Convenience Yields and Risk Premiums in the EU-ETS - Evidence from the Kyoto Commitment Period[☆]

Stefan Trück[a,*], Rafał Weron[b]

[a] *Faculty of Business and Economics, Macquarie University, Sydney, NSW 2109, Australia*
[b] *Department of Operations Research, Wrocław University of Technology, 50-370 Wrocław, Poland*

Abstract

We examine convenience yields in the EU-wide CO_2 emissions trading scheme (EU-ETS) during the first Kyoto commitment period (2008-2012). We find that the market has changed from initial backwardation to contango with significantly negative convenience yields in futures contracts. We further examine the impact of interest rate levels in the Eurozone, the increasing level of surplus allowances and banking as well as returns, variance or skewness in the EU-ETS spot market. Our findings suggest that the drop in risk-free rates during and after the financial crisis has impacted on the deviation from the cost-of-carry relationship for Kyoto commitment emission allowances (EUA) futures contracts. Our results also illustrate a negative relationship between convenience yields and the increasing level of inventory during the first Kyoto commitment period providing an explanation for the high negative convenience yields during Phase II. Finally, we find that market participants are willing to pay an additional risk premium in the futures market for a hedge against increased volatility in EUA prices.

Keywords: CO_2 Emissions Trading, Commodity Markets, Spot and Futures Prices, Convenience Yields.
JEL: G10, G13, Q21, Q28

[☆] This research was supported by Australian Research Council through grant no. DP1096326, National Science Centre (NCN, Poland) through grant no. 2013/11/B/HS4/01061 and the Robert Schumann Centre at European University Institute (EUI).

[*] Corresponding author: Department of Applied Finance and Actuarial Studies, Faculty of Business and Economics, Macquarie University, Sydney, NSW 2109, Australia.

Email addresses: `stefan.trueck@mq.edu.au` (Stefan Trück), `rafal.weron@pwr.edu.pl` (Rafał Weron)

Preprint submitted to Elsevier *March 11, 2015*

1. Introduction

The European Union's Emissions Trading System (EU ETS) is the largest cap-and-trade program yet implemented and has introduced emission allowances (EUA) as a new class of financial assets. Environmental policy has historically been a command-and-control type regulation where companies had to strictly comply with emission standards such that the trading scheme indicates a shift in paradigms. Under the Kyoto Protocol the EU had committed to reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 8% compared to the 1990 level by the year 2012, while the proposed caps in the EU-ETS for 2020 represent a reduction of more than 20% of greenhouse gases. After an initial pilot trading period (2005-2007), in 2008 there were new allocation plans for each of the countries and the first Kyoto commitment trading period lasted from 2008 to 2012. The third trading period started in January 2013 and will last until December 2020. Since its inception, the system has been significantly expanded in scope to include both new sectors and additional countries. It has evolved from a system with decentralized allocations based on national allocation plans towards a centralized system, featuring an EU-wide cap currently declining at an annual rate of 1.74%. For the second Kyoto commitment period (2013-2020), a high number of originally free allocations has also been replaced by a combination of auctioning, with full auctioning for all participating sectors as the long-term goal. Failure to submit a sufficient amount of allowances has also resulted in increased sanction payments from 40 Euro during the pilot trading period to 100 EUR per missing ton of CO_2 allowances during the second and third trading period (Chevallier, 2012; Hintermann, 2010).

As a result, the EU-ETS forces companies to hold an adequate number of allowances according to their carbon dioxide output, while participants face several risks specific to emissions trading. In particular, price risk and volume risk have to be considered. The former is due to the fluctuation of allowance prices, while the latter can be attributed to unexpected fluctuations in production figures and energy demand such that emitters do not know ex ante their exact demand for EUAs. Therefore, to hedge these risks, next to monitoring the spot market, also derivative instruments such as options and futures contracts for carbon emission allowances are of great importance. Market participants face the decision when to buy additionally required permits or sell surplus allowances, in particular given the fact that since Phase II the scheme allows for the banking of surplus allowances and usage at a later stage. Therefore, in particular the relationship between carbon spot and futures prices will significantly impact on risk management and hedging decisions for participating companies (Chesney and Taschini, 2012; Daskalakis et al., 2009; Seifert et al., 2008).

In this study, we examine convenience yields in the EU-wide CO_2 emissions trading scheme (EU-ETS) during the first Kyoto commitment period (2008-2012). While the connection between spot and futures prices as well as contango and backwardation market situations, have been thoroughly investigated for commodities like oil, electricity, gas or agricultural products, see, e.g., Bodie and Rosansky (1980); Chang (1985); Gibson and Schwartz (1990); Pindyck (2001); Schwartz and Smith (2000); Weron and Zator (2014), the convenience yield and risk premiums in the EU-ETS have not been studied extensively.

We are particularly interested in deviations from the cost-of-carry relationship in Phase II of the trading scheme, where banking of surplus allowances for usage in later periods was allowed.

We believe that such an analysis will provide us with information on existing risk premiums in the EU-ETS and will yield results on how much market participants are willing to pay for a hedge against the risk of price movements in the EUA market. Our findings suggest that during Phase II the market has changed from an initial short period of backwardation to contango with significantly negative convenience yields in futures contracts. These results indicate a significant deviation from the cost-of-carry relationship for EUA spot and futures contracts. Our analysis also yields insights into the driving factors of observed convenience yields in the EU-ETS. In particular, we examine the impact of interest rate levels in the Eurozone, surplus allowances and banking, and factors related to the dynamics and risk of EUA spot prices.

Clearly, interest rates are expected to have a significant impact on the relationship between commodity spot and futures prices. The risk-free rate has also been suggested as a key pricing factor for commodity derivatives, see e.g. Casassus and Collin-Dufresne (2005); Schwartz (1997); Schwartz and Smith (2000). Since interest rates are typically also related to – or even considered to be a proxy for – economic activity, they might well be expected to affect convenience yields. Our findings suggest that the drop in risk-free rates during the financial crisis in 2008, and the subsequently low interest rate levels as a result of the European Sovereign Debt crisis, have had a significant impact on the relationship between spot and futures contracts during the first Kyoto commitment period.

We also examine the relationship between banking of surplus allowances in the EU-ETS and the observed convenience yields. The theory of storage suggests a negative relationship between the convenience yield and inventory (Pindyck, 2001), such that an increasing amount of surplus allowances, as reported by Ellerman et al. (2014) and Zaklan et al. (2014), is expected to reduce convenience yields. We find confirmation for this relationship with convenience yields becoming more negative as surplus allowances increase towards the end of the Kyoto commitment period.

Finally, we study how the behavior of EUA spot prices impacts on the relationship between spot and futures contracts. We examine the relationship between variables such as realized variance and skewness of spot allowance prices and observed convenience yields. Similar measures have been applied in studies on risk premiums in equity markets (Hwang and Satchell, 1999), foreign currency markets (Christiansen, 2011; Jiang and Chiang, 2000; Kumar and Trück, 2014) or electricity markets (Bessembinder and Lemmon, 2002; Botterud et al., 2010; Bunn and Chen, 2013; Redl et al., 2009; Weron and Zator, 2014). We find that increased price volatility in the EUA spot market decreases convenience yields suggesting that market participants are willing to pay an additional premium in the futures market for a hedge against increased uncertainty in EUA prices.

Our study contributes to the literature in several dimensions. To the best of our knowledge, we provide the first study to consider the relationship between carbon emission spot and futures prices for the entire first Kyoto commitment period from 2008 to 2012. Also, unlike previous studies by Chang et al. (2013), Gorenflo (2013) and Madaleno and Pinho (2011), where an assumption about a constant average risk-free rate is made, we use actually observed daily risk-free rates for each maturity of the futures contracts to determine a more precise estimate of the convenience yield. We are also the first to thoroughly examine the impact of key factors such as interest rate levels, surplus allowances, and factors related to the dynamics of EUA spot prices on convenience yields and risk premiums in the EU-ETS. Our results provide important insights on the relationship between EUA spot and futures contracts and the drivers of convenience yields in this unique market.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides a review of the literature related to this study, namely on the analysis of EUA spot and futures contracts and convenience yields and risk premiums in other commodity markets. Section 3 reviews general concepts about the relationship between spot and futures prices in commodity markets and explains the rationale of normal backwardation or contango markets. It further illustrates the idea of the convenience yield as the benefit to the holder of commodity inventory. Section 4 provides our empirical analysis on CO_2 spot and futures prices, estimated convenience yields and the relationship between the identified driving factors and the yields. Section 5 concludes and makes suggestions for future work.

2. Literature

Since the official start of spot and futures trading in 2005, researchers have investigated the price behavior of CO_2 allowances. Benz and Trück (2008), Paolella and Taschini (2008) as well as Seifert et al. (2008) were among the first studies to provide an econometric analysis of the behavior of allowance prices and investigate different models for the dynamics of short-term spot prices. Another stream of literature is more concerned with the price drivers of allowance markets, like macroeconomic conditions (Bredin and Muckley, 2011; Chevallier, 2009a), marginal abatement costs (Hintermann, 2010), yearly compliance events (Chevallier, 2011), other commodities, equity and energy indices (Gronwald et al., 2011), and announcements regarding decisions of the European Commission on National Allocation Plans (Conrad et al., 2012). Kanamura (2015) examines the impact of energy prices and EUA-Certified Emission Reduction swap transactions on volatility in the EUA market.

Some authors have focused on price discovery in CO_2 spot and futures markets. But the conclusions they reached are at times contradictory. For instance, Milunovich and Joyeux (2010) and Niblock and Harrison (2012) find that spot and forward prices both contribute jointly to price discovery in carbon markets, while Gorenflo (2013) and Uhrig-Homburg and Wagner (2009) conclude that the futures market has a leadership position against the spot market and contributes the most to price discovery. Analyzing futures markets only, Benz and Hengelbrock (2008) report that the more liquid market (ECX) is leading the less liquid market (Nord Pool). Finally, a few studies have provided insights on the pricing of vanilla and exotic derivative instruments written on the EUAs, see, e.g., Carmona and Hinz (2011); Chesney and Taschini (2012); Daskalakis et al. (2009); Isenegger et al. (2013); Kanamura (2012).

So far less attention has been directed towards the relationship between EUA spot and futures prices, convenience yields and deviations from the cost-of-carry relation in the EU-ETS. Exceptions include the studies by Chang et al. (2013); Chevallier (2009b); Gorenflo (2013); Madaleno and Pinho (2011); Milunovich and Joyeux (2010); Uhrig-Homburg and Wagner (2009); Trück et al. (2015) that are highly related to the work conducted in this paper. In the following we will briefly review the findings and some of the limitations of these studies.

Milunovich and Joyeux (2010) examine the issues of market efficiency in the EU carbon futures market during the pilot trading period. The authors find that none of the carbon futures contracts examined are priced according to a cost-of-carry model. However, futures contracts referring to the pilot trading period form a stable long-run relationship with the spot price and can be considered as risk mitigation instruments. Interestingly, Uhrig-Homburg and Wagner (2009), also examining EUA prices during the pilot trading period, find contradictory results: examining the relationship between EU carbon spot and futures markets during Phase I, the authors suggest that after an initial period of rather noisy pricing, the cost-of-carry model is largely found to hold. They report that while the convenience yield is not consistent over time and temporary deviations from the cost-of-carry linkage may exist they generally vanish after only a few days. Unfortunately, the results of these two studies are limited to the first trading period where banking of allowances from the pilot to the later Kyoto commitment period was not allowed. Therefore, results on the cost-of-carry relationship between spot and futures contracts might be questionable, in particular when looking at inter-period relationships.

Chevallier (2009b) investigates the modeling of the convenience yield in the EU-ETS for the first year of Kyoto commitment period in 2008, using daily and intra-daily measures of volatility. The author finds a non-linear relation between spot and futures prices and suggests that the dynamics of the observed convenience yield can be best described by a simple autoregressive process. Madaleno and Pinho (2011) examine EUA spot and futures prices from an ex-post perspective also for the first Kyoto commitment period and find evidence for a significant negative risk premium (i.e. a positive forward premium) in the market. They also find a positive relationship between risk premiums and time-to-maturity of the futures contracts. More recently, Gorenflo (2013) suggests that the cost-of-carry hypothesis between spot and futures prices holds for the trial period while for the Kyoto commitment period there are deviations from the cost-of-carry relationship. Chang et al. (2013), based on the cost-of-carry model, examine the properties of convenience yields for CO_2 emissions allowances futures contracts with maturities from December 2010 to December 2014. The authors suggest that convenience yields for CO_2 emissions allowances exhibit a time-varying trend, are mean-reverting, while the standard deviation in the convenience yield declines with an increase in time-to-maturity. Note that unlike Chang et al. (2013), Gorenflo (2013) and Madaleno and Pinho (2011), where an assumption about a constant average risk-free rate is made, in our analysis we use the actually observed daily risk-free rates for each maturity to obtain more precise estimates of the convenience yield. Finally, Trück et al. (2015) investigate the relationship between spot and futures prices within the EU-ETS during the pilot trading and first Kyoto commitment period. They investigate price behavior, volatility term structures and correlations in EUA spot and futures contracts. Their findings suggest that during Phase II the market has changed from initial backwardation to contango. However, their analysis is mainly descriptive and does not examine the impact of interest rates, the level of surplus allowances and banking as well as returns, variance or skewness in the EU-ETS spot market on observed convenience yields.

Overall, due to the peculiarity of the market for CO_2 emission allowances as well as the ambiguous results on existing convenience yields in different commodity markets (Bierbrauer et al., 2007; Bodie and Rosansky, 1980; Botterud et al., 2010; Chang, 1985; Longstaff and Wang, 2004; Pindyck, 2001; Wei and Zhu, 2006; Weron, 2008; Weron and Zator, 2014), it seems worthwhile to compare more thoroughly the pricing relationship between EUA spot and futures prices. Also, while there have been a number of studies focusing on the dynamics of EUA spot prices, drivers of CO_2 allowance prices and the pricing of derivative contracts, so far only limited work on convenience yields and deviations from the cost-of-carry relationship in the EU-ETS has been conducted. As mentioned before, to the best of our knowledge in this paper we provide the first empirical analysis of the relationship between spot and futures prices, using data for the entire Phase II from 2008 to 2012. We also provide a pioneer study on examining the most important factors and their impact on the dynamics of observed convenience yields in the EU-ETS.

3. Emission Allowances and the Convenience Yield

Approaches for the valuation of forward and futures contracts can be conceptually divided into two groups (Fama and French, 1987; Geman, 2005; Weron, 2006). The first group suggests a risk premium to derive a model for the relationship between short-term and long-term prices. The second group is closely linked to the cost-of carry relationship and the convenience of holding inventories. In the following we follow the second approach and briefly illustrate the derivation of the convenience yield.

The rationale for such an approach stems from the fact that EUAs can be treated as a factor of production (Benz and Trück, 2006; Fichtner, 2004). Similar to other commodities, they can be 'exhausted' for the production of CO_2 and after their redemption they are removed from the market. Since a competitive commodity market is subject to stochastic fluctuations in both production and consumption, market participants will generally hold inventories. For emission allowances, producers may hold such inventories to reduce the costs of adjusting production over time or to avoid stockouts. The obvious parallels to a factor of production motivate the idea to adopt approaches from commodity markets (i.e. the convenience yield) rather then using typical financial models for asset pricing (i.e. the risk premium).

The convenience yield is usually derived within a no-arbitrage or cost-of-carry model which is based on considerations on a hedging strategy consisting of holding the underlying asset of the futures contract until maturity. Hereby, the long position in the underlying is funded by a short position in the money market account. Risk drivers determining the futures price in this case include the cost-of-storage for forwards on commodities, cost-of-delivery and interest rate risk. Differences between current spot prices and futures prices are explained by interest foregone in storing a commodity, warehousing costs and the so-called convenience yield on inventory. By assuming no possibilities for arbitrage between the spot and futures market, a formula for the convenience yield can be derived (Geman, 2005; Pindyck, 2001).

Let S_t be the spot price of a commodity asset at time t and $F_{t,T}$ be the futures price of the asset at time t with maturity T. The cost-of-carry model describes an arbitrage relation between the futures price, spot price and the cost of carrying the asset. Then, with zero cost of storage as it is the case for EUA contracts, the no-arbitrage cost-of-carry relationship between the two assets can simply be expressed by:

$$F_{t,T} = S_t e^{r_{T-t}(T-t)} + \epsilon_{t,T}, \tag{1}$$

where r_{T-t} denotes the risk-free rate at time t referring to a time period $T - t$.

This relationship does not hold in most commodity markets, what can partly be attributed to the inability of investors and speculators to short the underlying asset S_t. Instead, the literature usually suggests a correction to the cost-of-carry pricing formula that includes the convenience yield:

$$F_{t,T} = S_t e^{(r_{T-t} - c_{T-t})(T-t)}, \tag{2}$$

where c_{T-t} refers to the convenience yield observed at time t referring to a time period $T - t$, i.e. for a futures contract with maturity at T. Solving for c_{T-t}, we get the following equation for the convenience yield:

$$c_{(T-t)} = r_{T-t} - \frac{\ln(F_{t,T}) - \ln(S_t)}{T - t}. \tag{3}$$

As mentioned above, the convenience yield obtained from holding a commodity can be regarded as being similar to the dividend obtained from holding a company's stock. It represents the privilege of holding a unit of inventory, for instance, to be able to meet unexpected demand. According to Pindyck (2001), the spot price of a commodity can be explained similar to the price of a stock: like the price of a stock can be regarded as the present value of the expected future flow of dividends, the price of a commodity is the present value of the expected future flow of convenience yields. Alternatively, one could argue that the convenience yield is the *residual* needed to align cost-of-carry commodity futures prices with observed market prices.

At time t the futures price $F_{t,T}$ of a commodity with delivery in T can be greater, equal or less than the current spot price of the asset S_t. Further, it can also be greater or less than the expected spot price $E_t(S_T)$ at delivery T. The futures market is said to exhibit *backwardation* when the futures price $F_{t,T}$ is less than or equal to the current spot price S_t; it exhibits *normal backwardation* when the futures price is less than or equal to the expected spot price $E_t(S_T)$ at time T. On the other hand, the term *(normal) contango* is used to describe the opposite situation, when the futures price $F_{t,T}$ exceeds the (expected) spot price at time T (see e.g. Geman, 2005; Hull, 2005).

The differences between spot and futures prices can be explained by a typical insurance contract: in the (normal) backwardation case producers are buying insurance against falling prices, whereas in the contango case, consumers buy insurance against rising prices. The theory postulates that commodity futures markets usually exhibit backwardation and tend to rise over the life of a futures contract. Initially suggested by Keynes (1930) and Hicks (1946), the idea of backwardation assumes that hedgers tend to hold short positions as insurance against their cash position and must pay speculators a premium to hold long positions in order to offset their risk. Thus, observed futures prices $F_{t,T}$ with delivery at time T are often below the expected spot price $E_t(S_T)$. The notion of normal backwardation is equivalent to a positive risk premium since the risk is transferred to the long position in the futures contract; likewise normal contango is equivalent to a negative risk premium.

Formally the *risk premium* is defined as the reward for holding a risky investment rather than a risk-free one. In other words, the risk premium is the difference between the expected spot price, which is the best estimate of the going rate of the asset at some specific time in the future, and the forward price, i.e. the actual price a trader is prepared to pay today for delivery of the asset in the future (Botterud et al., 2010; Diko et al., 2006; Pindyck, 2001; Weron, 2008). Note, that in the financial mathematics literature yet a different notion is used. The *market price of risk* can be seen as a drift adjustment (a constant – λ, a deterministic function of time – λ_t) in the stochastic differential equation (SDE) governing the spot price dynamics to reflect how investors are compensated for bearing risk when holding the spot (Weron and Zator, 2014). In other words, the drift adjustment when moving from the original 'risky' probability measure P to the 'risk-neutral' measure P^{λ}, like in the Black-Scholes-Merton model (Hull, 2005). Although different in value, a constant market price of risk is of the same sign as the risk premium.

The empirical literature on backwardation or contango in commodity markets shows ambiguous results. While earlier studies find some evidence to support the normal backwardation idea for several products, recent studies also observe futures prices exceeding the expected future spot prices in empirical data. Bodie and Rosansky (1980) conduct an extensive study on risk and return of futures for major commodities traded in the United States. Combining futures contracts of selected commodities in a portfolio they find that the mean rate of return in the period from 1950 and 1976 clearly exceeded the average risk-free rate. Chang (1985) also finds evidence of normal backwardation over the period from 1951 to 1980 examining futures prices of agricultural commodities like wheat, corn and soybeans. Fama and French (1987) combine a variety of commodities like metal or agricultural products into a portfolio and investigate the risk premium in futures prices. They find marginal evidence of normal backwardation, however, the risk premium in examined futures prices is not significantly different from zero. In a more recent study, Pindyck (2001) finds evidence for backwardation while investigating futures markets for crude and heating oil. In particular, the degree of backwardation is larger during times of high volatility. Considine and Larson (2001a,b) also find backwardation in crude oil and natural gas markets, while Milonas and Henker (2001) get similar results for international oil markets.

However, there also some empirical studies suggesting contango markets. Longstaff and Wang (2004) and more recently Haugom and Ullrich (2012) examine whether the forward risk premium (i.e. the negative of the risk premium) paid in the PJM electricity market is significant. Their findings are both positive and negative risk premiums that vary systematically throughout the day and over the years. Botterud et al. (2010) and Weron (2008) find negative (on average) risk premiums in the Nord Pool Asian options and futures prices, but in a more recent study Weron and Zator (2014) report that both risk premia and convenience yields vary significantly over time. In particular, for shorter maturities (i.e. 1 week) the risk premia are on average positive, while for longer maturities (i.e. 6 weeks) they are on average negative. Bierbrauer et al. (2007) and Haugom et al. (2014) obtain similar results for medium-term futures contracts examining prices from the EEX and Nord Pool markets, respectively. A reasonable explanation for negative risk premiums (i.e. contango markets) in electricity futures prices is a higher incentive for hedging on the demand side relative to the supply side, because of the non-storability of electricity as compared to the limited and costly but still existent storage capabilities of fuel (water, coal, oil, gas). Finally, investigating the Samuelson effect in an empirical study on the behavior of metal prices, Fama and French (1988) found that violations of this pattern may occur when inventory is high. In particular, forward price volatilities can initially increase with contract horizon.

For EUAs, Madaleno and Pinho (2011) find evidence for a significant negative risk premium (i.e. a positive forward premium) in the market. They also find a positive relationship between risk premiums and time-to-maturity of the futures contracts. Gorenflo (2013) suggests that the cost-of-carry hypothesis between spot and futures prices holds for the trial period, while for the Kyoto commitment period there are deviations from the cost-of-carry relationship. Chang et al. (2013) suggest that convenience yields for Phase II and III futures contracts exhibit a time-varying trend, are mean-reverting, while the standard deviation in the convenience yield declines with an increase in time-to-maturity. Most recently, Trück et al. (2015) find that during Phase II the market has changed from initial backwardation to contango with significant negative convenience yields.

However, the above-mentioned studies do not relate the dynamics of observed convenience yields to explanatory variables such as interest rate levels, surplus allowances or the volatility of EUA spot prices.

4. Empirical Results

4.1. The Data

Data on spot and futures prices is sourced from PointCarbon, one of the major data suppliers for global gas, power and carbon markets. We consider spot and futures prices for the first Kyoto commitment period from April 8, 2008 to December 31, 2012. Spot contracts for EU emission allowances have a contract volume of 1 ton CO_2 and are quoted in EUR with a precision of two decimal points. During the considered period, futures contracts referring to both Phase II (2008-2012) and Phase III (2013-2020) were traded. In total we consider seven different futures contracts, four of them referring to an expiry data during the first Kytoto commitment period (2009, 2010, 2011, 2012), three of them referring to the second Kyoto commitment period beginning on January 1, 2013 (contracts with expiry in 2013, 2014 and 2015). The contract volume amounts to 1000 tons of CO_2 and the contracts expire on the last business day in December. For every futures contract a settlement price, in accordance with the current spot market price is established on a daily basis. According to a daily profit and loss balancing (variation margin), the change in the value of a futures position is credited to the trading participant or debited from her in cash. Delivery of the EU emission allowances is carried out up to two business days after maturity of the contracts.

For the risk-free rates we use daily European Central Bank (ECB) quotes for AAA-rated euro area central government bonds. These quotes are available for bonds with a maturity from 3 months up to 5 years. To match the yields for different time horizons until maturity of the considered futures contracts we use linear interpolation. Note that unlike the studies by Chang et al. (2013), Gorenflo (2013) and Madaleno and Pinho (2011), where an assumption about a constant average risk-free rate is made, we use the actually observed daily rates for each maturity.

4.2. Convenience Yields

Let us now examine the relationship between spot and futures contracts for the time period April 8, 2008 to December 31, 2012. Figure 1 provides the spot price series as well as December 2010, 2012 and 2014 futures price for the period considered.[1] We observe that the Phase II EUA spot price (bold solid line) on April 8, 2008 was EUR 23.53 and initially increased to its maximum level of EUR 29.38 on July 1, 2008. What followed was a relatively rapid decline in prices down to EUR 8.00 on February 12, 2009 which can mainly be attributed to the impacts of the financial crisis and lower expectations about economic output in the Eurozone due to the crisis. Spot prices increased again up to a level of EUR 15.45 in May 2009 and remained in the range EUR 13–16 up to June 2011. Since then, due to the European Sovereign Debt crisis, expectations about low economic output in future periods and the relatively high allocation of allowances, prices dropped to a level of approximately EUR 6.50 in December 2012. We also observe that spot and futures prices show a similar price behavior during the considered time period.

---

[1] Note that the 2010 futures contract expired on December 20, 2010, the 2012 futures contract on December 17, 2012, while the first price observation for the 2014 futures contract was available on December 21, 2010.



Figure 1: Spot price (solid black), December 2010 (dashed), December 2012 (dotted) and December 2014 (solid grey) futures price for the first Kyoto commitment period April 8, 2008 to December 31, 2012. The December 2010 futures contract expired on December 20, 2010, the December 2012 futures contract on December 17, 2012, while the first price observation for the 2014 futures contract was available on December 21, 2010.

The co-movement of spot and futures contracts during the first Kyoto commitment period is also confirmed by looking at the correlation coefficients between returns from spot and 2009, 2010, ..., 2015 futures contracts in Table 1. We find that correlations between spot and futures returns are all well above 0.95 and close to one. This is also true for futures contracts referring to Phase III, although correlations between Phase II spot and futures returns and the 2015 futures contracts are slightly lower than for most of the other contracts.

In a next step, using equation (3) we calculate convenience yields for the 2009-2014 futures contracts. Summary statistics for the estimated convenience yields are reported in Table 2. We find negative average convenience yields for all futures contracts, while the absolute value of the yields increases for contracts with longer maturities. While for Phase II futures contracts the mean of observed convenience yields has a range between roughly -1% for the 2009 contract and -2.14% for the 2012 contract, for Phase III average convenience yields are between -3.68% for the 2013 contract and -5.03% for the 2015 contract. Clearly, for Phase III the market indicates substantial negative convenience yields well above the level of the risk-free rate, such that $(r_{T-t} - c_{T-t}) > 0$ and, therefore, Phase III futures prices are typically significantly higher than the spot. This behavior is also illustrated in Figure 1, where the relatively large deviation of 2014 futures prices from the spot price is displayed. Interestingly, we also find that the standard deviation of convenience yields decreases for longer maturity of the futures contract. It is the highest for the convenience yield of the nearest term 2009 futures ($\sigma = 0.0156$) and by far the lowest for the 2015 futures contract ($\sigma = 0.0057$). These results are in line with the proposed time-to-maturity or Samuelson effect for commodity markets (Samuelson, 1965) that suggests a typically declining term structure in the volatility of futures prices as maturity increases. The behavior is generally explained by the fact that only few of the parameters affecting the opinion of investors about distant futures prices will change today. Hence, only minor effects are expected for futures with long maturities, even if

Delivery	Spot	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Spot	1.0000	0.9915	0.9809	0.9708	0.9689	0.9897	0.9888	0.9580
2009		1.0000	0.9895	0.9797	0.9794	-	-	-
2010			1.0000	0.9870	0.9779	0.9784	-	-
2011				1.0000	0.9774	0.9863	0.9819	-
2012					1.0000	0.9955	0.9944	0.9626
2013						1.0000	0.9970	0.9667
2014							1.0000	0.9680
2015								1.0000

Table 1: Correlations between returns from spot and futures contracts (2008-2015) for Kyoto commitment period market quotes from April 8, 2008 to December 31, 2012. Note that correlation coefficients between returns from the 2009 and 2013, 2014 and 2015 futures contracts could not be calculated because the 2009 contract expired before quotes for these contracts were available. The same is true for the correlation coefficient between 2010 and 2014, 2015 contracts and for 2011 and 2015 futures contracts.

Contract	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Mean	-0.0099	-0.0107	-0.0144	-0.0214	-0.0368	-0.0435	-0.0503
Median	-0.0116	-0.0125	-0.0152	-0.0205	-0.0346	-0.0447	-0.0508
Std	0.0156	0.0121	0.0114	0.0120	0.0112	0.0112	0.0057
Min	-0.0417	-0.0506	-0.0636	-0.0626	-0.0737	-0.0661	-0.0633
Max	0.0307	0.0285	0.0264	0.0230	-0.0204	-0.0200	-0.0303
Obs	411	670	924	1131	773	515	261

Table 2: Descriptive statistics for convenience yields for 2009 - 2015 futures contracts. The 2009 futures contract expired on December 14, 2009, the 2010 futures contract expired on December 20, 2010, the 2011 contract on December 19, 2011 and the 2012 contract on December 17, 2012. Phase III futures contract prices were available from December 16, 2009 (2013 futures), December 21, 2010 (2014 futures) and December 20, 2011 (2015 futures).

there are more significant changes to the spot price or near-term futures contracts.

Figure 2 provides a plot of the observed convenience yields for the December 2009, 2011 and 2012 futures contracts based on the cost-of-carry relationship described in Section 3. We observe that the market started in backwardation, with positive convenience yields indicating that the spot price was above the discounted price of Kyoto commitment period futures contracts. In the course of time, the market situation changed from backwardation to contango for the first time in July 2008. Prices were approximately in line with the cost-of-carry relationship until end of October 2008, but afterwards convenience yields become negative. For most of the time after January 2009, convenience yields for the 2010, 2011 and 2012 futures contracts are significantly smaller than zero. Thus, we find that none of the spot or futures contracts were priced according to the cost-of-carry relationship. The effect is more pronounced for futures contracts with longer maturities, i.e. the December 2011 and 2012 futures contracts. We also observe that as the contracts get closer to the expiry date, the convenience yield becomes more volatile.

Figure 3 displays the results for the relationship between Phase II spot and Phase III futures contracts. Note that inter-period banking between the phases is allowed such that the EU-ETS



Figure 2: *Upper panel:* Spot prices (EUR/ton) from April 8, 2008 to December 31, 2012. *Lower panel:* Convenience yields (EUR/ton) for 2009 (solid black), 2011 (dashed black) and 2012 (solid grey) EUA futures contracts. The 2009 futures contract expired on December 14, 2009, the 2011 contract on December 19, 2011 and the 2012 contract on December 17, 2012.



Figure 3: *Upper panel:* Spot prices (EUR/ton) from December 16, 2009 to December 31, 2012. *Lower panel:* Convenience yields (EUR/ton) for December 2013 (solid black), December 2014 (dotted black) and December 2015 (solid grey) EUA futures contracts. Phase III futures contract prices were available from December 16, 2009 (2013 futures), December 21, 2010 (2014 futures) and December 20, 2011 (2015 futures).

enables market participants to use Phase II permits also during Phase III. On the other hand, borrowing of permits from Phase III and using the allowances in Phase II is not allowed. Note that prices for the considered Phase III futures contracts were only available from December 16, 2009 (2013 futures), December 21, 2010 (2014 futures) and December 20, 2011 (2015 futures). Therefore, the lower panel of Figure 3 only provides a plot of the convenience yields for this time period. We find highly negative convenience yields for all Phase III futures contracts, usually in the range between -2% and -7%. In the year 2012, observed convenience yields have been reduced in magnitude, however, they remain below -2% for all contracts during the entire time period.

Note that our findings with respect to a clear deviation from the cost-of-carry relationship for Phase II are in line with earlier work examining EUA spot and futures contracts during the Kyoto commitment period (Chang et al., 2013; Gorenflo, 2013; Madaleno and Pinho, 2011; Trück et al., 2015). However, the consistently negative sign of observed convenience yields from March 2009 onwards, at least partially contradicts results reported in some of these studies. Madaleno and Pinho (2011) and Chang et al. (2013) report positive convenience yields during late 2009 and 2010 for some of the futures contracts (usually contracts with maturity during Phase II, i.e. expiry in December 2010, 2011 or 2012). The key reason for the deviation in our results, may be different assumptions about the risk-free rate. While Madaleno and Pinho (2011) assume a constant interest rate for the estimation period of 4%, Chang et al. (2013) choose a constant free-risk rate equal to the average coupon rate of 3.06%, i.e. the rate for three-year government bonds issued in 2010 in the European Union. Also Gorenflo (2013) state that the interest rate is assumed to be constant over time in his analysis. Note that in our study we do not assume a constant risk-free rate, but decided to use actual daily European Central Bank (ECB) quotes for AAA-rated euro area central government bonds for different maturities. Further, to match the yields for different time horizons until maturity of the considered futures contracts we use linear interpolation between quoted interest rates. As mentioned earlier, risk-free rates in the Eurozone have dropped significantly from a level of around 4% in September 2008 to a level below 1% since late September 2009. Therefore, it is no surprise that in our analysis we obtain different results in comparison to previous studies, where a significantly higher interest rate has been applied.

Overall, the negative convenience yields for Kyoto period futures contracts from 2009 onwards indicate that market participants saw no privilege in holding the allowance now with respect to future periods. We find that long positions in futures contracts are priced at a much higher level than suggested by the cost-of-carry relationship. Generally, a contango market as it is observed during Phase II would suggest currently available supply but potential medium-to-long-term shortages of a commodity. Under such a scenario, consumers might be interested in buying insurance against rising prices in the futures market. Therefore, a greater interest in long futures positions will drive prices of these contracts up. Observed negative convenience yields may be interpreted as consumers' willingness to pay an additional risk premium for a hedge against rising prices or future shortage of EUAs. Clearly, it can also be interpreted as a hedge against potential changes in regulation that may reduce the availability of permits in forthcoming years.

As banking and borrowing within the years of the Kyoto commitment period (i.e. 2008-2012) is allowed, one could also argue that the deviation from the cost-of-carry relationship may be due to different market expectations about interest rates in forthcoming years. Also increasing surplus levels and banking of EUAs might suggest expected relatively low scarcity of the allowances at



Figure 4: Daily short term (3-month) European Central Bank (ECB) quotes for AAA-rated Euro area central government bonds from April 8, 2008 to December 31, 2012.

time t versus some time in the future T. This encourages us to analyze the behavior of observed convenience yields with regards to possible drivers of the yields in more detail.

4.3. *Driving factors of the Convenience Yield*

In the following, we try to explain the observed deviations from the cost-of-carry relationship by a number of exogenous variables. In particular we attribute the existence of negative convenience yields with a relatively high absolute magnitude to the following factors: (i) interest rate levels in the Eurozone, (ii) the increasing level of surplus allowances and banking during Phase II, and (iii) market participants' willingness to pay an additional risk premium for a hedge against uncertainty about EUA price behavior and possibly rising prices in future periods.

4.3.1. *Interest Rates*

The first reason for observing negative convenience yields may be the extremely low risk-free rates in the Eurozone from 2009 onwards. The drop of the risk-free rate from roughly 4% in early 2008 to a rate near 0.5% from January 2009 onwards was initially due to the global financial crisis, while yields for AAA-rated government bonds have remained at such low levels ever since. Interest rates can be expected to impact on the relationship between commodity spot and futures prices and have been suggested as a pricing factor for commodity derivatives, see e.g. Casassus and Collin-Dufresne (2005); Schwartz (1997); Schwartz and Smith (2000). Note that in the three-factor model developed by Casassus and Collin-Dufresne (2005), the convenience yield can be dependent on the risk-free rate itself. As indicated by equations (3) and (4), the risk-free rate is also a key input in the cost-of-carry model and, therefore, will have an impact on deviations from this relationship and the calculation of the convenience yield. We also observe that convenience yields become more significant once risk-free rates in the Eurozone drop to the low levels we have seen since 2009. During periods of very low interest rates it may be more likely to observe negative convenience yields for risky assets. This could be a result of market expectations about rising interest rates in forthcoming periods. We use daily short term (3-month) European Central Bank (ECB) quotes for AAA-rated Euro area central government bonds as a proxy for the risk-free spot rate in our analysis. Figure 4 provides a plot of the interest rate applied in the analysis. We formulate the following hypothesis about the relationship between the risk-free rate and convenience yields in the EU-ETS:

Hypothesis 1: *Lower interest rates will decrease the convenience yield, such that we expect a positive relationship between interest rates and observed convenience yields.*

Based on *Hypothesis 1*, we would therefore expect a positive coefficient, when regressing convenience yields on short-term interest rates.

4.3.2. Banking

The second explanation refers to the possibility of banking EUAs and the surplus of allowances available during Phase II. Generally, the theory of storage suggests a negative relationship between the convenience yield and inventory, see e.g. Pindyck (2001). The owner of a commodity, who is free to consume it until maturity, is prepared for unexpected shortages in supply or increases in demand. The convenience yield then represents this additional benefit of holding a unit of inventory, for instance, to be able to meet unexpected demand. The value of this benefit should then be negatively related to the level of inventory. One could argue that it is particularly high if inventories of a commodity are low and consumers are forced to secure a short-term supply. On the other hand, high levels of inventory will reduce the benefits and, therefore, also the convenience yield. Considering the continuously increasing level of surplus allowances during the first Kyoto commitment period (Ellerman et al., 2014; Zaklan et al., 2014) and the extensive use of external credits coming from two of the Kyoto Protocol mechanisms, the clean development mechanism (CDM) and joint implementation (JI), one could argue that throughout Phase II an increasingly higher level of inventory was accumulated.[2] Therefore, the change in the market from backwardation to contango and significantly negative convenience yields for futures contracts could be a result of an increasing level of surplus allowances and banking. We formulate the following hypothesis about the relationship between surplus allowances and observed convenience yields:

Hypothesis 2: *An increase in the number of surplus allowances will decrease the benefit of holding spot contracts in comparison to a position in a futures contract. Thus, we expect a negative relationship between the EUA bank and observed convenience yields.*

Data on allowance banking behavior are available in the European Union Transaction Log (EUTL) and comprise installation-level information on free allocations, verified emissions and surrenders of both EUAs and Kyoto offsets against emissions (Zaklan et al., 2014). Note that in order to compute the correct size of the bank at a sub-system level, we would also require information on sales and purchases of EUAs. Unfortunately, for this level of detail, data are not available until several years later. However, since purchases and sales cancel each other out at the aggregate level, the correct size of aggregate EUA surplus levels can be calculated without requiring information on transfers. Table 3 provides figures for aggregate free allocations, verified emissions and surrenders

---

[2] See also http://europeanclimatepolicy.eu/.

Year	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Allocation	1,950,775	1,966,046	1,990,089	2,008,498	2,218,785
Emissions	2,100,311	1,860,378	1,919,639	1,885,373	1,929,554
Offset	83,379	80,299	133,782	251,368	500,704
EUA Bank	-66,157	119,811	324,043	698,535	1,488,680

Table 3: Aggregate free allocations, verified emissions and surrenders of both EUAs and Kyoto offsets against emissions and aggregate surplus levels (EUA bank) for Phase II at the end of 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012.

of both EUAs and Kyoto offsets against emissions as well as the aggregate EUA bank for Phase II. Note that this information is only available at annual frequency for the end of 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012, such that we use linear interpolation to determine EUA surplus allowance levels at higher frequency.[3] Table 3 clearly illustrates that after an initially negative EUA bank by the end of 2008, the number of surplus allowances has been significantly increasing with approximately 700,000, respectively 1,500,000, surplus allowances reported by the end of 2011 and 2012.

4.3.3. *Spot Market Volatility and Skewness*

The significantly negative convenience yields for Phase II and Phase III futures contracts indicate that long positions in futures contracts are priced above price levels suggested by the cost-of-carry relationship. As mentioned earlier, one may interpret this as consumers' willingness to pay an additional risk premium for a hedge against rising prices or shortage of EUAs in future periods.

Typical measures for risk and uncertainty about price movements in a financial market are the volatility or skewness of returns in the spot market. To include such measures for risk is also motivated by various studies on the relationship between spot and futures prices in other markets. For equity markets, e.g. Hwang and Satchell (1999) suggest to examine the relationship between risk premiums in the forward market and skewness and kurtosis in equity markets for emerging economies, while Jiang and Chiang (2000) examine the influence of currency and stock market volatility on forward premiums. For currency markets, Christiansen (2011) and Kumar and Trück (2014) find evidence for inter-temporal risk-return trade-off of foreign exchange rates and futures risk premiums being driven by explanatory variables such as realized variance, skewness and kurtosis for currency spot returns.

For electricity markets, Bessembinder and Lemmon (2002) suggest that risk premiums of forward contracts can be related to the variance and skewness of spot prices in electricity markets. The model has been tested in various applications to electricity markets all over the world, providing mixed evidence for the impact of variance and skewness of electricity spot prices on risk premiums in the forward market, see e.g. Bunn and Chen (2013); Handika and Trück (2013); Haugom and Ullrich (2012); Torró and Lucia (2011); Redl et al. (2009), just to name a few. Botterud et al. (2010) and Weron and Zator (2014) investigate convenience yields in the Nord Pool electricity market and find a significant relationship between the yields and spot price variance and skewness. For the relationship between EUA spot and futures contracts, Chevallier (2009b) and

---

[3] In our analysis we also used different approaches to interpolation, for example a cubic spline. However, the method of interpolation did not change the sign or significance of the estimated coefficients.

Madaleno and Pinho (2011) also regress observed convenience yields on measures of volatility in the spot market. However, their analysis is limited to either data from the pilot trading period only or observations up to 2009.

Motivated by this line of research, we examine the impact of volatility and skewness in the EUA spot market on the observed convenience yields during the first Kyoto commitment period. We apply an exponentially weighted moving average (EWMA) to model the volatility in the EUA spot market, where the variance estimate σ_t^2 for returns in the EUA spot market for day t is based on the following relationship:

$$VAR_t \;\equiv\; \sigma_t^2 = \lambda\sigma_{t-1}^2 + (1-\lambda)r_{t-1}^2, \tag{4}$$

with σ_{t-1}^2 being the previous day's estimate for the variance and r_{t-1}^2 the square of the most recent EUA return observation.[4] The estimated variance at each point in time is then used as an explanatory variable for the observed convenience yields. We formulate the following hypothesis about the relationship between variance in the EUA spot market and the convenience yields:

Hypothesis 3: *Increased variance in the spot market, will increase the demand for hedging and, therefore, increase futures prices. Thus, we expect a negative relationship between spot market volatility and observed convenience yields.*

4.4. The Convenience Yield Models

Overall, we apply the following *basic model* for the convenience yield:

$$\mathrm{CY}_{t,T} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1\mathrm{INT}_t + \alpha_2\mathrm{BANK}_t + \alpha_3\mathrm{VAR}_t + \epsilon_t, \tag{5}$$

where INT_t denotes the short term (3-month) interest rate in the Eurozone area at time t, BANK_t is an estimate of the number of EUA surplus allowances at time t, VAR_t is the estimated volatility in the EUA spot market at time t based on the applied EWMA model, see equation (4), and ϵ_t is the noise term (independent and identically distributed with mean zero and finite variance).

We also apply an extended model, where we include the estimated skewness SKEW_t and the most recent return r_t in the EUA spot market at time t. To model (realized) skewness we apply a rolling estimator based on the last k daily returns:

$$\mathrm{SKEW}_t = \frac{1}{k-1}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\frac{(r_i-\bar{r})^3}{\sigma_t}, \tag{6}$$

where σ_t denotes the standard deviation and $\bar{r}$ the average of EUA spot returns during the last k trading days. We choose $k = 20$ what roughly corresponds to the skewness of returns in the EUA spot market during the last month and formulate the following *extended model*:

$$\mathrm{CY}_{t,T} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1\mathrm{INT}_t + \alpha_2\mathrm{BANK}_t + \alpha_3\mathrm{VAR}_t + \alpha_4\mathrm{SKEW}_t + \alpha_5\mathrm{r}_t + \epsilon_t. \tag{7}$$

---

[4] Note that we also applied a GARCH(1,1) model for the conditional volatility of EUA returns. However, this did not change the sign and significance of the estimated coefficients and gave very similar results in comparison to using an EWMA model for the heteroskedastic behavior of EUA spot prices.

Results for the basic and extended models are provided in Tables 4 and 5, respectively. We report estimated coefficients as well as Newey-West HAC adjusted standard errors to account for autocorrelation and heteroskedasticity in the explanatory and dependent variable. Examining the results for the basic model, see equation (5), we can observe a high explanatory power of the applied model. Coefficients of determination for convenience yields are between 0.52 for 2015 futures contracts and 0.78 for 2009 contracts, suggesting that for all contracts more than half of the variation in the convenience yield can be explained by the proposed variables.

We find that in particular for Phase II futures contracts, risk-free interest rates significantly contribute to explaining the dynamics of the convenience yields. For 2009-2012 contracts, the estimated coefficients are all positive and significant at the 1% level, suggesting that the drop in short-term interest rates has contributed to the change from initial backwardation to contango for the market and the decline in convenience yields. Results are not so clear-cut for the convenience yields of Phase III futures contracts. Note, however, that quotes for the Phase III futures were only available from December 16, 2009 (2013 futures), December 21, 2010 (2014 futures) and December 20, 2011 (2015 futures) when risk-free rates had already reached a very low level around 0.5% and only exhibited rather small changes as indicated by Figure 4. Therefore, we would not expect a strong impact of changes in the risk-free rate for these contracts. Overall, our results provide strong evidence for *Hypothesis 1*, suggesting that lower interest rates decrease observed convenience yields in the EU-ETS.

We also find some evidence for the impact of banking and the increased number of surplus allowances on the convenience yield. While the relationship is insignificant for 2009 and 2010 futures contracts, we find a negative coefficient for convenience yields from 2011-2014 futures contracts. For the 2011 and 2013 contracts, coefficients are significant at the 1% level suggesting that for these contracts the rising number of surplus allowances has led to a further decrease in the convenience yield. Surprisingly, for the 2015 contract we find a positive coefficient what contradicts the proposed relationship in *Hypothesis 2*. Note, however, that the 2015 futures contract was only traded from December 20, 2011 onwards, such that only a relatively small number of observations is available. It may also be the case that by this time market participants were well aware of the recent development of the EUA bank such that the first quote on December 20, 2011 may already include expectations about a further increase in the EUA bank.

With regards to the relationship between volatility in the EUA spot market and the convenience yield, we find unambiguous support for *Hypothesis 3*. There is a significant negative relationship between spot market volatility and observed convenience yields for all contracts such that increased variance in the spot market further decreases the convenience yield. For 2009-2014 futures contracts, coefficients are negative and significant at the 1% level, while for the 2015 contract, the coefficient is significantly smaller than zero at the 5% level. Our results point towards the hypothesis that higher volatility and, therefore rising uncertainty about EUA price behavior, significantly increases the demand for hedging and, leads to an increase in observed futures prices. As a result, EUA futures prices exhibits strong contango, in particular during periods of higher volatility in the spot market. Similar results have also been obtained for electricity markets, where, for example, Botterud et al. (2010), Handika and Trück (2013), Redl et al. (2009) and Weron and Zator (2014) find a significant relationship between risk premiums or convenience yields and spot price variance.

Contract	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Intercept	-0.0182***	-0.0149***	-0.0142***	-0.0231***	-0.0249***	-0.0382***	-0.0623***
	(0.0030)	(0.0033)	(0.0022)	(0.0021)	(0.0037)	(0.0112)	(0.0047)
INT$_t$	0.0073***	0.0064***	0.0057***	0.0064***	0.0016	0.0124*	-0.0081
	(0.0012)	(0.0011)	(0.0009)	(0.0009)	(0.0033)	(0.0066)	(0.0213)
BANK$_t$	0.0304	0.0108	-0.0149***	-0.0045	-0.0154***	-0.0080	0.0126***
	(0.0285)	(0.0116)	(0.0056)	(0.0032)	(0.0047)	(0.0097)	(0.0037)
VAR$_t$	-7.3877***	-8.7156***	-7.7905***	-2.3038**	-3.7336***	-2.9395***	-0.7405**
	(2.1376)	(2.2526)	(1.6501)	(1.1397)	(0.7450)	(0.9220)	(0.3320)
F-stat	493.45	585.27	743.03	444.59	488.47	408.35	95.24
p-value	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	< 0.0001
R^2	0.7844	0.7250	0.7079	0.5420	0.6558	0.7057	0.5265
Obs	411	670	924	1131	773	515	261

Table 4: Estimation results for the basic model, see equation (5), for 2009-2015 futures contracts. We report estimated coefficients as well as Newey-West HAC standard errors in parentheses. The asterisks indicate significance of the variable at the 1% (***), 5% (**) and 10% (*) level of significance.

Contract	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Intercept	-0.0181***	-0.0150***	-0.0142***	-0.0230***	-0.0248***	-0.0386***	-0.0627***
	(0.0028)	(0.0033)	(0.0022)	(0.0021)	(0.0035)	(0.0112)	(0.0048)
INT$_t$	0.0073***	0.0064***	0.0057***	0.0063***	0.0018	0.0126*	-0.0071
	(0.0012)	(0.0011)	(0.0001)	(0.0001)	(0.0033)	(0.0065)	(0.0217)
BANK$_t$	0.0173	0.0099	-0.0148***	-0.0045	-0.0151***	-0.0078	0.0129***
	(0.0324)	(0.0112)	(0.0055)	(0.0031)	(0.0046)	(0.0097)	(0.0037)
VAR$_t$	-7.3375***	-8.5604***	-7.8245***	-2.2964**	-3.6243***	-2.9695***	-0.7727**
	(1.6845)	(2.1997)	(1.5957)	(1.1585)	(0.7702)	(0.9245)	(0.3423)
SKEW$_t$	0.0040***	0.0012	-0.0001	-0.0003	-0.0021*	0.0005	0.0003
	(0.0016)	(0.0016)	(0.0012)	(0.0015)	(0.0013)	(0.0010)	(0.0010)
r$_t$	0.0060	0.0062	0.0145*	0.0007	0.0148*	0.0105	0.0062
	0.0070	0.0061	0.0086	0.0128	0.0079	0.0069	0.0082
F-stat	330.1055	354.7710	446.8485	266.5728	309.2387	246.1167	57.5388
p-value	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	< 0.0001
R^2	0.8030	0.7276	0.7088	0.5423	0.6684	0.7074	0.5301
Obs	411	670	924	1131	773	515	261

Table 5: Estimation results for the extended model, see equation (7), for 2009-2015 futures contracts. We report estimated coefficients as well as Newey-West HAC standard errors in parentheses. The asterisks indicate significance of the variable at the 1% (***), 5% (**) and 10% (*) level of significance.

Finally, considering Table 5 that provides the results for the extended model, see equation (7), we find that including additional variables such as the skewness of spot price returns and the most recent return r_t in the EUA spot market does not provide a significant increase in the explanatory power of the model. The coefficient for skewness is insignificant for most of the contracts and yields different signs depending on which contract is being examined. While the coefficient for r_t is positive for all contracts, it is only significant at the 10% level for convenience yields referring to the 2011 and 2013 futures contract.

Overall, the extended model does not seem to provide any additional insights in comparison to the basic model and to contribute to a better explanation of the dynamics of convenience yields in the EU-ETS. While there is clear evidence for the impact of interest rate levels, banking and surplus allowances, and variance in the EUA spot market on the observed convenience yields, most recent returns in the spot market as well as higher moments of spot price behavior only seem to provide a minor additional explanatory power. We suggest to further investigate these measures in future studies, when more data on Phase III futures contracts is available.

5. Conclusions

We provide an empirical study on convenience yields in CO_2 allowance futures prices during the first Kyoto commitment period from 2008 to 2012. In particular we have examined deviations from the cost-of-carry relationship for Phase II and Phase III futures contracts as well as analyzed of the driving factors for the dynamics of observed convenience yields. While the connection between spot and futures markets has been thoroughly investigated for other commodities such as oil, electricity, gas or agricultural products, so far only a small number of studies have analyzed the convenience yield and risk premiums in the EU-ETS.

Our findings suggest that the EUA market has changed from an initial short period of backwardation to contango with significantly negative convenience yields. Observed average yields range from -1% to -2% for near-term contracts with delivery in 2009-2012, while they range from -3.5% to -5% for Phase III futures contracts with delivery in 2013, 2014 and 2015. Overall, our results indicate a significant deviation from the cost-of-carry relationship for EUA contracts and suggest that unlike many other commodities, carbon futures do not exhibit backwardation. To the contrary, we find that futures contracts are priced at a significantly higher level than implied by the cost-of-carry relationship. This suggests that consumers in EUA markets are interested in buying insurance against rising prices and are willing to pay an additional risk premium for a hedge against increased prices or shortage of EUAs in future periods, such as Phase III.

We then analyze the driving factors of the observed negative convenience yields in the EU-ETS by the examining the impact of interest rate levels, banking and surplus allowances, and factors related to the dynamics of the EUA spot market. Our findings suggest that a high percentage of the variation in convenience yields can be explained by these factors. More specifically, we find that the drop in risk-free rates during the financial crisis and the subsequently low interest rate levels, have had a significant impact on convenience yields. While the yields were initially very small but positive during 2008, with decreasing interest rates they have become predominantly negative since the second half of 2008. While risk-free rates have remained at a very low level ever since, also average convenience yields for Phase II and Phase III futures contracts have typically been negative since 2009. We also find evidence for the negative relationship between the convenience yield and inventory as it has been suggested in the theory of storage. Overall, convenience yields become increasingly negative as the number of surplus allowances rise towards the middle end of the Kyoto commitment period. We also find that the variance in the EUA spot market has a significant impact on observed convenience yields. The relationship is negative, implying that increased price volatility in spot prices further decreases convenience yields. This behavior also confirms that market participants are willing to pay an additional risk premium in the futures market for a hedge against increased uncertainty about EUA prices.

Our results provide important insights on the relationship between EUA spot and futures contracts and the drivers of convenience yields in this relatively new and unique market. Based on the findings of this study, a more thorough investigation of the relationship between convenience yields in the EU-ETS and the proposed factors during Phase III should be conducted in future work.

References

Benz, E., Hengelbrock, J., 2008. Liquidity and price discovery in the european CO_2 futures market: an intraday analysis. Working Paper, Bonn Graduate School of Economics.

Benz, E., Trück, S., 2006. CO_2 emission allowances trading in Europe - specifying a new class of assets. Problems and Perspectives in Management 3, 4–15.

Benz, E., Trück, S., 2008. Modeling the price dynamics of CO_2 emission allowances. Energy Economics 31(1), 4–15.

Bessembinder, H., Lemmon, M., 2002. Equilibrium pricing and optimal hedging in electricity forward markets. Journal of Finance 57, 1347–1382.

Bierbrauer, M., Menn, C., Rachev, S.T., Trück, S., 2007. Spot and derivative pricing in the EEX power market. Journal of Banking and Finance 31(11), 3462–3485.

Bodie, Z., Rosansky, V., 1980. Risk and return in commodities futures. Financial Analysts Journal 36, 27–39.

Botterud, A., Kristiansen, T., Ilic, M., 2010. The relationship between spot and futures prices in the Nord Pool electricity market. Energy Economics 32(5), 967–978.

Bredin, D., Muckley, C., 2011. An emerging equilibrium in the EU emissions trading scheme. Energy Economics 33, 353–362.

Bunn, D., Chen, D., 2013. The forward premium in electricity futures. Journal of Empirical Finance 23, 173–186.

Carmona, R., Hinz, J., 2011. Risk-neutral models for emission allowance prices and option valuation. Management Science 57(8), 1453–1468.

Casassus, J., Collin-Dufresne, P., October 2005. Stochastic convenience yield implied from commodity futures and interest rates. Journal of Finance 60 (5), 2283–2331.

Chang, E., 1985. Returns to speculators and the theory of normal backwardation. Journal of Finance 40, 193–208.

Chang, K., Sheng Wang, S., Peng, K., 2013. Mean reversion of stochastic convenience yields for CO_2 emissions allowances: Empirical evidence from the EU ETS. The Spanish Review of Financial Economics 11(1), 39–45.

Chesney, M., Taschini, L., 2012. The endogenous price dynamics of emission allowances and an application to CO_2 option pricing. Applied Mathematical Finance 19(5).

Chevallier, J., 2009a. Carbon futures and macroeconomic risk factors: A view from the EU ETS. Energy Economics 31(4), 614–625.

Chevallier, J., 2009b. Modelling the convenience yield in carbon prices using daily and realized measures. International Review of Applied Financial Issues and Economics 1(1), 56–73.

Chevallier, J., 2011. Detecting instability in the volatility of carbon prices. Energy Economics 33(1), 99–110.

Chevallier, J., 2012. Econometric Analysis of Carbon Markets. Springer.

Christiansen, C., October 2011. Intertemporal risk-return trade-off in foreign exchange rates. Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money 21 (4), 535–549.

Conrad, C., Rittler, D., Rotfuss, W., 2012. Modeling and explaining the dynamics of European Union allowance prices at high-frequency. Energy Economics 34(1), 316–326.

Considine, T., Larson, D., 2001a. Risk premium on inventory assets: The case of crude oil and natural gas. Journal of Futures Markets 21(2), 109–126.

Considine, T., Larson, D., 2001b. Uncertainty and the convenience yield in crude oil price backwardations. Energy Economics 23(5), 533–548.

Daskalakis, G., Psychoyios, D., Markellos, R., 2009. Modeling CO_2 emission allowance prices and derivatives: Evidence from the EEX. Journal of Banking and Finance 33(7), 1230–1241.

Diko, P., Lawford, S., Limpens, V., 2006. Risk premia in electricity forward prices. Studies in Nonlinear Dynamics & Econometrics 10(3), Article 7.

Ellerman, A., Marcantonini, C., Zaklan, A., 2014. The EU ETS: Eight years and counting. Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies Working Paper 2014-04, European University Institute.

Fama, E., French, K., 1987. Commodity futures prices: Some evidence on forecast power, premiums, and the theory of storage. Journal of Business 60(1), 55–73.

Fama, E., French, K., 1988. Business cycles and the behavior of metal prices. Journal of Finance 43, 1075–1093.

Fichtner, W., 2004. Habilitation: Produktionswirtschaftliche Planungsaufgaben bei CO_2-Emissionsrechten als neuen Produktionsfaktor. Universität Karlsruhe (TH).

Geman, H., 2005. Commodities and Commodity Derivatives. Wiley.

Gibson, R., Schwartz, E., 1990. Stochastic convenience yield and the pricing of oil contingent claims. Journal of Finance 45(3), 959–976.

Gorenflo, M., 2013. Futures price dynamics of CO_2 emission allowances. Empirical Economics 45, 1025–1047.

Gronwald, M., Ketterer, J., Trück, S., 2011. The relationship between carbon, commodity and financial markets: A copula analysis. Economic Record 87.

Handika, R., Trück, S., 2013. Risk premiums in interconnected Australian electricity futures markets. SSRN Working Paper. DOI 10.2139/ssrn.2279945.

Haugom, E., Hoff, G. A., Mortensen, M., Molnar, P., Westgaard, S., 2014. The forecasting power of medium-term futures contracts. Journal of Energy Markets 7 (4), 47–69.

Haugom, E., Ullrich, C. J., 2012. Market efficiency and risk premia in short-term forward prices. Energy Economics 34 (6), 1931–1941.

Hicks, J., 1946. Value and Capital, 2nd Edition. London: Oxford University Press.

Hintermann, B., 2010. Allowance price drivers in the first phase of the EU ETS. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management 59(1), 43–56.

Hull, J. C., 2005. Options, Futures and Other Derivatives, Sixth Edition. Prentice Hall.

Hwang, S., Satchell, S. E., October 1999. Modelling emerging market risk premia using higher moments. International Journal of Finance and Economics 4 (4), 271–96.

Isenegger, P., Wyss, R., Marquardt, S., 2013. The valuation of derivatives on carbon emission certificates. Working Paper.

Jiang, C., Chiang, T., 2000. Do foreign exchange risk premiums relate to the volatility in the foreign exchange and equity markets? Applied Financial Economics 10 (1), 95–104.

Kanamura, T., 2012. Comparison of futures pricing models for carbon assets and traditional energy commodities. The Journal of Alternative Investments 14 (3), 42–54.

Kanamura, T., 2015. Dynamic price linkage and volatility structure model between carbon markets. In: Steland, A., Rafajłowicz, E., Szajowski, K. (Eds.), Stochastic Models, Statistics and Their Applications. Vol. 122 of Springer Proceedings in Mathematics and Statistics. Springer International Publishing, pp. 301–308.

Keynes, J., 1930. A Treatise on Money, Vol 2. London, Macmillan.

Kumar, S., Trück, S., 2014. Unbiasedness and risk premiums in the Indian currency futures market. Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money 29 (C), 13–32.

Longstaff, F., Wang, A., 2004. Electricity forward prices: A high-frequency empirical analysis. Journal of Finance 59, 1877–1900.

Madaleno, M., Pinho, C., 2011. Risk premia in CO_2 allowances: spot and futures prices in the EEX market. Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal 22(5), 550–565.

Milonas, N., Henker, T., 2001. Price spread and convenience yield behavior in the international oil market. Applied Financial Economics 11(1), 23–36.

Milunovich, G., Joyeux, R., 2010. Market efficiency and price discovery in the EU carbon futures market. Applied Financial Economics 20(10), 803–809.

Niblock, S., Harrison, J., 2012. Do dynamic linkages exist among European carbon markets? International Business and Economics Research Journal 11(1), 33–44.

Paolella, M., Taschini, L., 2008. An econometric analysis of emission trading allowances. Journal of Banking and Finance 32(10), 2022–2032.

Pindyck, R., 2001. The dynamics of commodity spot and futures markets: A primer. The Energy Journal 22, 1–29.

Redl, C., Haas, R., Huber, C., Böhm, B., 2009. Price formation in electricity forward markets and the relevance of systematic forecast errors. Energy Economics 31 (3), 356–364.

Samuelson, P., 1965. Proof that properly anticipated prices fluctuate randomly. Industrial Management Review 6, 41–49.

Schwartz, E., 1997. The stochastic behavior of commodity prices: Implications for valuation and hedging. The Journal of Finance 52, 923–973.

Schwartz, E., Smith, J., 2000. Short-term variations and long-term dynamics in commodity prices. Management Science 46, 893–911.

Seifert, J., Uhrig-Homburg, M., Wagner, M., 2008. Dynamic behavior of CO_2 spot prices - a stochastic equilibrium model. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management 56(2), 180–194.

Torró, H., Lucia, J., 2011. On the risk premium in Nordic electricity futures prices. International Review of Economics and Finance 20, 750–763.

Trück, S., Härdle, W., Weron, R., 2015. The relationship between spot and futures CO_2 emission allowance prices in the EU-ETS. In: Gronwald, M., Hintermann, B. (Eds.), Emission Trading Systems as a Climate Policy Instrument - Evaluation and Prospects. MIT Press (forthcoming).

Uhrig-Homburg, M., Wagner, M., 2009. Futures price dynamics of CO_2 emission allowances: An empirical analysis of the trial period. Journal of Derivatives 17(2), 73–88.

Wei, S., Zhu, Z., 2006. Commodity convenience yield and risk premium determination: The case of the U.S. natural gas market. Energy Economics 28, 523–534.

Weron, R., 2006. Modeling and Forecasting Electricity Loads and Prices: A Statistical Approach. Wiley, Chichester.

Weron, R., 2008. Market price of risk implied by Asian-style electricity options and futures. Energy Economics 30, 1098–1115.

Weron, R., Zator, M., 2014. Revisiting the relationship between spot and futures prices in the Nord Pool electricity market. Energy Economics 44, 178–190.

Zaklan, A., Valero, V., Ellerman, A., 2014. An analysis of allowance banking in the EU ETS. Working Paper.