[AN OPTIMAL PRINCIPAL--AGENT HYBRID POLICY MODEL OF CARBON TAX AND EMISSION ALLOWANCE UNDER ASYMMETRIC INFORMATION]

[Qiang Tu, College of Management & Economics, Tianjin University, China, tuqiang11223344@163.com]

Keywords

hybrid policy; carbon tax; emission allowance; contract theory; asymmetric information

Overview

Different from the existing literature, we apply contract theory in this paper to study a hybrid policy with consideration of carbon tax and emission allowance under asymmetric information, in which the government (principal) is not able to observe the output type of the firm (agent). Thus, a principal--agent hybrid policy model considering both differential carbon tax rate and differential emission allowance is built to maximize the government's expected utility. Then, the equivalent formulation of this model is subsequently presented and the first-order condition is adopted to obtain the optimal solutions. Next, three degenerated models are set up to compare with this equivalent formulation for choosing the optimal hybrid policy. The results indicate that the policy including both differential carbon tax rate and differential emission allowance is the optimal hybrid policy. In addition, the carbon tax rate of the low-output-type firm would be higher than that of the high-output-type firm due to the information rent induced by asymmetric information. Finally, one numerical example is given to illustrate the effectiveness of these proposed models.

Methods

Under contract theory, a principal--agent hybrid policy model considering both differential carbon tax rate and differential emission allowance is built to maximize the government's expected utility. Then, the equivalent formulation of this model is subsequently presented and the first-order condition is adopted to obtain the optimal solutions. Next, three degenerated models are set up to compare with this equivalent formulation for choosing the optimal hybrid policy.

Results

The results presented that the hybrid policy considering both differential carbon tax rate and differential emission allowance is the optimal one. In this optimal hybrid policy, the carbon tax rate of the low-output-type firm is higher than that of the high-output-type firm due to the information rent induced by asymmetric information. It is noteworthy that, different from the existing researches, our paper focuses on designing the hybrid policy considering the firm's output type as asymmetric information rather than empirical analysis or known information.

Conclusions

This paper built a principal-agent model considering both the optimal hybrid policy of carbon tax and CO2 emission allowance. Here, the government as a principal faces the firm with unknown output treated as private information. A hybrid policy model of differential carbon tax rates and differential emission allowance was built with the purpose of maximizing the government's expected utility. The equivalent formulation of this model was subsequently presented and the first-order condition was adopted to obtain the optimal solutions. Next, three degenerated models were set up to compare with the equivalent formulation for choosing the optimal hybrid policy. The results presented that the hybrid policy considering both differential carbon tax rate and differential emission allowance is the optimal one. In this optimal hybrid policy, the carbon tax rate of the low-output-type firm is higher than that of the high-output-type firm due to the information rent induced by asymmetric information. It is noteworthy that, different from the existing researches, our paper focuses on designing the hybrid policy considering the firm's output type as asymmetric information rather than empirical analysis or known information. One numerical example was given to illustrate the effectiveness of the proposed model and the result implies that the government prefers to stimulate the firm to produce by allocating more emission allowance when the firm is low output type, but prefers to control CO2 emissions by decreasing allowance when the firm is getting high output type.

References

Bohringer C, Lange A. On the design of optimal grandfathering schemes for emissiona llowances. European Economic Review 2005; 49: 2041--2055.

Cansier D, Krumm R. Air pollutant taxation: An empirical survey. Ecological Economics 1997; 23(1): 59--70.

Chen F. Salesforce Incentive, Market information, and Production/Inventory Planning. Management Science 2005; 51(1): 60--75.

Cui L, Zhao R, Wang T. Principal--agent problem in a fuzzy environment. IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems 2007; 15: 1230-1237.

Dales JH. Pollution, property, and prices. Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1968.

Gerlagh R, Lise W. Carbon taxes: A drop in the ocean, or a drop that erodes the stone? The effect of carbon taxes on technological change. Ecological Economics 2005; 54: 241--260.

Johansson B. Climate policy instruments and industry—effects and potential responses in the Swedish context. Energy Policy 2006; 34: 2344--2360.

Lan YF, Zhao RQ, W. S. Tang. A bilevel fuzzy principal-agent model for optimal nonlinear taxation problems. Fuzzy Optimal Decisition Making 2011; 10: 211--232.

Lee CF. Analysis of the impacts of combining carbon taxation and emission trading on different industry sectors. Energy Policy 2008; 36: 722--729.

Lee CF, et al. Effects of carbon taxes on different industries by fuzzy goal programming: A case study of the petrochemical-related industries, Taiwan. Energy Policy 2007; 35: 4051--4058.

Liang QM, Fan Y, Wei YM. Carbon taxation policy in China: How to protect energy-and trade-intensive sectors? Journal of Policy Modeling 2007; 29: 311--333.

Lin BQ, Jiang ZJ, Zhang P. Allocation of sulphur dioxide allowance-An analysis based on a survey of power plants in Fujian province in China. Energy 2011; 36: 3120--3129.

Lin BQ, Li XH. The effect of carbon tax on per capita \$\rm CO_2\$ emissions. Energy Policy 2011; 39: 5137--5146.

Lozano S, Villa G, Brannlund R. Centralised reallocation of emission permits using DEA. European Journal of Operational Research 2009; 193: 752--760.

Lu CY, Tong Q, Liu XM. The impacts of carbon tax and complementary policies on Chinese economy. Energy Policy 2010; 38: 7278--7285.

Mugge D. The European presence in global financial governance: a principal-agent perspective. Journal of European Public Policy 2011; 18(3): 383--402.

O'Shea L. An economic approach to reducing water pollution: point and diffuse sources. Science of the Total Environment 2002; 282-283: 49--63.

Scrimgeour F, Oxley L, Fatai K. Reducing carbon emissions? The relative effectiveness of different types of environment tax: the case of New Zealand. Environmental Modelling and Software 2005; 20: 1439--1448.

Slesser M. Is an environmentally sustainable future for the European Community compatible with continued growth: carbon dioxide and the management of greed. Science of the Total Environment 1993; 129: 191--203.

Tamura H, Kimura T. Modeling and Policy Assessment of Carbon Tax and Emissions Trading for Preserving Global Environment.

17th IFAC World Congress 2008; pp: 15505--15510.

Tamura H, Teraoka R. Assessing Hybrid Policy of Carbon Tax and Emissions Trading under Uncertainty for Preserving Global Environment. 18th IFAC World Congress 2011; pp: 12916--12921.

Tullock G. Excee benefit. Water Resources Research 1967; 3(2): 643--644.

Viaggi D, Bartolini F, Raggi M. Combining linear programming and principal--agent models: An example from environmental regulation in agriculture. Environmental Modelling \& Software 2009; 24(6): 703--710.

Wang JN, Yan G. Studies on Chinese carbon tax on in response to climate change. Chinese Environment Science 2009; 29(1):

101--105.

Zetterberg L, et al. Short-run allocation of emissions allowances and long-term goals for climate Policy. A Journal of the Human Environment 2012; 41(1): 23--32.