

PRESS RELEASE ON BEHALF OF:

Transport & Environment, Seas at Risk, The Ecological Council - Denmark,  
Germanwatch

## **Copenhagen: China and India blocking aviation-shipping emissions deal**

### **Two degree limit and \$30 billion for developing countries climate fund at risk**

14 December 2009, For immediate release

*Copenhagen, Denmark* – A deal on including aviation and shipping emissions in the Copenhagen climate agreement is being blocked by China, India, Saudi Arabia and The Bahamas (1). Failure to include the two sectors (known collectively as bunker emissions) puts at risk both a major source of climate funding for developing countries and the long term success of climate reduction targets say environmental organisations.

Emissions from international shipping have grown by more than 85% since 1990, international aviation emissions have grown by over 50% over the same period. Left unchecked, emissions from aviation and shipping will double or triple by 2050, putting at risk the world's ability to keep global warming under 2 degrees centigrade.

Excluded from commitments in the Kyoto protocol, responsibility for cutting emissions from the two sectors was handed to the UN's International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) and International Maritime Organisation (IMO). But neither has come forward with a single binding measure in the twelve years that followed Kyoto. ICAO has actively blocked action (2) but is arguing in Copenhagen to keep responsibility for reducing these emissions. IMO has said the Copenhagen talks should agree a global cap on emissions for shipping.

In the run up to Copenhagen two possible ways of tackling emissions from the sectors gathered support from a number of countries: a separate global Emissions Trading System for aviation and shipping or a climate levy on marine fuel. Both options are feasible and would generate substantial revenues, estimated at \$25-37 billion per year, which could go towards the global climate fund for developing countries that has been a major part of the Copenhagen discussions.

The blocking countries in the so-called 'Bunkers Drafting Group' at Copenhagen are insisting that only developed countries be involved in bunker reduction schemes. But this is impractical as most ships are registered in developing countries, to take advantage of 'flags of convenience' for a variety of tax and legal reasons.

In any case, failure to agree on a global scheme will mean the developing world will miss out on the substantial climate funding package. Many of the world's Least Developed Countries back a deal that includes this crucial element and are opposed to the stance taken by a small group of blocking countries.

Bill Hemmings of Transport & Environment, a Brussels-based environmental organisation campaigning for sustainable transport said:

“Some of the developing world’s biggest economies are selfishly blocking a deal that could unlock the overall Copenhagen agreement. Developing countries would gain a substantial source of revenue and rapid growth in aviation and shipping emissions, which puts our ability to tackle climate change at risk, could be curtailed.”

John Maggs of Seas at Risk said:

“Without a global deal in Copenhagen, regional schemes are likely to pop up around the world. The EU has said many times that without a global deal, it will include shipping in its emissions trading scheme; it has already agreed to add aviation. International bunker fuels would also be covered under the emissions trading bill currently before the US congress. But money from such schemes will not be channelled to the developing world. Failure to reach a deal at Copenhagen would be a massive missed opportunity for the poorest countries.”

Campaigners are calling for emissions from international aviation and shipping to be cut by 40% below 1990 levels by 2020, in line with the necessary developing country targets.

(1) The Bahamas generates substantial revenues from registering ships under its ‘flag’. Dependence on these revenues leads them to support those in industry opposing climate measures.

(2) See ‘How ICAO and IMO failed the Climate Change Test’:  
[www.transportenvironment.org/Publications/prep\\_hand\\_out/lid:539](http://www.transportenvironment.org/Publications/prep_hand_out/lid:539)

- See also: ‘FAQ: Aviation/Shipping emissions at Copenhagen’:  
[www.transportenvironment.org/Publications/prep\\_hand\\_out/lid:564](http://www.transportenvironment.org/Publications/prep_hand_out/lid:564)

**For further information:**

Bill Hemmings, Transport & Environment  
+45 5148 7342, [bill.hemmings@transportenvironment.org](mailto:bill.hemmings@transportenvironment.org)  
[www.transportenvironment.org](http://www.transportenvironment.org)

John Maggs, Seas at Risk  
+44 7966 322 379, [jmaggs@gn.apc.org](mailto:jmaggs@gn.apc.org)  
[www.seas-at-risk.org](http://www.seas-at-risk.org)

Søren Dyck-Madsen, The Ecological Council, Denmark  
+45 30 89 60 80, [soeren@ecocouncil.dk](mailto:soeren@ecocouncil.dk)  
[www.ecocouncil.dk](http://www.ecocouncil.dk)

Dr. Manfred Treber, Germanwatch  
+49 173 496 9372, [treber@germanwatch.org](mailto:treber@germanwatch.org)  
[www.germanwatch.org](http://www.germanwatch.org)