

They are the elephants in the room



no deal without shipping & aviation emissions

Stopping dangerous climate change requires cuts in ship GHG emissions

International shipping is responsible for almost 3% of all CO₂ emissions and its emissions are expected to increase by up to 250% if no action is taken. Keeping warming below 1.5/2 degrees will only be possible if shipping reduces its climate impact.

The Clean Shipping Coalition therefore calls on countries participating in the Paris Climate Change Conference (COP21) to agree that the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) should set targets and agree emissions reduction measures that are consistent with shipping making a fair and proportionate contribution to keeping warming below 1.5/2 degrees.

Unfortunately the industry is resisting this move and the International Maritime Organisation (IMO), the International Chamber of Shipping (ICS) and others in the shipping industry have made a number of claims about the industry's performance in tackling climate change that are contradicted by the facts. See over for full details.



Learn more on
www.elephantsintheroom.eu

www.cleanshipping.org
info@cleanshipping.org

Shipping under the spotlight in Paris Climate Summit

The shipping industry is making claims about its performance in tackling climate change that simply don't stack up:

✘ **They say that** specific measures aimed at reducing shipping's overall contribution to CO₂ emissions, such as an overall cap, would artificially limit the ability of shipping to meet the demand created by the world economy, or would unbalance the level playing field that the shipping industry needs for efficient operation, and therefore must **be avoided.**" (IMO Secretary-General Sekimizu, September 2015)

✔ **The reality is** that ever since the 1997 Kyoto Protocol (Article 2.2) developed states have been required to pursue through the IMO the limitation or reduction of GHG emissions from shipping and, as the Marshall Islands Foreign Ministry recently observed the IMO Secretary General's "...call is not just a danger to the planet, but as the research points out, also to the shipping industry's future prosperity, and therefore the future stability of world trade." (Marshall Islands Foreign Ministry, Oct 2015)

✘ **They say that** the shipping industry is delivering carbon neutral growth.

✔ **The reality is** that ship GHG emissions are up 70% since 1990 and according to the current best available science (The 3rd IMO GHG Study) are expected to grow a further 50-250% by 2050.

✘ **They say that** IMO measures reduced ship GHG emissions from 2.8% to 2.2% of total between 2008 and 2012.

✔ **The reality is** that because the implementation date for the IMO's first regulations on energy efficiency is 2013, there can be no attribution of these measures to the observed trend. It is true that this change has occurred, and it is because shipping GHG emissions underwent a small absolute reduction, whilst the total emissions from other sectors increased. This absolute emission reduction is due to a reduction in shipping demand growth due to the global financial crisis and fleet overcapacity allowing energy-saving slow steaming.

✘ **They say that** slow steaming and the CO₂ savings it produces are hard wired into the fleet and here to stay.

✔ **The reality is** that there is no economic development or regulation that has occurred since publication of the 3rd IMO GHG Study that has 'hard wired' slow steaming into shipping. Referring to the fact that a large explanation for shipping's CO₂ reduction is slow steaming, a phenomenon recognised to be a function of market conditions, the 3rd IMO GHG Study says "...All three [oil tankers, container ships and bulk carriers] contain latent emissions increases (suppressed by slow steaming and historically low activity and productivity) that could return...if the market dynamics that informed those trends revert to their previous levels...".

✘ **They say that** ships built after 2025 will be 30% more fuel efficient.

✔ **The reality is** that this is only true if compared with a period of historically low ship design efficiency; design efficiency deteriorated 10% between 1990 and 2010.

✘ **They say that** a cap on global ship emissions is a cap on world trade.

✔ **The reality is** that between 2007 and 2012 trade increased and emissions fell by 10%. Numerous studies have shown that further emission reductions are feasible. The real threat to world shipping comes from inaction. The world's diminishing carbon budget means that a delay in reducing shipping emissions will require steeper emission reductions from this sector in later years, presenting a far bigger challenge to the industry which may in fact damage world trade.

✘ **They say that** shipping is part of the solution to climate change.

✔ **The reality is** that if all other countries and sectors achieve decarbonisation pathways consistent with a 2 degree stabilisation, shipping under current policy will be responsible for up to 17% of global CO₂ emissions by 2050. Even further policy at IMO that constrains shipping to carbon-neutral growth would lead shipping to be about 6% of global CO₂ emissions by 2050. Either scenario would make shipping an increasing part of the problem, and a risk for the achievement of climate stabilisation targets.

A fully referenced version of the above information can be found at www.elephantsintheroom.eu