

# Introduction to the questions of evasion in designing a policy

ECCP Brussels, 23rd June 2011

Mariella Kremlis
European Commission
DG Climate Action



#### **Studies Used**

- IHS Study Ships Port Visits
- 2009 CE DELFT Study Technical support for European Action to reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from international maritime transport
- 2010 UMWELTBUNDESAMT: Integration of Marine Transport into the European Emissions Trading System



#### **Types of Ship**

- Some ships may evade more easily
- Containers (IHS, CE DELFT):
  - Part load or part discharge between three or more ports
  - Use large ports as hubs and from there use feeder vessels
- Other segments more bound to a certain port





### Geographical Scope

### Distance/Route based system (CE DELFT, DE Study):

- highest evasion risk compared to scope covering EU territorial waters, Intra EU routes and time period scope.
- high environmental effectiveness



#### **CE DELFT Proposal**

#### **Proposal from CE DELFT:**

- Ships with single bill of lading will have to cover their emissions the last port of lading to the EU port
- Ships with multiple bills of lading will have to cover their emissions from the last port of call to the EU port



## Some questions to be addressed

- Are the bills of lading reliable?
- Do the potential "evasion ports" have sufficient capacity?
- What about the ballast voyages? (voyages that take place between ports of discharge and loading ports where the vessel is carrying no cargo)



## Further Questions to be addressed

- How can we find a balance between environmental effectiveness and low evasion risk when designing a policy?
- Is it a question of trade offs?
- How can evasion be fully minimized?
- Assuming strong MRV and enforcement policies, can incentives be given to ensure compliance? which ones?



### Thank you for your attention!

Mariella Kremlis
European Commission
DG Climate Action (CLIMA)
B-1049
Brussels, Belgium

mariella.kremlis@ext.ec.europe.eu +32 2 297 8666