



Session 7: How to achieve the removal of EHS by 2025

Ronald Steenblik, Special Counsellor,
Fossil-Fuel Subsidy Reform, OECD

G7 Workshop on Environmentally Harmful Subsidies
and Environmental Fiscal Reforms
Rome, 14-15 March 2017

Questions relating to international collective action

- **What is the ambition?**
 - Is the focus on **products** (trade perspective), sectors, or environmentally harmful activities? How many products, sectors or activities?
 - How many **countries**? If beyond the G7, should the principle of special and differentiation apply?
 - Should the timeline be the same for all products, or different (depending on the complexity of the subsidy landscape)?
- **What kind of agreement do you want?**
 - Target? Binding? If binding, how monitored, how enforced?
 - How would any agreement interact with pre-existing international efforts?

Alternative model 1: G20 commitment on FFS

- High-level, but non-binding, commitment at the leader level. Relatively small number of countries involved.
- Critical terms, like “subsidy”, “inefficient”, “wasteful” “encourage ... consumption”, “in the medium-term” not defined.
- “Official” data based on voluntary submissions, though more and more information from IOs and independent sources.
- Commitment provides political coverage, but implementation and participation in processes depends on coalition of the willing
- That said, non-binding approach has allowed some progress, facilitated by peer reviews. These peer reviews, through practice, may lead to convergence on terms.
- Whether they lead to full phase out of the subsidies of concern by any normal definition of “the medium term” remains to be seen.

Alternative model 2: WTO Agreement on Agriculture

- Binding commitment, by Trade Ministers. Most of the world involved.
- Critical terms, like “subsidy”, “specificity” and product coverage defined.
- “Official” data based on obligatory notifications; other information from IOs and independent sources helps complement this information.
- Commitment tied to specific actions within a specific timeframe.
- Special and differential treatment applied. (LDCs and developing countries subject to less stringent targets – however, status as a developing country is self-defined.)
- AoA achieved its objectives, though many unanswered issues .
- Negotiating a new agreement largely hostage to the “single undertaking” approach.



Contact us

We look forward to answering any questions you may have!



Ronald.Steenblik@oecd.org