



Reply to the comment by Zhang and Fang (2019) on consumption-based versus production-based accounting of CO₂ emissions



Zhang and Fang (2019) criticize our finding (Franzen and Mader, 2018) that there is (on average) no carbon leakage from developed to developing countries. In the paper we show that countries' GDP per capita is statistically not related to the ratio of consumption-based (CBA) to production-based (PBA) accounting of CO₂ emissions. Hence, the ratio of the two accounting schemes does not differ between richer and poorer countries or, put differently, does not depend on a country's GDP per capita. Zhang and Fang (2019) have two concerns with our paper: First, they believe that we should have used the Global Carbon Atlas (GCA) for both CBA and PBA and should not have mixed the data with the Emissions Database for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR); we used the EDGAR to obtain countries' PBA and the GCA to obtain their CBA. Second, the authors argue that we should not have used the ratio of CBA to PBA but the difference of CBA – PBA for our analyses. In what follows, we respond to both concerns.

The answer to Zhang and Fang's first concern is straightforward: The main results of the regression analysis of the CBA/PBA ratio on

OECD membership (or GDP) are not affected by the data source. This is shown in Fig. 1, which displays the differences between members and non-members of the OECD in terms of the CBA/PBA ratio obtained from random effects regression using the 110 countries for which the data is available. Furthermore, Fig. 1 displays the within effects of GDP per capita obtained from fixed effects panel regressions that only take into consideration the countries' within variance. Panel A of Fig. 1 is a replication of our earlier model using the newest updates of EDGAR (Janssens-Maenhout et al., 2017) for PBA and GCA (Peters et al., 2011) for CBA. Panel B extends the models by using the data that includes the newest available year, 2014. Finally, we analyze the effect using the data of GCA for both PBA and CBA (Panel C). The results always indicate that OECD membership is not related to the CBA/PBA ratio. This also holds true for a between (not shown in Fig. 1) and a within analysis of the CBA/PBA ratio on GDP per capita. Hence, the results do not depend on taking the data from EDGAR or GCA for PBA.

This does not come as a surprise since both data sources use the




Fig. 1. Regressions of the ratio of CBA to PBA of CO₂ emissions.

Note: Unstandardized regression coefficients with 95% confidence intervals. All models contain dummy variables for each year to control for overall time-trends. All standard errors are clustered by country, and therefore robust with respect to heteroscedasticity and autocorrelation. CBA = consumption-based accounting. PBA = production-based accounting. F&M = Franzen and Mader. EDGAR = Emissions Database for Global Atmospheric Research. GCA = Global Carbon Atlas. n = number of countries. N = number of observations (n multiplied by the number of years). Robustness checks comprise fixed effects (FE) panel regressions with country-specific constants and slopes (FEIS) (Brüderl and Ludwig, 2015), and penalized splines FE models (Ruppert et al., 2003) to test the parameter of gross domestic product (GDP) for linearity. Furthermore, we ran 110 regressions dropping one country each time to test for

statistical outliers. In addition, the robustness of standard errors was checked using non-parametric bootstrapping. Moreover, we reran all six models controlling for energy intensity, trade balance, and the shares of the industry and service sector of the GDP (data from World Bank, 2019). Likewise, we tested for the influence of omitted variables using the method suggested by Frank (2000). Finally, the robustness of the GDP effect was checked by substituting the purchasing power parity-corrected GDP per capita (PPP GDP p.c.) as gathered from the International Monetary Fund (2019) by the PPP GDP p.c. as provided by the World Bank (2019). None of these checks had any substantial influence on the estimates. All models and all the robustness checks were calculated using the statistical software package STATA 16.0. See also Table S1 in the supplement for the exact regression results of all six models. Table S2 describes all variables and Table S3 lists all countries included in the models.




Fig. 2. Between-countries correlations of GDP per capita and the CBA-PBA difference, 1997–2014.

Note: Scatterplots and linear ordinary least squares (OLS) regression lines of the bivariate correlation of GDP p.c. and the difference between CBA and PBA of CO₂ emissions by year. r = Pearson’s correlation coefficient. b = beta coefficient of the bivariate linear OLS regression between GDP p.c. and CBA-PBA (see Table S4 in the supplement for details). * = $p < 0.05$, ** = $p < 0.01$, *** = $p < 0.001$. The countries corresponding to the depicted country codes can be obtained from Table S3. The number of countries in the scatterplots is reduced from 110 to 107, because Cook’s D identified Singapore, Bahrain, and Switzerland as influential cases (Cook’s $D > 0.5$). Data sources: CBA: Global Carbon Atlas (GCA); PBA: Emissions Database for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR). Robustness checks for the OLS regressions comprise penalized splines models (Ruppert et al., 2003) to test the parameter of gross domestic product (GDP) for linearity. Furthermore, we ran 107 regressions dropping one country each time to test for statistical outliers. In addition, the robustness of standard errors was checked using non-parametric bootstrapping. Moreover, we reran all six models controlling for energy intensity, trade balance, and the shares of the industry and service sectors of the GDP (World Bank, 2019). Likewise, we tested for the influence of omitted variables using the method suggested by Frank (2000). Additionally, the robustness of the GDP effect was checked by substituting the purchasing power parity-corrected GDP per capita (PPP GDP p.c.) as gathered from the International Monetary Fund (2019) by the PPP GDP p.c. as provided by the World Bank (2019). Finally, we replaced the PBA emissions from the EDGAR by the PBA emissions from the GCA. None of these checks had any substantial influence on the estimates.

same definition of PBA. Also, the correlation of EDGAR and GCA PBA is 0.99. Hence, both data sources are almost identical with respect to the PBA data, and are compatible.

The second argument refers to taking the ratio of CBA/PBA versus the absolute difference of CBA-PBA. Whether one uses the relative or the absolute differences is more a matter of perspective than a question of right or wrong. Let’s for example take two countries. One has 5 tons of PBA CO₂ emissions per capita and the other 10 tons. Let’s assume that the absolute difference of CBA-PBA for the first is 0.5 and for the second 1 ton, then the relative differences are the same (10%) but the absolute difference is bigger for the country with the higher PBA. Since PBA is strongly associated with GDP (e.g. Franzen and Mader, 2016), an analysis of GDP on the ratio would result in a zero effect, but an analysis of the absolute difference would result in a positive effect of GDP.

This is exactly what we see in the data. Fig. 2 displays the simple OLS between country regressions of GDP on the absolute differences for the six available years. The average zero-order correlation is 0.36 and the regression coefficient 0.04. Hence, for every \$1000 increase of purchasing-power-adjusted GDP, the increase in CBA-PBA difference is 40 kg of CO₂ per capita. Therefore, Zhang and Fang do have a point,

taking the absolute difference instead of the ratio changes the results. However, Fig. 2 also reveals that the correlation did not change substantially over the last 18 years (from 1997 to 2014). This fact is also reflected by a fixed effects regression analysis which only takes into account the countries’ within variation of the absolute difference. The effect of GDP is statistically not significant (see Fig. 3). Hence, if we take the absolute difference of CBA-PBA into account, we do find GDP-related differences, but these did not change over the last 18 years; i.e. further changes in GDP did not increase the absolute difference. This finding is not compatible with the carbon leakage hypothesis. If richer countries displace CO₂-intensive industries into poorer countries then one would expect this process also to have occurred during the last 18 years. Instead the differences we observe were already present in 1997 and have not increased since then.

One way of avoiding the problem of taking relative differences or absolute differences is to dichotomize countries into those with a positive difference (CBA > PBA) and those with a negative difference (no country has exactly zero). In this way, both measures, ratio and difference, assign the countries into identical groups.

Countries in the negative group would profit from a change of




Fig. 3. Country and year fixed effects regressions of the difference between CBA and PBA of CO₂ emissions.

Note: Unstandardized regression coefficients with 95% confidence intervals. All models contain dummy variables for each year to control for overall time-trends. All standard errors are clustered by country, and therefore robust with respect to heteroscedasticity and autocorrelation. CBA = consumption-based accounting. PBA = production-based accounting. F&M = Franzen and Mader. EDGAR = Emissions Database for Global Atmospheric Research. GCA = Global Carbon Atlas. n = number of countries. N = number of observations (n multiplied by the number of years). All robustness checks mentioned in the caption of Fig. 1 were also applied here. None of these checks had any substantial influence on the estimates. See also Table S5 in the supplement for the exact regression results of all three models.

accounting schemes from PBA to CBA, and countries in the positive group would have a disadvantage. An analysis of this dichotomized variable (random effects logit model see model 8 of Table S4 in the supplement) shows that GDP is not related to it. The average GDP per capita of the negative difference group is 16 825 international dollars and 16 298 in the positive group. This difference is statistically not significant ($t = 0.39$, $p = 0.70$). Hence, changing the accounting scheme from PBA to CBA would not benefit the poorer countries per se, and adhering to the established PBA schemes does not put them into a worse position. From this perspective a change does not seem meaningful, and this confirms the conclusion of our paper (Franzen and Mader, 2018).

Our research question was the following: If countries changed from PBA to CBA how big would this change be in relative terms from the perspective of a given country. This relative perspective is often used in comparative research. For instance, changes in GDP or unemployment are usually presented in percentages and not in absolute numbers. A relative perspective also makes sense when it comes to CO₂ emissions. For example let's assume that Switzerland decreased its production-based CO₂ by one ton per capita, would that mean that Switzerland reduced it a lot, or a little? Whether one ton is a large or a small change for a given country depends on the level it started at. One ton means a lot for a country with low levels of CO₂ and it means a relatively small change for a country with high emission levels. Suppose representatives from every country were to sit around a (very) large table and decide between two different reduction schemes: In one scenario, all countries are required to reduce the same absolute amount of CO₂, and in the other scenario the same relative amount. The same absolute amount for every country would probably be judged as very unfair. The same relative amount might still be unfair but is much fairer than the same absolute amount. In the long run (this century) we estimate (Franzen and Mader, 2016) that CO₂ emission levels have to be reduced to 3 tons per capita for every individual on earth in order to reach the 2-degree target. Given that the earth can cope with about 30 Gt of CO₂ emissions per year, and given that the world population increases to 10 billion in the near future, the 3 tons per inhabitant of the world provides a helpful political goal. This is an absolute goal. But the way to get there can of course be expressed in relative reduction targets. In order to get there, the relative reduction goals must be much larger for rich countries as

compared to poor countries. We do not debate this position. We only debate the position that changing the accounting schemes from PBA to CBA is a helpful method to reach the 2-degree target. Instead, we believe that a change of the accounting schemes is rather complicated and distracts from the real problem of reducing CO₂ emissions to sustainable levels.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary material related to this article can be found, in the online version, at doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2019.11.005>.

References

- Brüderl, J., Ludwig, V., 2015. Fixed-effects panel regression. In: Best, H., Wolf, C. (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Regression Analysis and Causal Inference*. SAGE, London, pp. 327–358.
- Frank, K.A., 2000. Impact of a confounding variable on a regression coefficient. *Sociol. Method Res.* 29, 147–194.
- Franzen, A., Mader, S., 2016. Predictors of national CO₂ emissions: do international commitments matter? *Clim. Change* 139, 491–502.
- Franzen, A., Mader, S., 2018. Consumption-based versus production-based accounting of CO₂ emissions: Is there evidence for carbon leakage? *Environ. Sci. Policy* 84, 34–40.
- International Monetary Fund, 2019. *World Economic Outlook Database*, April 2019. Retrieved on 10 October 2019 from. <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2019/01/weodata/index.aspx>.
- Janssens-Maenhout, G., Crippa, M., Guizzardi, D., Muntean, M., Schaaf, E., Olivier, J.G.J., Peters, J.A.H.W., Schure, K.M., 2017. *Fossil CO₂ and GHG Emissions of All World Countries*. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.
- Peters, G.P., Minx, J.C., Weber, C.L., Edenhofer, O., 2011. Growth in emission transfers via international trade from 1990 to 2008. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 108, 8903–8908.
- Ruppert, D., Wand, M.P., Carroll, R.J., 2003. *Semiparametric Regression*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- World Bank, 2019. *World Bank Open Data*. Retrieved on 10 October 2019 from. <https://data.worldbank.org/>.
- Zhang, Q., Fang, K., 2019. Comment on “Consumption-based versus production-based accounting of CO₂ emissions: Is there evidence for carbon leakage?”. *Environ. Sci. Policy* 101, 94–96.

Axel Franzen*, Sebastian Mader
Institute of Sociology, University of Bern, Fabrikstrasse 8, 3012 Bern, Switzerland
 E-mail address: axel.franzen@soz.unibe.ch (A. Franzen).

* Corresponding author.