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Areas of Agreement

- Severe threats to regions in both nations
- Robust and interactive science communities
- Approximately 30% of global emissions
- Early bi-national engagement (1988, 1992) and mutual *signing* of Kyoto
- Subsequent national disengagement
- Default through decentralization
- No bi-national institutional leader
Points of Divergence

- Kyoto: Canada ratifies---and ignores (+26%)
- Kyoto: US spurns (+15%)
- Provinces: Maximum authority, minimal policy
- States: Moderate authority, major policy
  - Cap-and-trade
  - RPS and energy efficiency
  - Vehicle emission standards
  - Statewide reduction targets
  - Suing the feds
American State Policy Development

Table 1. State Climate Policy Adoption and Greenhouse Gas Emission Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of State Climate Policy Adoption*</th>
<th>High (&gt;15%)</th>
<th>Low (&lt;15%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (2 or more policies)</td>
<td>10 States Arizona</td>
<td>12 States California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minnesota Oregon</td>
<td>New Mexico Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (0-1 policies)</td>
<td>22 States Alabama</td>
<td>7 States Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Florida Texas</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Provincial Climate Policy Adoption and Greenhouse Gas Emission Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (2 or more policies)</td>
<td>High (&gt;15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (0-1 policies)</td>
<td>Low (&lt;15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 Provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newfoundland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manitoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quebec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Measures the adoption of the following policies within a state or province: Renewable Portfolio Standard, Carbon Tax, Renewable Fuel Standard, Carbon Cap-and-Trade, Statewide Emissions Target, Mandatory Emissions Reporting, Litigation against Federal Government, vehicle emission standards.
Sub-federal Cap & Trade Policies

Map 1 - States and Provinces With Carbon Cap-and-Trade Policies
Sub-federal RPSs
Possible Points of Convergence

- Cross-border diffusion, Canada-style (BC, perhaps Manitoba and Quebec)
- Federal governments scrutinize cap & trade
- Provincial-State Partnerships emerge
  - BC/MB enter WCI
  - MB enters MRGGRA
  - Powering the Plains
  - ECP/NEG
Case for Expanded Cooperation

- Intensive state policy development along Canadian border
- Energy interconnectedness
  - North-south movement
  - Limiting leakage and sinks
  - Renewable energy promotion or protection
    - RPS and related barriers
- North America as an international leader??
Case Against Expanded Collaboration

- Lack of an institutional home or leader
- Limited cross-border policy discussions (Congressional hearings)
- Policy capacity gap (mezzo-level staffing)
- Different policy styles (regulation v. voluntarism v. cap & trade)
- Protection of ‘home-grown’ energy sources and technologies
Where to Begin

- Lessons: RGGI, EU, Australia-New Zealand
- Expansion of regional experiments
- Toward a common framework
  - Common reporting metrics
  - Common definition of renewable energy and REC mechanisms
  - Interactive cap & trade provisions
- Thinking outside the box: New Bi-National or Continental Institution 100 years after IBWT that focuses upon climate?