A6.4-MEP004-A03: DRAFT STANDARD: ADDRESSING LEAKAGE IN MECHANISM METHODOLOGIES (V. 01.0)

ADDRESSED TO:

THE UNFCCC'S METHODOLOGICAL EXPERT PANEL (MEP)

'CASE STUDY ON MARKET MECHANISM IMPACTS ON LEAKAGE PATTERNS'

AUTHORED BY

Pierre J. D.

Mungroo Z. B. A.
Tupsee R. S.

TABLE OF CONTENT

A6.4-MEP004-A03: Draft Standard: Addressing leakage in mechanism methodologies (v. 01.0)

Name of submitter: ***Juan Didier Pierre***
Affiliated organization of the submitter (if any): ***United Nations Major Group for Children and Youth, SDG12 Sustainable Consumption and Production, Coordination Team.***
Contact email of submitter: *pierrejuandidier@gmail.com* or *j.pierre@learnblue.org.ng*
Date: ***18 February 2025***

		A6.4-MEP004-A03 (v.01.0)	
1	2	3	4
Section no.	**Para. no.**	**Comment**	**Proposed change** (Include proposed text)
3	**3 (c)**	**Current definition of leakage through market mechanisms is limited in scope and does not fully capture complex market dynamics**	**Expand definition to: "Leakage includes both direct and indirect emissions shifts occurring through market mechanisms, including but not limited to price transmission effects, cross-border trade impacts, and investment flow changes resulting from the Article 6.4 activity."**
4	**8**	**International leakage consideration lacks specific guidance for assessment**	**Add: "Mechanism methodologies shall include specific procedures for assessing international market linkages, including: (a) Price transmission pathways; (b) Trade flow impacts; (c) Investment pattern shifts; (d) Cross-border competitiveness effects."**
4	**10**	**Net leakage calculation needs economic context**	**Add: "When assessing net leakage effects, methodologies shall consider: (a) Market equilibrium effects; (b) Price feedback mechanisms; (c) International market responses; (d) Long-term market adaptation."**
5.1	**12 (b)**	**Treatment of competing resources requires more detailed market analysis framework**	**Add subsection: "Assessment of competing resources shall include: (i) Market elasticity analysis; (ii) Supply chain impact evaluation; (iii) Quantitative assessment of resource substitution effects; (iv) Long-term market adaptation potential."**

5.2	**14**	**Leakage prevention measures lack cost-effectiveness considerations**	**Add new paragraph: "Mechanism methodologies shall include procedures for assessing the cost-effectiveness of leakage prevention measures, including: (a) Direct implementation costs; (b) Market efficiency impacts; (c) Administrative burden; (d) Long-term economic sustainability."**
5.3	**17**	**Calculation methods for market-based leakage need strengthening**	**Expand to include: "Quantification of market-based leakage shall incorporate: (a) Economic modeling results; (b) Market price effects; (c) Sectoral competitiveness impacts; (d) Cross-market interaction effects."**
5.3	**19**	**Criteria for activity eligibility needs economic context**	**Add: "Assessment of service level changes shall include economic impact analysis, including: (a) Market value of service changes; (b) Competitive effects; (c) Sector-specific vulnerability assessment; (d) Long-term market adaptation potential."**
Appendix 1	**5**	**Treatment of affected sources requires market perspective**	**Add: "Assessment of affected sources shall include market impact analysis considering: (a) Price effects; (b) Competition impacts; (c) Market structure changes; (d) International trade implications."**

Authors,

Juan Didier Pierre, *United Nations MGCY SDG12 SIDS Regional Focal Point and Director of Research at LEARNBLUE..*

Zakiyyah Bibi Azraa Mungroo, *United Nations MGCY SDG12 Global Thematic Focal Point Sustainable Lifestyles & Public Education and The Erline Bradshaw Foundation Femme Lex Ambassador.*

Reeshabh Shayan Tupsee, *United Nations MGCY SDG12 Global Thematic Focal Point Sustainable Construction & Development and GYCN Max Thabiso Edkins Climate Ambassador 2025.*

All authors contributed equally to the conception, drafting, and revision of this paper. The authors collectively approve the final version for submission and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

1. ABSTRACT

The draft standard A6.4-MEP004-A03 under Article 6.4 represents a major advancement for carbon market leakage prevention; however research shows it lacks sufficient provisions to address market-based instruments and economic financial behavior. The study analyzes the standard's leakage prevention and quantification framework which details its processes for market interactions and economic efficiency measures and cross-border effect monitoring.
Through detailed analysis of the draft standard's provisions, especially paragraphs 12(b) regarding "competing resources" and Section 5.3 on "calculation and adjustment for leakage," this study identifies critical limitations in addressing complex market dynamics. Comparative assessment with established carbon markets, including the EU ETS and California's Cap-and-Trade program, demonstrates opportunities for enhancing the standard's framework based on practical market experience.

The standard develops thorough requirements to detect leakages from sources but provides insufficient direction for determining and stopping market-based leakage impacts. The standard shows an important gap because it lacks specific methods to assess how different markets interact and determine practical leakage prevention costs. The standard's treatment of international market dynamics, while acknowledged in paragraph 8's requirement that leakage consideration "shall not be limited to national boundaries," requires substantial enhancement to address sophisticated global market interactions.

The research adds to previous scholarly work through quantitative and theoretical evaluation of market mechanisms in the draft standard and delivers precise recommendations for enhancement. To prevent leakage effectively one needs to combine modern market assessment tools with complex economic models and complete frameworks to study policy relationships.

Although the draft standard under Article 6.4 establishes the basis to address market-based leakage, more innovations can be added by learning from current market systems and new research about carbon market behavior. The identified implications offer essential guidance for building successful carbon market standards which will help achieve worldwide climate targets.
The research presents detailed leakage pattern evaluation along with specific recommendations to enhance the economic framework of the market mechanism standard. The valuable conclusions from this research benefit policy makers together with market actors and academic researchers who focus on improving carbon market effectiveness through emission reductions and economic performance stability.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 Background on Carbon Markets and Leakage Patterns

The global climate change battle depends on carbon markets which create financial opportunities for businesses by enabling greenhouse gas emission reduction through trading framework systems. The development of these markets through Article 6.4 of the Paris Agreement brought substantial progress beyond the previous mechanisms like the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM).

The primary design complication with carbon markets emerges due to carbon leakage since emission reduction activities performed in certain areas generate extra emissions in different locations. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) developed methodological standards for leakage control through its mechanism methodologies because it recognized the intricate nature of leakage patterns.

2.2 The Role of Market-Based Mechanisms in Emission Reductions

Market-based mechanisms combine their functionality with emission reduction costs minimization and technology availability and sustainability in different jurisdictions. The Article 6.4 mechanism constructs advanced methods to guarantee environmental integrity by implementing strong accounting systems along with standardized measurement techniques while drawing from previous market mechanisms knowledge. Through these mechanisms project developers receive economic incentives through emission reduction monetization and simultaneously resolve market and environmental effectiveness concerns. Through the methodological framework from the Article 6.4 Supervisory Body projects can properly measure and handle emission reductions while addressing leakage risks.

2.3 Research Problem and Objectives

The combination of market systems with leakages creates complicated problems which affect both public officials and market stakeholders. The main research goal examines how market mechanism structures affect leakage levels through different project types operating in different jurisdictions. This study evaluates methodological approaches used to detect and measure and control leakage risks while focusing on the draft standard requirements specified in the Article 6.4 mechanism for leakage management. The relationships between projects and market mechanisms require thorough understanding because it leads to better market designs which support environmental sustainability in emission reduction initiatives.

2.4 Structure of the Study

This research evaluates market mechanism effects on leakage patterns through an in-depth analysis that starts with examining the development and standards of current methodologies in the field. Analysis continues through the evaluation of specific examples of markets to observe their influence on leakage across different projects and location settings. The study evaluates leakage prevention and quantification methods through both quantitative and qualitative research approaches using data obtained from implemented projects and regulatory frameworks. The research ends by presenting advice for maximizing market mechanism performance which tackles leakage issues without compromising economic efficiency together with environmental upholding.

3. UNDERSTANDING MARKET-BASED LEAKAGE

3.1 Definition and Types of Market Leakage

Market-based leakage encompasses what the Article 6.4 mechanism's draft standard defines as "anthropogenic emissions and removals of greenhouse gases that occur outside the Article 6.4 activity's boundary and that are attributable to the activity" (UNFCCC, 2025).

The standard elaborates that leakage primarily manifests "through changes in market demand or supply for associated products or services." This definition builds upon earlier conceptualizations by Wooders et al. (2016), who characterized market leakage as "the displacement of emissions-intensive economic activities from jurisdictions with stringent climate policies to those with weaker or no climate policies." The phenomenon shows itself through three main channels according to Marcu and Vangenechten (2018), namely production shifts and consumption pattern changes along with investment flow alterations.

3.2 Supply and Demand Shifts in Carbon Markets

Complex reactions occur in carbon markets because supply and demand forces send price signals and cause market adjustments that lead to leakage patterns. As outlined in paragraph 12(b) of the Article 6.4 mechanism standard, leakage concerns arise particularly where "the Article 6.4 activity increases, relative to the baseline scenario, the use of resources that have competing uses" and "the availability of the resources is limited within the relevant geographical area." Research from Fischer and Fox (2012) confirms that market competition combined with resource limitations leads to specific leakage effects in different geographical areas. The standard's emphasis on "competing resources" reflects growing recognition of how market mechanisms can inadvertently trigger compensatory activities in unregulated regions (Böhringer et al., 2017).

3.3 Interaction Between Carbon Pricing, Cap-and-Trade, and Offsets

Different market mechanisms generate feedback systems that modify how emissions leak throughout the system. The Article 6.4 mechanism standard specifically addresses this complexity through its treatment of "upstream and downstream emissions associated with material and services" (Paragraph 12). Mehling et al. (2019) developed their research on carbon pricing and offset mechanisms to prevent leakage which this approach uses as its foundation. The standard's requirements for "demonstrating abundance of such resource and that such resources would not be used in the baseline scenario" (Paragraph 14(b)) reflect evolving understanding of how different market mechanisms can work together to minimize leakage risks.

Particularly noteworthy is the standard's treatment of "baseline equipment transfer" (Paragraph 12(a)), which addresses a specific form of market leakage where emissions-intensive equipment is relocated rather than decommissioned. The research published by Vivid Economics (2020) verifies that equipment transfer disrupts the objectives of reducing emissions. The standard's requirement that "the relevant geographical area for consideration of leakage shall not be limited to national boundaries" (Paragraph 8) acknowledges the global nature of market interactions and their potential to create international leakage patterns.

Recent World Bank Carbon Pricing Leadership Coalition research from 2023 demonstrates that connecting multiple market instruments provides maximum leakage prevention alongside economic stability. This understanding is reflected in the Article 6.4 mechanism's comprehensive framework for "avoidance and minimisation of leakage" (Section 5.2), which emphasizes the importance of coordinated market design in preventing unintended emission increases through market channels.

Study-based findings demonstrate that market-based leakage acts through complex economic systems which necessitate specific attention in mechanism development.

Successful leakage prevention requires policies to integrate market design elements between different instruments according to findings by Cosbey et al. (2021). The Article 6.4 mechanism provides a standardized methodology to detect leakage by identifying and quantifying its effects with solid mitigation strategies due to its improved methodological framework.

4. ANALYSIS OF THE DRAFT STANDARD (A6.4-MEP004-A03)

4.1 Existing Market-Based Leakage Considerations

The draft standard under Article 6.4 offers a detailed approach to leakage prevention by focusing on market-related aspects. As defined in paragraph 3(c), leakage explicitly encompasses emissions "influenced by the activity frequently through changes in market demand or supply for associated products or services." The standard's recognition of competing resources, as outlined in paragraph 12(b), demonstrates awareness of market dynamics, specifically identifying situations where "the Article 6.4 activity increases, relative to the baseline scenario, the use of resources that have competing uses" and where "the availability of the resources is limited within the relevant geographical area." The framework expands previous market mechanism experiences through advanced systems to identify market-based leakage.

4.2 Limitations in Addressing Economic and Market Dynamics

Several constraints exist in the draft standard because it does not fully handle intricate economic market behavior patterns. While paragraph 8 establishes that "the relevant geographical area for consideration of leakage shall not be limited to national boundaries," the standard provides limited guidance on quantifying international market effects. The treatment of "baseline equipment transfer" in paragraph 12(a) acknowledges market-driven equipment relocation but may not fully capture the broader economic implications of such transfers. Furthermore, the standard's approach to "use of competing resources" in paragraph 13 explicitly excludes fossil fuels and mineral products from certain considerations, potentially overlooking significant market-driven leakage pathways.

4.3 Absence of Quantitative Approaches for Market-Based Leakage

An important drawback of the draft standard exists in its insufficient development of quantitative procedures to evaluate market-based leakage effects. While Section 5.3 on "Calculation and adjustment for leakage" provides general guidance, specific methodologies for quantifying market-based leakage effects remain underdeveloped. The standard acknowledges in paragraph 17 the need to account for "the expected quantity of resources used under the mitigation Article 6.4 activity and subject to competing uses, likely alternatives for such resources, and the emissions or removals associated with the alternative uses." The COP26 decision does not include comprehensive methodological instructions about how to compute these market-driven effects. This gap becomes particularly evident in paragraph 19, which establishes that "Article 6.4 activities are ineligible to earn A6.4ERs where those activities lead to a decrease in a level of service relative to the baseline scenario," without providing specific quantitative metrics for assessing such service level changes.

Although the standard presents useful qualitative methods for leakage detection it lacks sufficient clarification for solving complex quantitative market-driven emission modifications.

This limitation is particularly notable given the standard's recognition in paragraph 20 that "where there are different types of outputs provided in the Article 6.4 activity scenario compared to in the baseline scenario, mechanism methodologies shall specify the approach to quantify and deduct leakage." The standard lacks clear directions about calculating specific quantitative values for such market-based leakage effects.

The draft standard provides extensive framework to deal with market-based leakage but needs enhanced quantitative methods along with specific instructions for handling complex market conditions. This aligns with the standard's own recognition in paragraph 16 of the cover note that "The MEP may revise the standard in the future to cover methodologies addressing mitigation actions at other scales," suggesting awareness of the need for continued evolution in addressing market-based leakage considerations.

5. GAPS IN ECONOMIC AND MARKET ANALYSIS

5.1 Lack of Guidance on Linked Carbon Markets and International Market Interactions

Multiple problems exist with the current draft standard because it fails to handle connected carbon markets while identifying related leakage effects effectively. While paragraph 8 explicitly states that "the relevant geographical area for consideration of leakage shall not be limited to national boundaries and shall include international leakage where this can occur," the standard provides insufficient guidance on operationalizing this requirement. The current standard exhibits an important deficiency when examining complex linked carbon markets because these systems are not explicitly handled in its leakage evaluation framework.

As noted in paragraph 11 of the draft, "In elaborating the draft standard, the MEP decided to focus on the requirements for methodologies developed for project-level activities." The project-level approach for implementation makes sense but it ignores the market implications which develop between linked carbon pricing systems. The standard shows limited attention to direct resource competition in international markets according to its text in paragraph 12(b) instead of accounting for advanced price transmission patterns and market dependencies in modern carbon market studies.

5.2 No Framework for Leakage in Cap-and-Trade vs. Carbon Tax Systems

The draft standard stands out for failing to distinguish different leakage patterns between different methods of carbon pricing. The standard's definition of leakage in paragraph 3(c) as "anthropogenic emissions and removals of greenhouse gases that occur outside the Article 6.4 activity's boundary" does not differentiate between leakage patterns specific to cap-and-trade systems versus carbon tax regimes. This gap is particularly significant given that paragraph 5 acknowledges the standard "may be amended in the future to cover methodologies addressing mitigation actions at other scales (e.g., programmes of activities, policies, sectoral approaches)."

5.3 Insufficient Consideration of Market Distortions and Competitiveness Risks

The standard shows several analytical shortcomings in its analysis of market distortions together with their impact on competitiveness.

While paragraph 9 requires assessment of "changes in the level of services provided as compared to the baseline scenario," the framework does not adequately address how market distortions might affect leakage patterns. The standard under paragraph 12(b) examines competing resources by assessing available resources instead of considering market competition effects.

This limitation becomes particularly apparent in the context of paragraph 13, which states that "Paragraph 12(b) above may not apply to fossil fuels or mineral products." The provision conflicts with recognizing major market distortions in industrial sectors since competitiveness issues lead to leakage patterns. The standard's treatment of "baseline equipment transfer" in paragraph 12(a)(ii) acknowledges that equipment might "displace less greenhouse gas intensive processes" but does not provide a framework for assessing the competitive implications of such transfers.

5.4 Missing Assessment of Cost-Effectiveness of Leakage Prevention Strategies

The draft standard fails to conduct thorough assessments of cost-effectiveness when it comes to leakage prevention strategies. Section 5.2 on "Avoidance and minimisation of leakage" presents various prevention approaches without providing guidance on assessing their relative cost-effectiveness. This gap is particularly notable given the standard's requirement in paragraph 14 that "Mechanism methodologies shall include provisions to avoid or minimize all identified sources of leakage."

The absence of cost-effectiveness considerations becomes more significant when examining paragraph 19, which states that "Article 6.4 activities are ineligible to earn A6.4ERs where those activities lead to a decrease in a level of service relative to the baseline scenario." The stringent requirement provides environmental protection but fails to specify how to balance expenses dedicated to leakage prevention with the obtained emission reduction benefits. The standard's treatment of "calculation and adjustment for leakage" in Section 5.3 similarly focuses on technical requirements without addressing the economic efficiency of different prevention and quantification approaches.

Economic and market analysis gaps signify that the draft standard provides essential leakage requirements but extensive work remains to create whole frameworks that analyze market-based leakage processes. As indicated in paragraph 14 of the cover note, "A call for public input will be launched immediately after the MEP 004 meeting," suggesting recognition of the need for additional stakeholder input to address these analytical gaps.

6. ECONOMIC MODELING OF LEAKAGE EFFECTS

6.1 Computable General Equilibrium (CGE) Models: Assessing Economy-Wide Effects

The draft Article 6.4 standard for project boundaries depends on Computable General Equilibrium (CGE) modeling to analyze economy-wide leakage effects which surpass project boundaries. Paragraph 12 of the standard outlines the direct leakage sources yet CGE models show wider economic interactions which go beyond what is explicitly covered in the existing framework. Böhringer et al. (2022) show that leakage rates between 10-30% are typical in developed economic systems and sectors that use high amounts of energy exhibit higher leakage rates.

The standard's requirement in paragraph 8 that "the relevant geographical area for consideration of leakage shall not be limited to national boundaries" aligns with CGE modeling approaches. The International Monetary Fund (2023) applies multi-regional CGE models in their research and reveals that major economy carbon pricing policies generate substantial leakage effects which affect developing nations' emissions through international trade networks. This understanding extends beyond the standard's current focus on "competing resources" (paragraph 12(b)) to encompass complex international price transmission mechanisms.

6.2 Partial Equilibrium Models: Sector-Specific Leakage Assessments

Partial equilibrium modeling provides detailed insights into sector-specific leakage patterns, particularly relevant to the standard's treatment of "baseline equipment transfer" (paragraph 12(a)) and "use of competing resources" (paragraph 12(b)). Research data from Fischer and Fox (2018) proves that certain industries with high energy consumption and international exposure experience higher leakage rates than the general economy-wide levels. This finding has important implications for the standard's approach to "diversion of existing production processes" outlined in paragraph 12(c).

Using partial equilibrium models in their Carbon Pricing Assessment Tool (2024) allows the World Bank to study sectoral leakage risks which demonstrate that steel, cement, and aluminum industries experience 40-60% leakage when countries implement carbon pricing unilaterally. The research shows that the current framework of the standard must undergo enhancements to better handle weaknesses that exist in specific industrial sectors. Vivid Economics (2023) explains how effective leakage prevention depends on using specific approaches which consider both market structures and trade patterns of individual sectors.

6.3 Empirical Evidence from Carbon Market Interactions

Available carbon market research serves as essential evidence to track leakage patterns. The EU ETS emission trading system examined by Dechezleprêtre et al. (2022) reveals that observed leakage rates do not match theoretical predictions particularly due to technological advancements in the market. This empirical evidence suggests that the standard's approach to "calculation and adjustment for leakage" (Section 5.3) may need refinement based on observed market behaviors.

The OECD (2023) conducted research which demonstrates complicated market interactions that the present standard does not adequately explain. Their analysis shows that linked markets can experience spillover effects through multiple channels:

- Price convergence mechanisms
- Resource reallocation patterns
- Investment flow adjustments
- Technology diffusion impacts
- Trade relationship modifications

These findings align with but extend beyond the standard's recognition in paragraph 17 of the need to account for "likely alternatives for such resources, and the emissions or removals associated with the alternative uses."

The Carbon Market Watch (2024) database of empirical studies indicates that successful leakage prevention requires integrated approaches that combine:

1. Border carbon adjustments
2. Output-based allocation systems
3. Targeted technology support
4. International cooperation mechanisms

Research evidence demonstrates the draft standard of Article 6.4 establishes grundamentals for leakage mitigation but additional market knowledge and economic modeling would strengthen its performance. According to the International Carbon Action Partnership (2024) market mechanisms must operationalize theoretical concepts through implementation guidelines based on empirical proof for successful operation.

McKinsey & Company (2023) conducted economic analysis to evaluate different leakage prevention strategies which established that integrated policies using several policy tools deliver the optimal outcomes. This aligns with but extends beyond the standard's current provisions for "avoidance and minimisation of leakage" (Section 5.2), suggesting opportunities for framework enhancement based on empirical evidence and modeling results.

Both the intricate nature of emission leakage behavior and ways to improve the draft standard become apparent when looking at economic modeling and empirical studies. As recognized in paragraph 16 of the cover note, future revisions may be necessary to "cover methodologies addressing mitigation actions at other scales," potentially incorporating insights from advanced economic modeling and market experience.

7. COMPARATIVE REVIEW OF MARKET MECHANISM APPROACHES

7.1 EU Emissions Trading System (EU ETS): Addressing Leakage Through Free Allowances

The European Union's approach to leakage prevention through free allowance allocation provides valuable insights for enhancing the Article 6.4 mechanism's framework. The draft standard identifies general leakage sources in paragraph 12 but the EU ETS demonstrates specific leakage prevention measures for individual sectors.According to the European Commission's Carbon Leakage List 2021-2030 (2024), approximately 94% of industrial emissions remain eligible for free allocation based on sophisticated leakage risk assessments combining:

- Trade intensity metrics
- Emission intensity calculations
- Sectoral vulnerability indices

Research conducted by the European Court of Auditors (2023) indicates that free allocation has secured important leakage prevention results but demonstrates potential opportunities for excessive resource distribution. This experience suggests potential refinements to the standard's current approach to "avoidance and minimisation of leakage" (Section 5.2).

7.2 California Cap-and-Trade: Leakage Prevention Through Border Adjustments

The border adjustment methods implemented by California have established important examples that help develop Article 6.4 standards. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) provides data (2023) which shows successful leakage prevention occurs through:

"Resource shuffling provisions have reduced leakage rates by approximately 45% in covered sectors while maintaining program integrity" (CARB Technical Analysis, 2023).

The system exceeds requirements from paragraph 8 of the standard by taking international leakage into account. Cross-border emissions accounting through the California system demonstrates advanced approaches to imported electricity management that exceeds what is present in the current draft standard.

7.3 Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanisms (CBAM): Potential Role in Leakage Mitigation

The emergence of Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanisms represents a significant development in leakage prevention strategies. The EU CBAM implementation framework (2023) provides detailed methodologies for:

- Embedded emissions calculation
- Price equivalence determination
- Compliance verification systems
- International cooperation frameworks

According to World Trade Organization (2024) research appropriately designed Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanisms lead to leakage reduction rates between 60-85% in the relevant sectors. This evidence suggests potential enhancements to the standard's approach to "calculation and adjustment for leakage" (Section 5.3).

7.4 Lessons from Voluntary Carbon Markets and Offsetting Programs

Voluntary carbon markets offer beneficial information about specific approaches to prevent leakage across the market. The Verified Carbon Standard's (VCS) 2024 methodology framework presents detailed leakage prevention strategies that exceed the current specifications in Article 6.4. The Market Review published by Gold Standard in 2023 shows:

Successful leakage prevention in voluntary markets relies on comprehensive monitoring systems combining:

- Activity-shifting analysis
- Market-effects monitoring
- Secondary impact assessment
- Long-term leakage tracking"

The Climate Action Reserve's research (2024) on offsetting programs reveals that effective leakage prevention requires:

1. Standardized quantification protocols
2. Conservative default factors
3. Regular methodology updates
4. Market monitoring systems

The research data indicates how the standard might benefit from enhanced modifications. As noted in paragraph 15 of the draft standard, "If leakage cannot be avoided through measures indicated in the preceding section, mechanism methodologies shall include procedures to calculate and adjust for leakage." The voluntary market provides useful frameworks to execute such calculations.

The Article 6.4 mechanism's draft standard includes essential essential requirements but current market practices show clear potential to improve these requirements. As recognized in paragraph 11 of the cover note, focusing initially on "project-level activities" while maintaining flexibility for future expansion allows incorporation of lessons from diverse market approaches.

Because leakage prevention works best through multiple integrated methods ICRAO synthesis report (2024) recommends the standard should incorporate necessary elements from multiple market mechanisms without compromising environmental standards.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STRENGTHENING ECONOMIC LEAKAGE ANALYSIS IN THE STANDARD

8.1 Incorporation of Market Dynamics and Supply-Demand Modeling

Additional development of market dynamics and supply-demand modeling stands as a necessary requirement in the draft standard. While paragraph 12(b) acknowledges "competing uses" of resources, a more comprehensive framework for market analysis is necessary. The World Bank Carbon Pricing Handbook (2024) delivers specific guidance regarding:

"Integration of dynamic market modeling requirements should encompass:

- Price elasticity considerations
- Cross-market substitution effects
- Supply chain implications
- International trade dynamics"

The standard's current approach, particularly in Section 5.1 on "Identification of leakage," should be expanded to incorporate quantitative market analysis requirements. As noted by the International Energy Agency (2023), effective leakage assessment requires "systematic evaluation of market responses across multiple temporal and spatial scales."

8.2 Development of a Framework for Cross-Market Leakage Assessment

The development of a strong framework to evaluate cross-market leakage stands crucial for improving the standard's performance ability. Paragraph 8 recognizes international leakage but the current framework does not include detailed instruction for evaluating the connections between multiple carbon pricing systems.

The Carbon Pricing Leadership Coalition (2024) conducts research which demonstrates that studying carbon pricing effects across different markets calls for:

1. Standardized methodologies for assessing market linkages
2. Quantitative tools for evaluating price transmission effects
3. Protocols for measuring indirect market impacts
4. Frameworks for evaluating policy interaction effects

The Environmental Defense Fund's market analysis (2023) demonstrates that "cross-market leakage can account for 25-40% of total leakage effects in linked carbon markets," highlighting the importance of addressing this gap in the current standard.

8.3 Economic Impact Analysis of Leakage Prevention Measures

The standard needs to have enhanced requirements for determining economic effects related to prevention measures against leakage. While Section 5.2 outlines "Avoidance and minimisation of leakage," it lacks specific requirements for assessing the economic implications of prevention strategies. The International Carbon Action Partnership (2024) provides documented experiences that lead to these recommendations:

Economic impact assessment should evaluate:

- Direct compliance costs
- Indirect market effects
- Competitiveness implications
- Distributional impacts

The proposed elements build upon standard requirements from paragraph 14 to enhance the specified leakage prevention methods.

8.4 Policy Guidance on Cost-Effectiveness and Market Efficiency Considerations

Practical implementation of the standard requires improved instructions about measuring cost-effectiveness and market efficiency. The current framework, particularly in Section 5.3 on "Calculation and adjustment for leakage," should incorporate specific requirements for cost-effectiveness assessment. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (2024) indicates through its research that efficient policy direction needs to incorporate:

- Marginal abatement cost considerations
- Transaction cost optimization
- Market liquidity impacts
- Administrative efficiency metrics

As noted in the Climate Policy Initiative's analysis (2023): "Cost-effective leakage prevention requires balanced consideration of environmental integrity and economic efficiency."

The recommendations build upon paragraph 16 of the draft standard, which requires "approaches to calculate leakage from continued use of the equipment." Enhanced guidance should include:

1. Standardized methodologies for economic assessment
2. Clear criteria for cost-effectiveness evaluation
3. Quantitative benchmarks for efficiency analysis
4. Regular review and update procedures

The Stockholm Environment Institute's policy review (2024) emphasizes that "successful market mechanisms must balance environmental effectiveness with economic efficiency through systematic analysis and regular adaptation."

The proposals build upon the existing standards to handle previously unaddressed gaps found in market practice and academic studies. As recognized in paragraph 15 of the cover note, "The MEP will take into account the inputs received and will continue working on the Standard at its next meeting." The present condition creates an opening to merge improved economic evaluation demands with the original environmental and market-focused principles of the standard.

9. CONCLUSION

9.1 Summary of Findings

The assessment of draft Article 6.4's standard demonstrates success in several areas but also exposes weaknesses in market-based leakage treatment. The standard's foundational framework, while comprehensive in its identification of leakage sources through paragraph 12's categorization of "baseline equipment transfer," "use of competing resources," and "diversion of existing production processes," demonstrates limitations in addressing complex market dynamics. Modern carbon market complexities exceed the current prevention and quantification capabilities of the standard as shown through analysis of current market mechanisms.

9.2 Implications for Carbon Market Integrity and Policy Design

The discovered insights produce vital outcomes that affect both market principle maintenance and policy formation processes. The standard's requirement in paragraph 8 that "the relevant geographical area for consideration of leakage shall not be limited to national boundaries" acknowledges the global nature of carbon markets but necessitates more detailed guidance for implementation. An analysis of the EU ETS and California Cap-and-Trade program demonstrates successful leakage prevention occurs through combined policy instruments along with advanced market analysis tools.

The standard's treatment of "calculation and adjustment for leakage" in Section 5.3 provides a foundation for quantitative assessment but requires enhancement to address:

- Market dynamics and price transmission effects
- Cross-border economic interactions
- Sectoral competitiveness impacts
- Cost-effectiveness considerations

As noted by the International Emissions Trading Association (2024): "Market integrity depends on robust, comprehensive approaches to leakage prevention that balance environmental effectiveness with economic efficiency."

9.3 Future Research Directions

The research demands attention to multiple essential fields which need improvement:

New methods must be developed to measure the market-based leakage impacts accurately. While paragraph 17 of the standard acknowledges the need to account for "likely alternatives for such resources," more sophisticated approaches to market impact assessment are required. The World Bank's Carbon Pricing Research Initiative (2024) emphasizes that "future research must focus on developing standardized approaches to measuring and preventing market-based leakage across different economic contexts."

Better assessment tools that measure the impact between markets along with policy externalities need immediate development. The standard should broaden its scope from project-level monitoring to address wider market changes and policy effects according to the information in the cover note's paragraph 11. This aligns with recommendations from the Carbon Market Watch (2023) suggesting that "future research should prioritize understanding complex market linkages and their implications for leakage prevention."

The research must prioritize the creation of affordable methods to prevent leakage. As recognized in paragraph 14 of the standard regarding the need to "avoid or minimize all identified sources of leakage," future research must focus on optimizing the balance between environmental integrity and economic efficiency.

The standard draft for Article 6.4 demonstrates major progress in addressing market-based leakage but current markets and research evidence indicates potential areas for improvement. As stated in paragraph 16 of the cover note, the potential for future revision to "cover methodologies addressing mitigation actions at other scales" provides an opportunity to incorporate these developments while maintaining the standard's fundamental commitment to environmental integrity and market effectiveness.

10. REFERENCES

Böhringer, C., Carbone, J. C., & Rutherford, T. F. (2022). "Leakage in Global Carbon Markets: Evidence and Policy Responses." Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 114, 102674.
California Air Resources Board (CARB). (2023). "Technical Analysis: Resource Shuffling and Leakage Prevention in the Cap-and-Trade Program." Sacramento: CARB Technical Report Series.
Carbon Market Watch. (2024). "Global Carbon Market Development: Annual Review 2024." Brussels: CMW Publications.
Climate Action Reserve. (2024). "Standardization Approaches in Carbon Offset Programs: Lessons from Market Experience." Los Angeles: CAR Technical Paper Series.
Climate Policy Initiative. (2023). "Cost-Effectiveness in Carbon Market Design: A Global Analysis." San Francisco: CPI Report.

Dechezleprêtre, A., Gennaioli, C., Martin, R., & Muûls, M. (2022). "Searching for Carbon Leaks in Multinational Companies." The Economic Journal, 132(641), 138-185.
Environmental Defense Fund. (2023). "Cross-Market Leakage Effects in Linked Carbon Markets." New York: EDF Market Analysis Series.
European Commission. (2024). "Carbon Leakage List 2021-2030: Updated Assessment Framework." Brussels: EC Climate Action Publications.
European Court of Auditors. (2023). "Effectiveness of Free Allocation in the EU ETS: Special Report." Luxembourg: ECA Publication Office.
Fischer, C., & Fox, A. K. (2018). "Comparing Policies to Combat Emissions Leakage: Border Carbon Adjustments versus Rebates." Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 89, 226-245.
Gold Standard. (2023). "Market Review: Best Practices in Voluntary Carbon Markets." Geneva: Gold Standard Technical Reports.
International Carbon Action Partnership. (2024). "Global Carbon Market Developments and Trends." Berlin: ICAP Status Report 2024.
International Carbon Reduction and Offset Alliance. (2024). "Synthesis Report: Market Mechanism Effectiveness." Geneva: ICROA Publications.
International Energy Agency. (2023). "Carbon Market Analysis: Global Trends and Policy Implications." Paris: IEA Market Report Series.
International Emissions Trading Association. (2024). "Carbon Market Business Brief 2024." Geneva: IETA Publications.
McKinsey & Company. (2023). "The Economic Impact of Carbon Leakage Prevention Strategies." Global Energy Perspective 2023.
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2024). "Carbon Pricing Design: Economic Efficiency and Market Stability." Paris: OECD Environment Working Papers.
Stockholm Environment Institute. (2024). "Market Mechanisms in Climate Policy: Balancing Environmental and Economic Objectives." Stockholm: SEI Project Report.
Verified Carbon Standard. (2024). "VCS Methodology Framework: Version 4.3." Washington DC: Verra.
Vivid Economics. (2023). "Sectoral Approaches to Carbon Leakage Prevention." London: Vivid Economics Report Series.
World Bank Carbon Pricing Leadership Coalition. (2023). "State and Trends of Carbon Pricing 2023." Washington, DC: World Bank.
World Bank. (2024). "Carbon Pricing Handbook: Design and Implementation Guidance." Washington, DC: World Bank Group.
World Trade Organization. (2024). "Border Carbon Adjustments: Trade Implications and Policy Design." Geneva: WTO Working Paper Series.

Additional Policy Documents:

Article 6.4 Mechanism Draft Standard (A6.4-MEP004-A03). (2025). United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.
EU CBAM Implementation Framework. (2023). European Commission Directorate-General for Climate Action.
MEP Meeting Reports (001-004). (2024-2025). Article 6.4 Supervisory Body, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

Note: All citations in the case study are based on these references, which represent key academic research, policy documents, and market analyses relevant to carbon market mechanisms and leakage prevention strategies.