Tyndall°Centre
for Climate Change Research

The Clean Development Mechanism and Sustainable Development: A Panel Data Analysis.

Yongfu Huang and Terry Barker

February 2009

Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research Working Paper 130

The Clean Development Mechanism and Sustainable Development: A Panel Data Analysis

Yongfu Huang and Terry Barker

Tyndall Working Paper 130, February 2009

The Clean Development Mechanism and Sustainable Development: A Panel Data Analysis*

Yongfu Huang[a†] **Terry Barker**[a]
[a]4CMR, Department of Land Economy, University of Cambridge
19 Silver Street, Cambridge CB3 9EP

February 17, 2009

Abstract

The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) of the Kyoto Protocol is designed to allow the industrialised countries to earn credits by investing in greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction projects in developing countries, which contribute to sustainable development in the host countries. This research empirically investigates the long-run impacts of CDM projects on CO_2 emissions for 34 CDM host countries over 1990-2007. By allowing for considerable heterogeneity across countries, this research provides strong evidence in support of a significant effect of CDM projects on CO_2 emission reductions in the host countries. It offers ample recommendation for improving CDM development and serves to encourage the developing countries to strengthen their national capacity to effectively access the CDM for their sustainable development objectives.

Keywords: Clean Development Mechanism; CO_2 Emissions; Heterogeneous Dynamic Panels

JEL Classification: O19; Q54; Q56

*We thank Cathy Goss, Lynn Dicks, Esteve Corbera and seminar participants at the 2008 international sustainable development conference at Strasbourg (France) for valuable information and helpful suggestions. The usual disclaimer

†Corresponding author: Email: yh279@cam.ac.uk; Tel: 0044-1223 764873; Fax: 0044-1223 337130; URL: http://www.landecon.cam.ac.uk/yh279/huangyf.htm.

1 Introduction

Over the past 20 years, how to tackle climate change and achieve sustainable development has become one of the most important challenges facing the international community. As part of the Kyoto response towards mitigation of global warming, the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) was designed to create opportunities for synergies between cost-effective climate change mitigation and sustainable development. However, the question on whether the CDM is doing what it promises to do has given rise to much controversy. The research reported below empirically examines whether CDM projects contribute to sustainable development in developing countries, based on dynamic heterogeneous panels for 34 CDM host countries over 1990-2007.

As a global effort to respond to climate change and protect the environment, the Kyoto Procotol was introduced in 1997, coming into force on 16 February 2005. The Protocol calls for legally-binding limits on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by the developed countries (or the Annex I countries) of 5.2% below their 1990 levels over the first commitment period (i.e. 2008-2012). The CDM is an innovative cooperative mechanism under the Kyoto Protocol. As part of the emerging global carbon market, the CDM aims to achieve the dual aims of assisting developing countries in achieving sustainable development and assisting developed countries in achieving compliance with their GHGs emission reduction commitments.[1] The number of projects proposed as candidate CDM projects has been steadily rising. By the end

[1] At the global level, the CDM projects do not explicitly lead to a net decline in carbon emissions; instead, the emission reductions the CDM projects promise to bring about are essentially a "zero-sum" game in the sense that these reductions merely take place in a different place, not in the Annex I countries but in the non-Annex I countries. Therefore, whether or not the CDM contributes to the mitigation of global warming relies on the extent to which it results in reduced emissions in developing countries.

of November 2008, there were 4252 CDM projects in the pipeline.[2]

The CDM is the only Kyoto mechanism that involves developing countries in the climate change negotiations. The CDM is expected to stimulate foreign direct investment and speed up the transfer and deployment of low and zero carbon technologies from developed countries to developing countries. It is also anticipated to arouse business interest and engagement from the private sector into the issue of climate change mitigation via environmentally friendly investment, and ultimately help direct the host countries onto a lower carbon trajectory.

However, there has been much controversy as to the impacts of the CDM on sustainable development in developing countries. Examples are Banuri and Gupta (2000), Kolshus *et al.* (2001), Brown *et al.* (2004), Kim (2004), Cosbey *et al.* (2005), Sutter and Parreño (2007) and Boyd *et al.* (2007) to mention a few.[3] The existing research in this field is made up of one group of research supporting positive impacts, another group of research indicating negative impacts, and some having mixed views. Some forward-looking research (for example Banuri and Gupta, 2000) suggests that CDM projects could cause the widespread adoption of less GHGs-intensive technologies in non-Annex I countries, which would have positive implications for emission reductions in the non-Annex I countries. However, recent studies, at either the aggregated levels or the project level, suggest that, left to market forces, the CDM does not significantly contribute to sustainable development because the trade-off between the two benefits of the CDM falls in favor of cost-effective reduction benefits, and neglects the sustainable development benefits, which are not monetised in the carbon market (Sutter and Parreño,

[2] Data from the UNEP Risoe Centre (2008).

[3] See Olsen (2007) for a recent review of literature on the sustainable development contributions of the CDM.

2007; Kolshus *et al.* 2001). Since it is crucial to examine whether the CDM is fulfilling its sustainable development objective, this research carries out a panel data analysis into this issue.

One difficulty facing this research is that the actual definitions of sustainable development vary across countries. As decided by the Kyoto Protocol that it is the prerogative of host country to determine whether a CDM project contributes to its sustainable development objective, different CDM host countries define different sustainable development criteria according to their development priorities. Olsen (2007) shows that the sustainable development contributions of CDM projects can be evaluated at least in economic, social and environmental dimensions, and "there is no single, authoritative and universally accepted approach or methodology applicable to any CDM project regardless of project type or location".[4] Given that the primary objective of the CDM is to combat global warming, this research focuses on the environmental dimension of sustainable development in terms of CO_2 emission reductions.

More specifically, we empirically evaluate whether CDM projects lead to a decline in CO_2 emissions, at aggregated level, for 34 CDM host countries over 1990-2007. Within an Environmental Kuznets Curve framework, this research investigates the long-run and short-run dynamics of CDM project development, while controlling for country specific effects. This research employs the pooled mean group procedure to identify a common long-run effect for CDM projects, while allowing for short-run dynamics to differ across countries. This research provides strong evidence in support of a decline in CO_2 emissions associated with CDM projects. The finding of this

[4] Some approaches have been proposed for sustainability assessment of CDM projects, but they are qualitative in nature (Olsen and Fenhann, 2008; Cosbey *et al.*, 2005; Anagnostopoulos *et al.*, 2004).

research adds to the growing debate on this topic, and serves to encourage the developing countries to strenghen their national capacity to effectively access the CDM.

The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 describes the data and shows some preliminary evidence. Section 3 presents the econometric methods. The empirical results are reported in Section 4. Section 5 concludes.

2 Data and preliminary evidence

This section outlines the measures and data for CO_2 emissions, CDM, and GDP.

The dependent variable is the logarithm of CO_2 emissions per capita, denoted by $\mathbf{CO_2}$. This analysis mainly makes use of the CO_2 emissions from fuel combustion (by sectoral approach), in total as well as the emissions from energy sector, manufacturing industries and households, tertiary and agriculture sectors, respectively. Data on CO_2 emissions and population from 1990 up to 2007 are from the Global Energy Market Data (2008) of Enerdata. To check for robustness, it also considers the CO_2 emissions per capita from fuel combustion (by reference approach), which are taken from Enerdata as well.

The independent variable is an indicator (dummy) variable for the Clean Development Mechanism, simply denoted by **CDM**. It takes the value of one in the year when a country has a CDM project in the pipeline and in all years afterwards, and zero otherwise. The CDM projects in the pipeline include not only those called "confirmed projects" that have been at the registration stage, either registered or requested registration, but also those called "probable projects" that are at the validation stage, waiting to be registered and implemented over the next 3 years. Data on CDM projects in the pipeline are from the UNEP Risoe Centre (2008).

To reflect the so-called Environmental Kuznets Curve, which suggests an inverse U-shaped pattern between carbon emissions and economic development, this analysis includes GDP per capita in log and its squared term in the regression, denoted by **GDP** and $\mathbf{GDP}^2$, respectively. Data on GDP in US dollars at constant price and exchange rate (2005) per capita over 1990-2007 are taken from the Global Energy Market Data (2008) of Enerdata.

The whole sample includes 34 CDM host countries as listed in the Appendix Table 1. We exclude the CDM host countries which have their first CDM projects in the pipeline after year 2006.

Since renewable energy, biomass/biogas, energy efficiency are among the most popular project types to date, we present in Figure 1 some simple evidence on the CO_2 emissions from energy sector for 16 CDM host countries.[5] The upper chart of Figure 1 displays the cross-country median CO_2 emissions per capita 4 years before and after having their first CDM projects in the pipeline. The lower chart of Figure 1 plots the coefficients on the fixed effect estimates of 8 time dummies before and after the year when they started to have their first CDM projects in the pipeline to reflect the dynamic effect of the CDM development. The regression is estimated by OLS in which the unobserved country specific effects, time effects and control variables such as GDP per capita in log and GDP per capita in log squared are included. The two figures show that CO_2 emissions in the sample countries in general move upwards sharply prior to having CDM projects in the pipeline. After having CDM projects in the pipeline, CO_2 emissions have been shown to

[5] To facilitate a before-and-after event study, 16 CDM host countries are selected which had their first CDM projects in the pipeline before 2005.

Figure 1: CO2 emissions in energy sector before and after having CDM projects



Note: 16 CDM host countries having their first CDM projects in the pipeline by the end of 2004. Variables and data sources are described in the text. Upper figure shows the cross−country median CO2 emissions per capita in energy sector for these countries while the lower figure plots the coefficients of fixed effect estimates of 8 time dummies around the year when their first CDM projects were in the pipeline. The regression is estimated by OLS in which the country effects, time effects, GDP per capita in log and GDP per capita in log squared are included.

move up slowerly in the upper chart and immediately experience a drop in the lower chart. The charts vividly portray the main features of CO_2 emissions before and after CDM projects are made available. The effect of CDM projects on CO_2 emission reductions, at least in the short run, has been observed. However, this, alone, is not very convincing evidence. A more detailed econometric analysis of the relationship between **CDM** and CO_2 emissions will be conducted in what follows, based on panel data of 34 CDM host countries over 1990-2007.

3 Econometric methods

This analysis studies the impacts of CDM projects on CO_2 emissions in 34 host countries over the period from 1990 to 2007. Since we are dealing with a very dynamic process in which the geographic distribution of CDM projects has been observed as uneven, and the CO_2 emissions differ across countries, we need a unique method by which these features can be better captured. This section sets out a methodology that accounts for heterogeneous dynamic panels.

We assume the interactions between CDM projects and CO_2 emissions are represented by the unrestricted autoregressive distributed lag ARDL(p, q, q, q) systems:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{CO_2}_{it} &= \sum_{j=1}^{p}\alpha_{ij}\mathbf{CO_2}_{i,t-j} + \sum_{j=0}^{q}\beta_{ij}\mathbf{CDM}_{i,t-j} + \\
&\quad \sum_{j=0}^{q}\gamma_{ij}\mathbf{GDP}_{i,t-j} + \sum_{j=0}^{q}\delta_{ij}\mathbf{GDP}^2_{i,t-j} + \theta_i t + \mu_i + v_{it} \\
i &= 1, 2, ..., 34 \text{ and } t = 1, ..., 18 \qquad (1)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{CO_2}_{it}$ is the dependent variable and $\mathbf{CDM}_{it}$, $\mathbf{GDP}_{it}$ and $\mathbf{GDP}^2_{it}$

are the explanatory variables, as described in section 2. t is a time trend. μ_i are the unobservable country specific effects. v_{it} are errors assumed to be serially uncorrelated and independently distributed across countries. We allow for richer dynamics in the representations to control for business cycle influences.

Following Perman and Stern (2003), Müller-Fürstenberger and Wagner (2007) and Wagner and Müller-Fürstenberger (2008), we assume that the series of $\mathbf{CO_2}_{it}$, $\mathbf{CDM}_{it}$, $\mathbf{GDP}_{it}$ and $\mathbf{GDP}^2_{it}$ are integrated, and cointegrated for any individual countries, therefore v_{it} is a stationary process for all i. As shown by Engle and Granger (1987), there must be a vector error correction representation governing the co-movements of these series over time. The corresponding error correction equation to Equation (1) is as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\triangle\mathbf{CO_2}_{it} &= \alpha'_{ij}\left(\mathbf{CO_2}_{i,t-1} + \frac{\beta'_{ij}}{\alpha'_{ij}}\mathbf{CDM}_{it} + \frac{\gamma'_{ij}}{\alpha'_{ij}}\mathbf{GDP}_{it} + \frac{\delta'_{ij}}{\alpha'_{ij}}\mathbf{GDP}^2_{it}\right) \\
&\quad -\sum_{j=1}^{p-1}\left[(\sum_{m=2}^{1}\alpha_{im}) \triangle \mathbf{CO_2}_{i,t-1}\right] \\
&\quad -\sum_{j=0}^{q-1}\left[(\sum_{m=j+1}^{1}\beta_{im}) \triangle \mathbf{CDM}_{i,t-1}\right] \\
&\quad -\sum_{j=0}^{q-1}\left[(\sum_{m=j+1}^{1}\gamma_{im}) \triangle \mathbf{GDP}_{i,t-1}\right] \\
&\quad -\sum_{j=0}^{q-1}\left[(\sum_{m=j+1}^{1}\delta_{im}) \triangle \mathbf{GDP}^2_{i,t-1}\right] \\
&\quad +\mu_i + v_{it} \\
i &= 1, 2, ..., 34 \text{ and } t = 1, ..., 18 \qquad (2)
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\alpha_{ij}^{'} &= -\left(1-\sum_{j=1}^{p}\alpha_{ij}\right) \\
\beta_{ij}^{'} &= \sum_{j=0}^{q}\beta_{ij} \\
\gamma_{ij}^{'} &= \sum_{j=0}^{q}\gamma_{ij} \\
\delta_{ij}^{'} &= \sum_{j=0}^{q}\delta_{ij}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\alpha_{ij}^{'}$ is the coefficient for the speed of adjustment. $\frac{\beta_{ij}^{'}}{\alpha_{ij}^{'}}$, $\frac{\gamma_{ij}^{'}}{\alpha_{ij}^{'}}$, and $\frac{\delta_{ij}^{'}}{\alpha_{ij}^{'}}$ are the long-run coefficients for $\mathbf{CDM}_{it}$, $\mathbf{GDP}_{it}$ and $\mathbf{GDP}_{it}^{2}$, respectively, while $\sum\limits_{m=j+1}^{q}\beta_{im}$, $\sum\limits_{m=j+1}^{q}\gamma_{im}$, and $\sum\limits_{m=j+1}^{q}\delta_{im}$ are the short-run coefficients for $\mathbf{CDM}_{it}$, $\mathbf{GDP}_{it}$ and $\mathbf{GDP}_{it}^{2}$, respectively.

To analyze a set of panel data with large time and large cross-sectional dimensions, a number of methods have been proposed in the literature, for example the within groups (WG) estimator, mean group (MG) estimator due to Pesaran and Smith (1995) and pooled mean group (PMG) estimator due to Pesaran *et al.* (1999).

The WG estimator is consistent for the dynamic homogeneous model when time series dimemsion $\mathbf{T}$ is large, as cross-sectional dimention $\mathbf{N}\to\infty$ (Nickell, 1981). However, the WG estimator is based on rather restrictive assumptions in terms of the homogeneity of all slope coefficients and error variances, which are often not consistent with the reality for this context. Here the divergent patterns of CO_2 emissions, the development of CDM projects, and the level of income are observed across countries.

The MG approach instead allows all slope coefficients and error variances to differ across countries, having considerable heterogeneity. The

MG approach applies an OLS method to estimate a separate regression for each country to obtain individual slope coefficients, and then averages the country-specific coefficients to derive a long-run parameter for the panel[6]. For large T and N, the MG estimator is consistent. With sufficiently high lag order, the MG estimates of long-run parameters are super-consistent even if the regressors are nonstationary (Pesaran *et al.*, 1999). However, for small samples or short time series dimensions, the MG estimator is likely to be inefficient (Hsiao *et al.*, 1999). For small T, the MG estimates of the coefficients for the speeds of adjustment are subject to a lagged dependent variable bias (Pesaran and Zhao, 1999).

Unlike the MG approach, which imposes no restriction on slope coefficients, the PMG approach imposes cross-sectional homogeneity restrictions only on the long-run coefficients, but allows short-run coefficients, the speeds of adjustment and the error variances to vary across countries. The restriction of long-run homogeneity can be tested via a likelihood ratio test.[7] Under the null hypothesis of long-run homogeneity, the PMG estimators are consistent and more efficient than the MG estimators. Since the PMG estimator as well as the WG estimator are restricted versions of the set of individual group equations, the likelihood ratio test tends to reject the null at the conventional significance levels. Moreover, Pesaran *et al.* (1999) show that the PMG estimators are consistent and asymptotically normal irrespective of whether the underlying regressors are I(1) or I(0).

The PMG approach requires that the long-run coefficients for $\mathbf{CDM}_{it}$,

[6] More specifically, the MG estimator and its standard errors are calculated as $\widehat{\theta}_{MG} = \bar{\theta} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \widehat{\theta}_i}{N}$ and $se(\widehat{\theta}_{MG}) = \frac{\sigma(\widehat{\theta}_i)}{\sqrt{N}} = \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{i-1}^{N} \frac{(\widehat{\theta}_i - \bar{\theta})^2}{N-1}}}{\sqrt{N}}$, respectively.

[7] The restriction of long-run homogeneity can also be tested via a Hausman test, which is asymptotically distributed as a $\chi^2(p)$, where p is the number of parameters.

$\mathbf{GDP}_{it}$ and $\mathbf{GDP}_{it}^2$ are common across countries, that is,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\alpha_{ij}^{'} &= -\left(1-\sum_{j=1}^{p}\alpha_j\right)\\
\beta_{ij}^{'} &= \sum_{j=0}^{q}\beta_j\\
\gamma_{ij}^{'} &= \sum_{j=0}^{q}\gamma_j\\
\delta_{ij}^{'} &= \sum_{j=0}^{q}\delta_j
\end{aligned}
$$

4 Empirical evidence

In this section, the WG approach, MG approach and PMG approach are applied and compared to determine whether CDM project development leads to a decline in CO_2 emissions for the host countries.

The number of lags is constrained by the number of observations. As shown by Pesaran *et al.* (1999), the PMG estimator seems quite robust to outliers and the choice of ARDL order, especially when T is large. We adopt an autoregressive distributed lag ARDL(1, 1, 1, 1) system for this analysis with the corresponding error correction equation as follows.[8]

[8] The parameters reported in Tables 1, 2 and 3 for speeds of adjustment, long-run coefficients and short-run coefficients correspond to model parameters $\alpha_{i1}^{'}$, $\frac{\beta_{i1}^{'}}{\alpha_{i1}^{'}}$, $\frac{\gamma_{i1}^{'}}{\alpha_{i1}^{'}}$, $\frac{\delta_{i1}^{'}}{\alpha_{i1}^{'}}$, $-\beta_{i1}$, $-\gamma_{i1}$, $-\delta_{i1}$ of equation (3), respectively.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\triangle \mathbf{CO_2}_{it} &= \alpha_{i1}^{'}\left(\mathbf{CO_2}_{i,t-1} + \frac{\beta_{i1}^{'}}{\alpha_{i1}^{'}}\mathbf{CDM}_{it} + \frac{\gamma_{i1}^{'}}{\alpha_{i1}^{'}}\mathbf{GDP}_{it} + \frac{\delta_{i1}^{'}}{\alpha_{i1}^{'}}\mathbf{GDP}_{it}^{2}\right) \\
&\quad -\beta_{i1} \triangle \mathbf{CDM}_{i,t-1} - \gamma_{i1} \triangle \mathbf{GDP}_{i,t-1} - \delta_{i1} \triangle \mathbf{GDP}_{i,t-1}^{2} + \mu_i + v_{it} \\
i &= 1, 2, ..., 34 \text{ and } t = 1, ..., 18 \qquad (3)
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\alpha_{i1}^{'} &= -\left(1 - \alpha_{i1}\right) \\
\beta_{i1}^{'} &= \beta_{i0} + \beta_{i1} \\
\gamma_{i1}^{'} &= \gamma_{i0} + \gamma_{i1} \\
\delta_{i1}^{'} &= \delta_{i0} + \delta_{i1}
\end{aligned}
$$

Table 1 examines whether CDM projects result in reduced CO_2 emissions in the host countries, with the dependent variable being the CO_2 emissions (by sectoral approach) per capita in log. It reports three alternative pooled estimates of WG, PMG and MG with and without a time trend. We expect the long-run effects of CDM projects, level of GDP and squared GDP on CO_2 emissions to be homogenous across countries, although the short-run adjustments are more likely to differ across countries. This analysis centers on the PMG estimates.

The coefficients corresponding to the speeds of adjustment in Table 1 are significantly different from zero for two specifications, suggesting that Granger causality going from CDM projects to CO_2 emissions exists in the cointegrated system.

Moving from the WG to PMG estimates, we find the PMG estimates suggest much faster adjustment in two specifications than their WG counterparts. Imposing homogeneity on all slope coefficients except for the intercept, the WG estimates in two specifications suggest no evidence for the negative long-run effects of CDM projects on CO_2 emissions. However, the WG estimates show that an Environmental Kuznets Curve can be observed in these countries. When heterogeneity is sought, the PMG estimates, which impose homogeneity only on the long-run coefficients, provide strong evidence in support of a negative effect of CDM projects on CO_2 emissions. This tends to underscore the importance of allowing for heterogeneity across countries in this context. Moreover, the PMG estimates find evidence for an Environmental Kuznets Curve in these countries in the sense that pollution goes up when the level of income increases; however, when the income reaches a certain level, a decline in CO_2 emissions can be expected.

Moving from the MG to PMG in Table 1 changes the results significantly as well. In particular, imposing long-run homogeneity reduces the standard errors and the speeds of adjustment. As it is clear, the MG estimator imposes no restriction on all slope coefficients, and is potentially inefficient for small sample size. The MG approach confirms the finding by the PMG approach on a significant impact of CDM on CO_2 emission reductions; but it finds no evidence in support of a significant long-run effect of income on CO_2 emissions. When the MG and PMG estimates are compared, the likelihood ratio tests strongly reject the null of equality of all of long-run coefficients at conventional levels; therefore it doesn't appear that we are imposing too strong a constraint on data.

Table 2 looks at the impact of CDM development on CO_2 emissions per capita from manufacturing industries, energy sector, and households, tertiary and agriculture sectors, respectively. The PMG estimates suggest CDM projects reduce CO_2 emissions at 1% significance level from either the manufacturing industries or energy sector while 10% level from households, tertiary and agriculture. The significant impact of income on CO_2 emissions is also confirmed by the PMG estimates.

As a robustness test, Table 3 makes use of the CO_2 emissons (by reference approach) per capita over 1990-2007. The MG estimates suggest a positive effect of CDM projects on CO_2 emissions when a time trend is allowed while a negative effect when a time trend is absent. The PMG estimates confirm that the CDM projects are associated with CO_2 emission reductions and the Environmental Kuznets Curve can be observed.

In sum, after allowing for heterogeneity across countries, this analysis on annual data clearly shows a significant effect of CDM projects on CO_2 emission reductions. The findings in general suggest that the development of CDM projects could cause a decline in CO_2 emissions and has the potential to help developing countries achieve their sustainable development objective. On the impacts of income on CO_2 emissions, the WG and PMG estimates support an EKC hypothesis while the MG estimates do not support it. This finding is in line with Halkos (2003) among others who suggest that the EKC hypothesis is hard to be tested due to enormous heterogeneity across countries.

5 Concluding remarks

Under the Kyoto Procotol, the CDM is designed to allow the Annex I countries to invest in GHGs emission reduction projects in non-Annex I countries, while providing the non-Annex I countries with access to the flows of technology and capital that could contribute to their sustainable development objectives. The CDM projects in a country should act as a substantial stimulus to the development of low-carbon technologies, which, in turn, promote reduced CO_2 emissions, and should also be conducive to increased energy efficiency and conservation, increased investment flows and technology transfers, private and public capacity development as well as health, rural development and poverty reduction. Substantial research has been carried out to examine whether CDM projects contribute to sustainable development, suggesting contradictory findings. Due to a lack of data, panel data analysis or time series analysis on this issue at aggregated level has been hitherto lacking.

To investigate the impacts of CDM projects on CO_2 emissions, we conducted a dymanic panel data study allowing for considerable heterogeneity across countries for 34 CDM host countries over 1990-2007. It mainly focuses on the pooled mean group procedure which allows for heterogeneous dynamic adjustments towards a common long-run equilibrium. This research in general provides strong evidence in support of a significant impact of CDM projects on CO_2 emission reductions, indicating a decline in CO_2 emissions can be expected in the CDM host countries in the long run.

FindingS show that the CDM can play an important role in reducing CO_2 emissions and achieving sustainable development in developing countries. It provides ample recommendation for improving CDM development and serves to encourage developing countries to strengthen their national capacity to effectively access the CDM for national sustainable development objectives. Governments of developing countries should improve its institutional quality and formulate favorable policies to stimulate productivity of CDM projects, especially at their early stage of development. Governments can strengthen their capacity through international exchanges of experience or international networking to acquire beneficial information on other countries' CDM programs.

References

[1] Anagnostopoulos, Kostantinos, Alexandros Flamos, Argyris G. Kagiannas and John Psarras, 2004."The impact of clean development mechanism in achieving sustainable development." *International Journal of Environment and Pollution*, 21(1): 1-23.

[2] Banuri, Tariq and Sujata Gupta, 2000. "The Clean Development Mechanism and sustainable development: An economic analysis." In Ghosh P (ed) *In Implementation of the Kyoto Protocol,* Asian Development Bank.

[3] Boyd, Emily, Nathan E. Hultman, Timmons Roberts, Esteve Corbera, Johannes Ebeling, Diana M. Liverman, Kate Brown, Robert Tippman, John Cole, Phil Mann, Marius Kaiser, and Mike Robbins, 2007. "The Clean Development Mechanism: An assessment of current practice and future approaches for policy". Tyndall Centre Working Paper No. 114.

[4] Brown, Katrina, W. Neil Adger, Emily Boyd, Esteve Corbera-Elizalde and Simon Shackley, 2004. "How do CDM projects contribute to sustainable development?" Tyndall Centre Technical Report No. 16.

[5] Cosbey, Aaron, Jo-Ellen Parry,Jodi Browne, Yuvaraj Dinesh Babu, Preety Bhandari, John Drexhage, Deborah Murphy, 2005. "Realizing the development dividend: making the CDM work for developing countries." Phase 1 Report—Pre-publication Version, International Institute for Sustainable Development.

[6] Engle, Robert F and Clive W J Granger, 1987. "Co-integration and error correction: Representation, estimation, and testing." *Econometrica,* 55: 251-76.

[7] Global Energy Market Data (2008), the Enerdata. www.enerdata.fr.

[8] Halkos, George E., 2003. "Environmental Kuznets Curve for Sulfur: Evidence using GMM estimation and random coefficient panel data models." *Environment and Dvelopment Economics*, 8: 581-601.

[9] Hsiao, Cheng, M Hashem Pesaran and A. Kamil Tahmiscioglu, 1999. "Bayes estimation of short-run coefficients in dynamic panel data models". in C. Hsiao, K. Lahiri, L-F Lee and M.H. Pesaran (eds), *Analysis of Panels and Limited Dependent Variables: A Volume in Honour of G S Maddala,* Cambridge University Press, chapter 11, pp.268-296.

[10] Kim, Joy A., 2004. "Sustainable development and the Clean Development Mechanism: A South African case study." *The Journal of Environment & Development,* 13(3): 201-219.

[11] Kolshus, Hans H., Jonas Vevatne, Asbjørn Torvanger and Kristin Aunan, 2001. "Can the Clean Development Mechanism attain both cost-effectiveness and sustainable development objectives?" CICERO Working Paper 2001: 8. Oslo, Norway.

[12] Müller-Fürstenberger, Georg and Martin Wagner, 2007. "Exploring the Environmental Kuznets hypothesis: Theoretical and econometric problems." *Ecological Economics*, 62: 648-660.

[13] Nickel , Stephen J, 1981. "Biases in dynamic models with fixed effects". *Econometrica,* 49: 1418-1426.

[14] Olsen, Karen Holm, 2007. "The Clean Development Mechanism's contribution to sustainable development: A review of the literature." *Climatic Change,* 84 (1): 59-73.

[15] Olsen, Karen Holm and Jørgen Fenhann, 2008. "Sustainable development benefits of clean development mechanism projects: A new methodology for sustainability assessment based on text analysis of the project design documents submitted for validation." *Energy Policy,* 36(8): 2819-2830.

[16] Perman, Roger and David I. Stern, 2003. "Evidence from panel unit root and cointegration tests that the Environmental Kuznets Curve does not exist". *The Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, 47 (3): 325-347.

[17] Pesaran, M Hashem and Zhongyun Zhao, 1999. "Bias reduction in estimating long-run relationships from dynamic heterogeneous panels". in C. Hsiao, K. Lahiri, L-F Lee and M.H. Pesaran (eds), *Analysis of Panels and Limited Dependent Variables: A Volume in Honour of G S Maddala,* Cambridge University Press, chapter 12, pp.297-321.

[18] Pesaran, M Hashem and Ron Smith. 1995. "Estimating long-run relationships from dynamic heterogeneous panels." *Journal of Econometrics,* 68: 79-113.

[19] Pesaran, M Hashem, Yongcheol Shin and Ron Smith. 1999. "Pooled mean group estimation of dynamic heterogeneous panels." *Journal of American Statistical Association* 94: 621-34.

[20] Sutter, Christoph and Juan Carlos Parreño, 2007. "Does the current Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) deliver its sustainable development claim? An analysis of officially registered CDM projects." *Climatic Change,* 84 (1): 74-90.

[21] UNEP Risoe Centre, CDM/JI Pipeline Analysis and Database (2008)

[22] Wagner, Martin and Georg Müller-Fürstenberger, 2008. "The carbon Kuznets Curve: A cloudy picture emitted by bad econometrics?" Forthcoming in *Resource and Energy Economics*.

Table 1. Does CDM contribute to CO_2 emission reductions (sectoral approach)? 1990-2007

Dependent Variable: CO_{2it}	Without Time Trend			With Time Trend		
	Within Groups	Pooled Mean Group	Mean Group	Within Groups	Pooled Mean Group	Mean Group
Speed of adjustment	-0.216	-0.296	-0.517	-0.212	-0.490	-0.816
	[0.000]***	[0.000]***	[0.000]***	[0.000]***	[0.000]***	[0.000]***
Long-run coefficients						
CDM_{it}	-0.038	-0.170	-0.279	-0.031	-0.115	-0.098
	[0.374]	[0.000]***	[0.000]***	[0.451]	[0.000]***	[0.033]**
GDP_{it}	1.038	1.665	0.063	1.084	2.171	0.007
	[0.000]***	[0.000]***	[0.575]	[0.000]***	[0.000]***	[0.901]
GDP^2_{it}	-0.097	-0.203	0.039	-0.094	-0.138	-0.217
	[0.079]*	[0.000]***	[0.695]	[0.096]*	[0.002]***	[0.248]
Short-run coefficients						
$\Delta CDM_{i,t-1}$	0.001	-0.779	0.416	0.023	0.029	-0.010
	[0.947]	[0.017]**	[0.000]***	[0.946]	[0.006]***	[0.305]
$\Delta GDP_{i,t-1}$	0.301	2.177	-1.290	0.310	-2.361	0.061
	[0.133]	[0.247]	[0.175]	[0.108]	[0.024]**	[0.067]*
$\Delta GDP^2_{i,t-1}$	0.027	0.027	-0.002	0.001	2.983	-0.589
	[0.639]	[0.103]	[0.835]	[0.685]	[0.194]	[0.835]
Trend				0.000	-0.004	0.007
				[0.731]	[0.294]	[0.000]***
Observations	578	578	578	578	578	578
Number of Countries	34	34	34	34	34	34
Log Likelihood	713.46	1039.64	1166.60	713.56	1107.81	1278.02

Note: The dependent variable is CO2 emissions (sectoral approach) per capita in log. Variables and data sources are described in the text. This table presents the within group estimates, the Pesaran, Shin and Smith (1999)'s Pooled Mean Group estimates (PMG) and the Pesaran and Smith (1995)'s Mean Group estimates (MG), without and with a time trend, respectively. The PMG approach uses the MG estimates of long-run coefficients as initial values, and the Newton-Raphson algoithm. For the case of within group estimates, the standard errors are corrected for possible heteroscedasticity in the cross-sectional error variances. All equations included a constant country-speific term. Log Likelihood is to examine the null hypothesis of equality of all of the long-run coefficients. P-values are reported in the brackets. *, **, *** significant at 10%, 5%, 1%, respectively.

Table 2. Does CDM contribute to CO_2 emission reductions (by sector)? 1990-2007

Dependent Variable: CO_{2it}	Manufacturing Industries			Energy Sector			Households, Tertiary and Agriculture		
	Within Groups	Pooled Mean Group	Mean Group	Within Groups	Pooled Mean Group	Mean Group	Within Groups	Pooled Mean Group	Mean Group
Speed of adjustment	-0.294	-0.649	-0.870	-0.261	-0.627	-0.835	-0.220	-0.584	-0.885
	[0.000]***	[0.000]***	[0.000]***	[0.000]***	[0.000]***	[0.000]***	[0.000]***	[0.000]***	[0.000]***
Long-run coefficients									
CDM_{it}	-0.001	-0.065	-0.128	0.103	-0.092	0.420	-0.030	-0.033	-0.291
	[0.989]	[0.000]***	[0.000]***	[0.490]	[0.000]***	[0.000]***	[0.718]	[0.069]*	[0.000]***
GDP_{it}	1.223	1.626	0.016	0.762	0.892	-0.005	0.946	0.577	0.036
	[0.007]***	[0.000]***	[0.821]	[0.034]**	[0.000]***	[0.941]	[0.108]	[0.000]***	[0.727]
GDP^2_{it}	-0.346	-0.387	-0.118	0.108	0.206	0.014	-0.311	0.130	0.074
	[0.018]**	[0.000]***	[0.469]	[0.624]	[0.001]***	[0.917]	[0.001]***	[0.009]***	[0.638]
Short-run coefficients									
$\Delta CDM_{i,t-1}$	-0.027	3.703	0.056	0.354	13.678	0.004	0.012	6.913	-0.168
	[0.557]	[0.667]	[0.754]	[0.841]	[0.521]	[0.931]	[0.485]	[0.302]	[0.431]
$\Delta GDP_{i,t-1}$	0.528	-14.937	-0.029	-0.008	-2.936	-0.140	0.433	0.022	-0.113
	[0.096]*	[0.413]	[0.550]	[0.849]	[0.092]*	[0.000]***	[0.440]	[0.612]	[0.462]
$\Delta GDP^2_{i,t-1}$	-0.064	0.008	0.095	-0.039	0.032	-0.005	-0.067	-1.924	0.040
	[0.269]	[0.170]	[0.002]***	[0.435]	[0.313]	[0.931]	[0.015]**	[0.410]	[0.019]**
Trend	0.000	-0.007	0.009	0.000	0.009	0.026	0.000	-0.005	0.001
	[0.973]	[0.334]	[0.110]	[0.972]	[0.246]	[0.000]***	[0.964]	[0.463]	[0.739]
Observations	578	578	578	578	578	578	578	578	578
Number of Countries	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34
Log Likelihood	189.25	670.16	797.62	-26.58	637.77	766.92	367.89	804.59	952.14

Note: The dependent variable is CO2 emissions per capita in log from manufacturing industries, energy sector, and households, tertiary, and agriculture, respectively. Variables and data sources are described in the text. See Table 1 for more notes.

Table 3. Does CDM contribute to CO_2 emission reductions (reference approach)? 1990-2007

Dependent Variable: CO_{2it}	Without Time Trend			With Time Trend		
	Within Groups	Pooled Mean Group	Mean Group	Within Groups	Pooled Mean Group	Mean Group
Speed of adjustment	-0.233	-0.315	-0.564	-0.232	-0.548	-0.874
	[0.000]***	[0.000]***	[0.000]***	[0.000]***	[0.000]***	[0.000]***
Long-run coefficients						
CDM_{it}	-0.035	-0.136	-0.049	-0.034	-0.108	0.179
	[0.394]	[0.000]***	[0.290]	[0.420]	[0.000]***	[0.000]***
GDP_{it}	1.045	1.609	0.114	1.049	2.104	0.665
	[0.000]***	[0.000]***	[0.405]	[0.001]***	[0.000]***	[0.003]***
GDP^2_{it}	-0.083	-0.172	0.069	-0.083	-0.094	-0.234
	[0.102]	[0.000]***	[0.577]	[0.100]	[0.016]**	[0.433]
Short-run coefficients						
$\Delta CDM_{i,t-1}$	-0.005	-0.500	-0.431	0.047	3.876	1.292
	[0.703]	[0.379]	[0.044]**	[0.703]	[0.118]	[0.000]***
$\Delta GDP_{i,t-1}$	0.264	0.017	0.659	0.264	0.032	-0.010
	[0.203]	[0.079]*	[0.040]**	[0.179]	[0.005]***	[0.320]
$\Delta GDP^2_{i,t-1}$	0.048	2.118	-0.017	-0.005	-2.579	-2.036
	[0.426]	[0.196]	[0.119]	[0.426]	[0.009]***	[0.000]***
Trend				0.000	-0.004	0.008
				[0.976]	[0.442]	[0.000]***
Observations	578	578	578	578	578	578
Number of Countries	34	34	34	34	34	34
Log Likelihood	679.58	1011.05	1136.66	679.58	1089.20	1247.93

Note: The dependent variable is CO2 emissions per capita from fuel combustion (by reference approach) in log over 1990-2007. Variables and data sources are described in the text. See Table 1 for more notes.

Appendix Table 1: The List of Countries in the Full Sample

No.	Country Name	Country Code	First CDM Year
1	Argentina	ARG	2004
2	Armenia	ARM	2005
3	Bangladesh	BGD	2005
4	Bolivia	BOL	2004
5	Brazil	BRA	2003
6	Chile	CHL	2003
7	China	CHN	2004
8	Cote d'Ivoire	CIV	2005
9	Colombia	COL	2005
10	Costa Rica	CRI	2004
11	Ecuador	ECU	2004
12	Guatemala	GTM	2003
13	Honduras	HND	2004
14	Indonesia	IDN	2004
15	India	IND	2003
16	Iran	IRN	2005
17	Israel	ISR	2005
18	Jamaica	JAM	2005
19	Cambodia	KHM	2005
20	South Korea	KOR	2003
21	Sri Lanka	LKA	2005
22	Morocco	MAR	2004
23	Mexico	MEX	2004
24	Malaysia	MYS	2004
25	Nigeria	NGA	2005
26	Nicaragua	NIC	2005
27	Nepal	NPL	2005
28	Panama	PAN	2005
29	Peru	PER	2005
30	Philippines	PHL	2005
31	El Salvador	SLV	2005
32	Thailand	THA	2005
33	Uruguay	URY	2005
34	South Africa	ZAF	2004

Note: This table lists the country codes and country names for 34 CDM host countries considered in this analysis. The First CDM Year is the year when a country had its first CDM project in the pipeline. Data are from the UNEP Risoe Centre CDM/JI Pipeline Analysis and Database (2008).

Tyndall°Centre
for Climate Change Research

Tyndall Working Paper series
2000 - 2009

The Tyndall Centre working paper series presents results from research which are mature enough to be submitted to a refereed journal, to a sponsor, to a major conference or to the editor of a book. The intention is to enhance the early public availability of research undertaken by the Tyndall family of researchers, students and visitors. They can be downloaded from the Tyndall Website at:

http://www.tyndall.ac.uk/publications/working_papers/working_papers.shtml

The accuracy of working papers and the conclusions reached are the responsibility of the author(s) alone and not the Tyndall Centre.

Papers available in this series are:

- Dawson R., Hall J, Barr S, Batty M., Bristow A, Carney S, Dagoumas, A., Evans S., Ford A, Harwatt H., Kohler J., Tight M, (2009) **A blueprint for the integrated assessment of climate change in cities**: Tyndall Working Paper 129

- Carney S, Whitmarsh L, Nicholson-Cole S, Shackley S., (2009) **A Dynamic Typology of Stakeholder Engagement within Climate Change Research**: Tyndall Working paper 128;

- Goulden M, Conway D, Persechino A., (2008) **Adaptation to climate change in international river basins in Africa: a review:** Tyndall Working paper 127;

- Bows A., Anderson K., (2008) **A bottom-up analysis of including aviation within the EU's Emissions Trading Scheme:** Tyndall Working Paper 126;

- Al-Saleh Y., Upham P., Malik K., (2008) **Renewable Energy Scenarios for the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia:** Tyndall Working Paper 125

- Scrieciu S., Barker T., Smith V., (2008) **World economic dynamics and technological change: projecting interactions between economic output and CO2 emissions :**Tyndall Working Paper 124

- Bulkeley H, Schroeder H., (2008) **Governing Climate Change Post-2012: The Role of Global Cities - London:** Tyndall Working Paper 123
- Schroeder H., Bulkeley H, (2008) **Governing Climate Change Post-2012: The Role of Global Cities, Case-Study: Los Angeles**: Tyndall Working Paper 122

- Wang T., Watson J, (2008) **Carbon Emissions Scenarios for China to 2100**: Tyndall Working Paper 121

- Bergman, N., Whitmarsh L, Kohler J., (2008) **Transition to sustainable development in the UK housing sector: from case study to model implementation:** Tyndall Working Paper 120

- Conway D, Persechino A., Ardoin-Bardin S., Hamandawana H., Dickson M, Dieulin C, Mahe G, (2008) **RAINFALL AND WATER RESOURCES VARIABILITY IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA DURING THE 20TH CENTURY:** Tyndall Centre Working Paper 119

- Starkey R., (2008) **Allocating emissions rights: Are equal shares, fair shares? :** Tyndall Working Paper 118

- Barker T., (2008) **The Economics of Avoiding Dangerous Climate Change**: Tyndall Centre Working Paper 117

- Estrada M, Corbera E., Brown K, (2008) **How do regulated and voluntary carbon-offset schemes compare?**: Tyndall Centre Working Paper 116

- Estrada Porrua M, Corbera E., Brown K, (2007) **REDUCING GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FROM DEFORESTATION IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: REVISITING THE ASSUMPTIONS**: Tyndall Centre Working Paper 115

- Boyd E., Hultman N E., Roberts T., Corbera E., Ebeling J., Liverman D, Brown K, Tippmann R., Cole J., Mann P, Kaiser M., Robbins M, (2007) **The Clean Development Mechanism: An assessment of current practice and future approaches for policy**: Tyndall Centre Working Paper 114

- Hanson, S., Nicholls, R., Balson, P., Brown, I., French, J.R., Spencer, T., Sutherland, W.J. (2007) **Capturing coastal morphological change within regional integrated assessment: an outcome-driven fuzzy logic approach**: Tyndall Working Paper No. 113

- Okereke, C., Bulkeley, H. (2007) **Conceptualizing climate change governance beyond the international regime: A review of four theoretical approaches**: Tyndall Working Paper No. 112

- Doulton, H., Brown, K. (2007) **'Ten years to prevent catastrophe'? Discourses of climate change and international development in the UK press**: Tyndall Working Paper No. 111

- Dawson, R.J., et al (2007) **Integrated analysis of risks of coastal flooding and cliff erosion under scenarios of long term change**: Tyndall Working Paper No. 110

- Okereke, C., (2007) **A review of UK FTSE 100 climate strategy and a framework for more in-depth analysis in the context of a post-2012 climate regime**: Tyndall Centre Working Paper 109

- Gardiner S., Hanson S., Nicholls R., Zhang Z., Jude S., Jones A.P., et al (2007) **The Habitats Directive, Coastal Habitats and Climate Change – Case Studies from the South Coast of the UK**: Tyndall Centre Working Paper 108

- Schipper E. Lisa, (2007) **Climate Change Adaptation and Development: Exploring the Linkages**: Tyndall Centre Working Paper 107

- Okereke C., Mann P, Osbahr H, (2007) **Assessment of key negotiating issues at Nairobi climate COP/MOP and what it means for the future of the climate regime**: Tyndall Centre Working Paper No. 106

- Walkden M, Dickson M, (2006) **The response of soft rock shore profiles to increased sea-level rise.** : Tyndall Centre Working Paper 105

- Dawson R., Hall J, Barr S, Batty M., Bristow A, Carney S, Evans E.P., Kohler J., Tight M, Walsh C, Ford A, (2007) **A blueprint for the integrated assessment of climate change in cities.** : Tyndall Centre Working Paper 104

- Dickson M., Walkden M., Hall J., (2007) **Modelling the impacts of climate change on an eroding coast over the 21st Century**: Tyndall Centre Working Paper 103

- Klein R.J.T, Erickson S.E.H, Næss L.O,

Hammill A., Tanner T.M., Robledo, C., O'Brien K.L.,(2007) **Portfolio screening to support the mainstreaming of adaptation to climatic change into development assistance**: Tyndall Centre Working Paper 102

- Agnolucci P., (2007) **Is it going to happen? Regulatory Change and Renewable Electricity**: Tyndall Centre Working Paper 101

- Kirk K., (2007) **Potential for storage of carbon dioxide in the rocks beneath the East Irish Sea**: Tyndall Centre Working Paper 100

- Arnell N.W., (2006) **Global impacts of abrupt climate change: an initial assessment**: Tyndall Centre Working Paper 99

- Lowe T.,(2006) **Is this climate porn? How does climate change communication affect our perceptions and behaviour?**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 98

- Walkden M, Stansby P,(2006) **The effect of dredging off Great Yarmouth on the wave conditions and erosion of the North Norfolk coast**. Tyndall Centre Working Paper 97

- Anthoff, D., Nicholls R., Tol R S J, Vafeidis, A., (2006) **Global and regional exposure to large rises in sea-level: a sensitivity analysis**. This work was prepared for the Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change: Tyndall Centre Working Paper 96

- Few R., Brown K, Tompkins E. L, (2006) **Public participation and climate change adaptation**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 95

- Corbera E., Kosoy N, Martinez Tuna M, (2006) **Marketing ecosystem services through protected areas and rural communities in Meso-America: Implications for economic efficiency, equity and political legitimacy**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 94

- Schipper E. Lisa, (2006) **Climate Risk, Perceptions and Development in El Salvado**r, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 93

- Tompkins E. L, Amundsen H, (2005) **Perceptions of the effectiveness of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in prompting behavioural change,** Tyndall Centre Working Paper 92

- Warren R., Hope C, Mastrandrea M, Tol R S J, Adger W. N., Lorenzoni I., (2006) **Spotlighting the impacts functions in integrated assessments. Research Report Prepared for the Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 91

- Warren R., Arnell A, Nicholls R., Levy P E, Price J, (2006) **Understanding the regional impacts of climate change: Research Report Prepared for the Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change,** Tyndall Centre Working Paper 90

- Barker T., Qureshi M, Kohler J., (2006) **The Costs of Greenhouse Gas Mitigation with Induced Technological Change: A Meta-Analysis of Estimates in the Literature**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 89

- Kuang C, Stansby P, (2006) **Sandbanks for coastal protection: implications of sea-level rise. Part 3: wave modelling**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 88

- Kuang C, Stansby P, (2006) **Sandbanks for coastal protection: implications of sea-level rise. Part 2: current and morphological modelling**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 87

• Stansby P, Kuang C, Laurence D, Launder B, (2006) **Sandbanks for coastal protection: implications of sea-level rise. Part 1: application to East Anglia**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 86

• Bentham M, (2006) **An assessment of carbon sequestration potential in the UK – Southern North Sea case study:** Tyndall Centre Working Paper 85

• Anderson K., Bows A., Upham P., (2006) **Growth scenarios for EU & UK aviation: contradictions with climate policy,** Tyndall Centre Working Paper 84

• Williamson M., Lenton T., Shepherd J., Edwards N, (2006) **An efficient numerical terrestrial scheme (ENTS) for fast earth system modelling**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 83

• Bows, A., and Anderson, K. (2005) **An analysis of a post-Kyoto climate policy model**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 82

• Sorrell, S., (2005) **The economics of energy service contracts**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 81

• Wittneben, B., Haxeltine, A., Kjellen, B., Köhler, J., Turnpenny, J., and Warren, R., (2005) **A framework for assessing the political economy of post-2012 global climate regime**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 80

• Ingham, I., Ma, J., and Ulph, A. M. (2005) **Can adaptation and mitigation be complements?**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 79

• Agnolucci,. P (2005) **Opportunism and competition in the non-fossil fuel obligation market**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 78

• Barker, T., Pan, H., Köhler, J., Warren., R and Winne, S. (2005) **Avoiding dangerous climate change by inducing technological progress: scenarios using a large-scale econometric model**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 77

• Agnolucci,. P (2005) **The role of political uncertainty in the Danish renewable energy market**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 76

• Fu, G., Hall, J. W. and Lawry, J. (2005) **Beyond probability: new methods for representing uncertainty in projections of future climate**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 75

• Ingham, I., Ma, J., and Ulph, A. M. (2005) **How do the costs of adaptation affect optimal mitigation when there is uncertainty, irreversibility and learning?**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 74

• Walkden, M. (2005) **Coastal process simulator scoping study**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 73

• Lowe, T., Brown, K., Suraje Dessai, S., Doria, M., Haynes, K. and Vincent., K (2005) **Does tomorrow ever come? Disaster narrative and public perceptions of climate change**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 72

• Boyd, E. Gutierrez, M. and Chang, M. (2005) **Adapting small-scale CDM sinks projects to low-income communities**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 71

• Abu-Sharkh, S., Li, R., Markvart, T., Ross, N., Wilson, P., Yao, R., Steemers, K., Kohler, J. and Arnold, R. (2005) **Can Migrogrids Make a Major Contribution to UK Energy Supply?**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 70

• Tompkins, E. L. and Hurlston, L. A. (2005) **Natural hazards and climate change: what knowledge is**

transferable?, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 69

• Bleda, M. and Shackley, S. (2005) **The formation of belief in climate change in business organisations: a dynamic simulation model**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 68

• Turnpenny, J., Haxeltine, A. and O'Riordan, T., (2005) **Developing regional and local scenarios for climate change mitigation and adaptation: Part 2: Scenario creation**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 67

• Turnpenny, J., Haxeltine, A., Lorenzoni, I., O'Riordan, T., and Jones, M., (2005) **Mapping actors involved in climate change policy networks in the UK**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 66

• Adger, W. N., Brown, K. and Tompkins, E. L. (2004) **Why do resource managers make links to stakeholders at other scales?**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 65

• Peters, M.D. and Powell, J.C. (2004) **Fuel Cells for a Sustainable Future II**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 64

• Few, R., Ahern, M., Matthies, F. and Kovats, S. (2004) **Floods, health and climate change: a strategic review**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 63

• Barker, T. (2004) **Economic theory and the transition to sustainability: a comparison of approaches**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 62

• Brooks, N. (2004) **Drought in the African Sahel: long term perspectives and future prospects**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 61

• Few, R., Brown, K. and Tompkins, E.L. (2004) **Scaling adaptation: climate change response and coastal management in the UK**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 60

• Anderson, D and Winne, S. (2004) **Modelling Innovation and Threshold Effects In Climate Change Mitigation**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 59

• Bray, D and Shackley, S. (2004) **The Social Simulation of The Public Perceptions of Weather Events and their Effect upon the Development of Belief in Anthropogenic Climate Change**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 58

• Shackley, S., Reiche, A. and Mander, S (2004) **The Public Perceptions of Underground Coal Gasification (UCG): A Pilot Study**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 57

• Vincent, K. (2004) **Creating an index of social vulnerability to climate change for Africa**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 56

• Mitchell, T.D. Carter, T.R., Jones, .P.D, Hulme, M. and New, M. (2004) **A comprehensive set of high-resolution grids of monthly climate for Europe and the globe: the observed record (1901-2000) and 16 scenarios (2001-2100)**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 55

• Turnpenny, J., Carney, S., Haxeltine, A., and O'Riordan, T. (2004) **Developing regional and local scenarios for climate change mitigation and adaptation Part 1: A framing of the East of England** Tyndall Centre Working Paper 54

• Agnolucci, P. and Ekins, P. (2004) **The Announcement Effect And Environmental Taxation** Tyndall Centre Working Paper 53

- Agnolucci, P. (2004) **Ex Post Evaluations of CO2 –Based Taxes: A Survey** Tyndall Centre Working Paper 52

- Agnolucci, P., Barker, T. and Ekins, P. (2004) **Hysteresis and Energy Demand: the Announcement Effects and the effects of the UK Climate Change Levy** Tyndall Centre Working Paper 51

- Powell, J.C., Peters, M.D., Ruddell, A. and Halliday, J. (2004) **Fuel Cells for a Sustainable Future?** Tyndall Centre Working Paper 50

- Awerbuch, S. (2004) **Restructuring our electricity networks to promote decarbonisation**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 49

- Pan, H. (2004) **The evolution of economic structure under technological development**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 48

- Berkhout, F., Hertin, J. and Gann, D. M., (2004) **Learning to adapt: Organisational adaptation to climate change impacts**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 47

- Watson, J., Tetteh, A., Dutton, G., Bristow, A., Kelly, C., Page, M. and Pridmore, A., (2004) **UK Hydrogen Futures to 2050**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 46

- Purdy, R and Macrory, R. (2004) **Geological carbon sequestration: critical legal issues**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 45

- Shackley, S., McLachlan, C. and Gough, C. (2004) **The Public Perceptions of Carbon Capture and Storage**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 44

- Anderson, D. and Winne, S. (2003) **Innovation and Threshold Effects in Technology Responses to Climate Change**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 43

- Kim, J. (2003) **Sustainable Development and the CDM: A South African Case Study**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 42

- Watson, J. (2003), **UK Electricity Scenarios for 2050**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 41

- Klein, R.J.T., Lisa Schipper, E. and Dessai, S. (2003), **Integrating mitigation and adaptation into climate and development policy: three research questions**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 40

- Tompkins, E. and Adger, W.N. (2003). **Defining response capacity to enhance climate change policy**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 39

- Brooks, N. (2003). **Vulnerability, risk and adaptation: a conceptual framework**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 38

- Ingham, A. and Ulph, A. (2003) **Uncertainty, Irreversibility, Precaution and the Social Cost of Carbon**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 37

- Kröger, K. Fergusson, M. and Skinner, I. (2003). **Critical Issues in Decarbonising Transport: The Role of Technologies**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 36

- Tompkins E. L and Hurlston, L. (2003). **Report to the Cayman Islands' Government. Adaptation lessons learned from responding to tropical cyclones by the Cayman Islands' Government, 1988 – 2002**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 35

- Dessai, S., Hulme, M (2003). **Does climate policy need probabilities?**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 34

• Pridmore, A., Bristow, A.L., May, A. D. and Tight, M.R. (2003). **Climate Change, Impacts, Future Scenarios and the Role of Transport**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 33

• Xueguang Wu, Jenkins, N. and Strbac, G. (2003). **Integrating Renewables and CHP into the UK Electricity System: Investigation of the impact of network faults on the stability of large offshore wind farms**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 32

• Turnpenny, J., Haxeltine A. and O'Riordan, T. (2003). **A scoping study of UK user needs for managing climate futures. Part 1 of the pilot-phase interactive integrated assessment process (Aurion Project)**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 31

• Hulme, M. (2003). **Abrupt climate change: can society cope?**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 30

• Brown, K. and Corbera, E. (2003). **A Multi-Criteria Assessment Framework for Carbon-Mitigation Projects: Putting "development" in the centre of decision-making**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 29

• Dessai, S., Adger, W.N., Hulme, M., Köhler, J.H., Turnpenny, J. and Warren, R. (2003). **Defining and experiencing dangerous climate change**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 28

• Tompkins, E.L. and Adger, W.N. (2003). **Building resilience to climate change through adaptive management of natural resources**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 27

• Brooks, N. and Adger W.N. (2003). **Country level risk measures of climate-related natural disasters and implications for adaptation to climate change**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 26

• Xueguang Wu, Mutale, J., Jenkins, N. and Strbac, G. (2003). **An investigation of Network Splitting for Fault Level Reduction**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 25

• Xueguang Wu, Jenkins, N. and Strbac, G. (2002). **Impact of Integrating Renewables and CHP into the UK Transmission Network**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 24

• Paavola, J. and Adger, W.N. (2002). **Justice and adaptation to climate change**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 23

• Watson, W.J., Hertin, J., Randall, T., Gough, C. (2002). **Renewable Energy and Combined Heat and Power Resources in the UK**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 22

• Watson, W. J. (2002). **Renewables and CHP Deployment in the UK to 2020**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 21

• Turnpenny, J. (2002). **Reviewing organisational use of scenarios: Case study - evaluating UK energy policy options**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 20

• Pridmore, A. and Bristow, A., (2002). **The role of hydrogen in powering road transport**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 19

• Watson, J. (2002). **The development of large technical systems: implications for hydrogen**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 18

• Dutton, G., (2002). **Hydrogen Energy Technology**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 17

• Adger, W.N., Huq, S., Brown, K., Conway, D. and Hulme, M. (2002). **Adaptation to climate change: Setting**

the Agenda for Development Policy and Research, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 16

• Köhler, J.H., (2002). **Long run technical change in an energy-environment-economy (E3) model for an IA system: A model of Kondratiev waves**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 15

• Shackley, S. and Gough, C., (2002). **The Use of Integrated Assessment: An Institutional Analysis Perspective**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 14

• Dewick, P., Green K., Miozzo, M., (2002). **Technological Change, Industry Structure and the Environment**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 13

• Dessai, S., (2001). **The climate regime from The Hague to Marrakech: Saving or sinking the Kyoto Protocol?**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 12

• Barker, T. (2001). **Representing the Integrated Assessment of Climate Change, Adaptation and Mitigation**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 11

• Gough, C., Taylor, I. and Shackley, S. (2001). **Burying Carbon under the Sea: An Initial Exploration of Public Opinions**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 10

• Barnett, J. and Adger, W. N. (2001). **Climate Dangers and Atoll Countries**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 9

• Adger, W. N. (2001). **Social Capital and Climate Change**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 8

• Barnett, J. (2001). **Security and Climate Change**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 7

• Goodess, C.M., Hulme, M. and Osborn, T. (2001). **The identification and evaluation of suitable scenario development methods for the estimation of future probabilities of extreme weather events**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 6

• Barnett, J. (2001). **The issue of 'Adverse Effects and the Impacts of Response Measures' in the UNFCCC**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 5

• Barker, T. and Ekins, P. (2001). **How High are the Costs of Kyoto for the US Economy?**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 4

• Berkhout, F, Hertin, J. and Jordan, A. J. (2001). **Socio-economic futures in climate change impact assessment: using scenarios as 'learning machines'**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 3

• Hulme, M. (2001). **Integrated Assessment Models**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 2

• Mitchell, T. and Hulme, M. (2000). **A Country-by-Country Analysis of Past and Future Warming Rates**, Tyndall Centre Working Paper 1

Tyndall°Centre
for Climate Change Research

For further information please contact

Javier Delgado-Esteban