



SCORING AND RATIONALE FOR WORLD LEADER CARD GAME

Statement	Translation	Points	Rationale
'But where's the abatement incentive'?	How are we going to motivate people to move away from producing and consuming greenhouse gas emissions when there is no incentive (carbon price or otherwise) for them to do so?	6	Abatement is a great word, and you are correct to be concerned about the lack of incentives to reduce emissions.
'There are no two ways about it - we have to account for the externalities'	The negative impacts of greenhouse gas emissions on the health of people and planet need to be factored into the costs of production if we want to address the climate crisis. We can do that by putting a price on carbon.	6	We really do have to account for the externalities.
'I understand that carbon pricing is not a silver bullet, but it can certainly act as a catalyst for decarbonisation'	Carbon Pricing alone won't change the world, but it can mobilise people and businesses to act. We need regulatory policies (i.e end dates for coal-fired power plants) to complement market-based measures (i.e carbon pricing) if we want to drive the levels of emissions reductions required to prevent runaway global warming.	2	If you don't already know that carbon pricing can act as a catalyst for decarbonisation then we're not sure that you've <i>really</i> been listening.
'That's the beauty of carbon pricing, you don't have to pick winners, you can let them emerge'	No one knows what the world will look like in 2030, and what technologies are going to solve the climate crisis. By putting a price on carbon, we can drive high emitters towards low-cost low-carbon solutions, without having to make a gamble now about the future success of a particular technology.	7	It's a great sentence, and if we're choosing winners at the moment it's probably because certain people with vested interests have told us to do so. Well done for standing your ground world leader.
We just have to take responsibility for our consumption emissions'	Most country's emissions accounting systems only include territorial emissions (i.e emissions produced in that country). If we want to take responsibility for total domestic carbon footprints, we have to include the emissions that are produced abroad, as a result of domestic demand.	6	Yes, we really do, and this is an under-discussed issue. Time to start thinking about including some form of environmental conditionality in trade deals?
'To be fair, I'd consider CCUS at thirty pounds a tonne'	I'd invest in removing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere (via Carbon Capture, Utilisation and Storage technology) if it meant I saved thirty pounds a for every tonne of CO ₂ e that I produced	10	Nailed it

Statement	Translation	Points	Rationale
‘Don’t get me started on the co-benefits’	It’s not all about emissions targets - decarbonisation can improve health, provide jobs, reduce air pollution and ensure the protection of nature too. These co-benefits provide a very compelling reason for acting to address the climate crisis.	7	Please do get started on the co-benefits.
‘She does have a point - their effective carbon price is pretty substantial’	The sum of all of the different carbon taxes and tradable permits that operators in that country are paying for is quite high.	4	Acknowledging that she has a point.
‘Hypothecation does seem to make it more palatable’	Ring-fencing the revenue from a carbon price for specific ends (i.e investing in decarbonisation projects, or giving money to the public to protect them from costs) tends to lead to higher levels of public support.	9	It really does, and world leaders could do more to recognise this.
‘We’re also going to need some de-risking instruments’	Carbon prices can provide a solid signal that low-carbon investments are valuable today, and will be even more valuable tomorrow. But where technologies are uncertain, they need to be introduced alongside policies that reduce the risks of low- carbon investments - such as the ‘contracts for difference’ model used in the UK.	6	Snaps for recognising that the current policy landscape makes low-carbon investment a bit risky, and that Governments could do more to help.
‘What about measures to address the distributional impacts?’	The costs of decarbonisation will disproportionately fall on low-income households. Governments have a responsibility to introduce measures that can support households through the transition - for example by issuing grants for low-carbon heating, and ‘carbon credit’ payments through the social welfare system.	10	Finallllyyy.
‘I know that you’re worried about the uneven pricing but I’m pretty sure a CBAM can help with that’	Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanisms (CBAMs) can help account for variation in ambition when it comes to carbon pricing. By extending a domestic carbon price to imported goods, you can ensure that all producers - not just domestic ones - are subjected to equivalent carbon prices.	5	We love a bit of CBAM chat.
‘Price signals create a strong incentive towards mitigation’	Under a carbon pricing system, heavy emitters will be able to save money by reducing the volume of greenhouse gases that they produce. That is what makes carbon pricing such a powerful tool when it comes to driving emissions reductions	3	Great use of mitigation but you are also stating the obvious.
‘We’ve got to stop inhibiting low-carbon development’	The current system places too many barriers on low-carbon development, particularly when it comes to cost. Carbon pricing - along with other instruments - can reverse this trend and ensure that the market favours low-carbon production	5	Yes you do. But if the penny has only just dropped then you’re seriously behind on this one.

Statement	Translation	Points	Rationale
'Let's face it, we're creating an implicit negative carbon price'	By subsidising the production of fossil fuels, we are reducing the cost of fossil fuel consumption and production so much that it's actually creating a negative carbon price signal - incentivising ongoing fossil fuel production rather than the other way around. That's no way to drive decarbonisation..	10	Any leader who wants to talk about subsidies rather than pretending they don't exist deserves a LOT of credit in our eyes.
'We've just got to level the playing field'	There is no point in one country taking ambitious action to reduce emissions if others aren't going to do the same. It's only going to make them less competitive in a global market, because cheaper (more polluting) products can be imported from abroad. There are various ways that this can be addressed, including through Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanisms.	2	Yes you do. Please get on with it.
'Can you believe that we only price 22% of global emissions?'	The majority of emissions responsible for driving global warming are either exempt from or not covered by carbon pricing systems. That means that over three quarters of global emissions are being released freely into the atmosphere, without any penalty or financial incentive to change behaviour.	7	Thank you for reading the factsheet at the start of this pack.
'I'm afraid you can't act unilaterally on this one'	Climate change is a global issue, which requires global solutions. In the context of a globalized economy, no world leader is an island. We have to work together to raise ambition on climate action - including through the conditions we attach to trade deals - if we want to tackle the climate and ecological crisis.	4	Credit if you can pull this off as a casual remark, but it's also a bit of a no brainer and basically just a mission statement for COP.
'Well the Brits appear to have got the public on side'	The British Public understand the benefits of stronger, fairer and more consistent carbon pricing. 108,000 people recently signed a petition calling for stronger action on carbon pricing from the UK Government, and 94% of 22,000 UK respondents to a recent survey selected a carbon price of £75/tCO _{2e} as one of the top policies that they want to see implemented to address the climate crisis.	10	Any plug for Zero Carbon Campaign research is a 10/10 in our eyes.
'Do we even have the land capacity to satisfy offset demand?'	As more and more companies pledge to achieve 'net zero' emissions, demands for carbon 'offsets' are increasing. There is not enough land capacity to support this demand, which means stronger regulation is required to ensure that only those who cannot feasibly reduce their emission are allowed to offset them.	4	Not directly relevant but nice of you to raise it all the same.