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Outline of Analysis

• Impacts of emission levy on countries and commodity types
  – Prepare basic inventories and trade weight
  – Combine CO₂ inventory and trade
  – Analyze the price increase due to levy by countries and by commodity groups

• Impacts of speed reduction on CO₂ reduction
  – CO₂ reduction rate from cutting fleets’ speeds
  – Marginal abatement cost (MAC) of reducing CO₂ emissions
  – Compare MAC with cap-and-trade prices in other markets
Background

- International trade is increasing in the recent decade before the recession
  - Average above 3%
- More than 80% trade in volume was carried by ships
- Ship is one of the major sources of several pollutants
  - 1.2-1.6 million metric tons of particulate matter
  - 4.7-6.5 metric tons of sulfur oxides
  - 5.0-6.9 metric tons of nitrogen oxides
- Increasing attention is paid to GHG, especially CO$_2$
  - 1019 million tons of CO2
  - 3.3% of world CO2 emissions
  - 90% is from international shipping
Potential impact of shipping on WRE 450 / 550 emissions stabilization

Regulator Responses to CO₂

• IMO Policy Instrument to reduce CO₂
  – Market-based instrument
  – Ship operational index
  – Ship design index
    • Main Engine retrofit
    • Retrofit hull improvement

• Europe Union
  – With Japan, they are pushing to give IMO authority to audit the flag states
  – They plan to regulator GHG within EU if IMO does not take enough action
A larger ship will in most cases offer greater transport efficiency — "Efficiency of Scale" effect. A larger ship can transport more cargo at the same speed with less power per cargo unit. Limitations may be met in port handling.

Regression analysis of recently built ships show that a 10% larger ship will give about 4-5% higher transport efficiency.

Wing shaped sails installed on the deck or a kite attached to the bow of the ship uses the wind energy for added forward thrust. Both static wings with composite material and fabric material are possible.

Fuel consumption savings:
- Tanker: ~21%
- PCTC: ~20%
- Ferry: ~6.5%
Questions

• What is the effect of CO$_2$ reduction cost on trade
  • Its impacts on countries and commodities
• What is the effect of speed reduction
  • No technology bottleneck
  • Easy to enforce and monitor
• What is the economy behind
  • Higher cost on trade
  • Marginal abatement cost of slowing vessels
Data Source

- US Army Corps of Engineers
  - Clearance and Entrance (2002) dataset
  - More than 7,000 routes identified and analyzed
  - More than 10,000 international ship calls to the United States
- Ship Traffic Energy and Environmental Model (STEEM)
  - Port to Port distances
- Department of Commerce
  - U.S. Import and Export Dataset
  - Trade data by commodity groups and by countries
Inventory Estimate

- Bottom-up approach
  - Estimate CO$_2$ emissions from each ship that called the U.S. ports in 2002
  - Add up emissions from each ship
- Parameter assumption
  - SFOC: 206 g/kwh
  - Average main engine load factor: 0.8
  - Average auxiliary engine load factor: 0.5
Inventory Estimation

Fuel usage estimate

\[ Fuel_{i,j,k} = \sum_{i,j}(ME_{fuel_k} \times (\frac{s_i}{s_0})^3 + AE_{fuel_k}) \times \frac{d_{i,j}}{24 \times s_1} \]

CO\textsubscript{2} Emission

\[ CO_2 = 3.17 \times \sum_{i,j,k} \left\{ MF_k \times \left(\frac{s_{1k}}{s_{0k}}\right)^3 + AF_k \right\} \times \frac{d_{ij}}{24 \times s_{1k}} \]

Total CO\textsubscript{2} emissions: ~22 million tons
Basic Facts

- Total CO₂ emissions from International Shipping that call the United States: ~22 million tons
- 13.6 billion kg commodities were imported to the United States
- 2 ton CO₂ emission for every one ton of commodity
- Unit emission: Emission/weight of imported commodity
# Top Emitters of CO₂ in Trade with the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Emission (ton)</th>
<th>Annex I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>19,365,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>7,366,000</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China Taiwan</td>
<td>5,267,000</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China Mainland</td>
<td>5,229,000</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>4,841,000</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4,451,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>3,027,000</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>3,001,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>2,777,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Top Unit Emitters of CO$_2$ in Trade with the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>CO$_2$</th>
<th>Annex I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islands N.E.C.</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Sahara</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pacific Islands</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emission/Import Ration by Commodity

- Trade data classified by 2 digit Harmonized System (HS2)
- One underpinning assumption: CO$_2$ emissions from containerships are proportional to trade weight.
  - In practice commodities are packed in containers in one ship and transported
  - Calculate CO$_2$ emission and total weight
  - Assign CO$_2$ emissions to different commodity types according to their weight ratio
Unit Emission by Commodity

- Minerals
- Chemicals & Allied Industries
- Animal and Animal Products
- Vegetable Products
- Foodstuffs
- Wood and Wood Products
- Metals
- Stone/Glass
- Transportation
- Machinery/Electrical
- Plastics/Rubbers
- Footwear/Headgear
- Raw Hides, Skins, Leather, & Furs
- Textiles
- Miscellaneous

CO2 ratio by country

Mineral Products: 0.512
Chemicals: 0.256
Animal and Animal Products: 0.128
Vegetable Products: 0.064
Foodstuffs: 0.032
Wood and Wood Products: 0.016
Metals: 0.008
Stone/Glass: 0.004
Transportation: 0.002
Machinery/Electrical: 0.001
Plastics/Rubbers: 0.001
Footwear/Headgear: 0.001
Raw Hides, Skins, Leather, & Furs: 0.001
Textiles: 0.001
Miscellaneous: 0.001
### Price Increase due to CO₂ levy

Assume a $50 per ton CO₂ levy is imposed to commodities that are transported by international shipping.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Region</th>
<th>HS19: Food</th>
<th>HS72: Steal</th>
<th>HS61: Textile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>370%</td>
<td>2770%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islands N.E.C.</td>
<td>370%</td>
<td>790%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>360%</td>
<td>540%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>530%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>530%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>490%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Guiana</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>430%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>410%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayman Isl</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>370%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>350%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Speed Reduction and CO$_2$ Mitigation

Re-visit equation 2, the CO$_2$ is directly related to the relationship between operational speed and designed speed

$$CO_2 = 3.17 \times \sum_{i,j,k} \left\{ MF_k \times \left( \frac{s_{1k}}{s_{0k}} \right)^3 + AF_k \right\} \times \frac{d_{ij}}{24 \times s_{1k}}$$

Reducing speed can reduce CO$_2$ emission
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Reduction in Speed</th>
<th>CO2 saving (mt/yr)</th>
<th>Fuel usage (mt/yr)</th>
<th>CO2 saving % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6,520,000</td>
<td>9,210,000</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12,290,000</td>
<td>7,390,000</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17,340,000</td>
<td>5,800,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>21,640,000</td>
<td>4,440,000</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25,180,000</td>
<td>3,330,000</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assume no extra ship is added into the lineup to cover the already published schedule.
Marginal Abatement Cost of CO₂

• Marginal abatement cost = extra reduction of CO₂/extra cost of reducing CO₂
• Marginal abatement cost = CO₂ price
• Calculation
  – Assume ships operate at their optimal speed which is defined as the speed that shipping companies produce maximum profit
  – When regulators mandate speed reduction from optimal speed, there is cost (opportunity cost)
• IMO is looking at the possibility of 10% speed reduction
  – Marginal cost is around $20 per ton
• Haven't considered extra ships that maintain the frequency
  – Otherwise, the CO₂ reduction rate will be discounted
  – Marginal cost will be much higher

\[ S_{1k} = \left( \frac{C_k + P \cdot AF_k}{2P \cdot MF_k} \right) s_{0k}^3 \]
Policy Implication

- CO₂ emission is directly related to trade
  - Regulations regarding the emissions from international shipping will effect international trade
  - More coordination between IMO and WTO
- Countries and commodities would be hit unequally if there were a CO₂ reduction cost
  - Though bigger countries are responsible for most emissions, small countries are most severely hurt
  - Heavy goods are most affected
  - True for both Cap-and-Trade and Emission Levy
• Speed reduction is one of solutions to CO$_2$ from ships
• CO$_2$ price is higher than current market prices
  – Even without consideration of extra ships
Future Work

• The marginal cost when extra ships are taken into considerations
  – Fewer CO$_2$ reduction
  – More cost
  – Higher marginal cost
  – A separate carbon market?
• Its influence on international trade
  – Empirical works linking low transport cost with growing trade
  – What is the opposite
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