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Mexican CO₂ Tax: a good start, but need for improvement

- Tax on **fossil fuel production & imports**, not on emissions
  - Equivalent? In principle yes, but...
    - Only emissions from combustion, process emissions are left out (e.g. manufacturing cement)

- Introduced as **one element of a comprehensive tax reform package**: opposition significant, but public attention fixated on other taxes.
  - Downside: lower salience (Chetty et al.)

- **Applicable to: manufacturers, producers and importers.**
  - Pemex, CFE & manufacturers (approx. 30 entities) – liberalization of energy market will increase the number of liable entities.
Mexican CO$_2$ Tax: a good start, but need for improvement

- Good direction, but **low price** (first set at $5.7/tCO2, approved by Congress at US $3.7/tCO2)

- **Inefficient signal**: initially designed to charge depending on carbon content of fuels, but discussions in Congress led to different shadow prices for different fuels.
  - Implicitly capped at 3% of the fuel price (not explicitly in the law)

- Yearly _adjusted by inflation_, not beyond.

- **Not revenue neutral** (but created to avoid raising other taxes), _no simultaneous announcement for climate protection investment._

- Liable companies may choose to pay the tax with credits from CDM projects developed in Mexico.
  - These would be accepted in an amount equivalent to the value of credits at the time of paying the tax.
**CO₂ Tax:**
President’s proposal

**Proposed tax MX$ 70.68 /tCO₂**
(US$ 5.7 dollars)

**Carbon content in each fuel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>Natural gas</th>
<th>LPG</th>
<th>Gasoline</th>
<th>Jet fuel</th>
<th>Diesel</th>
<th>Fuel oil</th>
<th>Petroleum coke</th>
<th>Coal (anthracite)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CO₂</strong></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="CO₂" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="CO₂" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="CO₂" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="CO₂" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="CO₂" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="CO₂" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="CO₂" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="CO₂" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tax per unit of fuel (MXN/Unit)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>Natural gas</th>
<th>LPG</th>
<th>Gasoline</th>
<th>Jet fuel</th>
<th>Diesel</th>
<th>Fuel oil</th>
<th>Petroleum coke</th>
<th>Coal (anthracite)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.94</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.42</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.21</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.71</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.17</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.74</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.99</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.83</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cents / m³</strong></td>
<td><strong>cents / l</strong></td>
<td><strong>cents / l</strong></td>
<td><strong>cents / liter</strong></td>
<td><strong>cents / liter</strong></td>
<td><strong>cents / liter</strong></td>
<td><strong>cents / kg</strong></td>
<td><strong>cents / kg</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change in price (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>Natural gas</th>
<th>LPG</th>
<th>Gasoline</th>
<th>Jet fuel</th>
<th>Diesel</th>
<th>Fuel oil</th>
<th>Petroleum coke</th>
<th>Coal (anthracite)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.10%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.70%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.40%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.60%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.60%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.60%</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.10%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.00%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tax per ton of CO₂ (MXN / t CO₂)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>Natural gas</th>
<th>LPG</th>
<th>Gasoline</th>
<th>Jet fuel</th>
<th>Diesel</th>
<th>Fuel oil</th>
<th>Petroleum coke</th>
<th>Coal (anthracite)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>70.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.68</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MXN / tCO₂</strong></td>
<td><strong>MXN / tCO₂</strong></td>
<td><strong>MXN / tCO₂</strong></td>
<td><strong>MXN / tCO₂</strong></td>
<td><strong>MXN / tCO₂</strong></td>
<td><strong>MXN / tCO₂</strong></td>
<td><strong>MXN / tCO₂</strong></td>
<td><strong>MXN / tCO₂</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: SEMARNAT & Centro Mario Molina
The Political Economy of Carbon Taxes, or “living in Stavins’ World”.

“In principle, both carbon taxes and cap-and-trade can achieve cost-effective reductions.”

“But the key difference is that political pressures on a carbon tax system will most likely lead to exemptions of sectors and firms, which reduces environmental effectiveness and drives up costs, as some low-cost emission reduction opportunities are left off the table.”

But political pressures on a cap-and-trade system lead to different allocations of the free allowances, which affect distribution, but not environmental effectiveness, and not cost-effectiveness.”

Stavins, 2012.

**CO₂ Tax:** Approved by Congress

**US $3.7 /tCO₂**, introduced exemptions, capped price-change at 3%

### Carbon content in each fuel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>Natural Gas</th>
<th>LPG</th>
<th>Gasoline</th>
<th>Jet Fuel</th>
<th>Diesel</th>
<th>Fuel Oil</th>
<th>Petroleum Coke</th>
<th>Coal (anthracite)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tax per unit of fuel (MXN/Unit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>Exempted</th>
<th>LPG</th>
<th>Gasoline</th>
<th>Jet Fuel</th>
<th>Diesel</th>
<th>Fuel Oil</th>
<th>Petroleum Coke</th>
<th>Coal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax (MXN/Unit)</td>
<td>6.6 cents / l</td>
<td>10.4 cents / l</td>
<td>0.0* cents / l</td>
<td>12.6 cents / l</td>
<td>13.5 cents / l</td>
<td>1.6 cents / kg</td>
<td>2.4 cents / kg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Change in price (%) implicitly capped at 3%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>Exempted</th>
<th>LPG</th>
<th>Gasoline</th>
<th>Jet Fuel</th>
<th>Diesel</th>
<th>Fuel Oil</th>
<th>Petroleum Coke</th>
<th>Coal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change (%)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tax per ton of CO₂ (MXN/ t CO₂), different prices!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>Exempted</th>
<th>LPG</th>
<th>Gasoline</th>
<th>Jet Fuel</th>
<th>Diesel</th>
<th>Fuel Oil</th>
<th>Petroleum Coke</th>
<th>Coal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax (MXN/tCO₂)</td>
<td>40.7 MXN / tCO₂</td>
<td>45.3 MXN / tCO₂</td>
<td>0.0* MXN / tCO₂</td>
<td>46.4 MXN / tCO₂</td>
<td>45.8 MXN / tCO₂</td>
<td>5.8 MXN / tCO₂</td>
<td>10.9 MXN / tCO₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The carbon tax does not apply to JET FUEL because Mexico is a signatory of the Convention on International Civil Aviation (also known as the Chicago Convention) since 1946, which exempts commercial aviation fuel from taxation.

Sources: SEMARNAT & Centro Mario Molina
Where does inefficiency stem from?
Optimal case: single, uniform carbon price.

A single uniform carbon price sends an economy wide signal---technology and sector blind.
Abatement cost (MXN/t CO$_2$)

Inefficiency of the Mexican tax.
Case 1: high rate for sector with low abatement costs... less harmful case.

Different rates per sector distorts artificially prioritize more expensive abatement options.
Inefficiency of the Mexican tax.
Case 2: high rate for sector with high abatement costs... most harmful case.

More costly activities are implemented instead of less costly activities and less abatement effort! Overall the cost is higher!

This is the worst case scenario.
## What is the carbon tax doing? Income generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>Tax rate</th>
<th>Revenue 2014+2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPG</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet fuel</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel oil</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cokes</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Average exchange rate=14.58

Source: SHCP (2015)
What is the carbon tax doing? Emissions reductions

Current emissions are compared to counterfactual (what would have happened without carbon tax):

Price elasticities: Gasoline: (-0.8 +/- 0.2)
Coal, Diesel, LPG: (-0.4 +/- 0.2)

Income elasticities
Gasoline: (-1.0 +/- 0.1)

Approximately 1.8 million tCO2 per year
Lessons: carbon tax in Mexico

• Introducing carbon pricing as one element of a comprehensive tax reform package can increase its public acceptance (public attention typically focused on other taxes)

  • Downside: salience is low! Consumers & producers underreact to taxes that are not salient (Chetty et al. 2009) With low salience, low behavioral change, low emissions reduction.

• Advantage of fuel-based CO$_2$ tax: administratively simple
  • Downside: monitoring activities and CO$_2$ tax not strictly linked

• Good direction, but inefficient signal: Different shadow prices for different fuels
  • Stavins: this would not occur under an ETS

• Dynamic efficiency of the tax: long term price signal?
The policy challenge: for the first time we have unconditional targets Vs aspirational targets (LGCC & Copenhagen pledges)

- Achieving the targets with command & control would be more expensive
- Low + inefficient carbon tax would not be enough!

**Unconditional target: 22% vs. BAU by 2030**

Source: SEMARNAT (2015)
Addressing the challenge: policy options for Mexico

One single overarching instrument? Vs

Fix carbon tax!

Consider...

Higher certainty on costs
Lower certainty on environmental effect
Administratively simple

Policy Mix

1. Carbon tax + ETS
2. Carbon tax + innovation & tech adoption + ETS + energy efficiency + CELs market

Consider...

Check for policy interaction
Stringent policies will drive the change, the others act as backstop
One overarching instrument: fix carbon tax

1. Eliminate exemptions and equalize the tax rate for all fuels
2. Increase tax level and introduce price trajectory (long term price signal)
3. Draft rules for accepting credits
4. Facilitate behavioral change (i.e. elasticities are not fixed)
5. Reduce other sectorial fossil fuel subsidies (e.g. fisheries)
Future agenda: policy mix?

Abatement cost (MXN/t CO₂)

Abatement effort (Mt CO₂)

Action blocked by non-economic barriers

Carbon price-action economy wide!

Technology support policies to reduce long-term costs

Source: based on Hood (2011)
Option 1: ETS + carbon tax

Do we even need an ETS if we already have a carbon tax?

Sectors not covered by carbon tax could be covered by Mexican ETS: industry, residential, waste, & power?

- Not covered
- Partially covered
- Tax so low - considered as not covered
- Partially covered
- Covered

Source: ICAP (2015)
Option 1: ETS + carbon tax

Possible, but check for policy interaction!

• For some sectors carbon tax will act as a backstop, but in other sectors it will act as the leading policy (e.g. transport)

• Need to adjust cap considering previous policies (e.g. carbon tax)

• Revisit assumptions and adjust cap periodically.
Option 2: ETS + energy efficiency + RES support

Cross-check for policy interactions

BAU emissions

Energy efficiency

RES support: Clean energy certificates mkt

Carbon price (ETS)

Mexican emissions target: 22% below BAU by 2030

a) Supplementary policies underachieve

b) Supplementary policies overachieve

b) Drastic change in economic circumstances (lower BAU)

ETS?

Source: based on Hood (2011)
Final remarks

• Lessons from the Mexican experience in carbon pricing:
  • Tax as one element of fiscal package - can increase public acceptance
  • **Fuel-based tax is administratively simple**
  • Challenges
    • Tax rate: good start, need to **increase rate and remove inefficiencies**!
    • **CDM- mechanism**, how to develop linkages with other markets

• Policy challenge: mandatory, non-conditional GHG reduction targets
  • **Good arguments for policy mix**! BUT Crosscheck for policy interaction!

• ETS + carbon tax is possible- sectors not covered by tax can be covered by ETS
  • Current discussion: intensity vs. absolute cap
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### Option 1: international experience  CO2 tax + ETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denmark</strong></td>
<td>Tax covers consumption of fossil fuel. Sectors covered by the EUT-ETS have <strong>refund provisions</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ireland</strong></td>
<td>Carbon tax limited to sectors outside of the EU ETS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>France</strong></td>
<td>Tax on energy products based on the content of CO2 on fossil fuel consumption that is <strong>not covered by EU ETS</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norway</strong></td>
<td>Emissions <strong>not covered</strong> by the tax, included in ETS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sweden</strong></td>
<td>Installations in EU ETS <strong>exempted from carbon tax</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future agenda: policy options (climate policy mix)

Policy mix instead?

Arguments for:

- **Institutional barriers** are not addressed through prices (Myopic behavior)
- **Other externalities**
- **Carbon tax is too low**... changing it would face the same political barriers!
- Some sectors are facing zero rate of $CO_2$ tax.

Arguments against:

- May introduce harmful interactions that would raise costs & dampen environmental effect.
- Need to build institutional capacity before.

Source: based on Goerlach (2015)
• Liable companies may choose to pay the tax with credits from CDM projects developed in Mexico.

• These would be accepted in an amount equivalent to the value.

• Example: Mexican certified reduction, accepted instead or carbon tax liability by Mexican government, Mexican government values the certificate at NZ value, and accredits instead of tax, emissions reductions correspond to NZ (not to Mexico).
Setting the foundations for an ETS in Mexico:

- **Climate Change Act (2012)**
  - Basic framework for a voluntary ETS, lack of a clear implementation plan!

- **Electric Industry Act (2014)**
  - RPS, clean energy certificates market

- **National Emissions Registry (2014)**
  - Installations > 25,000 tCO2e
  - Based on emissions factors
  - Penalties/third party verification
  - First step towards ETS/important for setting the cap

- **Energy transition Act (2015)**
  - Legal debate over whether it gave legal faculty to SEMARNAT to introduce ETS
  - Defined clean energy

- **Several unofficial announcements**
  - ETS by 2018?

Current regulation sets the framework for a voluntary ETS, however a mandatory scheme is under discussion.
### CO₂ Tax: President’s proposal

**Proposed tax of MX$ 70.68 pesos per ton of CO₂ (US$ 5.7 dollars)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>Tax (MXN)</th>
<th>Implicit price per ton of CO₂ (MXN)</th>
<th>% change in price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>70.68</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet fuel &amp; other kerosene</td>
<td>18.71</td>
<td>70.68</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td>19.17</td>
<td>70.68</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP Gas</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>70.68</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Oil</td>
<td>20.74</td>
<td>70.68</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td>70.68</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum Coke</td>
<td>18.99</td>
<td>70.68</td>
<td>16.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Coke</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>70.68</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propane</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>70.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butane</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>70.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>17.83</td>
<td>70.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Centro Mario Molina, 2013.
Approved version by Congress introduces changes that will generate inefficiencies in price signals

### Approved carbon tax, 2013 Tax Reform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>Tax (MXN)</th>
<th>Implicit price per ton of CO₂ (MXN)</th>
<th>% Change in price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>cents per m³</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propane</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>cents per liter</td>
<td>39.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butane</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>cents per liter</td>
<td>42.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>cents per liter</td>
<td>45.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet fuel and other kerosene</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
<td>cents per liter</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP Gas</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>cents per liter</td>
<td>40.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel</td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>cents per liter</td>
<td>46.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Oil</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>cents per liter</td>
<td>45.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum Coke</td>
<td>1.56*</td>
<td>cents per kg</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Coke</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>cents per kg</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Coal</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>cents per kg</td>
<td>10.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact in the right direction, but inefficiencies due to different implicit prices.

* The carbon tax does not apply to air fuel because Mexico is a signatory of the Convention on International Civil Aviation (also known as the Chicago Convention) since 1946, which exempts commercial aviation fuel from taxation.