1. Introduction

Australia is said to be one of the worst per capita greenhouse gas polluters, and uses coal fuel heavily [1]. In addition, Australia is also the driest inhabited continent on earth. There is strong evidence to show that Australia's climate is changing, with warming of 0.8 ° C since 1960, also increasing drought intensity, less snow, and more rain in northwest Australia [2]. Therefore, the climate issue in Australia has become one of the most polarizing and political issues. Australia’s target to reduce greenhouse gas emissions are by 5% below the 2000 level, in 2020 according to the Kyoto Protocol and 26-28% below the 2005 level, when it reaches 2030, in accordance with the Paris Agreement signed by almost all countries in the world [3].

In accordance with that, the Australian government has issued several policies on climate issues in Australia to reduce greenhouse gas or carbon emissions in Australia. However, many of these efforts were thwarted or even stopped. Although Australia’s plan for 2020 seems to be working, the same thing does not occur with the plan for 2030.

The major parties in Australia, The Coalition (consisting of Liberal Party and National Party), and the Australian Labor Party (ALP), believes that climate change is real. But have different ways of achieving the emissions reduction targets. The Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) was implemented in 2012 by Julia Gillard's government of ALP, as a two-stage policy. The initial stage is the issuance of
restrictions on the production of emissions and pricing of carbon licenses by the government, and the second stage is an emission trading scheme based on the floating market prices.

After Tony Abbot and the Coalition won the 2013 election, they have an alternate policy to the ETS. That is the Emissions Reduction Fund (ERF), which gives incentives to pollutant companies to carry out emissions reduction projects and a safeguard mechanism that provides penalties with to those who went beyond the government's carbon limit. The ERF does not support any well-known economists and has received great resistance from the opposition. It also does not have a strong foundation in proving that the policy model can reduce emissions according to the target. However, the policy passed both houses (House of Representatives and Senate) and was implemented in 2014. The Coalition and the Australian Labor Party (ALP) have the same target for reducing emissions by 2020, but ALP has a more ambitious target for 2030. Here are their differences [4][5].

- The Coalition (Liberal Party of Australia, National Party of Australia, Liberal National Queensland, and Country Liberal): targets a 5-25% reduction from 2000 levels by 2020, in accordance with the ambitions of the global agreement. Then 26-28% below the 2005 level in 2030, according to the minimum limit agreed by Australia in the Paris Agreement.
- Australian Labor Party (ALP): also targets 5-25% below 2000 levels by 2020, targeting a reduction of 45% by 2030, and a reduction of 80% in 2050, which is in line with the United Kingdom and Germany.

ALP is very keen on their policy choices and implementation, and they make a strong case as to how the ERF is not any better than the ETS. They also have the society and scientists backing up their claims. In view of that, the research question for this study is, why did the Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) policy by the Australian Labor Party shifted to the Emissions Reduction Fund (ERF) by the Coalition in Australia in 2014?

It is not only because they are the reigning party, although it sure is a factor, but there are other policies not changing just because they won the election. That is what will be discussed in this study. The factors, comprehensively, as to why those policies shifted.

1.1. Conceptual and theoretical review

The Author uses concept and theory by Bruno Dente (2014) and Carter A. Wilson (2000). Dente describes the stages in policy making. Namely identify the actors involved, the actor's goals, and the actor's decision-making resources. Furthermore, Wilson explains the policy regime and its dimensions and the factors that cause a policy shift. The author will explain further about which specific points of the concept and theory will be used in this study.

The first stage is to identify the actors. Who has contributed, or can contribute to the development and results of the adoption of relevant behavior. The actors in question are the people who actually act. Of course, some people have interests that are considered important because they act according to the decisions taken [6].

This concept assumes that the actors in the policy-making process are rational, so it makes sense to assume that these goals are consistent and have a direct connection with their interests. These interests can be in the form of money, enhancing their reputation, or implementing values that contribute to the identity’s definition. In essence, all actors act if they have a cause. To understand how and when actors can effectively participate in the process of policymaking, the political exchange concept can be used [7]:

"...It has been defined (Coleman 1964, Chap. 6) as the ability of actor A, who can control outcome X, which is of interest to actor B, to influence the latter, who can in turn control outcome Y, which is of interest to actor A. It is easy to understand how this concept is widely based on the idea of power, considered as the ability to influence other actors (actor B’s behaviour can only be explained as a result of actor A’s behaviour), adding the consideration that this is due to actor A’s capacity to generate results that actor B is interested in."

In this study, the author will only use one out of four dimensions in the policy regime that Wilson mentioned, to explain how power and power regulation present strong interest groups to support a
policy regime. Hence, some members of the dominant class or business sector, play a direct role in the passage of a policy, especially to replace existing policies. As well as how countries tend to favor business interests because of their favorable position (positional advantages).

Regime change does not occur spontaneously, rather gradually. Although these stages do not have to take place in the same order and sometimes occur simultaneously: 1) stressors / enablers, 2) paradigm shifts, 3) power shifts, 4) legitimacy crisis, and 5) organizational and policy change [8]. This study will use the first, third, and fourth points to explain the Emissions Trading Scheme policy shift by the Australian Labor Party to the Emissions Reduction Fund by the Coalition. The first point, stressors / enablers involve external factors that influence the policy regime. This weakens the policy regime, creates conditions suitable for change, or acts as a trigger for change. They generate pressure on organizational arrangements, and provoke questions about the legitimacy of ongoing arrangements. This is what Cobb and Elder call trigger events.

The next point is power shifts. Which in this case, explain the dissolution of the old or previous coalition, and the formation of a new one, along with consolidation in the dominant class. Power shifts also occur along with changes in the country's role and governance, changes in the position of president and congress. Many types of power shifts are accelerated or are possible because of the impact of the stressor. Power shifts also occur when opposition groups challenge the ruling regime and gain leadership skills, knowledge resources, and organizations. Leadership skills require the ability to raise funds, set goals, articulate ideas, gain access to the media, influence public opinion, mobilize large numbers of supporters, build coalitions, create political momentum, and develop effective strategies that identify appropriate targets, broaden issues, and get access to other sectors. Leadership also includes the ability to exploit trigger events, capabilities to achieve organizational goals, and the ability to convince members on the possibility of change [9].

At the legitimacy crisis stage, these political leaders operate to expand the problem, attract media attention, increase the problem's visibility, move the arena of conflict to other places, and a larger audience, far from the established policy community. Leaders outside the government create a crisis of legitimacy when they build people's doubts about the validity of the stories, images, and authority that form the basis of the established policy regime this study, the author will only use one out of four dimensions in the policy regime that Wilson mentioned, to explain how power and power regulation present strong interest groups to support a policy regime. Hence, some members of the dominant class or business sector, play a direct role in the passage of a policy, especially to replace existing policies. As well as how countries tend to favor business interests because of their favorable position (positional advantages).

Regime change does not occur spontaneously, rather gradually. Although these stages do not have to take place in the same order and sometimes occur simultaneously: 1) stressors / enablers, 2) paradigm shifts, 3) power shifts, 4) legitimacy crisis, and 5) organizational and policy change [8]. This study will use the first, third, and fourth points, to explain the shift in the Emissions Trading Scheme policy by the Australian Labor Party to the Emissions Reduction Fund by the Coalition. The first point, stressors / enablers involve external factors that influence the policy regime. This weakens the policy regime, creates conditions suitable for change, or acts as a trigger for change. They generate pressure on organizational arrangements, and provoke questions about the legitimacy of ongoing arrangements. This is what Cobb and Elder call trigger events.

The next point is power shifts. Which in this case, explain the dissolution of the old or previous coalition, and the formation of a new one, along with consolidation in the dominant class. Power shifts also occur along with changes in the role and governance of the country, changes in the position of president and congress. Many types of power shifts are accelerated or are possible because of the impact of the stressor. Power shifts also occur when opposition groups challenge the ruling regime, gain leadership skills, knowledge resources and organization. Leadership skills require the ability to raise funds, set goals, articulate ideas, gain access to the media, influence public opinion, mobilize large numbers of supporters, build coalitions, create political momentum, and develop effective strategies that identify appropriate targets, broaden issues, and get access to other sectors. Leadership
also includes the ability to exploit trigger events, capabilities to achieve organizational goals, and the ability to convince members on the possibility of change [9].

At the legitimacy crisis stage, these political leaders operate to expand the problem, attract media attention, increase the visibility of the problem, move the arena of conflict to other places and to a larger audience, far from the established policy community. Leaders outside the government create a crisis of legitimacy when they build people’s doubts about the validity of the stories, images, and authority that form the basis of the established policy regime.

2. Method
This research is descriptive explanatory and uses a qualitative approach. The method used is a case study. The author collects data and information from several literatures such as books, journals, articles, and media. The author builds the introduction and theoretical background as the foundation to the research. As carbon pricing is not just an important issue in Australia, but globally significant. A decision made in certain countries could affect the decision made in other countries, just like how Australian governments discussed other countries’ stances on carbon pricing as a base for their argument. That is why the author also researches comparative politics studies regarding carbon trade.

The author uses Carter A. Wilson’s and Bruno Dente’s theories and concept as a compass in researching for the results of this study. Focusing on the actors, the goals, and the reasons behind a shifting policy, specifically the Emissions Trading Scheme by Australian Labor Party to Emissions Reduction Fund by the Coalition. The books and journals regarding climate change science and solutions for Australia and the rise and fall of carbon trading created a deeper understanding of the science and the appropriate solutions for Australia’s environmental issues. In addition to that, studying the books and journals on political party regulations in Australia and understanding policy decisions, created a foundational understanding of the many aspects that contributes towards making a policy in Australia. On the other hand, studying the mass media and non-governmental organizations’ stances towards the issue, paints a picture of how the public is reacting to this particular subject, and how it can affect the shift of a certain policy the media can affect public opinion.

One of the most essential and core parts of the study is data derived from the Australian institution’s website, Hansard. The author collects first-hand data from the Hansard website, as it is a transcript of all the proceedings happening in Australia’s parliament. The author collected direct quotes from each party’s members, representing their own stances, the parties’ and their constitution’s stances on respective issues. By collecting them, the author has significant and legitimate data to support the claims that are made in this study. The meetings discussing the policy shift from ETS by Australian Labor Party to ERF by the Coalition happened in the House of Representatives (HoR), as well as the Senate. The author summarized important key arguments in those meetings from Hansard’s transcripts to form an alignment with their own parties’ policies and reasons. These meetings showed concrete evidence and events of what the books, journals, and mass media reported and discussed. The arguments in the HoR and the Senate showed how the debates in their meetings are affecting a bill to become law. After learning about the respective parties’ stances and the response of the public towards them and their policies, the author then discusses it with the theories and concept used in this study is descriptive explanatory and uses a qualitative approach. The method used is a case study. The author collects data and information from several literatures such as books, journals, articles, and media. The author builds the introduction and theoretical background as the foundation to the research. As carbon pricing is not just an important issue in Australia, but globally significant. A decision made in certain countries could affect the decision made in other countries, just like how Australian governments discussed other countries’ stances on carbon pricing as a base for their argument. That is why the author also researches comparative politics studies regarding carbon trade.

The author uses Carter A. Wilson’s and Bruno Dente’s theories and concept as a compass in researching for the results of this study. Focusing on the actors, the goals, and the reasons behind a shifting policy, specifically the Emissions Trading Scheme by Australian Labor Party to Emissions Reduction Fund by the Coalition. The books and journals regarding climate change science and
solutions for Australia and the rise and fall of carbon trading created a deeper understanding about the science and the appropriate solutions that are available for Australia’s environmental issues. In addition to that, studying the books and journals on political party regulations in Australia and understanding policy decisions, created a foundational understanding of the many aspects that contributes towards making a policy in Australia. On the other hand, studying the mass media and non-governmental organizations’ stances towards the issue, paints a picture on how the public is reacting to this particular subject, and how it can affect the shift of a certain policy, also how the media can affect public opinion.

One of the most essential and core parts of the study is data derived from the website of the Australian institution, Hansard. The author collects first-hand data from the Hansard website, as it is a transcript of all the proceedings happening in the parliament of Australia. The author collected direct quotes from members of each parties, representing their own stances, also the parties’ and their constitution’s stances on respective issues. By collecting them, the author has significant and legitimate data to support the claims that are made in this study. The meetings discussing the policy shift from ETS by Australian Labor Party to ERF by the Coalition happened in the House of Representatives (HoR), as well as the Senate. The author summarized important key arguments in those meetings from the transcripts in Hansard to form an alignment with their own parties’ policies and reasons. These meetings showed concrete evidence and events of what the books, journals, and mass media reported and discussed. The arguments in the HoR and the Senate showed how the debates in their meetings are affecting a bill to become law. After learning about the respective parties’ stances and the response of the public towards them and their policies, the author then discusses it with the theories and concept used in this study.

3. Results and discussion

Implementation of the Emissions Trading Scheme by the Australian Labor Party in Julia Gillard’s government, operates as a hybrid. It uses a fixed price until July 1, 2014 after which emission caps will be imposed and trade is expected to begin. Temporary operation of fixed prices is to avoid the negative potential of price volatility which was part of the specific risks discussed during the negotiation of the framework after the Kyoto Protocol [10].

The government sets an initial price in the early stage of this regime to give way to floating prices that are in accordance with the market. This includes a compromise between environmental integrity and cost suppression. Business interest refers to the price of carbon permits in European trade (at the time AUD $15) while environmentalists have informed the Government Treasurer that a price of around AUD $131 per ton is needed to achieve the greenhouse gas reduction target. Finally the price of AUD $23 per ton for the first year was chosen as a compromise. This follows the Garnaut Climate Change Report's recommendation, even though the report states that this price is meant for a scheme where no free permits were given. This scheme applies to large pollutants, which are entities that emit 25,000 tons of CO2e per year. The government says that they are responsible for around 60% of Australia's greenhouse gas emissions. The logic behind the threshold is not to burden small pollutants with the costs and administration imposed by this scheme, even though those who approach the threshold must verify that their emission levels do not exceed them. The Clean Energy Regulator then reduced the list of entities affected by this scheme, which previously numbered 500 (initially 1,000) to only 294 shortly before the scheme was put into effect [11].

Prime Minister Tony Abbott’s administration (the Coalition) that won the election in 2013, submitted a legislation to amend the Carbon Credits (Carbon Farming Initiative) Act 2011 to include a major part of their Direct Action Plan policy, the Emissions Reduction Fund (ERF). Meanwhile, the Australian Labor Party has enacted the Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) under the Clean Energy Act 2011 which has been running since July 2012. The Carbon Farming Initiative Amendment Act 2014 will implement the ERF as a substitute for ETS, and provide a transition for the Carbon Farming Initiative. In June to October 2014, parliament debated whether a policy shift from ETS to ERF was the right option to reduce emissions in Australia [12].
The debates in the parliament are not exactly fast and swift, the one in the Senate even ran for 7 hours straight. Out of the many arguments that was made, some of them are highlighted to represent the collective case for each sides, one is by Senator Cormann from the Liberal Party:

“I say it again: coal is good for humanity. Coal has been central to our economic prosperity. We owe much of our quality of life here in Australia today to the contribution coal has made to our economic development in the past—and it will continue to contribute in the future, both here in Australia and around the world [13].”

Clearly, the ones who are pushing for the ERF policy shift support fossil fuel extractions businesses. The Coalition’s representatives’ arguments can be summarized as follows:

- Carbon Tax is an unnecessary burden on Australian businesses and reduces Australia's international competitiveness.
- Carbon Tax raises energy costs for Australian businesses and households. ETS is destroying Australia’s competitiveness.
- ERF does not create a large new architecture of government, but will continue and straighten out structures and processes that are already understood by industry.
- Environmental protection and economic growth are not mutually exclusive and can go hand in hand.

On the other hand, the opposition have strong objection to the bill and a policy shift, one of the arguments made in the HoR was by Mark Butler of the ALP:

“(1) the Government’s poor record on environmental and climate change issues; (2) that payments from the Emissions Reduction Fund need to be financed from the federal budget, and paid for by taxpayers rather than big polluters; (3) the need to fully examine the range of changes proposed to the CFI and the impact this will have on the existing land sector projects; (4) the lack of robust and defensible assurance from the Government about the ability of the CFI amendment and the Emissions Reduction Fund to achieve Australia’s emissions reduction target; (5) that since the 2013 election Australia’s international reputation on climate change action has been damaged by becoming the first nation to move backwards on climate change while the rest of the world, including China and the US, is moving forward; and (6) the need for the Government to pass an Emissions Trading Scheme to place a cap on carbon pollution and drive a clean energy future for Australia [14].”

Overall, the arguments made by the opposition (Australian Labor Party) can be summarized as the following:

- The majority of Australia’s main trading partner countries use emissions trading schemes.
- The ERF actually betrays the traditional value of Liberals, which is a commitment to a market-based economy.
- There are no renowned economists who support ERF. Based on research, ERF will increase the amount of emissions and require far more costs than the initial budget.
- Similar schemes have a track record of under delivery on emission reductions contracts and incentives are only available to auction winners.
- A permanent period of 25 years does not guarantee emission reductions after that time limit, the ERF only provides funds for the first 5 years, allowing the projects to overcharge.
- ETS uses money owned by large pollutants without burdening Australian taxpayers' money.
- ERF burdens the Australian community by using tax money paid by them which was then allocated to the ERF.
- Safeguard mechanism, the only important part of the ERF, that is to put an emissions cap for pollutants, is pushed back to not be applied in the early stages of ERF and could be toned down to the point of meaningless.
- CFI Amendment Bill 2014 eliminate the competitive advantage that Australia is developing, and encourage businesses to waste resources, or rely on government subsidies for profit.

Some members of the Liberal Party were actually supportive towards an emissions trading scheme
in the past, but now they suddenly are not. Also for the Coalition to not want the ETS to be implemented because it is a form of a carbon tax is ironic, considering safeguard mechanism is a form of a tax. It is a baseline and when pollutants go over that line, they have to pay. That is tax, according to Senator Milner of the ALP [15].

After going through a long process of debate in parliament, the CFI Amendment Bill 2014 was successfully passed. Although the Senate Inquiry recommendation stated: 

“A recent Senate inquiry into direct action did not hear any evidence that suggested direct action will achieve its goal of a five per cent reduction to Australia’s emissions by 2020. The Senate committee recommended that the government not proceed with the emissions reduction fund, as it is fundamentally flawed on the following grounds: there is no legislated limit or 'cap' on Australia's emissions in line with emissions reductions targets, there is insufficient funding to be able to secure enough abatement to meet Australia's emissions targets now and into the future, and there is a lack of a robust safeguard mechanism with stringent baselines and penalties for exceeding baselines [16].”

There was plenty of evidence to suggest that some of the concerns of those against ERF had actually taken place after the ERF was actually implemented. Low emission reductions, emission production increased, even away from the target. This is reinforced by the results obtained from several ERF contracts. In May 2016, it was seen that two-thirds of ERF funds had been used, but only reached 7% of the total emission reduction targets needed for 2030 [17].

Business groups need policies that are profitable, but they are limited by the role they have in the policy making process. On the other hand, the current ETS policy raises taxes that they must pay to the government, which comes from their own company’s money. The Liberal Party or the Coalition can help implement policies that are more business-friendly, one that does not cause businesses to spend money if they want to produce emissions. The Coalition formed a draft law that said the government would provide a fund of AUD $2.55 billion to be given to large pollutants wishing to work on emissions reduction projects [18]. With that, ETS will also be abolished. Of course, businesses that produce a lot of emissions support the Coalition's policy. In essence, not only sparring their own pockets, but the pollutants will get a chance to have parts of the taxpayers’ funds too.

Hence, large pollutant companies make large donations to the Liberal Party. This is not the first time this has happened, but in this case, a large businessman's donation can show the interests of a group being granted by an actor, thus creating a political exchange, in accordance to what was stated by Dente. According to Senator Sue Lines, one report confirmed the suspicion that the Coalition had a deal with Palmer United Party which is the party of Clive Palmer, a coal businessman who clearly would benefit from implementing the ERF [19].

In Australia, political parties have an obligation under the law to provide details about donations to each party in excess of AUD $12,100. However, this does not rule out the possibility of large donations made in several transactions under AUD $12,100. In view of this case, the Australian Greens mentioned that Australia’s democracy today is showing that the industry can buy policy outcomes, in other words, by making such large donations to a party. In view of this case, the Australian Greens mentioned that Australia’s democracy today is showing that the industry can buy policy outcomes, in other words, by making such large donations to a party. Therefore, the Greens request that the Federal Parliament impose a rule that all donations above AUD $1,000 must be declared, and donations are limited to AUD $ 4,000 for every four years for individual or organizational donors [20]. According to the Greens, these contributions are considered not large enough to affect the outcome of a policy. Thus, people can still show their support for the values they want in Parliament, but not enough to buy an outcome or bribe a political party [21].

In 2012 to 2013, the Liberal party received four times more donations than the Australian Labor Party (ALP). In 2017, the Liberal Party again became the party that received the largest amount of donations compared to other parties, and The Michael Crouch Foundation became the largest donor with a donation of AUD $350,000 to the Liberal Party. Since 2012, large fossil fuel companies have donated more than AUD $8.2 million to the Liberal / National parties, although only 10% of the total
donations were correctly announced to the public [22]. Furthermore, political exchange can be seen more through the policy outcomes produced and championed by the Liberal Party and those in the Coalition.

The Coalition which was in opposition before the 2013 elections, weakened the Emissions Trading Scheme regime by the Australian Labor Party, which was then in power as government. They act as triggers for change, by taking various actions, such as underlining, or emphasizing the oddities committed by the ruling government, regarding policies to reduce their emissions. Julia Gillard once said that she would not have a carbon tax under her leadership, and then issued an Emissions Trading Scheme [23]. The Coalition claimed that the ETS is a form of carbon tax. This was detrimental to Gillard, albeit the explanation that her policies are carbon pricing and carbon trading. Accusations that the policy had a carbon tax element still hurt Gillard and the Australian Labor Party politically.

The Coalition as opposition at the time also increased the visibility of new problems caused by the implementation of ETS, and how private companies that they believed were job providers and contributors of Australia's economic growth, should be given incentives by the government, not imposed by taxes instead, among other accusations made by the Coalition. These things create a strategic and favorable situation for alternative policies. The situation created has become so tense that it has prompted a rethink of the current policy. That is where the Coalition’s ERF comes to play.

The Coalition created a legitimacy crisis that allowed some people to lose confidence in the government, particularly the ETS. The power shift began when the Coalition challenged the ruling regime and promised to abolish the carbon tax if elected. Furthermore, they have leadership skill which is their ability to collect funds provided by business people (the result of political exchange). In addition to that, they articulate their ideas to the media, which influences public opinion and mobilizes a large amount of support. They developed an effective strategy for achieving targets, and thus created political momentum in the 2013 elections.

4. Conclusion
As we can see, resources such as money and connections can go a long way in influencing the interest group's desired policy outcome (the business group in this case). Although the Emissions Trading Scheme has a more solid scientific background and clearly was more environmentally-beneficial, it was still replaced by an environmentally-worse policy and one that strayed away from Australia’s Paris Agreement and Kyoto Protocol targets. All this happened mainly through the power of the business group. This shows how influential the business group still is in policymaking, even the power shift that happened through a series of trigger events created by the Coalition is possible through the help of the business group’s resources, such as money and connections. This political exchange resulted in the Coalition shifting the existing policy into a more business-friendly one at the environment’s cost. This policy shift also shows that the government has to have more accountability and bind towards Australia’s emissions reduction targets. One solution is to have stricter donation rules, to rule out any excessive donations towards a political party or representative that can be labeled as political exchange for the interest group’s preferred policy outcome. So that the policy produced for emissions reduction purposes can actually benefit the environment, not any other party.
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