel.org](http://www.witchmodel.org)). WITCH is a Ramsey-type neoclassical optimal growth model with a detailed description of the energy sector. A game-theoretic structure governs the interaction

---

<sup>1</sup> Data on China from the World Bank Development Indicators.

of thirteen regions of the world.

A first scenario of energy demand and composition is derived under the assumption that no action is taken to reduce GHGs emissions. We refer to this scenario as the Business-as-Usual (BaU). A second set of scenarios studies the transformations induced by a tax on GHGs emissions. Five scenarios will explore the implications of carbon pricing on GHGs emissions, on carbon intensity of energy and energy intensity of GDP, on power generation technologies, and on the macroeconomic cost of the five stylized climate policy scenarios.

Among the many studies that have generated long-term energy and emissions outlook for China using energy-economy models we signal Jiang and Hu (2006), Cai et al. (2008), ERI (2009), IEA (2007, 2010) and Zhou et al. (2011). With respect to these studies we expand the time horizon beyond 2050, we consider a wide range of carbon prices that span all the climate policy targets now under discussion and we use a model that has a solid macroeconomic foundation and complex international interactions. We lack instead a more precise description of end-use technologies and non-electric energy demand, which might overstate marginal abatement costs in those sectors. Blanford, Richels and Rutherford (2008) generate long-term scenarios for China using MERGE, a model that shares many similarities with WITCH. They make an interesting analysis of energy intensity dynamics and assess the role of China in two scenarios that stabilize global GHG concentrations at 550 ppme and 450 ppme in 2100. Earlier studies include Kram et al. (2000), van Vuuren et al. (2003), who use SRES scenarios to derive alternative technological and emission trajectories for China.

Scenarios developed by IAMs are most informative when used for comparative analysis. The large set of carbon prices that we use allows testing the elasticity of the Chinese economy and energy system under a wide range of policy regimes. Throughout the paper we also compare China to OECD economies. Although still a developing country, China can be compared to other developed economies when it comes to the size of the economy, of emissions and of energy demand. This enables us to get deeper insights on the Chinese reactivity to carbon taxes and to make judgements on the political acceptability of several policy targets that are debated in the policy arena. In another paper we compare China to India, using four tax scenarios generated using an older version of the model (Massetti, 2011).

The rest of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 introduces the reader to historic data and to the BaU scenario. Section 2 also contains a brief overview of the WITCH model. Section 3 presents the five climate policy scenarios. Conclusions follow with several remarks on a realistic climate policy pattern for China. The Appendix displays detailed information on

the optimal energy mix in the BaU and in the five policy scenarios.

## 2. Historic data and the BaU Scenario

Table 1 synthetically displays key data on the economy, on the energy system, on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and on key efficiency indicators from 1960 to 2100. Historic data (1960-1990) has been gathered from a variety of sources by the World Bank in its Development Indicators series. Future scenarios are produced using the latest version of the WITCH model (Bosetti et al., 2006; Bosetti, Massetti and Tavoni, 2007; Bosetti et al., 2009b; www.witchmodel.org ).

	Historic data		WITCH BaU scenario					Historic data		WITCH BaU scenario			
	1970	1990	2010	2030	2050	2100		1970	1990	2010	2030	2050	2100
<b>The Economy</b>						<b>CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions</b>							
<b>GDP (trillion \$)</b>						<b>CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (Gt)</b>							
China	0.1	0.4	3.7	15.2	31.9	57.6	China	0.8	2.5	6.8	12.6	17.9	20.9
OECD	9.7	19.5	39.8	59.0	78.9	124.3	OECD	9.2	11.0	13.1	14.5	17.0	19.9
World	11.8	24.3	53.2	102.4	173.4	361.0	World	14.9	22.6	29.0	42.7	59.2	80.2
<b>GDP per capita ('000 \$)</b>						<b>CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per capita (metric tons)</b>							
China	122	392	2,718	10,324	22,477	47,913	China	0.9	2.2	5.0	8.6	12.6	17.4
OECD	12,290	21,388	35,914	50,589	67,228	113,408	OECD	11.6	12.0	11.9	12.5	14.5	18.1
World	3,200	4,613	7,712	12,320	18,868	39,632	World	4.0	4.3	4.2	5.1	6.4	8.8
<b>GDP Growth rate (% , average yearly rate)</b>						<b>Population, total (millions)</b>							
China	-	7.7	11.2	7.3	3.8	1.2	China	818	1,135	1,359	1,467	1,418	1,202
OECD	-	3.5	3.6	2.0	1.5	0.9	OECD	793	914	1,108	1,165	1,173	1,096
World	-	3.7	4.0	3.3	2.7	1.5	World	3,685	5,272	6,904	8,315	9,188	9,110
<b>The Energy System</b>						<b>Efficiency Indicators</b>							
<b>Energy use (Mtoe)</b>						<b>Carbon Intensity of Energy (t of CO<sub>2</sub> per Mt of oil equivalent)</b>							
China	-	863	1,955	3,659	5,113	5,620	China	-	2.85	3.48	3.44	3.50	3.71
OECD	3,241	4,333	5,006	5,556	6,039	6,189	OECD	2.83	2.53	2.63	2.61	2.81	3.21
World	-	8,574	10,636	15,034	19,565	23,957	World	-	2.63	2.73	2.84	3.02	3.35
<b>Energy use per capita (toe)</b>						<b>Energy Intensity of GDP (t of oil eq. / '000 \$)</b>							
China	-	0.8	1.4	2.5	3.6	4.7	China	-	1.94	0.53	0.24	0.16	0.10
OECD	4.1	4.7	4.5	4.8	5.1	5.6	OECD	0.33	0.22	0.13	0.09	0.08	0.05
World	-	1.6	1.5	1.8	2.1	2.6	World	-	0.35	0.20	0.15	0.11	0.07
<b>Fossil fuels energy consumption (% of total)</b>						<b>Carbon Intensity of GDP (t of CO<sub>2</sub>-eq / '000 \$)</b>							
China	-	75	85	90	92	91	China	-	5.53	1.84	0.83	0.56	0.36
OECD	95	84	90	88	86	80	OECD	0.94	0.56	0.33	0.25	0.22	0.16
World	95	81	86	87	88	86	World	-	0.93	0.54	0.42	0.34	0.22

*Notes:* 1970 and 1990 data aggregated by the World Bank Development Indicators. Fossil fuel comprises coal, oil, petroleum, and natural gas products (source: International Energy Agency). Energy use refers to use of primary energy before transformation to other end-use fuels (source: International Energy Agency). Carbon dioxide emissions are those stemming from the burning of fossil fuels and the manufacture of cement (source: CDIAC). GDP at purchaser's prices data are in constant 2000 U.S.\$\$. Dollar figures for GDP are converted from domestic currencies using 2000 official exchange rates (Source: World Bank national accounts data, and OECD National Accounts data files). Population data is from a variety of sources, midyear estimates. 2010-2100 data are from the WITCH model Business-as-Usual scenario.

**Table 1. Historic data and future scenario on the economy, energy system and emissions.**

WITCH (World Induced Technical Change Hybrid model) is an Integrated Assessment Model (IAM) with endogenous technical change in the energy sector at its core. The economy evolves along the lines of a Ramsey-Cass-Koopmans optimal growth framework. Thanks to a synthetic description of end-use and energy sector technologies it is possible to reduce the degree of complexity and to focus on key technological transformations: fuel switching, energy efficiency, cost reductions in existing technologies and R&D investments to foster innovation.

A second peculiarity of WITCH is a characterization of the non-cooperative interaction of world regions – on global climate, technology and natural resources – by means of an open-loop Nash game, as in the Rice model (Nordhaus and Yang, 1996; Nordhaus and Boyer, 2000). International R&D spillovers and global learning connect the technological frontier of all regions in this non-cooperative framework (Bosetti et al., 2008).

In WITCH emissions arise from fossil fuels used in the energy sector and from land use changes and forestry that release carbon sequestered in biomasses and soils (LULUCF). Emissions of CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, SLF (short-lived fluorinated gases), LLF (long-lived fluorinated) and SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols, which have a cooling effect on temperature, are also identified. The model relies on estimates for reference emissions, and a top-down approach for mitigation supply curves for non-CO<sub>2</sub> gases and for LULUC F emissions. The patten of aerosols is exogenous.

The latest version of the model that we use includes the separation of wind and solar power, endogenous investments in oil upstream and endogenous trade of oil, bioenergy with carbon capture and sequestration (BECCS) together with other minor improvements and a revised BaU scenario.<sup>2</sup>

The Chinese economy has expanded at remarkably high rates during the past thirty years. From 1970 to 1990 China's GDP has grown at an average rate of 7.7% per year. From 1990 to 2010 the expansion of the economy has been even faster, with an average growth rate of 10.5% according to the latest estimates of 2010 GDP by the World Bank.<sup>3</sup> From 2010 to 2030 the average yearly growth rate is still high in the BaU scenario, while it progressively


---

<sup>2</sup> Solar power is described as a backstop technology whose cost follows a two-factor learning curve. The cost of wind electricity is defined by four components: depletion and learning, spinning reserve, backup capacity and discarded electricity. As the best sites get exhausted the cost of wind power increases. However, learning-by-doing endogenously reduce the investment cost. The cost of the biomass feedstock is determined by WITCH on the basis of regional supply cost curves obtained by the land use GLOBIOM model (Havlík et al. 2011). GLOBIOM accounts for residual emissions associated with the full life cycle of growing, harvesting and transporting the biomass. Investments in oil upstream are endogenous (Massetti and Sferra 2010). Further documentation available from the authors on request.

<sup>3</sup> Our BaU scenario shows a slightly higher growth rate because it does not include the effects of the global economic crisis.

declines to reach present level growth rates of OECD economies between 2030 and 2050. In the second half of the century, in our BaU scenario, China grows still faster than other OECD economies but slower than the world average. Economic growth has fuelled an unprecedented improvement in the standard of life during the past forty years. Average GDP per capita increased about twenty-fold from 1960 to 2010. Despite this remarkable growth the average OECD citizen was still about ten times richer than the average Chinese in 2010. The BaU scenario displays a progressive convergence of income per capita but the gap remains wide for still many decades: in 2050 GDP per capita is about three times higher in OECD economies than in China, in 2100 about two times higher.


The persistence of the income gap between the richest economies and China has – and will have – important repercussions in all international negotiations to share the global cost of containing global warming. However, China will surpass the world average per capita GDP between 2030 and 2050, in our scenarios. Thus, China will emerge as a peculiar actor in future climate negotiations. From one side, there are factors that will push towards a limited involvement: China will not be as affluent as the major world economies for most of the century and Chinese emissions per capita will still be 50% lower than in OECD economies. On the other side, there are factors that will push towards a higher commitment: China is and will likely remain the major emitter of GHG during the whole century – capable of nullifying the efforts of other economies to control global warming – with a growing responsibility towards all poorer economies that will bear heavy negative climate change impacts (Blanford, Richels and Rutherford, 2008; Carraro and Massetti, 2011; Massetti, 2011; Zhang, 2011).



Source: see notes to Table 1. Base year 1971.

**Figure 1. Long-term time series of GDP, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and energy use.**





Source: see notes to Table 1. Base year 1971.

**Figure 2. The indices of energy intensity of GDP and of carbon intensity of energy.**

The rise of energy consumption during the past thirty years has been much less impressive than the rise of the economy in China (see Table 1 and Figure 1), making it possible to produce in 2005 the same level of aggregate output than in 1975 with only one-fourth of energy inputs (see Figure 2).

Levine, Zhou and Price (2009) distinguish among three different eras in China’s energy story. The first is the “Soviet Model” and goes from 1949 to 1980. In these early years of the communist regime China followed the Russian model with low energy prices, predominance of heavy industries and no concern for environmental effects. This leads to very high inefficiencies both on the demand and supply side. The “Classic” period goes from 1980 through 2002. In 1980 Deng Xiaoping stated the goal to quadruple GDP while only doubling energy consumption between 1980 and 2000. New institutions were created to promote energy conservation, among them the most important was the Bureau of Energy-Saving and Comprehensive Energy Utilization in the State Planning Commission. Energy conservation centres were spread throughout the country, employing more than 7,000 people at their peak. All these efforts – together with a long-term shift of the economy towards less energy intensive industries – explain the success of Chinese energy demand management, well beyond Deng Xiaoping’s expectations. Finally, from 2002 through 2005 China lived a phase of “Out-of-control Growth” in energy demand (see Figure 1 and Figure 2). Levine, Zhou and Price (2009) believe that the sharp increase in energy use and the reversal of the long-term energy intensity trend is explained by more lenient policies to manage energy demand and by a fast expansion of energy intensive industries, stimulated by exports (China enters the WTO

in 1995) and by domestic demand (cement and steel to build infrastructures). Emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> skyrocketed from 2002 to 2005, surpassing U.S. emissions in 2006 (Levine and Aden 2008), between nine and fourteen years earlier than what estimated in 2004.

The share of fossil fuels in total energy consumption has increased during the past thirty years. Fossil fuels covered 64% of energy demand in 1975, 75% in 1990 and about 80% in 2010 (Table 1). Coal – the fossil fuel with the highest content of carbon per unit of energy – has played a major role in satisfying the growing appetite for energy in China. Between 2003 and 2005 the power sector has seen the fastest expansion ever recorded in world history: 66GW of new capacity were installed each year, with a dominant role of coal-fired power plants (Zhou, Levine and Price, 2010). About 200GW of new capacity translate into more than one large coal power plant of 1GW per week. Since the expected lifetime of coal-fired power plants is about forty years, three years of “Out-of-Control Growth” of energy will have repercussions on global CO<sub>2</sub> emission for many decades.

Energy use increases 260% between 2010 and 2050 in our BaU scenario. After 2050 energy demands reaches a plateau. For a comparison, energy demand from OECD economies increases by only 12% from 2020 to 2050 and remains flat for the next fifty years. At global level an extra 9,000 Mtoe of energy will be needed in 2050 with respect to 2010, 35% of this incremental demand will go to China. The rest of developing countries will instead generate the largest fraction of energy demand after 2050. The growth of energy demand is mitigated by strong efficiency gains: in 1990 China used 1.9 tonnes of oil equivalent (toe) per 1,000 US\$ of output, in 2050 0.16 toe. China reduces its energy intensity of output twice as fast as the OECD economies between 2010 and 2050 (Table 1). The average annual optimal contraction of energy intensity in our BaU scenario is equal to 3.0% from 2010 to 2050, a slower improvement than what witnessed during the past 20/30 years but a net reversal compared to the “Out-of-Control” years in which energy intensity increased an average 3.8% per year.

There are reasons to expect that a fourth era in the Chinese story of energy efficiency is about to begin. Levine, Zhou and Price (2009) call this a “modern re-enactment of the early days.” A key role will be played by governmental regulation. In November 2005 the Politburo mandated a 20% reduction by 2010 in energy intensity, compared to 2005 (an average 4.3% per year). It is early to assess if the Chinese government achieved this target, but preliminary data show that energy intensity declined by 19.1% between 2006 and 2010 (Zhou et al., 2011).

Chinese officials perceive all the threats that an out-of-control expansion of energy

demand will pose to future economic growth and have put energy efficiency again at the top of their agenda. “Ten Key Projects” were incorporated in the 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan. The most important actions include: the renovation of coal-fired industrial boilers; district-level combined heat and power projects; oil conservation and substitution; and energy efficiency and conservation in buildings (Levine, Zhou and Price, 2009; Zhou, Levine and Price, 2010). A decisive contribution to higher energy efficiency will come from market forces: energy prices are currently reflecting their actual cost in China (IEA 2007); electricity prices were increased from 0.43 RMB/kWh in May 2004 to 0.51 RMB/kWh in July 2006 (Moskovitz et al., 2007).<sup>4</sup>

An intense debate on the future pattern of energy efficiency in China has spurred after China pledged in the Copenhagen Accord to reduce the GHG emissions content of GDP by 40-45% in 2020 compared to 2005. Although not binding, this target reflects the present commitment of Chinese authorities to reduce GHG emissions.<sup>5</sup> We cannot address this issue with a sufficient precision because our scenarios reflect long-term growth and energy sector dynamics rather than short term fluctuations of the economic cycle. However, our scenarios indicate that the Copenhagen pledge could be achieved in a BaU scenario. This does not mean that the target will not present challenges. It rather indicates that it is in the self-interest of China to increase energy efficiency, without accounting for the global environmental benefits.

With respect to other scenarios in the literature, our BaU has an optimistic view of the energy efficiency potential in China in the next decades (Zhou et al. 2011, ERI 2009, IEA 2010). On the other hand, we have a pessimistic outlook in terms of carbon content of energy and see a prolonged use of coal in the power sector. Although renewables and nuclear are by far the energy sources with the fastest growth rate in our BaU scenario, they remain marginal for many decades (see Table A2-A5). In our BaU scenario the share of fossil fuels in energy use increases from 85 to 92% in 2050, in line with the historic trend (Figure 1 and Figure 2); the carbon content of energy remains roughly the same during the whole century. Total emissions are therefore driven by population, economic growth and energy use.

A moderate growth of population, a fast expansion of economic activity and a marginal increase of carbon intensity of energy translate into a 260% expansion of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fuels use from 2010 to 2050, and an additional 17% increase from 2050 to 2100. In 2050


---

<sup>4</sup> IEA (2007) and Moskovitz et al. (2007) cited in Zhou, Levine and Price (2010).

<sup>5</sup> China also committed to increase the share of non-fossil fuels in primary energy consumption to around 15% by 2020 and to increase forest coverage by 40 million hectares and forest stock volume by 1.3 billion cubic meters by 2020 from the 2005 levels.

China emits as much CO<sub>2</sub> from fuel combustion as the whole OECD. However, emissions per capita remain lower than in OECD economies. They are instead much higher than in the rest of the world. Contrary to the 2050 outlook of Zhou et al. (2011), we do not see emissions peaking, not in 2030, not in any other period. We have a trajectory that is closer to Blanford, Richels and Rutherford (2008), ERI (2009) and IEA(2010).

One explanation behind the continuous growth of emissions in our BaU scenario is certainly the absence of any policy that constraints the use of fossil fuels, for local or global concerns. One other possibility is that we underestimate the long-term penetration potential of nuclear and natural gas, especially if low-cost shale gas becomes available. While we leave for future research the analysis of alternative BaU scenario, in the next Section we study how the Chinese reacts to five different carbon tax scenarios in our model. Scenarios in which energy use is constrained for domestic reasons are also left for future research.



Notes: All GHG emissions included. Source: WITCH model.

**Figure 3. The tax scenarios.**

### 3. Climate policy scenarios

In this Section we explore scenarios in which explicit policy measures are taken to reduce the level of GHGs emissions in China. We focus on five emission tax scenarios which span a wide range of emission reduction targets.<sup>6</sup> For the first three scenarios (t1, t2, t3) the tax rate starts at 7, 21 and 36 US\$ per ton of CO<sub>2</sub>-eq in 2015. In all three scenarios the tax then increases at 5% per year. The other two scenarios (t500, t450) are designed to stabilize radiative forcing at 3.8 and 2.7 w/m<sup>2</sup>, roughly 550 and 450 ppme.<sup>7</sup> Carbon pricing starts in 2025 (t550) and 2020 (t450). The t450 scenario keeps temperature increase above the pre-industrial level below 2°C during the whole century. We assume that the same tax applies to all world regions. Therefore we include spillovers on natural resources use and on technological progress triggered by climate policy. Figure 3 displays the time path of the carbon taxes.

Figure 4 displays the pattern of emissions in the BaU and in the policy scenarios in China and in the OECD. The t450 scenario is the most demanding in terms of emissions reductions, followed closely by the t3 and the t2 scenarios. The t550 scenario is less demanding than the t3 and t2 scenarios in the first and last decades of the century. The t1 scenario can be considered a 550ppme with “overshoot” scenario: emissions eventually reach the t550 level, but are much higher during the transition.<sup>8</sup> While emissions start declining immediately in OECD economies, in China only the very aggressive t3 and t450 taxes peak before 2025. The other remarkable difference with respect to OECD economies is that emissions never become negative. This happens because OECD economies have relatively more abundant biomass and lower residual emissions than in China. Therefore bioenergy with carbon capture and sequestration (BECCS) – which generates electricity while absorbing emissions from the atmosphere – generates net negative emissions.

Figure 5 displays the percentage deviation of emissions in each tax scenario with respect to the BaU. The Chinese economy initially is relatively more elastic than the OECD, because lower energy efficiency and higher carbon intensity offer relatively cheaper abatement options. In 2050, the response of the two economies is instead very similar. This


---

<sup>6</sup> For simplicity, we often refer to the tax on all GHG emissions as “carbon tax”.


<sup>7</sup> The emissions tax is obtained by solving the model imposing a global pattern of emissions that is consistent with the 2100 radiative forcing target and allowing countries to trade emissions allowances internationally to equate marginal abatement costs. We then run the model imposing the carbon price as a tax, thus avoiding complex distribution issues.

<sup>8</sup> WITCH is a perfect foresight model. The level of future taxation influences present decisions. Therefore it is optimal to smooth the transition to a regime of emissions taxes in WITCH. This explains why emissions decline with respect to the BaU before 2020 in Figure 4 and Figure 5.



intuition is confirmed by the analysis of the relationship between carbon taxes and emission reductions.



**Figure 4. The time pattern of GHG emissions in China and in OECD economies, in the BaU and in the tax scenarios.**



**Figure 5. Change of GHG emissions trajectories with respect to the BaU in China and in OECD economies.**



*Notes:* Panel A: abatement expressed in percentage of all GHG emissions with respect to the BaU. Panel B: abatement expressed in percentage of all GHG emissions with respect to 2010. All data points from the five tax scenarios are pooled together.

**Figure 6. The impact of the carbon tax on GHG emissions**

If we pool all our climate policy scenarios we have about 100 different combinations of carbon taxes and GHG emission levels. We use this rich set of model-generated observations to estimate a more general relationship between carbon taxes and the optimal abatement level in both China and OECD economies (Figure 6A). The elasticity of emission reductions with respect to the BaU is not constant for both China and the OECD. For a low level of taxation, China is more elastic than the OECD: at 25\$ the elasticity is 0.60 for China and 0.55 for the OECD. They have the same elasticity at 51\$ and then China becomes less elastic: at 500\$ the elasticity is 0.19 for China and 0.33 for the OECD.<sup>9</sup> From another perspective, Figure 6A reveals that China has a flatter marginal abatement cost curve for low levels of the tax than the OECD and a steeper curve for high tax levels.

If we consider abatement with respect to the BaU, Figure 6A reveals that China and the OECD behave quite similarly when subject to a carbon tax. Instead, if we consider the rate at which emissions are reduced with respect to the year 2010, we find a totally different pattern, as shown in Figure 6B. When the tax is roughly lower than 125\$ emissions still increase with respect to the base year in China, while they decline for any level of taxation in the OECD. The major reason is that China's economy grows faster than the OECD economies for many decades in our scenarios, providing continuous pressure on energy demand and emissions.

A useful exercise is to assess the level of the tax that is coherent with the long-term mitigation targets set during the Major Economies Forum (MEF) meeting at the 2009 G8 Summit in Italy. MEF leaders announced that they intend cutting global emissions by 50% in 2050 with respect to 2005. High income economies will take the lead and cut their emissions by 80%. This implies that developing countries must reduce their emissions by about 30/35% with respect to 2005, according to our BaU scenario. Figure 6B gives a measure of how expensive this target can be for developing countries in general and China in particular: the tax should be between 250\$ and 500\$ to achieve the desired emission reductions. Furthermore, it is realistic to assume that China would be required to reduce emissions more than the least developed countries. A 50% contraction with respect to 2005 seems a reasonable guess for China. In that case, the tax should rise up to about 750\$, in the same


---

<sup>9</sup> Denoting with  $y$  the reduction of emissions with respect the BaU and with  $x$  the tax level, we estimate the following functional form using OLS:  $\ln(y_t) = \alpha_t + \beta_t \ln(x_t) + \gamma_t [\ln(x_t)]^2 + \varepsilon_t$ . The number of observations is 84. The coefficients are all significant at the 1% level:  $\alpha_{china} = -4.05$ ;  $\beta_{china} = 1.03$ ;  $\gamma_{china} = -0.07$ ;  $\alpha_{oecd} = -3.81$ ;  $\beta_{oecd} = 0.79$ ;  $\gamma_{oecd} = -0.04$ . The adjusted  $R^2$  is equal to 0.968 for China and 0.963 for the OECD.



range as the tax level necessary to reduce emissions by 80% with respect to 2005 in the OECD. Therefore, the MEF target seems ambitious. It asks for very high level of taxes, and the distribution of effort among world countries does not stand a preliminary fairness test.

A caveat applies to our analysis: by pooling all observations we implicitly assume that the elasticity of emissions to carbon taxes is time independent. This is obviously not true. Technical progress, economic growth, price changes in non-renewable sources of energy, and many other important drivers change over time and affect marginal abatement costs. A tax of 1,000\$ would definitely trigger a very different reaction if applied in 2010 rather than in the second half of the century. However, if we assume that the optimal pattern of taxes increases gradually over time and rule out extreme possibilities, we find that the loss of precision is small (see Table A1 in the appendix).<sup>10</sup> We believe that the insights that we obtain using an observations-based analysis rather than a scenario-based analysis are greater than the loss of precision in which we incur by treating marginal abatement costs as time independent.



*Notes:* Each data point marks the combination of carbon intensity and energy efficiency with respect to 2010, in percentage. We consider only CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fossil fuels. Each marker corresponds to a year, from 2010 to 2100. The black solid line marks the year 2050.


**Figure 7. The time pattern of the carbon intensity of energy and the energy efficiency of the economy in China and in OECD countries.**

The transformations induced by climate policy can be grouped into two major categories: those increasing energy efficiency and those decreasing the carbon content of energy. Figure 7 gives a synthetic description of optimal movements along the dimension of

<sup>10</sup> For example a tax of 100\$ in 2035, 2045 and 2070 would induce a -54%, -53%, -54% change of emissions with respect to the BaU in China; a -40%, -43%, -44% change in the OECD. A tax of 50\$ in 2030, 2035, 2050, would induce a -29%, -32%, -32% change of emissions in China; a -27%, -29%, -30% in the OECD.


energy efficiency and of de-carbonization of energy. In both China and the OECD energy efficiency increases substantially in the BaU. While carbon intensity of energy remains rather stable in China, in our BaU scenario it is optimal to increase the carbon intensity in OECD economies: without any concern for global warming world countries continue to rely for many decades on abundant and relatively cheap fossil fuels.

The introduction of emission taxes reinforces the trend of energy efficiency improvements and tilts down-ward all curves, indicating a substantial de-carbonization of energy in all scenarios. Energy efficiency improves much faster in China than in the OECD. The de-carbonization of the economy proceeds instead at a very similar pace, as highlighted by the solid dark line that marks 2050. However, China reaches a lower bound to the carbon intensity of the economy in 2100.



Notes: The horizontal axis has logarithmic scale.

**Figure 8. Carbon taxes and technological dynamics: fossil fuels and low/zero-carbon substitutes.**



Notes: The horizontal axis has logarithmic scale.

**Figure 9. Carbon taxes and technological dynamics: carbon-free technologies**

What are the transformations needed in the power sector to substantially reduce the carbon content of energy in China? High carbon taxes reduce drastically the attractiveness of cheap fossil fuels in power generation. For example, the tax on each kWh generated with traditional coal power plants in China, would range between 0.3 to 6.0 cents in 2030, 2.8 to 40 cents in 2050 and between 27 cents and 1.55 \$ in 2100. During the same time the cost of the power plant would decline from about 2 cents per kWh to about 1 cent. Therefore the carbon tax component would dwarf any other investment, maintenance and operation cost. To a less extend, the same applies to natural gas without CCS.


We pool again all observations that we obtain from our five carbon tax scenarios and

we derive a relationship between the level of the carbon tax and the share of total electricity generation covered by a given technology. Tables A2 and A3 in the appendix provide data on electricity generation by scenario, year and technology.

Figure 8 focuses on fossil fuel-based technologies. Coal without CCS rapidly declines, faster in China than in the OECD: the elasticity is equal to -0.89 in China and -0.80 in the OECD. However with a tax roughly equal to 250\$ China still covers between 5 and 15% of electricity with coal, while in the OECD the share is not higher than 3%. Coal with CCS expands rapidly but also rapidly reaches a peak: around 270\$ t/CO<sub>2</sub>e in China and 130\$ t/CO<sub>2</sub>e in the OECD. At the peak, coal with CCS covers about 25% of total electricity production in China, only about 10% in the OECD. Coal with CCS is a bridge technology, much more important in China than in the OECD. Gas power generation plays a minor role in China but when a tax on emissions is introduced it offers a first alternative to carbon intensive coal. The share of gas increases from 2 to 5% when the tax reaches about 100\$ t/CO<sub>2</sub>e, then it rapidly declines. In OECD countries the share of gas is initially much larger than in China, but it quickly converges to the same level of China when the tax reaches 100\$ t/CO<sub>2</sub>e. For higher levels of the tax gas is gradually phased-out in both China and the OECD. Gas with CCS starts to emerge as a viable option at about 100 100\$ t/CO<sub>2</sub>e, however it covers at most 6% of total electricity supply in the OECD and only 4% in China. It peaks at about 275\$ in the OECD and 700\$ in China.

Figure 9 focusses on zero or negative emissions technologies. Nuclear power is an ideal candidate to substitute coal power plants in China and increases steadily up to 60% of total electricity generation. In the OECD nuclear already covers about 30% of total primary in 2010 and would slightly increase up to 40% in the BaU scenario. The carbon tax increases its penetration with respect to the BaU, but only marginally. The Figure portrays a striking contrast of the future for nuclear in China and the OECD. It is important to note that limits to the deployment of nuclear for security concern would alter greatly this picture. Wind power becomes an important component of electricity supply when the tax increases above 100\$ t/CO<sub>2</sub>e in China; in the OECD wind is adopted already at relatively low carbon prices. While the investment cost declines as global cumulative installed capacity increases, the exhaustion of the best sites and grid management penalty costs constraint the expansion of wind in both China and the OECD. We find that wind has an extra 5% penetration potential in China with respect to OECD economies. Finally, BECCS has the advantage of being a net sink for emissions. OECD economies have much larger supply of biomass than China in our scenarios and can use it in combination with coal in IGCC power plant to supply up to 15% of


electricity generation with the highest tax levels. BECCS becomes a valid alternative when the tax reaches 100\$ t/CO<sub>2</sub>e in China, it reaches the maximum generation potential and remains stable thereafter. In the OECD BECCS become part of the generation portfolio with taxes just above 50\$ t/CO<sub>2</sub>e. The limits to the expansion of BECCS greatly influence the cost to comply with the highest tax levels. Further analysis is necessary to introduce international trade of biomass and alternative assumptions on biomass potential. Photovoltaic is considered part of a general carbon-free backstop technology in the newest version of WITCH. The initial cost is too high compared to other alternatives, but investments in R&D can make it competitive. We do not find any incentive to invest in a new carbon free power generation technologies because we let nuclear and CCS to expand without any constraint. Opposition to nuclear and opposition to or technical problems in CCS would push investments in the backstop power generation technology (see for example Bosetti et al. 2009a).



*Notes:* Costs are expressed as the ratio between the discounted sum of GDP losses with respect to the BaU scenario and cumulative discounted GDP in the BaU scenario. Interest rate: 3%, 5% and the endogenous, region specific interest rate of the model. The interest rate for OECD economies is an average of five regions' interest rates, with weights equal to their GDP. In the BaU, the interest rate is equal to 12% in China and to 3.6 in the OECD, in 2010; in 2100 the interest rate is equal to 1.5% in China and 1.6% in the OECD. The interest rate

used varies among tax scenarios.

**Figure 10. The cost of reducing GHGs emissions.**



*Notes:* Fitted curves are dashed. We estimate a quadratic relationship except for the OECD when the interest rate is equal to 5%. For China the coefficients have all p-values lower than 0.05. The adjusted  $R^2$  are as follows: 0.987 (5%), 0.981 (3%), 0.982 (end.). For the OECD, the coefficient of the temperature squared has a p-value equal to 0.147 in the 5% case, thus we adopt a linear relationship; the adjusted  $R^2$  is equal to 0.873; in the 3% case the p-value of temperature squared is equal to 0.07, the adjusted  $R^2$  is equal to 0.935; when we use the

endogenous interest rate the p-values are below 0.05, the adjusted  $R^2$  is equal to 0.948.

### **Figure 11. Marginal temperature control cost curves.**

Macroeconomic discounted costs of emissions reductions are displayed in Figure 10. Costs are measured as the ratio between discounted GDP losses and BaU discounted GDP. We use three different discount rates: 3% constant, 5% constant and the endogenous rate of return on capital investments, which is equal to the marginal product of capital. Rates of returns are not equalized because we do not assume capital mobility. This is of course a rough representation of world capital markets, but it has the advantage of generating higher rates of return in developing countries than in developed economies without the complexities of imperfect capital mobility models. Rates of return decline endogenously as capital accumulation proceeds. The pure time preference rate is instead the same in all countries, equal to 3 at the beginning of the century and declining over time.

Costs are much higher in China than in OECD economies if the 3% or the 5% interest rates are used. With the endogenous interest rate (our preferred choice) the cost of climate policy is always higher in China, but the gap with the OECD diminishes. China abates relatively more than the OECD for a level of the tax below 500\$ (see Figure 6). This is typically a price range that we find in early years, when the interest rate in China is high, which contributes to the sharp reduction of costs if measured using the endogenous interest rate. The OECD contributes instead relatively more when the tax is very high. Since this typically happens in late years, with a 5% constant interest rate the cost of climate policy appears very low in the OECD. If we use instead the endogenous interest rate the cost doubles.

Figure 10 has important implications for future negotiations on climate change as countries will not accept excessively high policy costs. Bosetti and Frankel (2011) have examined an international climate architecture which is based on the postulate that countries will not cooperate to reduce emissions if – among other conditions – costs will exceed 1% of GDP in discounted terms. In we use endogenous interest rates this limits politically feasible action to the t1 scenario, which delivers a temperature increase far above the 2°C. If the bar is raised to 1.5%, the 550ppme stabilization target becomes feasible and the cost would be roughly the same in the OECD and in China.

It must be recalled however, that we are not counting the benefits from reduced warming. If climate impacts will be felt more at the end of the century, lower/higher interest rates would discount more/less the future benefits of climate policy, balancing (at least in

part) the effect of interest rates of discounted costs. A careful evaluation of the incentives to participate to a global deal on climate change requires a cost-benefit analysis in a coalition theory framework, which is beyond the scope of this work.

Finally, it is instructive to relate the temperature level in 2100 to the cost of achieving that level. Figure 11 reproduces marginal temperature control cost curves obtained pooling all scenarios for China and the OECD, using different interest rates. When we use endogenous interest rates, we find a quadratic relationship between the temperature level and the cost. When we use constant 3% or 5% interest rates the curve becomes steeper in China and flatter in the OECD. With high discount rates the curve becomes linear in the OECD. The choice of the appropriate interest rate is therefore crucial and has very different implications in countries at different levels of economic development.

## 4. Conclusions

This paper uses historic data and scenarios on future economic development, energy use and emissions developed using the WITCH model to convey four key messages.

First, without specific climate policy measures China's emissions are likely to grow substantially in the next decades. Even if energy efficiency improvements return to the fast pace that was recorded in the eighties and in the nineties, continued economic growth and a rather stable carbon content of energy would not stabilize GHG emissions.

Second, despite fast economic growth, in our BaU scenario China will have a relatively low level of GDP per capita for still many years. The gap between China and the OECD economies, in terms of GDP per capita, will narrow but will remain substantial. China will therefore be in the peculiar position of being the greatest emitter of GHG but at the same time not rich enough to afford costly abatement measures.

Third, by pooling all the tax-emission reductions combinations from the five tax scenarios we find that the elasticity of emissions is higher in China than in the OECD until the tax reaches 500 \$/tCO<sub>2</sub>-eq. This implies that China will abate emissions more than the OECD when the tax is low. For high levels of the tax emissions become very inelastic in China.

Fourth, attaining the 2009 Major Economies Forum goal of reducing global emissions by 50% can be very expensive for China and other developing countries. Our best guess indicates that China would need to introduce a tax equal to about 750 \$/tCO<sub>2</sub>-eq in 2050 to



achieve that goal. This is in line to what required to OECD economies, which are more flexible and can reduce emissions by 80% below present levels, as promised by the MEF. This target is only aspirational and far from being part of an international treaty. However, it offers a useful benchmark to evaluate possible future climate policy scenarios.

Fifth, in our preferred estimates, the discounted cost of following the 2°C trajectory is equal to 5.4% and to 2.7% of GDP in China and the OECD, respectively. All other policy targets are more expensive for China than for the OECD. This calls for a more equitable distribution of the mitigation burden among world countries. If this is believed to be inefficient, very high compensations are necessary to steer China towards a 2°C compatible trajectory.

Finally, a mild commitment to introduce some sort of emissions pricing in China is much needed in a post-2020 climate architecture. Even a modest contribution would be extremely important due to the scale of emissions from China. The lowest tax scenario that we study (10 US\$ per ton of CO<sub>2</sub>-eq in 2020, 43 US\$ in 2050, 495\$ in 2100) could be a useful starting point in the next round of negotiations. It can be politically feasible and at the same time bring large emission reductions in China.

For the crucial role that China has and will have in determining global future climate it is of utmost importance that the gap between the stated goals and what appears politically feasible is filled in the next ten-twenty years.

## References

- Blanford, G.J., R.G. Richels and T.F. Rutherford (2008), 'Revised Emissions Growth Projections in China: Why Post-Kyoto Climate Policy Must Look East', The Harvard Project on International Climate Agreements, Discussion Paper 08-06, September 2008.
- Bosetti, V., and J. Frankel (2011), 'Politically Feasible Emissions Targets to Attain 460 ppm CO<sub>2</sub> Concentrations', *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy*, December 2011.
- Bosetti, V., C. Carraro, E. Massetti, A. Sgobbi and M. Tavoni (2009a), 'Optimal Energy Investment and R&D Strategies to Stabilise Greenhouse Gas Atmospheric Concentrations', *Resource and Energy Economics*, 31(2): 123-137.
- Bosetti, V., C. Carraro, E. Massetti, and M. Tavoni (2008), 'International Technology Spillovers and the Economics of Greenhouse Gas Atmospheric Stabilization', *Energy Economics* 30(6): 2912-2929.
- Bosetti, V., C. Carraro, M. Galeotti, E. Massetti, and M. Tavoni (2006), 'WITCH: A World Induced Technical Change Hybrid Model', *The Energy Journal*, Special Issue. Hybrid Modelling of Energy-Environment Policies: Reconciling Bottom-up and Top-down, December 2006: 13-38.
- Bosetti, V., E. De Cian, A. Sgobbi, and M. Tavoni (2009b), 'The 2008 WITCH Model: New Model Features and Baseline', FEEM Note di Lavoro No. 085.2009, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan.
- Bosetti, V., E. Massetti, and M. Tavoni (2007), 'The WITCH Model, Structure, Baseline, Solutions', FEEM Note di Lavoro No. 010.2007, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan.
- Cai, W., C. Wang, J. Chen, K. Wang, Y. Zhang, and X. Lu (2008), 'Comparison of CO<sub>2</sub> Emission Scenarios and Mitigation Opportunities in China's Five Sectors in 2020.' *Energy Policy*, 36(3): 1181-1194.
- Carraro, C. and E. Massetti (2011), 'Editorial', *International Environmental Agreements, Law, Economics and Politics*, Special Issue. Reconciling Domestic Energy Needs and Global Climate Policy: Challenges and Opportunities for China and India, 11(3): 205-208.
- Carraro, C. and E. Massetti (2012), 'Beyond Copenhagen: A Realistic Climate Policy in a Fragmented World', *Climatic Change*, 110(3): 523-542.

- Clarke, L., J. Edmonds, V. Krey, R. Richels, S. Rose, and M. Tavoni (2009), 'International Climate Policy Architectures: Overview of the EMF 22 International Scenarios', *Energy Economics* 31(2): 64-81.
- Energy Research Institute (2009), '2050 China Energy and CO2 Emissions Report (CECER)', Beijing: Science Press.
- IEA (2007), *World Energy Outlook*, Paris: International Energy Agency.
- IEA (2010), *World Energy Outlook*, Paris: International Energy Agency.
- Jiang, K. and H. Xiulian (2006), 'Energy Demand and Emissions in 2030 in China: Scenarios and Policy Options', *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies*, 7(3): 233-250.
- Kram, T., T. Morita, K. Riahi, R.A. Roehrl, S. Van Rooijen, A. Sankovski, B. De Vries (2000), 'Global and Regional Greenhouse Gas Emissions Scenarios', *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 63(2-3): 335-371.
- (<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0040162599001134>) Levine, M., and N. Aden (2008), 'Global Carbon Emissions in the Coming Decades: The Case of China', *Annual Review of Environmental and Resources*, 33.
- Levine, M.D., N. Zhou, and L. Price (2009), 'The Greening of the Middle Kingdom: The Story of Energy Efficiency in China', Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory Working Paper No. LBNL-2413E.
- Massetti, E. (2011). "Carbon Tax Scenarios for China and India: Exploring Politically Feasible Mitigation Goals." *International Environmental Agreements, Law, Economics and Politics*, Special Issue. Reconciling Domestic Energy Needs and Global Climate Policy: Challenges and Opportunities for China and India, 11(3): 209-227.
- Moskovitz, D. (2008), 'Climate Change Policy Options for China's Power Sector', Regulatory Assistance Project.
- Nordhaus, W.D., and J. Boyer (2000), *Warming the World: Economic Models of Global Warming*, Cambridge Mass. and London: MIT Press.
- Nordhaus, W.D., and Z. Yang (1996), 'A Regional Dynamic General-Equilibrium Model of Alternative Climate-Change Strategies', *The American Economic Review* 86(4): 741-765.
- Tavoni, M. (2010), 'Assessing the Climate Pledges of China and India: How Much do They Bite?' FEEM Policy Brief No. 03.2010, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan.
- van Vuuren, D., Z. Fengqi, B. de Vries, J. Kejun, C. Graveland, and L. Yun (2003), 'Energy and Emission Scenarios for China in the 21st Century—exploration of Baseline Development and Mitigation Options,' *Energy Policy*, 31(4): 369-387.
- World Bank (2009), *The World Development Indicators 2006 (WDI) Database*, Washington

DC: The World Bank.

- Zhang, Z. (2011), 'In what format and under what timeframe would China take on climate commitments? A roadmap to 2050' *International Environmental Agreements, Law, Economics and Politics*, Special Issue. Reconciling Domestic Energy Needs and Global Climate Policy: Challenges and Opportunities for China and India, 11(3): 245-259.
- Zhou, N., M.D. Levine, and L. Price (2010), 'Overview of Current Energy Efficiency Policies in China', *Energy Policy* 38(11): 6439-6452.
- Zhou, N., D. Fridley, M. McNeil, N. Zheng, J. Ke and M. Levine (2011), 'China's Energy and Carbon Emissions Outlook to 2050', Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory Working Paper No. LBNL-4472E.

## Appendix

Tax (\$ / tCO <sub>2</sub> )	Year	Change of emissions wrt BaU	
		China	OECD
49	2030	-0.29	-0.27
51	2035	-0.32	-0.29
55	2055	-0.32	-0.30
102	2045	-0.53	-0.43
104	2035	-0.54	-0.40
115	2070	-0.54	-0.44
119	2045	-0.56	-0.47
698	2050	-0.78	-0.79
715	2085	-0.83	-0.88
731	2075	-0.82	-0.84
344	2070	-0.74	-0.72
351	2095	-0.73	-0.68
352	2060	-0.73	-0.66
1164	2095	-0.87	-0.98
1192	2085	-0.87	-0.95

**Table A1. Comparison of GHG emissions change at different time periods for similar tax levels.**

	YEAR	ELECTRICITY	COAL	COAL CCS	GAS	GAS CCS	OIL	NUCLEAR	WIND	HYDRO	BECCS
<b>BaU</b>											
	2010	3176	2174	0	69	0	104	128	90	611	0
	2025	7066	5354	0	123	0	152	291	202	945	0
	2050	15200	12843	0	161	0	145	618	280	1153	0
	2075	19238	16623	0	122	0	98	885	301	1211	0
	2100	19251	16123	0	96	0	75	1213	517	1227	0
<b>t1</b>											
	2010	3171	2169	0	69	0	103	128	90	611	0
	2025	6104	4259	0	146	0	182	371	202	945	0
	2050	10473	7397	0	260	0	237	1146	280	1153	0
	2075	10310	3130	806	320	0	267	3134	1088	1211	354
	2100	11870	742	1550	60	132	133	5039	2528	1227	459
<b>t2</b>											
	2010	3162	2160	0	70	0	104	127	90	611	0
	2025	5000	2921	0	182	0	229	520	202	945	0
	2050	7873	1972	909	390	0	363	2218	514	1153	354
	2075	10469	468	1388	88	204	233	4399	2052	1211	428
	2100	13138	112	429	9	273	91	7434	3105	1227	459
<b>t3</b>											
	2010	3127	2119	0	71	0	107	129	90	611	0
	2025	4393	2092	0	211	0	267	677	202	945	0
	2050	7602	496	1667	343	0	345	2604	601	1153	392
	2075	10934	119	850	34	272	191	5429	2368	1211	459
	2100	14261	29	99	4	184	46	8749	3464	1227	459
<b>t550</b>											
	2010	3176	2173	0	69	0	104	128	90	611	0
	2025	6735	4984	0	131	0	163	310	202	945	0
	2050	7937	1643	1481	268	0	250	2241	510	1153	392
	2075	10342	390	1766	293	0	250	4154	1861	1211	418
	2100	11791	1805	89	264	0	221	5175	2584	1227	428
<b>t450</b>											
	2010	3172	2161	0	73	0	110	127	90	611	0
	2025	4426	1711	201	266	0	337	671	202	945	95
	2050	7664	406	1305	32	318	115	3157	719	1153	459
	2075	11044	97	712	3	303	77	5749	2433	1211	459
	2100	13918	24	163	0	204	56	8416	3368	1227	459

**Table A2: Electricity generation (TWh) – China.**

YEAR	ELECTRICITY	COAL	COAL CCS	GAS	GAS CCS	OIL	NUCLEAR	WIND	HYDRO	BECCS
BaU										
2010	10897	3648	0	1637	0	357	3493	315	1444	0
2025	13128	4034	0	1694	0	326	4860	601	1611	0
2050	16992	6000	0	1460	0	230	6021	1565	1715	0
2075	19861	7420	0	998	0	143	7351	2204	1744	0
2100	21727	7442	0	725	0	100	8964	2743	1752	0
t1										
2010	10881	3635	0	1635	0	357	3493	315	1444	0
2025	12582	3128	0	1695	0	327	5215	604	1611	0
2050	15199	1869	554	1542	0	239	7297	1766	1715	216
2075	17463	446	1690	577	240	124	8584	2779	1744	1278
2100	19649	110	583	59	473	44	10120	3755	1752	2753
t2										
2010	10710	3311	0	1697	0	369	3570	315	1444	0
2025	12017	1484	291	1705	0	330	5887	607	1611	101
2050	15034	361	1234	794	348	198	7624	1901	1715	860
2075	17597	89	861	105	798	77	8800	3196	1744	1926
2100	19069	25	38	11	838	19	9609	3738	1752	3038
t3										
2010	10600	3098	0	1746	0	379	3616	315	1444	0
2025	11898	1320	324	1552	0	306	6038	609	1611	137
2050	15129	316	1098	351	836	160	7567	1930	1715	1154
2075	17240	79	751	48	917	49	8396	3164	1744	2092
2100	18715	23	0	5	538	8	9598	3751	1752	3038
t550										
2010	10895	3643	0	1643	0	358	3488	315	1444	0
2025	12382	2465	0	1902	0	364	5433	605	1611	0
2050	15201	587	1215	467	530	128	7383	1857	1715	1319
2075	17627	143	1316	47	709	82	8426	3046	1744	2113
2100	19405	38	720	41	624	71	10124	3825	1752	2210
t450										
2010	10662	3107	0	1812	0	394	3588	315	1444	0
2025	12022	1312	348	1540	0	392	6109	611	1611	97
2050	15688	315	1782	160	758	46	6991	1856	1715	2066
2075	17051	78	791	17	692	17	8041	3068	1744	2603
2100	18509	22	0	4	518	11	9680	3748	1752	2772

**Table A3: Electricity generation (TWh) – OECD.**

YEAR	TPES	COAL	COAL CCS	GAS	GAS CCS	OIL	NUCLEAR	WIND	HYDRO	BIOMASS	BECCS	BACKSTOP
BaU												
2010	81.9	48.1	0.0	3.1	0.0	18.7	0.5	0.3	2.2	8.9	0.0	0.0
2025	133.7	76.7	0.0	6.0	0.0	36.5	1.0	0.7	3.4	9.3	0.0	0.0
2050	214.1	129.8	0.0	9.2	0.0	57.5	2.2	1.0	4.1	10.1	0.0	0.0
2075	243.1	156.7	0.0	9.1	0.0	58.6	3.2	1.1	4.4	10.1	0.0	0.0
2100	235.3	152.7	0.0	8.3	0.0	53.9	4.4	1.9	4.4	9.8	0.0	0.0
t1												
2010	81.8	48.1	0.0	3.1	0.0	18.7	0.5	0.3	2.2	8.9	0.0	0.0
2025	122.3	65.9	0.0	5.9	0.0	35.7	1.3	0.7	3.4	9.3	0.0	0.0
2050	167.5	84.8	0.0	9.1	0.0	54.2	4.1	1.0	4.1	10.1	0.0	0.0
2075	149.1	48.7	7.3	8.9	0.0	51.2	11.3	3.9	4.4	9.9	3.6	0.0
2100	132.8	29.6	14.0	5.4	0.9	37.2	18.1	9.1	4.4	9.4	4.7	0.0
t2												
2010	81.7	48.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	18.7	0.5	0.3	2.2	8.9	0.0	0.0
2025	108.3	52.6	0.0	5.9	0.0	34.4	1.9	0.7	3.4	9.3	0.0	0.0
2050	140.4	40.0	8.2	9.9	0.0	50.7	8.0	1.8	4.1	10.0	3.6	3.9
2075	141.0	27.4	12.5	7.8	1.3	29.2	15.8	7.4	4.4	9.7	4.4	21.0
2100	122.8	24.6	3.9	4.3	1.8	1.0	26.8	11.2	4.4	9.3	4.7	30.9
t3												
2010	81.4	47.5	0.0	3.1	0.0	18.8	0.5	0.3	2.2	8.9	0.0	0.0
2025	99.5	44.4	0.0	5.9	0.0	33.4	2.4	0.7	3.4	9.3	0.0	0.0
2050	134.7	27.8	15.0	9.4	0.0	45.4	9.4	2.2	4.1	10.0	4.0	7.3
2075	130.5	24.6	7.7	6.3	1.8	20.8	19.5	8.5	4.4	9.7	4.7	22.4
2100	122.5	23.9	0.9	3.2	1.2	0.5	31.5	12.5	4.4	9.2	4.7	30.4
t550												
2010	81.9	48.1	0.0	3.1	0.0	18.7	0.5	0.3	2.2	8.9	0.0	0.0
2025	130.0	73.1	0.0	6.0	0.0	36.3	1.1	0.7	3.4	9.3	0.0	0.0
2050	130.0	37.3	13.3	7.5	0.0	43.9	8.1	1.8	4.1	10.0	4.0	0.0
2075	140.2	26.8	15.9	8.6	0.0	35.4	15.0	6.7	4.4	9.8	4.3	13.4
2100	141.2	38.1	0.8	8.3	0.0	20.7	18.6	9.3	4.4	9.4	4.4	27.0
t450												
2010	82.4	48.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	19.3	0.5	0.3	2.2	8.9	0.0	0.0
2025	103.0	40.6	1.8	6.7	0.0	37.0	2.4	0.7	3.4	9.3	1.0	0.0
2050	113.1	27.1	11.7	5.1	2.1	20.2	11.4	2.6	4.1	9.8	4.7	14.3
2075	114.6	24.5	6.4	4.1	2.0	5.6	20.7	8.8	4.4	9.6	4.7	23.8
2100	122.2	23.9	1.5	3.4	1.3	0.6	30.3	12.1	4.4	9.3	4.7	30.8

**Table A4: Total primary energy supply (EJ) – China.**



YEAR	TPES	COAL	COAL CCS	GAS	GAS CCS	OIL	NUCLEAR	WIND	HYDRO	BIOMASS	BECCS	BACKSTOP
<b>BaU</b>												
2010	209.6	50.8	0.0	46.2	0.0	92.2	12.6	1.1	5.2	1.4	0.0	0.0
2025	229.0	51.5	0.0	49.5	0.0	100.8	17.5	2.2	5.8	1.8	0.0	0.0
2050	252.8	63.1	0.0	49.2	0.0	104.6	21.7	5.6	6.2	2.4	0.0	0.0
2075	259.7	73.3	0.0	44.3	0.0	98.5	26.5	7.9	6.3	2.9	0.0	0.0
2100	259.1	73.5	0.0	40.9	0.0	93.1	32.3	9.9	6.3	3.2	0.0	0.0
<b>t1</b>												
2010	209.3	50.7	0.0	46.1	0.0	92.1	12.6	1.1	5.2	1.4	0.0	0.0
2025	217.9	43.0	0.0	48.2	0.0	98.1	18.8	2.2	5.8	1.8	0.0	0.0
2050	221.2	29.3	5.0	46.4	0.0	97.4	26.3	6.4	6.2	2.2	2.2	0.0
2075	216.4	17.5	15.2	35.6	1.6	84.0	30.9	10.0	6.3	2.1	13.1	0.0
2100	198.1	14.8	5.2	24.8	3.1	63.9	36.4	13.5	6.3	1.6	28.3	0.0
<b>t2</b>												
2010	207.2	47.4	0.0	46.7	0.0	92.5	12.9	1.1	5.2	1.4	0.0	0.0
2025	202.7	27.7	2.6	46.4	0.0	94.1	21.2	2.2	5.8	1.7	1.0	0.0
2050	227.2	16.9	11.1	47.3	0.0	87.6	27.4	6.8	6.2	1.9	8.8	13.1
2075	217.7	14.7	7.8	40.2	0.0	42.6	31.7	11.5	6.3	1.6	19.8	41.6
2100	184.2	14.2	0.3	26.7	0.0	0.6	34.6	13.5	6.3	1.0	31.3	55.7
<b>t3</b>												
2010	206.1	45.3	0.0	47.1	0.0	92.9	13.0	1.1	5.2	1.4	0.0	0.0
2025	196.1	26.2	2.9	43.8	0.0	90.4	21.7	2.2	5.8	1.6	1.4	0.0
2050	226.1	16.6	9.9	47.5	0.0	79.3	27.2	6.9	6.2	1.6	11.9	18.9
2075	201.2	14.6	6.8	35.8	0.0	29.7	30.2	11.4	6.3	1.3	21.5	43.7
2100	173.6	14.1	0.0	19.1	0.0	0.1	34.6	13.5	6.3	0.8	31.3	53.9
<b>t550</b>												
2010	209.7	50.8	0.0	46.3	0.0	92.3	12.6	1.1	5.2	1.4	0.0	0.0
2025	217.2	36.9	0.0	50.5	0.0	100.4	19.6	2.2	5.8	1.8	0.0	0.0
2050	198.6	18.8	10.9	32.3	3.5	78.5	26.6	6.7	6.2	1.6	13.6	0.0
2075	209.6	15.1	11.8	30.2	4.6	65.6	30.3	11.0	6.3	1.8	21.7	11.1
2100	213.5	14.3	6.5	30.5	4.1	54.1	36.4	13.8	6.3	1.9	22.7	22.9
<b>t450</b>												
2010	209.0	45.4	0.0	48.3	0.0	94.6	12.9	1.1	5.2	1.4	0.0	0.0
2025	219.9	26.1	3.1	51.5	0.0	100.7	22.0	2.2	5.8	1.7	1.0	5.7
2050	191.3	16.5	16.0	27.1	5.0	32.3	25.2	6.7	6.2	1.1	21.3	33.9
2075	171.1	14.6	7.1	19.9	4.5	4.8	28.9	11.0	6.3	0.9	26.8	46.2
2100	172.5	14.1	0.0	16.7	3.4	0.1	34.8	13.5	6.3	0.8	28.5	54.2

**Table A5: Total primary energy supply (EJ) – OECD.**

## NOTE DI LAVORO DELLA FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI

### Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Working Paper Series

Our Note di Lavoro are available on the Internet at the following addresses:

<http://www.feem.it/getpage.aspx?id=73&sez=Publications&padre=20&tab=1>  
[http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/JELJOUR\\_Results.cfm?form\\_name=journalbrowse&journal\\_id=266659](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/JELJOUR_Results.cfm?form_name=journalbrowse&journal_id=266659)  
<http://ideas.repec.org/s/fem/femwpa.html>  
<http://www.econis.eu/LNG=EN/FAM?PPN=505954494>  
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/handle/35978>  
<http://www.bepress.com/feem/>

### NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2011

SD	1.2011	Anna Alberini, Will Gans and Daniel Velez-Lopez: <a href="#">Residential Consumption of Gas and Electricity in the U.S.: The Role of Prices and Income</a>
SD	2.2011	Alexander Golub, Daiju Narita and Matthias G.W. Schmidt: <a href="#">Uncertainty in Integrated Assessment Models of Climate Change: Alternative Analytical Approaches</a>
SD	3.2010	Reyer Gerlagh and Nicole A. Mathys: <a href="#">Energy Abundance, Trade and Industry Location</a>
SD	4.2010	Melania Michetti and Renato Nunes Rosa: <a href="#">Afforestation and Timber Management Compliance Strategies in Climate Policy. A Computable General Equilibrium Analysis</a>
SD	5.2011	Hassan Benchekroun and Amrita Ray Chaudhuri: <a href="#">“The Voracity Effect” and Climate Change: The Impact of Clean Technologies</a>
IM	6.2011	Sergio Mariotti, Marco Mutinelli, Marcella Nicolini and Lucia Piscitello: <a href="#">Productivity Spillovers from Foreign MNEs on Domestic Manufacturing Firms: Is Co-location Always a Plus?</a>
GC	7.2011	Marco Percoco: <a href="#">The Fight Against Geography: Malaria and Economic Development in Italian Regions</a>
GC	8.2011	Bin Dong and Benno Torgler: <a href="#">Democracy, Property Rights, Income Equality, and Corruption</a>
GC	9.2011	Bin Dong and Benno Torgler: <a href="#">Corruption and Social Interaction: Evidence from China</a>
SD	10.2011	Elisa Lanzi, Elena Verdolini and Ivan Haščič: <a href="#">Efficiency Improving Fossil Fuel Technologies for Electricity Generation: Data Selection and Trends</a>
SD	11.2011	Stergios Athanassoglou: <a href="#">Efficient Random Assignment under a Combination of Ordinal and Cardinal Information on Preferences</a>
SD	12.2011	Robin Cross, Andrew J. Plantinga and Robert N. Stavins: <a href="#">The Value of Terroir: Hedonic Estimation of Vineyard Sale Prices</a>
SD	13.2011	Charles F. Mason and Andrew J. Plantinga: <a href="#">Contracting for Impure Public Goods: Carbon Offsets and Additionality</a>
SD	14.2011	Alain Ayong Le Kama, Aude Pommeret and Fabien Prieur: <a href="#">Optimal Emission Policy under the Risk of Irreversible Pollution</a>
SD	15.2011	Philippe Quirion, Julie Rozenberg, Olivier Sassi and Adrien Vogt-Schilb: <a href="#">How CO2 Capture and Storage Can Mitigate Carbon Leakage</a>
SD	16.2011	Carlo Carraro and Emanuele Massetti: <a href="#">Energy and Climate Change in China</a>