A model of emissions and the price of carbon

GE.Espinosa Joint work with R.Carmona and N.Touzi

April 2010



1997: Kyoto protocol

1997: Kyoto protocol

ightarrow countries must act against greenhouse gases and in particular \emph{CO}_2

1997: Kyoto protocol

ightarrow countries must act against greenhouse gases and in particular \emph{CO}_2

different possibilities to control emissions



1997: Kyoto protocol

ightarrow countries must act against greenhouse gases and in particular \emph{CO}_2

different possibilities to control emissions

 \rightarrow carbon market one of them



1997: Kyoto protocol

ightarrow countries must act against greenhouse gases and in particular \emph{CO}_2

different possibilities to control emissions

- \rightarrow carbon market one of them
- → indirect tax

- beginning of the year, EU fixes the target emissions κ

- beginning of the year, EU fixes the target emissions κ
- each firm buys a certain number of certificates

- beginning of the year, EU fixes the target emissions κ
- each firm buys a certain number of certificates
- certificate = "right to pollute"

- beginning of the year, EU fixes the target emissions κ
- each firm buys a certain number of certificates
- certificate = "right to pollute"
- firms can trade certificates

- beginning of the year, EU fixes the target emissions κ
- each firm buys a certain number of certificates
- certificate = "right to pollute"
- firms can trade certificates
- end of the year, if global emissions are below κ , then nothing to pay

- beginning of the year, EU fixes the target emissions κ
- each firm buys a certain number of certificates
- certificate = "right to pollute"
- firms can trade certificates
- end of the year, if global emissions are below κ , then nothing to pay
- else, each firm pays taxes for its emissions not covered by certificates.

As a tradable asset, we assume that the price of certificates satisfies:

$$dY_t = Z_t dB_t$$

$$Y_T = \lambda 1_{[\kappa, +\infty)}(E_T)$$

under a probability \mathbb{Q} , where E are the global emissions.

A firm can trade certificates.

 \rightarrow control θ (portfolio).

n firms whose emissions are assumed to be given by:

$$dE_t^i = (b_t^i - \xi_t^i)dt + \sigma_t^i dB_t$$

$$E_0^i = 0$$

n firms whose emissions are assumed to be given by:

$$dE_t^i = (b_t^i - \xi_t^i)dt + \sigma_t^i dB_t$$

$$E_0^i = 0$$

 b^i is the "business as usual" drift, while ξ^i is the control.

n firms whose emissions are assumed to be given by:

$$dE_t^i = (b_t^i - \xi_t^i)dt + \sigma_t^i dB_t$$

$$E_0^i = 0$$

 b^i is the "business as usual" drift, while ξ^i is the control.

$$E = \sum_{i=1}^{n} E^{i}.$$

By increasing ξ^i , a firm can decrease its emissions.

By increasing ξ^i , a firm can decrease its emissions.

But it is in return of a cost: $c^i : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, C^1 , strictly convex and satisfies Inada conditions, for each $t \in [0, T]$:

$$(c^i)'(-\infty) = -\infty$$
 and $(c^i)'(+\infty) = +\infty$.

The wealth is:

$$X_t^i = X_t^{i,\xi,\theta} = x^i + \int_0^T \theta_t^i dY_t - \int_0^T c^i(\xi_t^i) dt - E_T^i Y_T.$$

The wealth is:

$$X_t^i = X_t^{i,\xi,\theta} = x^i + \int_0^T \theta_t^i dY_t - \int_0^T c^i(\xi_t^i) dt - E_T^i Y_T.$$

Given a utility function U^i , each firm wants to solve:

$$\sup_{(\xi,\theta)\in\mathcal{A}}\mathbb{E}U^i(X_T^{i,\xi,\theta}).$$

Using classical techniques of portfolio optimization in complete markets we get:

Using classical techniques of portfolio optimization in complete markets we get:

If Y is given, then there exists an optimal control $(\hat{\xi}^i, \hat{\theta}^i)$ with:

$$\hat{\xi}_t^i = (c')^{-1}(Y_t).$$

Is it possible to find a price process consistent with the previous study?

Is it possible to find a price process consistent with the previous study?

In other words we want to solve:

$$\begin{split} dE_t^i &= \{b_t^i - [(c^i)']^{-1}(Y_t)\}dt + \sigma_t^i dB_t, \quad E_0^i = 0, \text{ for each } i \\ dY_t &= Z_t dB_t, \quad Y_T = \lambda \mathbf{1}_{[\kappa, +\infty)}(E_T). \end{split}$$

For certain b^i 's and σ^i 's, this leads to the forward-backward SDE:

$$dE_t = \{b(t, E_t) - f(Y_t)\}dt + \sigma(t)dB_t, \quad E_0 = 0$$

$$dY_t = Z_t dB_t, \quad Y_T = \lambda 1_{[\kappa, +\infty)}(E_T),$$

Terminal condition Y_T not continuous w.r.t the forward variable E.

Terminal condition Y_T not continuous w.r.t the forward variable E.

 \rightarrow no general results

Terminal condition Y_T not continuous w.r.t the forward variable E. \rightarrow no general results

We approximate by a sequence of regular FBSDEs and show convergence. Finally: existence and uniqueness of the solution.

The introduction of the tax makes the emissions decrease and

The introduction of the tax makes the emissions decrease and

- the bigger the sanction (λ)
- the smaller the target (κ)

The introduction of the tax makes the emissions decrease and

- the bigger the sanction (λ)
- the smaller the target (κ)

the bigger is the decrease.

Incomplete market: introduction of a Brownian motion by firm. Look for a global equilibrium, as in Karatzas and Shreve. Add the condition:

$$\forall t, \ \sum_{i=1}^n \theta_t^i = 0.$$

Short Bibliography

- Fully coupled forward-backward stochastic differential equations and applications to optimal control, Peng and Wu.
- Forward-backward stochastic differential equations and their applications, Ma and Yong, Springer.
- Methods of Mathematical Finance, Karatzas and Shreve, Springer.