NAVIGATING THE CARBON MAZE

AN INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS OF COMPLIANCE AND STRATEGY UNDER THE EU'S CBAM

International Trade Council
tradecouncil.org

A work by the International Trade Council
Published by the International Trade Council

For use in other publications or references, contact:
publications@tradecouncil.org
www.tradecouncil.org

First Edition: February 2026

Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction: The Specter of Carbon Leakage and the EU's Climate Ambition

The European Union has positioned itself at the vanguard of global climate action, articulating an ambition that is as profound as it is precarious: to become the first climate-neutral continent by 2050. This objective, enshrined in the European Climate Law, is not merely aspirational; it is a legally binding commitment that necessitates a fundamental re-engineering of the European economic edifice. The primary legislative vehicle for this transition is the 'Fit for 55' package, a comprehensive suite of policies designed to reduce the bloc's net greenhouse gas emissions by at least 55% by 2030, relative to 1990 levels. At the heart of this architecture lies the European Union's Emissions Trading System (ETS), a pioneering experiment in market-based environmental regulation launched in 2005.

The ETS operates on a seemingly straightforward 'cap and trade' principle. A cap is set on the total amount of certain greenhouse gases that can be

emitted by installations in covered sectors, and this cap is reduced over time. Within this cap, companies can buy or sell emission allowances as needed, creating a tangible carbon price and, in theory, incentivizing the most cost-effective decarbonization pathways. For years, this system has been the central pillar of the EU's strategy, a testament to its faith in market mechanisms to solve environmental externalities. Yet, this very mechanism, designed to drive internal decarbonization, exposed a critical vulnerability-a specter that threatens to undermine the entirety of the EU's climate project. This specter is known as 'carbon leakage.'

The Conundrum of Carbon Leakage

Carbon leakage describes a situation where stringent climate policies in one jurisdiction lead to a rise in greenhouse gas emissions in another. The logic, at first glance, appears deceptively simple. If European industries, such as steel, cement, or fertilizer producers, are required to pay a price for their carbon emissions under the ETS, while their international competitors are not, a competitive disadvantage emerges. This cost differential can trigger two primary forms of leakage. The first, and most direct, involves 'production leakage,' where a company relocates its carbon-intensive production to a country with less stringent, or entirely absent, climate regulations. The second, more subtle form, is 'investment leakage,' where new investments are channeled away from the regulated region towards these more lenient jurisdictions. In either scenario, the outcome is perverse: greenhouse gas emissions are not genuinely reduced on a global scale but are merely displaced. The EU's domestic emissions may fall, but this reduction is offset, perhaps even surpassed, by an increase elsewhere, resulting in a zero-sum, or even negative, game for the global climate.

For years, the EU sought to mitigate this risk primarily through an internal mechanism: the generous allocation of free emission allowances to sectors

deemed at high risk of leakage. The rationale was to shield these industries from the full cost of the ETS, thereby preserving their competitiveness against foreign rivals. However, this approach was fraught with contradictions. Critics have argued, with considerable evidence, that the over-allocation of free allowances has often resulted in windfall profits for corporations, blunted the incentive for deep decarbonization, and cost taxpayers billions in foregone auctioning revenue. It was a temporary fix that, one might argue, treated the symptom rather than the underlying disease of uneven global carbon pricing.

The Emergence of a New Institutional Paradigm: The CBAM

The inadequacies of the free allowance system, coupled with the EU's escalating climate ambitions, created the political and economic impetus for a new, more assertive institutional innovation. The solution that emerged from this crucible of policy debate was the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM). Proposed as a cornerstone of the 'Fit for 55' package, the CBAM represents a fundamental shift in strategy-from internally subsidizing EU industries to externally pricing the carbon content of specific imported goods. The mechanism requires EU importers of certain goods-initially cement, iron and steel, aluminum, fertilizers, electricity, and hydrogen-to purchase 'CBAM certificates' corresponding to the carbon price that would have been paid had the goods been produced under the EU's carbon pricing rules. A transitional phase, focused on reporting obligations, began on October 1, 2023, with financial adjustments set to take effect from 2026, coinciding with the gradual phasing out of free allowances for these same sectors.

The stated purpose of the CBAM is twofold: to prevent carbon leakage and to encourage the EU's trading partners to adopt more robust climate policies of their own, thereby creating a level playing field for both EU and non-EU

businesses. It is, in essence, an attempt to export the EU's carbon price, transforming a domestic environmental policy into a de facto international trade standard. This move has not been without controversy, sparking intense international debate about its legitimacy, its potential characterization as protectionism, and its geopolitical ramifications, particularly for developing nations.

Thesis and Structure of the Book

This book contends that the CBAM is more than a mere technical adjustment to the ETS; it is a pivotal institutional experiment that will reshape the landscape of international trade, corporate strategy, and global climate governance. Its implementation forces a direct confrontation between the logics of the World Trade Organization and the imperatives of the Paris Agreement, creating a complex 'carbon maze' for firms, policymakers, and international institutions to navigate. Our central thesis is that the strategic responses of firms to the CBAM will be shaped not only by the direct compliance costs it imposes but also by the intricate institutional pressures and opportunities it creates within global value chains.

This institutional analysis will unfold over the subsequent nine chapters. Chapter 2 will dissect the legal and economic architecture of the CBAM, examining its operational mechanics and its relationship with the EU ETS and international trade law. Chapter 3 develops our theoretical framework, drawing on institutional theory to understand how firms perceive and process regulatory pressures. Chapters 4 through 7 will present in-depth case studies of the sectors initially targeted by the CBAM-steel, aluminum, cement, and fertilizers-analyzing the specific compliance challenges and strategic adaptations emerging within each. Chapter 8 broadens the scope to explore the significant geopolitical and diplomatic responses to the CBAM, mapping the fault lines of international cooperation and conflict.

Chapter 9 will evaluate the potential for the mechanism's future expansion and the inherent challenges of measurement, reporting, and verification. Finally, Chapter 10 will synthesize our findings, offering concluding reflections on the CBAM's role as a potential blueprint for future climate policy and its ultimate effectiveness in navigating the treacherous path toward global decarbonization.

Chapter 2

The Economic Architecture of Carbon Pricing and Border Adjustments

To grasp the intricate machinery of the European Union's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM), one must first return to a foundational concept in economics: the market's failure to account for the full costs of production. The invisible hand, celebrated for its efficiency in allocating resources, has long struggled with an invisible problem-the unpriced consequences of economic activity borne by society at large. Greenhouse gas emissions represent perhaps the most profound and perilous example of this market failure, a global negative externality demanding a global, or at least coordinated, solution. This chapter lays the theoretical economic groundwork for understanding the CBAM, beginning with the classical remedy for such market failures and progressing to the complex realities of international trade that necessitate policies like border adjustments.

The Theory of Externalities and Pigouvian Taxes

At its core, an externality is a cost or benefit imposed upon a third party who is not a participant in the transaction between a buyer and a seller. When a factory emits CO2, it imposes a cost-in the form of climate change impacts like extreme weather, sea-level rise, and agricultural disruption-on the global population. These costs are not reflected in the price of the factory's products. Economists term this a "negative externality," a situation where the social cost of an activity exceeds the private cost faced by the producer. This divergence leads to an overproduction of the harmful good because the market price signals that it is cheaper to produce than it actually is for society as a whole.

The classic economic prescription for this ailment was formulated by British economist Arthur C. Pigou in his seminal 1920 work, The Economics of Welfare. Pigou argued that to correct for a negative externality, the government should impose a tax on the activity equal to the marginal external cost it generates. Such a tax, now known as a "Pigouvian tax," forces the producer to internalize the externality-that is, to treat the social cost as a private cost of production. The logic is elegant: by making the polluter pay, the tax aligns the private cost with the social cost, leading the market to produce the socially optimal quantity of the good.

To effectively set a Pigouvian tax on carbon, policymakers must estimate the monetary value of the damage caused by emitting one additional ton of CO2. This figure is known as the Social Cost of Carbon (SCC). Calculating the SCC is a monumental task, involving complex models that project future economic damages from climate change and then discount them to their present value. Estimates vary widely, reflecting different assumptions about climate sensitivity, discount rates, and the valuation of non-market impacts. For example, recent estimates place the SCC at approximately $185 per ton

of CO2, a figure vastly higher than the average global carbon price of around $6 per ton recorded in 2022. Despite the methodological challenges, the SCC provides the theoretical benchmark for an ideal carbon price.

Carbon Taxes Versus Cap-and-Trade Systems

Once the principle of carbon pricing is accepted, the debate shifts to the choice of instrument. The two primary market-based mechanisms are the carbon tax (a price instrument) and the cap-and-trade system, also known as an Emissions Trading System or ETS (a quantity instrument).

A carbon tax is the direct application of Pigouvian theory. It sets a fixed price per ton of CO2 emitted, providing businesses with price certainty. Firms can then decide whether it is cheaper to pay the tax or to invest in emissions reduction technologies. Its main advantage is its simplicity and predictable impact on the cost of carbon. However, the environmental outcome-the total amount of emissions reduced-is uncertain, as it depends on how firms respond to the set price.

Conversely, a cap-and-trade system sets a firm limit, or cap, on the total amount of greenhouse gases that can be emitted by covered sectors. The government then issues or auctions a corresponding number of emission allowances. Firms that can reduce their emissions cheaply can sell their excess allowances to firms for whom abatement is more expensive. This trading establishes a market price for carbon. The key advantage of an ETS is certainty about the quantity of emissions reductions; the cap ensures a specific environmental outcome. The primary drawback is price volatility. The price of allowances can fluctuate with the business cycle, technological changes, and other market forces, creating uncertainty for firms planning long-term investments.

In a world of perfect information, the two systems are theoretically

equivalent. One can achieve a specific emissions target either by setting a cap at that level (and letting the market find the price) or by setting a tax at the corresponding market price (and letting the market determine the quantity). The choice often hinges on whether policymakers prioritize price stability or emissions certainty. The EU, with its pioneering ETS, has long favored the quantity-based approach, creating the world's largest carbon market.

Economic Models of International Trade and Environmental Policy

The elegant theory of carbon pricing confronts a messy reality when implemented unilaterally in a globalized world. When one country or bloc, like the EU, imposes a stringent climate policy while its trading partners do not, it creates a cost asymmetry. Domestic industries facing a carbon price see their production costs rise relative to competitors in unregulated jurisdictions. This dynamic gives rise to the phenomenon of "carbon leakage".

Carbon leakage occurs when climate policy in one jurisdiction leads to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions in another. It can happen through two main channels. First, energy-intensive, trade-exposed industries might relocate production to countries with laxer environmental regulations to avoid the carbon cost (direct leakage). Second, domestic demand might shift from domestically produced goods to cheaper, more carbon-intensive imports (indirect leakage). The result is that the unilateral climate policy is undermined; domestic emissions may fall, but global emissions may remain unchanged or even increase, rendering the policy ineffective at tackling the global climate problem.

Economic models, such as Computable General Equilibrium (CGE) and partial equilibrium models, are used to estimate the potential magnitude of

carbon leakage. While estimates vary significantly depending on the model's assumptions, they confirm that the risk is most acute for specific energy-intensive and trade-exposed sectors like steel, cement, aluminum, and fertilizers-the very sectors initially targeted by the EU's CBAM.

The Theoretical Justification for Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanisms

It is here, at the intersection of climate policy and international trade, that the economic rationale for a Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism emerges. A CBAM is designed to be a remedy for carbon leakage. The fundamental principle is to ensure that imported goods face the same carbon price as domestically produced goods. By imposing a charge on the embodied carbon of imports from countries without an equivalent carbon price, a CBAM aims to level the playing field and eliminate the cost advantage of producing in a jurisdiction with weaker climate policies.

In theory, a well-designed CBAM corrects the market distortion caused by asymmetric climate policies. It reduces the incentive for domestic firms to relocate and for consumers to switch to carbon-intensive imports, thus preserving the integrity and effectiveness of the domestic climate policy. Furthermore, it creates an incentive for trading partners to adopt their own carbon pricing policies. If a foreign producer's country implements a carbon price, that cost can typically be deducted from the CBAM charge, encouraging a global convergence of climate ambition.

The theoretical case for a CBAM is compelling as a tool to address leakage and promote fair competition. However, its path from economic theory to practical policy is fraught with challenges, which subsequent chapters will explore in detail. The design must navigate the treacherous waters of international trade law, the technical complexities of measuring embodied carbon, and the diplomatic sensitivities of imposing a border charge on

trading partners.

Ultimately, the economic architecture of carbon pricing and border adjustments rests on a simple premise: the costs of climate change are real and must be integrated into the global economy. As we move from the foundational theories discussed here to the specific institutional design of the EU's CBAM in the next chapter, we will see how this ambitious policy attempts to translate elegant economic principles into a workable, albeit complex, real-world mechanism.

Chapter 3

Unpacking the CBAM: Legal and Regulatory Framework

The theoretical underpinnings of carbon leakage and the economic rationale for a border adjustment mechanism, as discussed in the preceding chapter, give way here to the concrete realities of the European Union's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM). This chapter delves into the intricate legal and regulatory architecture of the CBAM, moving from abstract principles to the tangible obligations placed upon importers and the strategic recalibrations demanded of non-EU producers. One might argue this is the technical heart of the book, where the policy's ambition is translated into a set of binding rules and procedures. The adoption of Regulation (EU) 2023/956 on May 10, 2023, marked a pivotal moment, establishing a mechanism that is, for the first time on such a scale, applying an environmental tariff based on a product's carbon footprint.

Scope of the CBAM: Covered Sectors and Products

The initial scope of the CBAM is both targeted and strategic, focusing on sectors deemed to have the highest risk of carbon leakage and significant carbon emissions. These sectors are cement, iron and steel, aluminum, fertilizers, electricity, and hydrogen. This selection was not arbitrary; it reflects a calculated approach to cover a substantial portion of industrial emissions while managing the administrative complexity of a novel and far-reaching policy instrument. The EU estimates that this initial phase will capture over 50% of the emissions in the sectors covered by the EU Emissions Trading System (ETS).

It is crucial to note that the regulation's scope extends beyond these broad categories to include specific precursor materials and some downstream products, all meticulously defined by their Combined Nomenclature (CN) codes. This level of detail is essential for customs authorities and importers to determine precisely which goods fall under the CBAM's purview. For instance, while raw aluminum is covered, a finished product like an aluminum car door may not be, highlighting the nuanced application of the regulation. The EU has signaled its intention to expand the CBAM's scope by 2030 to encompass all sectors currently under the EU ETS, potentially including organic chemicals, polymers, and petroleum products. This phased expansion allows for a period of learning and adjustment for both regulators and the private sector.

The Transitional Phase (2023-2025) and Reporting Requirements

Recognizing the novelty and complexity of the CBAM, the EU has implemented a transitional phase, which began on October 1, 2023, and will run until December 31, 2025. This period is designed as a 'learning phase' for all stakeholders, including importers, non-EU producers, and national authorities. During this time, the primary obligation on importers is one of

reporting, not payment. Importers of CBAM-covered goods are required to submit quarterly reports detailing the volume of their imports and the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions embedded within them.

The first quarterly report, covering the fourth quarter of 2023, was due by January 31, 2024. These reports must include both direct and indirect emissions embedded in the imported goods. The data gathered during this phase will be instrumental for the European Commission to refine the methodology for calculating embedded emissions and to make any necessary adjustments before the definitive system takes full effect. While no financial adjustments are required during this period, non-compliance with reporting obligations can still result in penalties, signaling the seriousness with which the EU views this preparatory stage.

The responsibility for this reporting falls squarely on the shoulders of the EU importer, who must act as the 'reporting declarant'. This necessitates a significant degree of cooperation and information sharing along the supply chain, as the emissions data must originate from the producers themselves. This has, perhaps predictably, raised concerns among industries about the practicalities of obtaining accurate and verifiable data from suppliers in non-EU countries.

Calculation of Embedded Emissions and the Role of Default Values

The calculation of embedded emissions is, without a doubt, one of the most technically challenging aspects of the CBAM. The regulation provides for several methods to determine these emissions. The primary and preferred method is based on the actual emissions from the production process, determined either through direct measurement or calculation based on activity data. This approach demands a high level of data accuracy and transparency from non-EU producers.

However, the European Commission has acknowledged that obtaining such detailed data may not always be feasible, particularly in the initial stages. To address this, the regulation allows for a degree of flexibility during the transitional period. Until the end of 2024, importers have the option of using alternative methods, such as relying on monitoring and reporting schemes in the country of production, provided they offer a similar level of accuracy to the EU's methodology.

Furthermore, and crucially for the initial reporting periods, importers are permitted to use default values published by the European Commission. These default values represent an estimation of the average emissions intensity for the production of specific goods. Until July 31, 2024, these default values could be used without any quantitative limit to determine the total embedded emissions. After this date, however, the use of default values for complex goods is capped at 20% of the total embedded emissions, pushing importers to obtain actual emissions data from their suppliers. This phased approach is a pragmatic concession, designed to ease the initial reporting burden while clearly signaling the expectation of a transition towards more precise, installation-specific data. It seems the Commission is attempting to strike a balance between rigor and feasibility, a recurring theme in the CBAM's design.

The Mechanics of Purchasing and Surrendering CBAM Certificates

With the conclusion of the transitional phase on January 1, 2026, the CBAM will enter its definitive phase, and the financial obligations will commence. From this point forward, EU importers of covered goods will be required to purchase and surrender a corresponding number of CBAM certificates to cover the embedded emissions of their imports. This is the core mechanism through which the CBAM will equalize the carbon price between imported

and domestically produced goods.

To participate in this system, importers must apply for the status of an 'authorized CBAM declarant' through the national competent authorities in their respective EU member states. These authorized declarants will then be able to purchase CBAM certificates. The price of these certificates will be directly linked to the weekly average auction price of EU ETS allowances, ensuring a consistent carbon price for both domestic and imported goods.

By May 31st of each year, starting in 2027 for the 2026 reporting year, authorized declarants must submit an annual CBAM declaration. This declaration will detail the total quantity of covered goods imported in the preceding year and their total embedded emissions. The declarant must then surrender the corresponding number of CBAM certificates. An important provision in the regulation allows for the deduction of any carbon price already paid in the country of origin from the number of certificates to be surrendered. This is a critical element for ensuring fairness and encouraging the adoption of carbon pricing schemes in non-EU countries. The gradual phase-out of free allowances for CBAM sectors within the EU ETS will run in parallel with the phasing-in of the CBAM's financial obligations, a synchronized approach designed to prevent double protection for EU industries.

This intricate framework of reporting, verification, and certificate trading represents a significant shift in the landscape of international trade. It moves beyond traditional tariffs and quotas to embed climate considerations directly into the economic transactions at the EU's borders. The success of this complex machinery will undoubtedly depend on the diligent and coordinated efforts of importers, producers, and regulatory authorities. As we will explore in the following chapter, the strategic implications of this new reality are already beginning to ripple through global supply chains, forcing a

fundamental rethinking of carbon as a component of competitive advantage.

Chapter 4

An Institutional Analysis of CBAM Compliance

The Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) represents a paradigm shift in the European Union's approach to climate policy, extending its regulatory reach beyond its borders to address the persistent issue of carbon leakage. As explored in the preceding chapters, the economic and environmental ambitions of the CBAM are substantial. However, the translation of these ambitions into effective, real-world implementation hinges on the creation and successful navigation of a novel and complex institutional landscape. This chapter adopts an institutional lens to dissect the practical challenges of CBAM compliance for firms both within and outside the EU. It seems the very architecture of this new regulatory space, from the granular level of data collection to the macro-level coordination between authorities, will fundamentally shape the strategic responses of economic actors and, ultimately, the mechanism's overall success.

The Foundational Challenge: Data Collection and Verification of Embedded

Emissions

At the heart of the CBAM's operational framework lies a deceptively simple requirement: to declare the greenhouse gas emissions embedded in certain goods imported into the EU. This task, however, unravels into a cascade of institutional and organizational challenges. For non-EU producers, this necessitates the establishment of robust internal processes for monitoring, reporting, and verifying emissions data at the installation level-a capability that, for many, is entirely new.

The transitional period, which began on October 1, 2023, is intended as a pilot phase for stakeholders to adapt to these new demands, requiring quarterly reporting of embedded emissions without immediate financial obligation. Yet, even this preparatory stage has exposed significant hurdles. A recent survey of German companies, for instance, revealed that a majority were unable to report the actual emissions of their non-EU suppliers, citing insufficient data availability as a primary barrier. This information asymmetry between EU importers and their third-country suppliers represents a critical institutional friction point.

To address this, the CBAM regulation allows for the use of default values, particularly in the initial stages, when actual data is unavailable. These default values, published by the European Commission, are intentionally conservative and often include a markup, creating a strong economic incentive for producers to develop the capacity for accurate, installation-specific reporting. One might argue this is a feature, not a bug, designed to catalyze the very institutional changes required for global carbon accounting.

Furthermore, the definitive phase of the CBAM, commencing on January 1, 2026, will mandate that all reported emissions data be verified by an accredited third-party organization. This introduces another layer to the

institutional ecosystem, requiring a new market of accredited verifiers with the technical expertise to assess emissions data across diverse industrial sectors and geographical contexts. The process of accreditation, oversight, and mutual recognition of these verifiers is itself a significant institutional undertaking for the EU. For producers, the failure to provide verified data results in the application of higher default emissions values, directly impacting their market competitiveness by increasing the carbon cost levied at the border.

A New Governance Architecture: National Authorities and the Central Registry

The administration of the CBAM is not monolithic; it is a multi-level governance system that relies on the coordinated action of both member state-level bodies and a centralized EU authority. Each EU member state is required to designate a National Competent Authority (NCA) responsible for the core administrative tasks of the CBAM within its jurisdiction. These NCAs are the primary interface for importers, responsible for authorizing CBAM declarants, reviewing declarations, and selling the requisite CBAM certificates.

This decentralized approach allows for implementation that is, perhaps, more attuned to national administrative and industrial contexts. However, it also introduces the potential for regulatory fragmentation. To counteract this, the European Commission has established a central CBAM Registry, an electronic database intended to standardize and streamline the flow of information between importers, NCAs, and the Commission itself. This registry serves as the backbone of the system, housing data on authorized declarants and their CBAM certificates, and automating information sharing to ensure consistent application of the rules across the Union.

Importers, or their representatives, must apply for the status of "authorised

CBAM declarant\" through their respective NCA, a process managed via the registry's Authorisation Management Module. This creates a new institutional status for firms, contingent on demonstrating the financial and operational capacity to meet their CBAM obligations. The NCAs hold considerable power, with the authority to grant or refuse authorization and to impose penalties for non-compliance. The entire edifice rests on the seamless functioning and interoperability of these national and supranational institutional components.

The SME Conundrum: Disproportionate Burdens and Emerging Asymmetries

While large multinational corporations may possess the resources and expertise to navigate this new regulatory terrain, the CBAM presents acute challenges for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), particularly those in non-EU countries. These firms often lack experience with carbon accounting and may struggle with the administrative burden of tracking and reporting emissions for each shipment. The costs associated with data collection, verification, and potentially hiring specialized consultants can be prohibitive, creating a significant barrier to entry for the EU market.

This places SMEs in a precarious position. As EU importers push compliance costs down the supply chain, smaller suppliers who cannot provide the requisite data risk being excluded from established value chains. This dynamic could inadvertently lead to market consolidation, favoring larger, more vertically integrated firms that can more easily manage the data and verification requirements. The result is a potential widening of structural inequalities between large and small economic actors in the global marketplace.

In recognition of these challenges, the European Parliament has approved measures aimed at easing the burden on smaller entities. A key reform

introduces a 50-tonne annual import threshold, a de minimis rule expected to exempt a large number of importers by volume while still capturing the vast majority of embedded emissions in targeted sectors. While this provides some relief, it does not entirely resolve the challenges for SMEs that operate above this threshold or for those who are part of the supply chains of larger importers. The fundamental issue remains one of capacity-building and the need for technical and financial support to enable these smaller players to participate in the decarbonizing global economy.

Navigating the Overlap: CBAM and Third-Country Carbon Pricing

A central tenet of the CBAM's design is to avoid double pricing of carbon. The regulation explicitly allows importers to claim a reduction in their CBAM obligation for any carbon price already paid in the country of origin. This provision is crucial for the mechanism's political and legal viability, as it acknowledges the climate efforts of third countries and incentivizes the global adoption of carbon pricing. The EU has committed to supporting developing countries in establishing their own carbon pricing systems.

This interplay, however, is fraught with institutional complexity. The CBAM regulation is specific about the types of carbon prices that are eligible for deduction, generally limited to explicit carbon taxes or allowances under an emissions trading system (ETS). This creates a potential conflict with countries that utilize different regulatory instruments, such as emissions standards or indirect taxes, to achieve their climate goals. Critics argue this approach may be seen as discriminatory, favoring the EU's specific model of climate regulation.

Moreover, the process of verifying that a carbon price has been \"effectively paid\"-accounting for any rebates or subsidies-adds another layer of administrative and diplomatic complexity. It requires a detailed

understanding and assessment of the diverse and evolving carbon pricing landscapes in numerous trading partner nations. As of early 2025, while the number of emissions trading systems globally has grown significantly, there remain vast disparities in price levels and coverage, making direct comparability a persistent challenge. The operationalization of this crediting mechanism will be a key test of the CBAM's ability to foster international cooperation rather than instigate trade disputes.

As firms and nations grapple with these new institutional realities, the path to compliance is clearly not a straightforward one. It demands the development of new organizational capabilities, the establishment of novel governance structures, and a delicate balancing act between the EU's climate ambitions and the economic realities of its global trading partners. The strategic decisions made in response to these challenges, which we will turn to in the next chapter, will ultimately determine the contours of the carbon-constrained global economy that the CBAM seeks to create.

Chapter 5

Corporate Strategy in the Shadow of the CBAM

The introduction of the European Union's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) represents more than a regulatory shift; it is a fundamental reshaping of the competitive landscape for carbon-intensive industries. For decades, the specter of "carbon leakage"-whereby companies relocate production to jurisdictions with less stringent environmental policies-has haunted climate policy discussions. The CBAM, by design, seeks to neutralize this threat by imposing a carbon price on certain imported goods, thereby leveling the playing field between EU and non-EU producers. This mechanism, which entered its transitional phase on October 1, 2023, and is set for full implementation on January 1, 2026, forces a strategic reckoning for corporations globally. It is no longer sufficient for firms to view carbon emissions as a mere externality; they are now a tangible cost that directly impacts market access and profitability. This chapter shifts the analytical focus from the institutional architecture of the CBAM to the strategic responses of the corporations operating within its

shadow. We will explore the myriad ways in which firms are likely to adapt their supply chains, investment decisions, and product designs to mitigate CBAM-related costs and, in some cases, to seize a competitive advantage. The analysis will distinguish between reactive strategies, aimed at immediate compliance and cost minimization, and proactive strategies, which seek to leverage the new regulatory environment for long-term strategic gain.

Supply Chain Restructuring and Sourcing Decisions

The most immediate and perhaps most disruptive impact of the CBAM will be felt within global supply chains. For companies importing CBAM-covered goods into the EU-initially cement, iron and steel, aluminum, fertilizers, electricity, and hydrogen-the need to track and report embedded emissions is a significant operational challenge. This necessitates a level of transparency and data collection that has not been standard practice for many industries. Consequently, a primary strategic response involves a thorough mapping and reassessment of existing supply chains. Firms are now compelled to look beyond traditional metrics of cost, quality, and reliability to include the carbon intensity of their suppliers.

One might argue that this will inevitably lead to a preference for suppliers in jurisdictions with existing carbon pricing mechanisms or those who have already invested in decarbonization. Indeed, the CBAM regulation allows for the deduction of any carbon price already paid in the country of origin, creating a direct financial incentive to source from less carbon-intensive producers. This could trigger a significant realignment of global trade flows, with a potential shift away from suppliers in countries with lax environmental regulations. However, the reality is likely to be more complex. For many firms, long-standing supplier relationships, logistical efficiencies, and specialized capabilities will not be easily abandoned. Therefore, a more

nuanced approach is likely to emerge, involving a combination of supplier diversification, targeted engagement to encourage decarbonization among existing partners, and, in some cases, vertical integration to gain greater control over the carbon footprint of production processes. The artificial restructuring of supply chains to circumvent CBAM obligations is also a possibility that the European Commission has already moved to address in its proposals.

Investment in Decarbonization Technologies and Processes

The CBAM, in essence, extends the economic logic of the EU's Emissions Trading System (ETS) beyond its borders. Just as the EU ETS has spurred investment in cleaner technologies within the Union, the CBAM is designed to incentivize similar investments globally. For non-EU producers, the prospect of a carbon levy on their exports to the lucrative EU market fundamentally alters the calculus of decarbonization investments. Projects that were previously deemed economically unviable may now become strategically essential. This is particularly true for industries such as steel and cement, where process emissions are a significant component of their carbon footprint.

The strategic imperative to invest in decarbonization is not solely a defensive measure to mitigate CBAM costs. For forward-thinking companies, it presents an opportunity to gain a significant competitive advantage. Firms that can successfully reduce the embedded emissions in their products will not only face lower CBAM liabilities but may also be able to command a premium for their greener goods. This is especially relevant as consumer and investor preferences increasingly favor sustainable products. The European Commission has estimated that while the CBAM may lead to a slight reduction in GDP, it is also projected to increase investment by 0.39% by 2030 compared to a scenario of continued free

allowances under the ETS. This suggests an anticipated shift in capital allocation towards green technologies and processes.

The Role of Green Procurement and Product Differentiation Strategies

The CBAM will undoubtedly accelerate the trend towards green procurement. EU-based importers, who are ultimately responsible for purchasing and surrendering CBAM certificates, will have a strong incentive to source lower-carbon products to minimize their regulatory burden. This creates a powerful market signal that will ripple through global supply chains. Companies that can effectively differentiate their products based on their environmental performance stand to benefit significantly. This goes beyond mere marketing; it requires robust and verifiable data on the carbon footprint of products, a challenge that many firms are now grappling with.

Product differentiation in the age of the CBAM will likely take several forms. Some companies may focus on developing entirely new, low-carbon product lines. Others may seek to certify the lower-carbon attributes of their existing products through recognized standards and labeling schemes. The outdoor apparel company Patagonia, for instance, has long built its brand around environmental stewardship, using recycled materials and donating a percentage of its sales to environmental causes. While not directly subject to the initial phase of the CBAM, such a strategy of deep-seated environmental branding provides a useful template for firms in the targeted sectors. The ability to credibly communicate a product's lower carbon footprint to customers will become a key competitive differentiator.

Lobbying and Engagement with Policymakers

The implementation of a policy as complex and far-reaching as the CBAM inevitably involves a degree of political negotiation and refinement. It is

therefore unsurprising that corporate lobbying and engagement with policymakers have been, and will continue to be, a critical component of corporate strategy. For many firms, this engagement is a defensive measure, aimed at securing favorable interpretations of the rules, seeking exemptions, or delaying the phase-in of the mechanism. The risk of reputational damage from being perceived as obstructing climate action, however, is a significant consideration.

A more proactive approach to policy engagement involves collaborating with policymakers to shape the future direction of the CBAM and other climate policies. This can include advocating for the inclusion of certain sectors, influencing the methodologies for calculating embedded emissions, or promoting international cooperation on carbon pricing. For example, a company that has invested heavily in decarbonization may lobby for a more stringent and broader application of the CBAM to create a larger market for its low-carbon products. This type of engagement, which aligns corporate interests with broader climate goals, is likely to be more effective and sustainable in the long run. There is also the potential for international collaboration, where countries with similar climate ambitions form alliances to harmonize their carbon pricing and border adjustment mechanisms.

As we look ahead, the strategic responses of corporations to the CBAM will be a key determinant of the policy's ultimate success in driving global decarbonization. The choices made in boardrooms around the world-whether to reactively comply or proactively innovate-will not only shape the future of individual firms but also the trajectory of the global transition to a low-carbon economy. The next chapter will delve deeper into the specific compliance challenges and reporting requirements that firms will face as they navigate this new regulatory landscape.

Chapter 6

The Macroeconomic Impacts of the CBAM

To move from the institutional architecture of the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) to its real-world consequences is to step into a realm of considerable economic uncertainty. While the mechanism's primary goals-preventing carbon leakage and leveling the competitive playing field-are clear, the broader macroeconomic ripples it will generate are subject to intense debate and divergent modeling outcomes. The CBAM is, after all, a novel instrument, a first-of-its-kind attempt to project a domestic carbon price onto a global stage. Its effects will inevitably be complex, touching everything from trade flows and industrial competitiveness to consumer prices and international investment decisions. Acknowledging this inherent uncertainty is not a preamble to analytical paralysis; rather, it is a necessary starting point for a critical engagement with the potential futures the CBAM might sculpt for the European Union and its global trading partners.

Impacts on Trade Flows and Patterns

At its core, the CBAM is a trade policy instrument designed to alter the calculus of international commerce. By imposing a cost on the embedded carbon of specific imports-initially cement, iron and steel, aluminum, fertilizers, electricity, and hydrogen-it is intended to disincentivize carbon-intensive production abroad. The most immediate and anticipated consequence is a potential shift in the sourcing of these goods. Economic logic suggests that EU importers will seek to minimize their CBAM liabilities, potentially leading to a diversion of trade away from countries with high-carbon production methods and towards those with cleaner industrial processes or domestic carbon pricing schemes that can be deducted from the CBAM cost.

However, the scale of this trade diversion is a matter of significant conjecture. Some general equilibrium models project substantial shifts, while others suggest the initial impact will be more contained. The European Central Bank, for instance, found the overall direct impact on trade to be "relatively contained," adding on average just 0.1% to the value of EU imports. Yet, for specific products like iron, steel, and aluminum, the cost increase will be far more significant, creating pronounced sectoral effects. For developing countries, particularly those with carbon-intensive export sectors, the risks are pronounced. Nations like Mozambique, Zimbabwe, and Cameroon, alongside larger economies such as India and China, face considerable exposure depending on their trade composition and the carbon intensity of their key industries.

Furthermore, the long-term effects on global value chains are, perhaps, even more profound and harder to predict. As the CBAM phases in and potentially expands its scope to downstream products, the administrative complexity and costs will multiply. Calculating embedded emissions across

intricate, multi-tiered supply chains, such as in the automotive sector, presents a formidable challenge that could lead to a fundamental restructuring of how and where components are sourced. This could either fragment existing value chains or, conversely, incentivize the formation of "green" supply chains clustered around low-carbon production hubs.

Effects on Industrial Competitiveness

The question of competitiveness lies at the very heart of the CBAM's rationale. For years, EU industries in emission-intensive, trade-exposed (EITE) sectors have argued that unilateral climate policy puts them at a disadvantage against foreign competitors not subject to similar carbon costs. The CBAM, coupled with the phasing out of free allowances under the EU's Emissions Trading System (ETS), is designed to remedy this by ensuring imported goods face an equivalent carbon price. In theory, this should level the playing field within the EU market.

Yet, the reality is far more nuanced. While the CBAM may protect EU producers of primary materials like steel and cement from direct import competition, it does little to enhance their competitiveness in export markets outside the EU. Without a mechanism like export rebates-a politically and legally contentious proposition under World Trade Organization (WTO) rules-EU exporters will still bear the full cost of the ETS, while their international rivals may not. This could lead to a loss of market share for EU firms in third countries. Moreover, downstream industries within the EU, such as automotive and machinery manufacturing, could face rising input costs for basic materials like steel and aluminum. This creates a potential tension between protecting upstream EITE sectors and maintaining the competitiveness of the broader manufacturing base, which relies on these inputs. Some analyses suggest that the overall macroeconomic effects will be small, but the transition from free allowances to the CBAM may

negatively impact activity levels in certain EU sectors, especially those with high export shares.

Potential for Inflammatory Pressures and Consumer Welfare Effects

Any policy that increases the cost of basic industrial goods inevitably raises questions about inflation and the impact on consumers. The CBAM is no exception. By design, it will increase the price of certain imported goods, and as free ETS allowances are phased out, the costs for domestic producers will also rise. These higher costs are likely to be passed, at least in part, down the supply chain to consumers in the form of higher prices for everything from construction materials to cars and canned goods.

The magnitude of this inflationary effect is, again, a key point of uncertainty. Some economists argue the impact will be modest and spread out over the lengthy phase-in period, potentially adding no more than 0.1% per year to the EU's Harmonised Index of Consumer Prices (HICP). They suggest that foreign firms might absorb some of the cost by lowering their export prices, and EU firms might squeeze profit margins to remain competitive. However, in an economic environment already buffeted by inflationary shocks from other sources, such as geopolitical events and supply chain disruptions, even a small, persistent upward pressure on prices could become a political challenge. The ultimate impact on consumer welfare will also depend on how governments choose to use the revenue generated from the sale of CBAM certificates, which is projected to be substantial, potentially reaching €35 billion annually by 2030. Redistributing this revenue through social programs or tax cuts could mitigate the regressive impacts of higher consumer prices.

The CBAM's Influence on Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) Decisions

Beyond immediate trade flows, the CBAM is poised to influence longer-term capital allocation and foreign direct investment (FDI) decisions. The mechanism alters the strategic calculation for multinational firms by introducing a new variable: the cost of carbon in investment location choices. One might argue that the CBAM could spur FDI into the EU or its periphery, as foreign companies seek to establish cleaner production facilities inside the tariff wall to serve the European market directly, thereby avoiding CBAM levies. This aligns with the EU's goal of encouraging cleaner industrial production globally.

Conversely, the CBAM could also trigger a strategic shift in FDI away from export-oriented production in carbon-intensive jurisdictions. A multinational firm might reconsider building a new steel plant in a country with lax environmental regulations if a primary export market is the EU. Instead, it may opt for FDI in a country with a cleaner energy grid or an established carbon price. This could lead to what might be termed "investment leakage" avoidance, where capital flows towards greener economies. For developing nations, this presents both a challenge and an opportunity. Those that fail to decarbonize their industrial base may see themselves become less attractive for FDI, while those that proactively invest in green technology and infrastructure could position themselves as preferred investment destinations. The CBAM, therefore, becomes not just a trade tool but a powerful, if indirect, instrument of global industrial policy, compelling firms and nations to integrate carbon costs into their long-term investment strategies.

As we have seen, the macroeconomic landscape shaped by the CBAM is one of intersecting pressures and profound uncertainties. The intended

effects on trade and competitiveness are accompanied by complex and sometimes contradictory consequences for inflation, consumer welfare, and global investment patterns. Navigating this maze requires not only a grasp of the economic models but also an appreciation for the institutional responses and strategic gamesmanship that the policy will inevitably provoke, a subject to which we will turn our attention in the subsequent chapter.

Chapter 7

The Geopolitics of Carbon: CBAM and International Relations

The European Union's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) is far more than a technical adjustment to its Emissions Trading System (ETS); it represents a significant inflection point in the relationship between climate policy and international trade. By externalizing the cost of carbon embedded in certain imports, the EU has unilaterally altered the terms of trade, a move that inevitably reverberates through the corridors of global diplomacy. This chapter explores the geopolitical dimensions of the CBAM, framing it as a pivotal, and perhaps contentious, development in international climate and trade diplomacy. It is a policy that acts as a double-edged sword: on one side, it holds the promise of driving global decarbonization and preventing carbon leakage; on the other, it risks igniting trade disputes and straining relations with key partners.

The Shadow of Geneva: CBAM and the WTO Framework

At the heart of the geopolitical maelstrom surrounding the CBAM is its contested relationship with the legal framework of the World Trade Organization (WTO). The EU has consistently maintained that the mechanism is designed to be fully compliant with WTO rules. The official justification centers on leveling the playing field, ensuring that the carbon price applied to domestic production is mirrored for imports, thereby preventing the undermining of the EU's climate objectives through carbon leakage. This is not merely an environmental policy, but an instrument of trade that must, therefore, adhere to the foundational principles of the WTO.

However, this assertion has not been universally accepted. A primary concern revolves around the principle of non-discrimination, a cornerstone of the WTO system. Critics argue that the CBAM could violate the Most-Favored-Nation (MFN) principle by discriminating between products originating from different countries based on their domestic climate policies. By assessing the carbon content of imports and potentially applying different charges, the EU could be seen as treating 'like' products differently, a potential breach of its WTO obligations. Furthermore, the mechanism could be challenged as an additional border duty in excess of agreed-upon tariff schedules, or as a quantitative restriction on imports, both of which are generally prohibited under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

Legal scholars and trade experts remain divided on the ultimate compatibility of the CBAM with WTO law. The EU may seek to justify the measure under the general exceptions of GATT Article XX, which permits trade-restrictive measures necessary to protect human, animal, or plant life or health (Article XX(b)) or relating to the conservation of exhaustible natural resources (Article XX(g)). Yet, the path to a successful defense under Article

XX is fraught with legal uncertainty and stringent requirements. The measure must not be applied in a manner that would constitute arbitrary or unjustifiable discrimination between countries where the same conditions prevail, nor can it be a disguised restriction on international trade. The very novelty of the CBAM ensures that any potential dispute brought before the WTO would venture into uncharted legal territory, with the potential to set a significant precedent for the future of trade and climate governance.

Reactions from the Economic Heavyweights

The geopolitical implications of the CBAM are most vividly illustrated by the reactions of the world's major economies. These responses are a complex mixture of concern, strategic calculation, and, in some cases, outright opposition.

China: As a significant trading partner of the EU and the world's largest emitter of carbon dioxide, China's reaction is of paramount importance. Beijing has voiced strong concerns, viewing the CBAM as a unilateral trade measure disguised as environmental policy. China's Ministry of Commerce has argued that the mechanism constitutes a new form of trade protectionism that unfairly penalizes developing countries and violates WTO principles. Officials have criticized the EU for disregarding China's own significant efforts in green and low-carbon development, particularly pointing to the establishment of default values for carbon intensity that they deem to be unfairly high and discriminatory. There is a palpable risk that these tensions could escalate, with China considering retaliatory measures such as imposing its own tariffs on EU imports or formally challenging the CBAM at the WTO. Despite this confrontational rhetoric, China may also pursue a more pragmatic path, utilizing the CBAM's transitional period to enhance its national Emissions Trading System and engage in dialogue with the EU. The dynamic between the EU and China over the CBAM will be a critical

determinant of the mechanism's ultimate geopolitical impact.

United States: The United States has approached the CBAM with a degree of caution and some skepticism. While the US shares the EU's climate ambitions, its own approach to carbon pricing is fragmented and lacks a national equivalent to the EU ETS. This has led to concerns from Washington that the CBAM could penalize American companies and undermine fair competition. The U.S. Trade Representative's office has characterized the CBAM as a potential unfair trading practice, estimating that it could affect a significant volume of U.S. exports to the EU. This stance reflects a broader tension in the transatlantic relationship, where cooperation on climate change is tempered by underlying economic and trade rivalries. The EU's unilateral action on carbon pricing at the border could, it seems, complicate efforts to forge a united front on climate policy among Western economies and potentially lead to a framework where the US is forced to consider its own border adjustment mechanism to avoid being at a disadvantage.

India: India has been one of the most vocal critics of the CBAM, framing its opposition in the context of climate justice and developmental equity. New Delhi argues that the mechanism disproportionately burdens developing nations and infringes upon the principle of \"common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities\" (CBDR-RC), a cornerstone of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Indian officials have expressed concern that the CBAM could severely impact the competitiveness of key export sectors such as steel and aluminum. In response, India is exploring a multi-pronged strategy. This includes the potential for a WTO challenge and bilateral negotiations with the EU. A recently concluded Free Trade Agreement (FTA) between the EU and India includes provisions for technical cooperation on the CBAM and a commitment that any flexibilities offered to other countries will also apply to

India. Domestically, India is also considering the implementation of its own carbon pricing mechanism, which could allow it to retain the revenue that would otherwise be paid at the EU border.

The North-South Divide: Implications for Developing Countries

The CBAM has, perhaps inevitably, exposed and exacerbated the long-standing divide between developed and developing nations in the global climate regime. For many countries in the Global South, the CBAM is perceived as a form of "green protectionism" that imposes the EU's climate policy preferences on the rest of the world, without due consideration for their different developmental stages and historical responsibility for climate change.

The principle of common but differentiated responsibilities is central to this critique. Developing countries argue that they should not be expected to bear the same burden of decarbonization as industrialized nations, who have historically contributed the most to greenhouse gas emissions. The CBAM, by imposing a uniform carbon cost at the border, is seen as undermining this principle.

The economic impacts on developing countries are a significant concern. Studies suggest that the CBAM could lead to a reduction in trade levels and a loss of GDP for many developing nations, with African countries potentially being the most negatively affected. The compliance costs associated with the CBAM's reporting and verification requirements can also be particularly burdensome for smaller economies and businesses with limited administrative capacity.

The EU has stated its commitment to supporting developing countries in implementing the CBAM and transitioning to greener industries. However, the adequacy and effectiveness of this support will be crucial in determining

whether the CBAM is ultimately viewed as a tool for global climate action or as an instrument of economic coercion. Without significant financial and technical assistance, the CBAM risks being seen as an external imposition that undermines trust and cooperation in the multilateral climate process.

A Catalyst for Global Carbon Pricing?

Despite the significant geopolitical challenges it presents, the CBAM also has the potential to act as a powerful catalyst for the adoption of carbon pricing policies around the world. The prospect of having to pay a carbon levy at the EU border creates a strong incentive for other countries to implement their own domestic carbon pricing mechanisms, thereby allowing them to collect the revenue themselves.

There is already evidence that this "CBAM effect" is taking hold. A number of jurisdictions, including the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia, are actively considering or developing their own carbon border adjustment mechanisms. In Asia, major economies like China and India are expanding their domestic emissions trading systems, partly in response to the EU's policy. This proliferation of carbon pricing initiatives could, in the long run, lead to a more harmonized global approach to climate mitigation and a more level playing field for international trade.

The CBAM is, in essence, a high-stakes gamble. It is an assertion of the EU's regulatory power on the global stage and a bold attempt to integrate climate considerations into the fabric of international trade. The coming years, as the CBAM moves from its transitional phase to full implementation, will reveal whether this gamble pays off. The key to its success will lie not only in its technical design and legal defensibility but also in the EU's ability to navigate the complex geopolitical landscape it has helped to create. The path forward requires a delicate balance of firm commitment to its climate goals and a willingness to engage in genuine

dialogue and cooperation with its international partners. Failure to strike this balance could see the CBAM become a source of enduring conflict, undermining the very global cooperation that is essential to addressing the climate crisis. The next chapter will delve into the practical challenges of implementation, examining the administrative complexities and institutional arrangements necessary to make this ambitious policy a reality.

Chapter 8

Case Studies: Sectoral Deep Dives into CBAM's Impact

The preceding chapters have developed an institutional framework for understanding the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM), analyzing its theoretical underpinnings, legal architecture, and strategic implications in broad strokes. The analysis, however, remains incomplete without descending from this thirty-thousand-foot view to the granular reality of the factory floor, the corporate boardroom, and the national industrial strategy councils where the policy's true impact materializes. This chapter undertakes that descent. Through a series of in-depth case studies, we explore the distinct challenges, strategic calculations, and potential compliance pathways for the key industrial sectors initially targeted by the CBAM: iron and steel, aluminum, cement, and the emerging domains of fertilizers and hydrogen. Each sector presents a unique puzzle, a different configuration of technological constraints, capital investment cycles, and exposure to the carbon pricing mechanism that is now rippling out from Brussels.

The Iron and Steel Industry: Technological Pathways and Compliance Costs

The iron and steel sector is, in many ways, the centerpiece of the CBAM regulation. As a foundational pillar of modern industrial economies and a significant source of global greenhouse gas emissions-accounting for approximately 7-9% of total anthropogenic CO2 emissions-its inclusion was both inevitable and profoundly consequential. The sector's emissions profile is dominated by the conventional blast furnace-basic oxygen furnace (BF-BOF) route, a process reliant on coal and coke as both a heat source and a chemical reductant, which is inherently carbon-intensive.

For non-EU steel producers heavily reliant on this production method, such as those in India, China, and Ukraine, the CBAM presents a formidable economic challenge. The compliance cost is not trivial. Projections under various carbon pricing scenarios suggest that by 2030, CBAM-related import charges could reach between $72 and $83 per ton of steel for major exporters like South Korea and India, respectively. By 2034, as free allowances under the EU's Emissions Trading System (ETS) are fully phased out, these costs could escalate to over $200 per ton. This represents a significant portion of the product's value, fundamentally altering the competitive landscape for exporters to the EU market.

The strategic response for firms in this sector is, therefore, a complex calculation involving capital investment, technological readiness, and long-term market positioning. One might argue that the most direct pathway to compliance is a fundamental technological shift. The primary alternative to the BF-BOF process is the electric arc furnace (EAF) route, which primarily uses recycled steel scrap and electricity. While significantly less carbon-intensive, its scalability is constrained by the global availability of high-quality scrap.

This reality forces a focus on more disruptive innovations for primary steelmaking. The most promising, and arguably the one most directly incentivized by the CBAM, is the transition to Direct Reduced Iron (DRI) production using green hydrogen as the reducing agent instead of natural gas or coal. This H2-DRI process, when coupled with an EAF powered by renewable electricity, offers a pathway to near-zero-emission steel production. However, the barriers are substantial. The current cost of green hydrogen remains high, and the necessary infrastructure for its production and transport is in its infancy. Consequently, many firms face a difficult choice: absorb the rising CBAM costs, seek new markets, or embark on a costly and uncertain multi-decade journey of technological transformation.

The Aluminum Sector: Electricity Intensity and Embedded Emissions

If the challenge for steel is primarily about the chemistry of iron reduction, the challenge for aluminum is almost entirely about electricity. The production of primary aluminum via the Hall-Héroult smelting process is one of the most electricity-intensive industrial activities on the planet, consuming, on average, around 14 megawatt-hours (MWh) of electricity per metric ton of metal produced. This means that the carbon footprint of aluminum is inextricably linked to the carbon intensity of the electricity grid from which a smelter draws its power. The CBAM, in its focus on embedded emissions, effectively puts the energy mix of exporting nations under a microscope.

This dynamic creates a stark divergence in CBAM exposure. Producers in jurisdictions with abundant, low-cost hydroelectric power, such as Canada or parts of South America, are relatively well-positioned. Their embedded emissions are low, and their compliance burden will be correspondingly light. Conversely, producers in countries where the electricity grid is

dominated by coal, most notably China, which accounts for the majority of global primary production, face a severe competitive disadvantage. For these producers, the indirect emissions from electricity consumption constitute the bulk of their CBAM liability.

The strategic imperative for aluminum firms, therefore, centers on securing access to clean energy. This can involve direct investment in dedicated renewable energy generation, negotiating long-term power purchase agreements (PPAs) with renewable providers, or relocating production to regions with cleaner grids. The concept of "green aluminum," produced with renewable energy, is rapidly moving from a niche marketing concept to a core strategic necessity for accessing the European market. The CBAM acts as a powerful catalyst in this transition, creating a tangible price premium for low-carbon aluminum and penalizing metal smelted with fossil fuels. The future of the global aluminum trade, it seems, will be shaped as much by the cost of electrons as by the cost of alumina.

The Cement Industry: Process Emissions and Decarbonization Challenges

The cement sector presents perhaps the most intractable decarbonization challenge among the initial CBAM industries. Its emissions profile is unique and particularly stubborn. While energy consumption for heating kilns to temperatures exceeding 1,400°C is a significant source of CO2, it only accounts for about one-third of the sector's total emissions. The majority-up to two-thirds-are so-called "process emissions," which are released directly from the chemical transformation of limestone (calcium carbonate, CaCO3) into clinker (calcium oxide, CaO), the key binding agent in cement. This calcination process is fundamental to cement chemistry, meaning these emissions cannot be eliminated simply by switching to a cleaner fuel source.

This chemical reality places cement producers in a difficult position. For major exporters to the EU, such as Turkey, Vietnam, and China, the CBAM levy applies directly to these unavoidable process emissions. The primary technological solution currently available to address these emissions at scale is Carbon Capture, Utilization, and Storage (CCUS). While technically feasible, CCUS technologies are exceptionally capital-intensive and have yet to be deployed widely in the cement industry, facing hurdles related to cost, infrastructure for CO2 transport and storage, and long-term liability.

Alternative strategies focus on reducing the amount of clinker in the final cement product by blending it with supplementary cementitious materials (SCMs) like fly ash or ground granulated blast-furnace slag. Innovations in novel cements, such as limestone calcined clay cement (LC3), also promise to reduce the clinker-to-cement ratio significantly. However, these approaches are constrained by the availability of SCMs and the slow pace of revision in construction standards and building codes. For the cement industry, the CBAM is not merely an incentive for fuel switching but a direct challenge to the core chemistry of its product, forcing a confrontation with deep-seated technological and institutional inertia.

The Fertilizer and Hydrogen Sectors: Emerging Challenges and Opportunities

The inclusion of fertilizers and hydrogen in the initial CBAM scope signals the EU's forward-looking approach, targeting sectors that are both energy-intensive and critical to future decarbonization efforts. For the fertilizer industry, the primary concern is the production of ammonia, a key precursor, which is predominantly manufactured using the Haber-Bosch process. This process typically relies on hydrogen derived from natural gas (so-called "grey hydrogen"), a method that is highly carbon-intensive. The CBAM will thus penalize imported fertilizers based on the embedded

emissions from this fossil fuel feedstock.

The strategic pathway here mirrors that of other sectors: a shift towards cleaner production methods. This involves transitioning from grey hydrogen to "blue hydrogen" (produced from natural gas with CCUS) or, ideally, "green hydrogen" (produced via electrolysis powered by renewable electricity). As with steel, the cost and availability of green hydrogen remain the primary barriers.

Hydrogen itself presents a fascinating duality under the CBAM framework. The regulation applies to imported carbon-intensive grey hydrogen, treating it as a traded commodity with a significant carbon footprint. This creates a barrier for producers who rely on fossil fuels. Simultaneously, however, the CBAM generates a powerful demand signal for green hydrogen across multiple sectors. As steel, fertilizer, and chemical producers seek to lower their own embedded emissions to remain competitive in the EU market, their demand for green hydrogen as a feedstock and energy source is set to accelerate. In this sense, the CBAM acts as both a stick against carbon-intensive hydrogen production and a powerful carrot for the nascent global green hydrogen economy. It is a clear example of how the mechanism seeks not only to penalize emissions but to actively cultivate the markets for their alternatives.

These sectoral deep dives reveal that while the CBAM presents a uniform carbon price signal at the border, its impact on the ground is anything but uniform. The strategic responses required are deeply contingent on the unique technological and economic realities of each industry. From the fundamental process chemistry of cement to the electricity grids powering aluminum smelters, the CBAM forces a reckoning with the embedded carbon that has long been an externality in global trade. As we will explore in the subsequent chapter, these firm- and sector-level strategic

adjustments will inevitably aggregate into broader geopolitical and macroeconomic realignments, reshaping global trade flows and industrial policy.

Chapter 9

The Future Evolution of the Carbon Maze

To gaze into the future of the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) is to engage in an exercise of informed speculation. The mechanism, having navigated a labyrinthine path to its current form, is by no means a static entity. Its very design anticipates adaptation, review, and expansion. The transitional period, which began on October 1, 2023, and runs until the end of 2025, serves as a crucial learning phase, gathering data that will inevitably shape the definitive system launching in 2026. Yet, the trajectory of this evolution is subject to a complex interplay of economic pressures, geopolitical maneuvering, and the relentless march of climate science. One might argue that the true test of the CBAM lies not in its initial implementation but in its capacity to evolve into a truly comprehensive and globally influential instrument of climate policy.

The Expanding Frontier: New Sectors and Downstream Products

The initial scope of the CBAM is deliberately circumscribed, targeting a select group of carbon-intensive and trade-exposed sectors: cement, iron and steel, aluminum, fertilizers, electricity, and hydrogen. This focused approach was a pragmatic choice, intended to manage the administrative complexity and political sensitivity of such a novel policy. However, it is widely anticipated that this frontier will expand. The logic of preventing carbon leakage dictates that as long as significant industrial sectors remain outside the CBAM's purview, the risk of emissions simply shifting elsewhere persists.

Already, discussions are underway to broaden the mechanism's reach. A review by the European Commission has signaled the potential inclusion of organic chemicals and polymers by 2030. More immediately, proposals have been put forth to extend the CBAM downstream along existing value chains, particularly for steel and aluminum. A proposal from late 2025, for instance, aims to add approximately 180 new product categories, such as machinery, automotive parts, and even some household appliances like washing machines, starting from January 1, 2028. This vertical expansion is critical to prevent what is known as 'resource shuffling' or 'input dumping,' where producers might export finished or semi-finished goods to the EU to circumvent the levy on the raw materials.

The inclusion of indirect emissions-those stemming from the electricity consumed during production-represents another significant evolutionary step. During the transitional phase, importers are required to report these emissions, but financial obligations will only apply after 2026, and initially only for some sectors like cement and fertilizers. The methodology for calculating these indirect emissions is complex and will undoubtedly be refined based on the data collected during the initial years. The full

incorporation of indirect emissions across all covered sectors is a logical, if challenging, next step to ensure the CBAM accurately reflects the true carbon footprint of imported goods.

The Contentious Question of Export Rebates

Perhaps one of the most fraught and legally complex issues shaping the CBAM's future is the debate over export rebates. As the EU phases out the free allocation of emissions allowances to its domestic industries-a process running in parallel with the CBAM's phase-in until 2034-European exporters argue they will be placed at a competitive disadvantage in global markets. They will bear the full cost of the EU's carbon price, while their international competitors may not. This has led to calls for a system of export rebates, which would refund the carbon costs associated with goods produced in the EU but sold outside of it.

The primary obstacle to such a system is its questionable compatibility with the rules of the World Trade Organization (WTO). Opponents argue that export rebates could be construed as an illegal subsidy, potentially triggering retaliatory tariffs from trading partners. The EU has been meticulous in designing the CBAM to align with WTO principles, framing it as an environmental measure, not a protectionist tariff. Introducing export rebates could undermine this legal standing. The tension here is palpable: on one hand, the political and economic pressure to protect domestic industries is immense; on the other, the need to maintain a rules-based international trading order is paramount. The resolution of this issue will be a defining feature of the CBAM's long-term structure and its acceptance on the global stage.

Symbiosis and Divergence: CBAM and the EU ETS

The relationship between the CBAM and the EU Emissions Trading System (ETS) is foundational; the CBAM is, in essence, the external dimension of the ETS. The price of CBAM certificates is directly linked to the weekly average auction price of EU ETS allowances. As the ETS evolves, so too must the CBAM. The gradual phasing out of free ETS allowances is the primary driver for the CBAM's implementation schedule.

Looking ahead, the expansion of the ETS itself will have direct implications for the CBAM. The introduction of a new, separate 'ETS II' for fuels used in road transport and buildings from 2027 will cover a significant portion of the EU's remaining emissions. While these sectors are not currently prime candidates for CBAM inclusion due to the nature of their products, the underlying principle of extending carbon pricing will likely influence future thinking about the CBAM's scope. The ultimate goal is to ensure comprehensive carbon pricing across the economy, and the CBAM must adapt to prevent leakage from any sector subject to such a price. The seamless integration and alignment of these two mechanisms are crucial for the coherence and effectiveness of the EU's climate policy architecture.

From Unilateralism to Cooperation: Climate Clubs and Global Carbon Pricing

While the CBAM is a unilateral measure, its ultimate success may depend on its ability to foster multilateral cooperation. The mechanism is designed to incentivize the adoption of carbon pricing schemes in other countries. If a non-EU producer can demonstrate that a carbon price has already been paid on their goods in their home country, that amount can be deducted from their CBAM obligation. This creates a powerful incentive for nations to implement their own carbon taxes or emissions trading systems, thereby keeping the revenue within their own borders rather than paying it to the EU.

This dynamic could pave the way for the formation of 'climate clubs'-groups of countries with similar levels of climate ambition and linked carbon pricing systems. Jurisdictions with emissions trading systems deemed compatible with the EU ETS, such as Switzerland and potentially the United Kingdom, could be exempted from the CBAM, creating a larger, integrated carbon market. Such clubs could become powerful blocs in international climate negotiations, driving a race to the top on carbon pricing. However, this vision is not without its challenges. Developing nations, in particular, have raised concerns about fairness and the principle of 'common but differentiated responsibilities,' arguing that the CBAM places a disproportionate burden on their economies. Some critics have labeled it a form of 'green protectionism'. The EU has countered that revenues will not be directly used for climate finance in developing countries but will be supported through other initiatives like the Global Gateway program. The allocation of CBAM revenues remains a point of contention and a key area for future policy development, with some advocating for a portion to be dedicated to global climate finance.

The path forward for the Carbon Maze is one of increasing complexity and scope. Its evolution will be a constant negotiation between the need to prevent carbon leakage, the legal constraints of international trade law, and the diplomatic imperative to build a global coalition for climate action. The mechanism's journey from a targeted, transitional tool to a potentially broad and interconnected pillar of international climate policy will be a defining narrative in the global effort to decarbonize, leaving an indelible mark on the landscape of institutional economics for decades to come.

Chapter 10

Conclusion: Navigating the Path Forward

Our journey through the institutional labyrinth of the European Union's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) concludes here, but the broader economic and political narrative it has initiated is only just beginning. This book has endeavored to chart the intricate pathways of compliance, the strategic recalibrations of firms, and the profound institutional shifts heralded by what is arguably the most ambitious, and contentious, trade-linked climate policy to date. We have navigated a maze of regulatory complexity, geopolitical tension, and economic uncertainty, revealing the CBAM not as a singular policy instrument, but as a multifaceted phenomenon with far-reaching implications for the global economic order.

At its core, our analysis confirms that the CBAM represents a fundamental duality. On one hand, it stands as a potentially powerful catalyst for global decarbonization. By seeking to prevent 'carbon leakage'-whereby EU

companies might move carbon-intensive production to countries with laxer environmental rules-it aims to create a level playing field and encourage cleaner industrial production in non-EU countries. The mechanism, which will require importers to purchase carbon certificates corresponding to the emissions embedded in their goods, is designed to extend the carbon price of the EU's Emissions Trading System (ETS) to imports, thereby promoting a global reduction in emissions. There is emerging evidence that the mere prospect of the CBAM is prompting policy shifts, with nations like the UK, Canada, and Japan advancing their own carbon pricing schemes in response.

On the other hand, the CBAM is perceived by many as a source of significant trade friction, a form of "green protectionism" that threatens to disrupt the global trading system. Nations such as China, India, and Brazil have voiced strong opposition, framing it as a unilateral trade barrier that unfairly penalizes developing economies. Critics argue that it undermines the long-standing principle of "Common But Differentiated Responsibilities" (CBDR-RC), which posits that developed countries, due to their historical contribution to emissions, should bear a greater burden in climate mitigation. An analysis by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) suggests the policy could reduce exports from developing countries while having a relatively small impact on global CO2 emissions, potentially shifting income from developing to developed nations. This tension places the CBAM at a precarious crossroads, where its success as a climate tool is weighed against its potential to incite retaliatory measures and deepen geopolitical divides.

Navigating the Path Forward: Recommendations for Stakeholders

Given this complex landscape, the path forward requires proactive and

strategic engagement from all affected parties. For businesses, both within and outside the EU, the message is one of adaptation and strategic foresight. Firms exporting to the EU must now treat carbon management as a core component of business strategy. The immediate priorities should include investing in robust digital monitoring, reporting, and verification (MRV) systems to accurately track embedded emissions. In the longer term, structural transformation through technology upgrades and a decisive shift toward cleaner energy sources will be essential not merely for compliance, but for maintaining a competitive edge in a market that increasingly prices carbon.

For the governments of non-EU countries, particularly in the developing world, a multi-pronged approach is necessary. First, engaging in constructive diplomatic dialogue with the EU is paramount to voice concerns and negotiate potential accommodations. Second, developing domestic carbon pricing or equivalent regulatory frameworks is perhaps the most direct strategic response. Doing so not only aligns with global climate goals but also allows countries to capture the carbon revenue that would otherwise be paid to the EU through CBAM certificates. Finally, governments must provide robust support to their domestic industries, offering technical assistance and financial incentives to facilitate the transition to lower-carbon production processes.

The Evolving Landscape of Climate Governance

The emergence of the CBAM signals a pivotal, perhaps irreversible, shift in the institutional architecture of global climate governance. It marks a departure from the consensus-based, voluntary framework of the Paris Agreement towards a more assertive, and potentially fragmented, regime where climate policy is explicitly linked to trade leverage. This new paradigm challenges the traditional separation of trade and environmental policy,

forcing a convergence that the World Trade Organization and other multilateral bodies are still grappling with. One might argue that while this unilateral turn risks fracturing international cooperation, it may also represent a necessary evolution-a pragmatic response to the slow progress of multilateral climate negotiations and the persistent problem of free-riding. The path forward is thus one of institutional evolution under pressure, where the actions of a major economic bloc compel a global recalibration of the relationship between economic activity and environmental responsibility. The Carbon Maze, as we have explored it, is not static; it is an ever-changing landscape that will continue to test the resilience and adaptability of firms, governments, and the very foundations of the global economic order.

References

1. Agence Française de Développement. (2022). Impacts of CBAM on EU trade partners: consequences for developing countries (Research Papers No. 238)
2. Aggarwal, N., Piotrowski, M., & Frampton, G. (2024, January 31). Decarbonizing the aluminum market: Challenges and opportunities. Atlantic Council
3. alcircle. (2026, February 3). MPE backs CBAM extension from 2028 into downstream aluminium, steel & iron products
4. Argus Media. (2026, January 27). EU cement importers aim to avoid CBAM default values
5. Artem Earth. (n.d.). The Impact of CBAM on Global Supply Chains: Challenges and Opportunities
6. Attinasi, M. G., et al. (2025). The EU's CBAM: Implications for Member States and Trading Partners. IMF Working Papers, 2025(125)
7. Auer, R., Ferrara, L., & Mauro, F. (2024). *The EU's CBAM: implications for member states and trading partners*. European Central Bank
8. Bellona. (2025, May 14). The EU ETS and the CBAM: the use of carbon pricing revenues. UPTAKE CDR Stakeholder Forum
9. Bellora, C., & Fontagné, L. (2022). *Impacts of CBAM on EU trade partners: consequences for developing countries*. Agence Française de Développement
10. Bellora, C., & Fontagné, L. (2022). EU in Search of a WTO-Compatible Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CEPII Working Paper No. 2022-01). CEPII

11. Caliendo, L., et al. (2025). Evaluating the EU Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism with a Quantitative Trade Model. arXiv

12. Capital Economics. (2025, October 15). The macroeconomic implications of CBAM in the EU

13. Carbon Clean. (2021, January 6). Reducing Cement CO2 Emissions with CCUS Technology

14. Carbon Herald. (2026, January 2). EU Expands CBAM: A Review Shows It Urges Other Countries to Use Carbon Pricing

15. Cembureau. (n.d.). Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism

16. CFP Energy. (2025, May 15). Why Cement is a Key Focus for CBAM

17. Chepeliev, M., & van der Mensbrugghe, D. (2020). How Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism is Energizing the EU Carbon Market and Industrial Transformation. ResearchGate

18. Clausing, K., Elkerbout, M., Nehrkorn, K., & Wolfram, C. (2024, October 10). *How Carbon Border Adjustments Might Drive Global Climate Policy Momentum*. Resources for the Future

19. Climease. (2025, April 30). The CBAM Scope expansion - What to Expect Next

20. Coolset. (2026, January 1). Which goods are covered under CBAM? (Sector breakdown guide)

21. Coolset. (2026, January 4). CBAM timeline, deadlines and phases: What to expect in 2026

22. CRU. (2026, February 3). European coil and green steel round-up: European coil prices rise on CBAM, new quotas

23. De Angelis, S. (2023, December 11). Beginning Of The EU CBAM Transition Period: What You Need To Know. JD Supra

24. Dechezleprêtre, A., & Haramboure, A. (2025, March 21). *EU Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism: What is it, how does it work and what are the effects?*. OECD

25. Dentons. (2021, March 26). European Parliament sends the Commission and Council its checklist for a "WTO-compatible EU carbon border adjustment mechanism"

26. EKI Energy Services Limited. (n.d.). Dilemma of CBAM: What is it, criticisms, and how will it impact businesses and carbon markets

27. Elkerbout, M., Nehrkorn, K., & Kleimann, D. (2025, May 28). *For Climate-and-Trade Policies, the Principle of "Common but Differentiated Responsibilities" Cuts Both Ways*. Resources for the Future

28. Energiron. (n.d.). Technological pathways to decarbonization

29. Energy Storage Europe. (n.d.). The development of the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism(CBAM) and Emissions Trading System (ETS)

30. Erforth, B. (2023, May 9). *A Political Economy Perspective on the EU's Carbon Border Tax*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace

31. EUROFER. (n.d.). *WTO consistency of EU ETS incorporating CBAM and free allocation*. The European Steel Association

32. EUROMETAL. (2026, January 15). European steel sector reels from carbon border tax hit

33. European Aluminium. (n.d.). NET-ZERO BY 2050: SCIENCE-BASED DECARBONISATION PATHWAYS FOR THE EUROPEAN ALUMINIUM INDUSTRY

34. European Central Bank. (n.d.). The EU's CBAM: implications for member states and trading partners

35. European Commission. (2025, December 16). Commission strengthens the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism

36. European Commission. (n.d.). *Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism*. Taxation and Customs Union

37. European Commission. (n.d.). *CBAM Legislation and Guidance*. Taxation and Customs Union

38. European Commission. (n.d.). Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism. Taxation and Customs Union

39. European Commission. (n.d.). Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism. Taxation and Customs Union

40. European Commission. (n.d.). CBAM Sectors. Taxation and Customs Union

41. European Parliament. (2025, July 3). Linking the EU and UK emissions trading systems

42. European Roundtable on Climate Change and Sustainable Transition. (2025, December 9). Future of Emissions Trading in the EU: EU ETS - CBAM Strawman

43. EY. (2023, May 17). Final regulations published for new EU Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) and EU Emission Trading System revisions; CBAM transition period begins 1 October 2023

44. Felbermayr, G., Mahlkow, H., & Sandkamp, A. (2024). *Effects of the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) on income and emissions in the EU and globally*. FIW - Research Centre International Economics

45. Fleurquin, L. (2025). The European Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM): a theoretical and practical analysis of its efficiency. [Master's thesis]. Catholic University of Louvain

46. Gao, Y., & Wang, Y. (2025). The Impact of EU Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism: Perspective from Developed and Developing Countries. ResearchGate

47. German Environment Agency. (2022, October 27). The EU CBAM and a climate club: Synergies and potential obstacles for full integration

48. German Institute of Development and Sustainability. (n.d.). Evaluating the impact of CBAM on developing countries

49. GIZ. (2021). *Assessment of impacts of the EU-CBAM*. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

50. Global Cement. (2022, June 29). Too taxing? How the CBAM affects cement exporters to the EU

51. Global Efficiency Intelligence. (n.d.). The Impact of the EU CBAM on Global Steel Trade

52. Global Solutions Initiative. (n.d.). *Avoiding a carbon trade war: G20 dialogue and coordination and the European Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM)*

53. Gourdon, J., & Deke, O. (2026, January 27). EU Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism Is Set to Get Bigger: Implications for trade and industrial value chains. IISD

54. Grammatikas, V. (2025). The EU Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism and WTO Law. Is the EU's CBAM compatible with WTO regulations? [Master's thesis]. University of Macedonia

55. Greenhouse Gas Protocol. (n.d.). Calculating CO2 process emissions from Cement Production (Cement-based Methodology)

56. Hasanbeigi, A., Springer, C., & Irish, H. (n.d.). Green H2-DRI Steelmaking: 15 Challenges and solutions. Global Efficiency Intelligence

57. He, Y., et al. (2023). Exports or foreign direct investment? A multinational firm's production decision under carbon border adjustment mechanism. International Journal of Production Research

58. He, Y., Koornneef, J., & Vollebergh, H. (2024). EU's carbon border adjustment mechanism CBAM - industrial effects. *Climate Policy*, 1-17

59. Homaio. (2024, March 20). The EU CBAM blueprint, evolution and effects from 2023 onward

60. Huang, T., Liu, Z., & Zhao, T. (2022). Evolutionary Game Analysis of Responding to the EU's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism. Energies, 15(2), 427

61. Hydrogen Europe. (n.d.). ETS and CBAM - implications for the hydrogen sector

62. ICAP. (2026, January 19). EU CBAM enters compliance phase and outlines path ahead. International Carbon Action Partnership

63. Institute for European Environmental Policy. (2025, May 19). The EU CBAM's reform and remaining implementation challenges for low- and middle- income countries

64. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (n.d.). CO2 EMISSIONS FROM CEMENT PRODUCTION. IPCC - Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories

65. International Energy Agency. (2022). Steel Climate Impact 2022 - An International Benchmarking of Energy and CO2 Intensities. IEA

66. International Energy Agency. (n.d.). Aluminium. IEA

67. International Energy Agency. (n.d.). Iron & steel. IEA

68. Irish Steel. (2025, October 9). CBAM CLINIC REPORT

69. Joint Research Centre. (n.d.). Decarbonisation Options for the Aluminium Industry. JRC Publications Repository

70. Joint Research Centre. (n.d.). Greenhouse gas intensities of the EU steel industry and its trading partners. JRC Publications Repository

71. KTG Industrial. (2026, January 20). The impact of CBAM on FDI enterprises in Vietnam

72. Lahn, G., & Sliv, L. (2026, January 27). Why renewables and electrification hold the keys to EU energy security. Chatham House

73. Lee, H. (2025, December 15). The impact of the EU's CBAM on business and the carbon-pricing landscape. World Economic Forum

74. Legal Response International. (n.d.). *Carbon border adjustment mechanism and WTO rules*

75. Legal Response International. (n.d.). Carbon border adjustment mechanism and WTO rules

76. McKinsey & Company. (2024, December 19). Green-steel hubs: A pathway to decarbonize the steel industry

77. MDPI. (2026, February 1). Cement Industry Pollution Mitigation: A Comprehensive Review on Reducing Environmental and Health Impacts

78. Mehling, M. (2025, August 9). *Border carbon adjustments, WTO-law and the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities*. ResearchGate

79. Mehling, M., van Asselt, H., & Das, K. (2022). The European Union's CBAM as a de facto Climate Club: The Governance Challenges. Frontiers in Climate, 4

80. Meng, H. (2024). Challenges and Controversies to the European CBAM from a Legal Perspective. Highlights in Business, Economics and Management, 25, 235-241

81. Metalshub. (2025, December 3). CBAM regulation report: navigating the EU's new carbon border rules for metals. Metalshub

82. Metrio. (n.d.). Total energy consumption

83. Misicka, S. (2026, January 23). *How Europe's carbon border tax will change trade and climate policy*. SWI swissinfo.ch

84. Normative. (2025, March 19). *The EU's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM), explained*

85. Normative. (2025, March 19). The EU's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM), explained

86. Normative. (2025, March 19). The EU's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM), explained

87. Norton Rose Fulbright. (2026, January 26). EU: Commission proposes to extend CBAM scope and adopts implementing legislation

88. Novelis. (n.d.). Decarbonization of the aluminum packaging sector

89. O'Donnell, L., & Smeets, B. (2023, June 2). EU and U.S. Cooperation on Climate Clubs and Related Trade Measures. Center for Strategic and International Studies

90. Okundamiya, M. S., Emagbetere, E., & Ogujor, E. A. (2021). Decarbonization of the Iron and Steel Industry with Direct Reduction of Iron Ore with Green Hydrogen. MDPI

91. Ozai, I. (2022, June 6). *Implementing a Differential Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism: How to Design a CBAM Compliant with International Law*. Kluwer Law International

92. Pienknagura, S., & Islam, S. (2025, September 12). Macroeconomic Exposure to the EU's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism: The Case of the Middle East and Central Asia. IMF

93. Platts, S. G. (2022, June 22). Direct-reduced iron becomes steel decarbonization winner. S&P Global

94. PwC. (n.d.). CBAM implications for fertilizers and possible extension to other sectors

95. Raju, S. (2024, August 29). *Making a Border Carbon Adjustment Mechanism Work for Climate, Trade, and Equity*. Trade, Environment, and Sustainability Solutions (TESS)

96. ResearchGate. (n.d.). Energy consumption of primary aluminium production (based on...)

97. Resources for the Future. (2024, October 10). How Carbon Border Adjustments Might Drive Global Climate Policy Momentum

98. Rosendahl, K. E., & Storrøsten, H. B. (2023). EU's carbon border adjustment mechanism CBAM - industrial effects. Climate Change Economics, 14(04)

99. S&P Global. (2025, February 25). *How Will the EU's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism Impact Global Industries?*. S&P Global Market Intelligence

100. S&P Global. (2025, November 5). FEATURE: Fertilizer sector navigates CBAM challenges, uncertainties ahead

101. Sapir, A. (2021, July 19). The European Union's carbon border mechanism and the WTO. Bruegel

102. Scott, J. (2023). *Global EU climate action and the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities*. EUI Cadmus

103. Shabnam, S. (2024). The European Union Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism and Its compatibility with WTO law. TeseoPress

104. Singh, J. (2024, August 20). The Cost Conundrum: How CBAM Could Affect the Competitiveness of EU Manufacturers. CSEP

105. Strategic Energy. (2026, January 27). Carbon rules are reshaping global trade: what CBAM means for Mercosur

106. Sustainable Ships. (2025, March 15). What is the carbon footprint of steel?

107. swissinfo.ch. (2026, January 23). How Europe's carbon border tax will change trade and climate policy

108. Tagliapietra, S., & Veugelers, R. (2026, February 2). *How can Europe make CBAM a decarbonisation success story?*. Bruegel

109. The Carbon Trust. (n.d.). *CBAM: What it means for businesses*

110. The Sustainability Cloud. (n.d.). CBAM rules for the hydrogen and fertiliser sector

111. Timmons, D. (2025, February 25). How Will the EU's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism Impact Global Industries?. PCI

112. Tsujita, Y. (2024). Volatility of EU's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) under WTO Agreements-The Significance of Leveling. *Journal of World Trade*, *58*(1)

113. Tunley Environmental. (2025, January 31). What Sectors are Impacted by CBAM

114. U.S. Department of Energy. (n.d.). US Energy Requirements for Aluminum Production

115. U.S. Energy Information Administration. (2012, August 16). Energy needed to produce aluminum

116. U.S. Geological Survey. (2024, August 20). Heating Limestone: A Major CO_2 Culprit in Construction

117. UNCTAD. (2021). *A European Union Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism: Implications for developing countries*. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development

118. UNCTAD. (2024, December 3). Learning from CBAM's transitional phase: Early impacts on trade and climate efforts

119. UNFCCC. (n.d.). *A European Union Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism: an update on the implications for Developing Countries*

120. Wikipedia. (2024, May 22). EU Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism

121. Wikipedia. (2024, May 29). European Union Emissions Trading System

122. Wirdyansyah, D. M. (2025). Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) and Its Implications for Developing Economies: A Systematic Literature Review. Indonesian Journal of Energy

123. World Business Council for Sustainable Development. (2011, May). CO2 and Energy Accounting and Reporting Standard for the Cement Industry

124. World Economic Forum. (2024, September 13). Cement is a big problem for the environment. Here's how to make it more sustainable. World Economic Forum

125. World Economic Forum. (2024, September 30). 3 ways the aluminium industry can decarbonize faster

126. World Economic Forum. (2025, December 12). Climate and Competitiveness: Border Carbon Adjustments in Action

127. World Economic Forum. (2025, December 15). *The impact of the EU's CBAM on business and the carbon-pricing landscape*

128. World Economic Forum. (2025, December 15). The impact of the EU's CBAM on business and the carbon-pricing landscape

129. worldsteel.org. (2025). Sustainability Indicators Report 2025

130. Zanikian, F. (2026, January 27). Carbon rules are reshaping global trade: what CBAM means for Mercosur. Strategic Comments

131. Zapantis, J., & Nakano, J. (2023, February 17). *Analyzing the European Union's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism*. Center for Strategic & International Studies