



Climate Policy >

Volume 16, 2016 - Issue 6

7,738 96  
Views | CrossRef citations to date | Altmetric

RESEARCH

# Compliance of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol in the first commitment period

Igor Shishlov Romain Morel & Valentin Bellassen

Pages 768-782 | Published online: 10 Jun 2016

Cite this article <https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2016.1164658>

Check for updates

Sample our Engineering & Technology Journals  
>> Sign in here to start your access to the latest two volumes for 14 days

Full Article

Figures & data

References

Citations

Metrics

Reprints & Permissions

Read this article

Share

## Abstract

This article provides an ex post analysis of the compliance of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol during the first commitment period (2008–2012) based on the final data for national GHG emissions and exchanges in carbon units that became available at the end of 2015. On the domestic level, among the 36 countries that fully participated in the Kyoto Protocol, only nine countries emitted higher levels of GHGs than committed and therefore had to resort to flexibility mechanisms. On the international level – i.e. after the use of flexibility mechanisms – all Annex B Parties are in compliance. Countries implemented different compliance strategies: purchasing carbon units abroad, stimulating the domestic use of carbon credits by the private sector and incentivizing domestic emission reductions through climate policies.

Overall, the countries party to the Protocol surpassed their aggregate commitment by an average 2.4 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e yr<sup>-1</sup>. Of the possible explanations for this overachievement, 'hot-air' was estimated at 2.2 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e yr<sup>-1</sup>, while accounting rules for land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) further removed 0.4 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e yr<sup>-1</sup> from the net result excluding LULUCF. The hypothetical participation of the US and Canada would have reduced this overachievement by a net 1 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e yr<sup>-1</sup>. None of these factors – some of which may be deemed illegitimate – would therefore on its own have led to global non-compliance, even without use of the 0.3 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e of annual emissions reductions generated by the Clean Development Mechanism. The impact of domestic policies and 'carbon leakage' – neither of which is quantitatively assessed here – should not be neglected either.

## Policy relevance

Given the ongoing evolution of the international climate regime and the adoption of the Paris Agreement in December 2015, we believe that there is a need to evaluate the results of the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol. To our knowledge there has been no overarching quantitative *ex post* assessment of the Kyoto Protocol based on the final emissions data for 2008–2012, which became available in late 2015. This article attempts to fill this gap, focusing on the domestic and international compliance of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol in the first commitment period.

## KEYWORDS:

Carbon accounting   carbon emissions trading   compliance   GHG emissions   Kyoto Protocol

## Correction Statement

This article has been republished with minor changes. These changes do not impact the academic content of the article.

## Notes

1. See Appendix 1 for a detailed list of countries.

2. For example, Poland's target was  $-6\%$ , and its average annual aggregated GHG emissions in 2008–2012 were  $29.7\%$  below base year. It therefore overreached its target by  $29.7-6 = 23.7\%$ .

## Related Research Data

### Pricing Carbon

Source: Unknown Repository

Rapid growth in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions after the 2008–2009 global financial crisis

Source: Nature Climate Change

National greenhouse-gas accounting for effective climate policy on international trade

Source: Nature Climate Change

Can CDM monitoring requirements be reduced while maintaining environmental integrity?

Source: Climate Policy

The Kyoto Protocol: Hot air

Source: Nature

Policy MonitorEdited by Maureen CropperThe Clean Development Mechanism: History, Status, and Prospects

Source: Review of Environmental Economics and Policy

Review of the experience with monitoring uncertainty requirements in the Clean

## Related research

People also read

Recommended articles

Cited by  
96

## Information for

Authors

R&D professionals

Editors

Librarians

Societies

## Opportunities

Reprints and e-prints

Advertising solutions

Accelerated publication

Corporate access solutions

## Open access

Overview

Open journals

Open Select

Dove Medical Press

F1000Research

## Help and information

Help and contact

Newsroom

All journals

Books

## Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources  
by email

 Sign me up

  

  

Copyright © 2026 Informa UK Limited Privacy policy Cookies Terms & conditions

Accessibility



Registered in England & Wales No. 01072954  
5 Howick Place | London | SW1P 1WG