Implementing the EU ETS in Germany

by Franzjosef Schafhausen Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Protection and Nuclear Safety, Berlin

on the occasion of the

Side event "The EU emissions trading scheme: State of the Play"

at the UNFCCC (SBSTA/SBI)

24 May 2006 Bonn

Discussion in Germany is going on...

<u>... in a "business as usual"</u> <u>manner!</u>



<u>But ...</u>

By implementing the EU emissions trading scheme a chain reaction is going on which is changing business culture: Carbon dioxide is moving more and more out of the domain of the environmental officer at a company to the boardroom and the chief financial officer and the chief executive officer.

Germany's Climate Change Programme: Targets and Timetables

| Climate Change related Targets | | Status |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| burden sharing | Reduction of CO_2 , CH_4 , N_2O , HFCs, PFCs and SF_6 by 21 % in the period 2008 – 2012 compared to 1990 and 1995 | Ratification of the KP by national law |
| 2020 target | Reduction of greenhouse gas emissions more than 30 % by 2020 on the condition that the EU agrees to a GHG reduction of 30 % by 2020 (base year 1990). | Contract of the black- red Coalition (2005) |
| Renewables | Doubling the share of renewables by 2010 to primary energy consumption from 2.4 to 5 % and by 2020 to 10 % to electricity generation from 5 % to 12,5 % and by 2020 to 20 % | Renewable Energy Act (2004) |
| СНР | Maintaining, modernising and expanding CHP with the aim of reducing CO ₂ by an additional 10 mill. t and 23 mill. t by 2010 (base year 1998) | CHP – Act (2001) + CHP commitment by German Industries (2001/2004) |
| Energy Efficiency | Doubling the energy productivity of the society by 2020 compared to 1990 | National Strategy on Sustainable Development |

Background

- Germany is close to comply with it's Kyoto target (approximately 19,5 % of 21%)
 - but: important impact of unification (significant emission reduction in the early 90ies, high costs, clear cuts between East and West)
- Germany's energy balance is traditionally based on hard coal and lignite
 - But: the role of renewables and energy efficiency is getting more and more important
- Germany has a successful record in climate policies
 - but: a long and strong tradition on command and control and voluntary agreements

Current emissions trends

- Trend in energy sector since 1999-2004: upwards: plus 31 million t (!)
- Trend in industry: further decrease in CO₂ emissions since 1998 – minus 7 million t
- Trend in private households: tendency towards reduction with very substantial temperature-related deviations (2004: minus 14 million t compared with 1990)
- Trend in transport sector: downward trend since 1999 with private transport (minus 15 million t between 1999 and 2004) but still 8.4 million t higher than in base year 1990
- Conclusion: Germany will not automatically reach its target (minus 21 % in period 2008-2012). Instead, decisions on NAP I and NAP II lead to need for action in remaining sectors "private households" and "transport". The 2005 Climate Protection Programme (13th July 2005) covers areas where action is still needed

<u>The implementation of the ET –</u> <u>scheme in Germany</u>

<u>The EU Trading Scheme – Legal</u>

implementation in Germany

- TEHG Treibhausgasemissionshandelsgesetz (Greenhouse Gas Emissions Trading Act) entered into force on 14. Juli 2004
- ZuG2007 Zuteilungsgesetz2007 (Allocation Act 2007) entered into force on 31. August 2004
- ZuV2007 Zuteilungsverordnung (Allocation Ordinance 2007) entered into force on 1. September 2004
- KostV Kostenverordnung (Cost Ordinance) entered into force on 1. September 2004
- Act on the implementation of the "linking directive" ("ProMechG" - Linkage between the EU – ETS and the Kyoto-Mechanisms "Joint Implementation" and "Clean Development Mechanism") entered into force on 30th september 2005

<u>Under preparation – to be developed:</u>

- NAP II (draft on 13 April 2006) and ZuG2012 (under preparation)
- Act on Reporting and Monitoring KSSG (under preparation)

Consultation Structure

 Working Group "Emissions Trading To Combat the Greenhouse Effect (AGE)"- Permanent Hearing

> Established by the Federal Cabinet on 18 October 2000 under the chairmanship of the Environment Ministry (Chairman: Franzjosef Schafhausen)

> 90 Members: Federal Government, State Governments (*Länder*), Business (Associations as well as Companies), Environmental NGO's, Trade Unions

Subgroups on: Cross-cutting issues, legal implementation, Joint Implementation and Clean Development Mechanism

55 two days lasting meetings held since December 2000.

National Allocation – The Strategic Challenge

 Numerous installations in the energy industry and energyintensive production sectors – 1849 installations covered

> 99 % of CO_2 emissions in public electricity supply 96 % of CO_2 emissions in the industrial energy sector 87 % of process-related CO_2 emissions > 60 % of CO_2 emissions in all other industrial production installations

• ET sector represents 500 million t CO₂

of which 250 million t CO_2 are concentrated among the four largest electricity and energy suppliers: E.ON, RWE, Vattenfall and EnBW.

Definition of the cap





Emission Budgets

| | Period 2005 - 2007 | Period 2008 - 2012 |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| Greenhouse Gases | 974 | 962 |
| CO ₂ - Total | 859 | 846 |
| CO ₂ – E+I | 503 | 495 |
| CO ₂ – Tertiary+HH+T | 356 | 351 |
| CO ₂ - Emissions Trading | 499 | 491 |
| | 495 | |

| Allocation Rules | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| General Allocation Method | Free allocation based on historic emissions (2000 – 2002 for the first period) for both trading periods (2005 – 2007 und 2008 – 2012) multiplied with the compliance factor < 1 |
| | Issuance of allowances in equal annual shares |
| | Special rules for installations commissioned in 2003 and 2004: allocation based on estimated emissions with ex post adjustments to output volume – compliance factor 1 for 12 years. |
| Closure Rules | In case of closure , allowances are cancelled |
| | Operator's obligation to report on closure to the competent authority (DEHSt). |
| | Subsequent cancellation of emissions permit possible. |
| | If actual emissions fall below the allocated amount by 40 %, the allocation will be adjusted ex post |

| Allocation Rules | |
|---|---|
| New Comer Rule (totally new entrants on the german market) | Allocation according to demanding BAT benchmark 750 g CO_2/kWh for power production but not more as to be needed – at least 365 g CO_2/kWh for gas power plants < for 14 years |
| | Reserve for new entrants only. |
| | 2008 – 2012: Compensation for phase-out of nuclear energy under the new installations rule. |
| Early action Rule | Criteria for Early action installations: Improvement of specific CO_2 - emissions (product oriented CO_2 -efficiency) by 7 (1994) to 12 per cent (2002) Installations commissioned between 1. January 1994 and 31 December 2002 are allocated on the basis of compliance factor 1 without specific reduction evidence |
| Malus Rule for old and inefficient power plants | Malus = "efficiency dividend" (additional minus 15 %) for Power plants with very low efficiency rates (lignite fired 31 % resp. 32 % / hard coal fired 36 %) |

| Allocation Rules | |
|------------------|--|
| CHP Rule | Avoidance of negative incentives and prevention of market entry barriers. |
| | For old installations: allocation of 27 t CO ₂ /GWh CHP power |
| | The CHP-allocation is reduced by 5 % if the CHP power production decreases by 1 % (ex post adjustment) |
| | The special CHP-allocation is not applied if the installation gets compliance factor 1 because of early action |
| | For new installations: double benchmark: 750 g CO ₂ /kWh for power and 220 g CO ₂ /kWh (to be discussed further) for heat |
| Transfer Rule | Transfer of allowances from existing installations to be closed to replacement installations (4 years). Following the Transfer Period: compliance factor 1 for 14 additional years. |

| Allocation Rule | |
|--|---|
| Option Rule | Possibility for incumbents to use the New Comer rule (521 installations did) |
| Banking Rule (between 2007 and 2008) | No banking between the first and the second trading period |

<u>Special provisions NAP I (2005 – 2007)</u> <u>– creating burden for the Compliance</u> <u>Factor</u>

• Set aside for new entrants:

3 mio. t CO₂/year

- Compensation for nuclear power: 1.5 mio. t CO₂/year
- Budget for combined heat & power: 2,0 (1.5) mio. t CO₂/year
- Emissions with compliance factor = 1 early action (estimation): 111 (114) mio. t CO₂/year

process-related emissions (steel, lime, cement, glass) process-related emissions (refineries/mineral oil)

64,2 (61) mio. t CO₂/year

7,5 mio. t CO₂/year

Compliance Factor

- Compliance factor 2005 2007: <u>0,9709</u>
- Emission reduction of <u>2.91 %</u> for incumbents compared to baseline period 2000 – 2002
- Compliance factor = 1 for
 - process-related emissions (CO₂-emissions resulting from a chemical reaction and not from a combustion process)
 - installation with "early action" (mainly used for installations in the eastern part of Germany)
 - new installations

Reduction by German Industries?

Yes. But most of the compliance factor is due to distributional effects.

NAP 2005 - 2007

EF = reduction- set aside – process- - Early action – CHP - hardship oriented emissions 0,9709 = 0,9960 - 0,0090 - 0,0034 - 0,0067 - 0,0030 – 0,0030 Reduction Distribution

Results of the Allocation

| Sektor | Number of Installations | | Volume of allowance Trading Period 2005 – 2007 | |
|------------------|-------------------------|--------|--|--------|
| Energy supply | 1.236 | 66,8 % | 1.171 | 78,9 % |
| Industry | 613 | 33,2 % | 314 | 21,1 % |
| total | 1.849 | 100 % | 1.485 | 100 % |

Results of the Allocation



Transaction costs



Results of Allocation

| Activity | Average Allocation per installation | Highest Allocation per installation | Lowest Allocation per installation |
|--------------|---|---|--|
| Energy | 947.196 | 86.001.132 | 12 |
| Steel | 2.591.343 | 21.199.014 | 723 |
| Refineries | 1.981.696 | 10.913.541 | 8.070 |
| Cement | 1.483.454 | 4.450.791 | 107.661 |
| Lime | 414.148 | 6.765.480 | 12.165 |
| Paper & pulp | 122.632 | 1.178.316 | 312 |
| Glass | 156.268 | 834.162 | 6.873 |
| Ceramics | 36.669 | 269.028 | 840 |
| Zellstoff | 1.086.962 | 2.317.182 | 42.193 |
| total | 803.137 | 86.001.132 | 12 |

Installations affected by cutbacks pursuant to Art. 4 (4) and Art. 5 ZuG2007

| Cutback of allocation in % | No. of installations |
|----------------------------|----------------------|
| 0 % | 376 |
| 0 – 2 % | 116 |
| 2 – 4 % | 146 |
| 4 – 6 % | 385 |
| 6 – 7.4 % | 262 |
| 7.4 % | 564 |
| Total | 1,849 |

A unique Compliance Factor?



Institutional Structure

| <u>Task</u> | Actor |
|---|---|
| Supervision (permit and control) | Federal and Regional Governments/Administration – Federal Emissions Trading Authority – DEHSt – Implementation problems between the federal and the regional level |
| Administration – 'competent authority' (Registry – Transaction Log – Inventory) | Government – Federal Emissions Trading Authority – (DEHSt) |
| Trade – trading platform (electronic, like electricity exchange) | Private industry (exchange(s), trading intermediaries, brokers, OTC traders) |
| Monitoring / Verification | State/Private (accredited verifiers) – Federal Emissions Trading Authority |

The allocation process

- poor data availability
 - many installations (complicated definition of installations based on German Clean Air Act - BlmSchG)
 - Scope of the implementation not exactly defined
 - problem: Federal administration vs. Laender administration
 - reference period definition in a very early stage
- political statements/decisions at a very early stage
 - free allocation for all installations (incumbents & new entrants)
 - early action provisions
 - National Allocation Plan must be implemented by an Act (ZuG 2007)
 - No political acceptance for auctioning

The allocation process

- allocation adjustment by fixed cap on a very late stage ("second compliance factor")
- many uncertainties for the operators as well as the administration and policy makers on final allocation
- 58 combinations between the allocation rules possible from the economic point of view a real nightmare
- fixed caps for 2005/2007 and 2008/2012 not only for industry + energy but also for households + small consumers + transport (§ 4 ZuG2007)
- no differentiation between sectors

Consequences

- Relativising the basic cocept on two levels Brussels and Berlin
- Existence of a highly complex an intransparent system (58 combinations of rules used for the first allocation period)
- Contribution to climate protection comparatively small
- Effects of reallocation are considerable
- Although self-inflicted by massive lobbying, there are complaints about the burden caused by business
- Dispute over the consideration of opportunity costs for the calculation of electricity prices

VET - table

- 21 Mio. t gap between the 2005 allocation and the 2005 emissions
- 9 Mio. t reduction (2000/2002 2005)
- 12 Mio. t over allocation (option rule)
- more than 10 Mio. t could be taken back (withdrawal through expost adjustement)
- RWE, E.ON, EnBW are "short"
- Vattenfall is "long"
- Local energy suppliers are "long"
- Industry ist "long" (+ 10,6 %)

VET - table

| Rank ing | Sector/branch | Difference in absolute terms (- = surplus / + = deficit) | in % (- = surplus / + = deficit) |
|-------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | Fibre | - 1.179.000 | - 81,4 % |
| 2 | Ceramics | - 667.500 | - 27,7 % |
| 3 | Paper and pulp | - 785.500 | - 15,7 % |
| 4 | Cement | - 3.661.500 | - 15,4 % |
| 5 | Combustion installations 20 – 50 MW | - 1.532.700 | - 15,4 % |
| 6 | Glass | - 685,700 | - 14,9 % |
| 7 | Iron and steel | - 2.039.000 | - 14,0 % |

VET - table

| Ranking | Sector/branch | Difference in absolute terms (- = surplus / + = deficit) | In % (- = surplus / + = deficit) |
|---------|--|--|--------------------------------------|
| 8 | Compressor | - 248.000 | - 13,2 % |
| 9 | Combustion installations | - 68.200 | - 13,0 % |
| 10 | Lime | - 790.000 | - 8 % |
| 11 | Iron and Steel | - 500.000 | - 3,2 % |
| 12 | Combustion installations > 50 MW | - 7.503.000 | - 2,0 % |
| 14 | Refineries | - 87.000 | - 0,4 % |

<u>Cost-effective possibilities to reduce CO₂ in</u> <u>Germany !? – Opportunities -</u> <u>The Ecofys - Study</u>

| Range of costs (€/t CO ₂ - reduction) | Reduction potential in mill. t CO_2/a |
|---|---|
| < - 10 | 23 |
| - 10 bis 0 | 16 |
| 0 - + 10 | 16 |
| +10 - + 20 | 15 |
| + 20 - + 50 | 19 |

Opportunities of CO₂- emission reduction in

Germany (Lower Saxony – "co2ncept – study" by the

association of enterprises Lower Saxony)

| Installations | Total CO ₂ - emissions | CO ₂ -emission reduction |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 59 | 780.000 t | |
| 41 | | 225.000 t = 28 % technically feasible |
| 29 | | 210.000 t < 10 €/t CO ₂ Compared with the actual price of european allowances (EAU) companies mentoined above could benefit by reducing CO ₂ -emissions ~3 mio €/y |

Federal Ministry for Economics and Labor:

"Marginal Costs of CO₂ – reduction are very much lower than 30 €/t" (letter by Federal Minister Michael Glos, Berlin, 16 May 2006)

So – ET provides the right economic incentives to reduce greenhouse gases

Potenziale – n gestern und heute



* Technik von 1972 (RWE, Niederaußem, 300 MW Block – 35,8%)
+Technik von 1953 (RWE, Frimmerdorf, 150 MW Block – 30,2%)

Potenziale – n gestern und heute





Gasturbine SGT5-8000H

| Brennstoff | Gas, Öl | |
|------------|---------|--|
| Leistung | 340 MW | |

Wirkungsgrad 39 %

GUD-Anlage SCC5-8000H in Irsching/Deutschland Leistung 530 MW Wirkungsgrad 60 % GT Versuchsbetrieb ab 2007 GUD kommerzieller Betrieb ab 2011

The German Government's Position on Flex Mechs

- Priority is given to 'domestic action,
- Use of 'Kyoto mechanisms' supplementary
- Great interest among German industry in the use of JI and CDM
- German Government interest is focussed on 'improved energy efficiency' and 'use of renewable energy, - a "CDM – Initiative" will be started during the nex months
- Wait and see attitude due to the ongoing work in Bruxelles

 reports on "sinks" and "National Compensation Projects" until 30th June 2006
- Germany not in compliance for JI First Track

Present Situation in Germany

| | CDM | JI – Germany as investor country | JI – Germany as host country |
|---|-------------|--|------------------------------------|
| Number of projects | 47 | 47 | 65 |
| Endorsed | 14 | 4 | 15 |
| Approved | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Indirect participation | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| expected reduction in CO ₂ -equivalents | 58,8 Mio. t | | 20 Mio. t |

<u>CDM – Projects (Germany as investor</u> <u>country)</u>

| Type of project | number |
|-------------------|--------|
| Energy efficiency | 22 |
| Renewables | 10 |
| CH ₄ | 5 |
| N ₂ O | 5 |
| HFC's | 3 |
| others | 2 |

CDM-Projects (Germany as investor country)

| Country/region | number |
|-----------------------|--------|
| China | 11 |
| India | 6 |
| Other Asian countries | 11 |
| Africa | 9 |
| Latin America | 8 |
| Other countries | 2 |

<u>JI – Projects (Germany as investor</u> <u>country)</u>

| Country/region | Number |
|----------------|--------|
| Russia | 19 |
| Ukraine | 17 |
| Bulgaria | 4 |
| Romania | 2 |
| Poland | 3 |
| Others | 2 |

Negotiations on MoU's

• <u>CDM</u>

Brasilia, Chile, China, Cuba, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Ghana, India, Israel, Columbia, Morocco, Mexico, Moldavia, Panama, Pakistan, South Africa, Thailand, Tunesia, Vietnam,

• <u>JI</u>

Bulgaria, Latvia, New Zealand, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Ukraine, Hungary



Main stream on the EU Level

- One Directive but 25 National Allocation Plans
- Harmonisation strongly needed
- First come first served basis for new entrants
- Sectoral differentiation
- Auctionioning used only in some MS (Ireland, Denmark, Hungary) but there is an interest
- Benchmarking for incumbents without fuel differentiation (unique emissions factor – unique load factor)
- Not ex post adjustments

Germany's starting point

The framework for NAP II

- no modification of the EU Directive
- no ex post adjustment (NAP guidance 22 december 2005)
- Coverage of additional installations
- NAP II has to be more reliable and more transparent
- NAP II has to be less complex
- Special provisions have to be reduced
- the Problem of the windfall profits caused by the calculation of the Opportunity – costs has to be solved
- Facilitation for small emitters simplifying application, monitoring and allocation

The Contract of the black-red Coalition (11th November 2005)

- more Transparency
- more Simplicity
- less comprehensivness
- reducing of the number of special provisions
- Solving the opportunity costs problem
- Avoiding distortions of the competition
- Supporting the inclusion of the aviation

Burden for the second trading period

| • | Early action | 56 Mio. |
|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| • | Transfer provision § 10 ZuG2007 | 2 Mio. ⁻ |
| • | New entrants § 11 ZuG2007 | 20 Mio. |
| • | New entrants in 2003/2004 § 8 ZuG2007 | 19 Mio. [•] |
| • | volume of emissions with CF 1 | 102 Mio. |
| • | KfW-Mechanism | 5 Mio. |
| • | volume of emissions with CF 0,9875 | |
| • | volume of emissions with CF 0,85 | |
| | | |

- annual reserve for the second trading period
 10 Mio. t
- annual budget to cover the administration costs 2 Mio. t
- allocation to small emitters (CF = 1)
 6 Mio. t
- CHP provision (CF = 0,9875) 60 Mio. t

The Macro Plan

- Cap for installations under the Emissions Trading Scheme: 495,5 mio. t CO₂/a
- Cap includes small emitters and additional industrial-scale installation (nap guidance 22 december 2005)
- Reduction performance: households, transport, Trade/Commercial/Services: additional reduction of 7 mio. t/a CO2 for the 2008 – 2012 trading period (base year 2004)
- General allocation method: grandfathering = allocation on the basis of average emissions during a reference period
- Reference period: 2000 2005 levelling out of extraordinary developments

<u>Compliance factor – sectoral</u> <u>differentiation</u>

- Industry including the additional installations (NAP guidance on 22 december 2005) and industrial and public CHP: 0,9875 of the average emissions amount in the reference period (reasons: strong international competition, limited possibilities to avoid CO₂-emissions because of process related emissions)
- Energy supply: 0,85 (low international competition, high windfall profits)
- Compliance Factor 1: small emitters, new entrants under the new comer rules (§ 8 ZuG2007 + § 11 ZuG2007), new entrants under the transfer rule, early action installations

New entrants

New comers

- Compliance Factor 1 = Allocation 100 % free of charge for new installations with highly efficient technology (bat benchmarks) – exemption from compliance factor for 14 years
- CHP: double benchmark for power and heat

Tranfer Rule for installations which replace others

- Transfer of allowances from existing installations to be closed to replacement installations (4 years). Following the Transfer Period: compliance factor 1 for 10 additional years.
- Installations which replace others and already have a permit in accordance with the Federal Immissions Control Act (BImSchG) receive their allocations pursuant to the transfer rule of the Allocation Act 2007



- 10 mio. t CO₂/a for new entrants not applying for the transfer rule
- A small proportion of 2 mio. t CO₂/a will be sold to finance the costs of the system (administration of JI/CDM + "KfW-Mechanism")

Special provisions

- Process related emissions: sectoral differentiation takes process-related emissions into account – Compliance Factor hardly ambitious – no special process related emissions provision
- Small emitters: simplifying application and monitoring. Compliance factor 1 for emitters with average CO₂emissions during the reference period lower than 25.000 t CO₂/a
- Option rule: waived
- Hardship clause (§ 7 (10) ZuG2007): waived
- Early action: early action rule of NAP I expires
- CHP: 98,75 % allocation (promotion of climate friendly technologies)

Special provisions

- Malus rule: continues
- Closure rule: Avoiding closure bonuses beyond the respective trading period – satisfactory solution to the problem of partial closure
- JI/CDM: threshold 12 % of the volume of allowances allocated for the whole trading period (300 Mio. t CO₂ 2008 -2012)
- No ex post adjustments

Thank's for listening

Current Information and Assistance

Information on current developments, documents for download, findings of the Working Group Emissions Trading As A Means To Combating Climate Change:

http: www.bmu.de

http://www.umweltbundesamt.de/emissionshandel