

# Updating the EU Emissions Trading System

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

## Introduction

---

The [European Green Deal](#), adopted by the Commission in December 2019, has tackling climate change and reaching the objectives of the Paris Agreement and other environmental issues (including addressing air pollution) at its core. The [2050 climate neutrality objective, which the Commission proposed in 2018](#) and the [European Council](#) and [Parliament](#) endorsed, is one of its central elements. [The Commission has proposed to enshrine climate neutrality into EU law](#). In order to set the EU on a sustainable path to achieve climate neutrality by 2050, the Commission has proposed in the Communication on stepping up the [EU's 2030 climate ambition](#) an EU-wide, economy-wide net greenhouse gas emissions reduction target of at least 55% in 2030 (compared to 1990).

Building on the existing 2030 legislation and the Communication on stepping up the EU's 2030 climate ambition, the Commission will review and propose to revise, where necessary, the key relevant legislation by June 2021. This will include a coherent set of changes to, notably, the EU Emissions Trading System Directive, the Effort Sharing Regulation and the Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF) Regulation, CO2 Emissions Performance Standards for Cars and Vans and, the Renewable Energy Directive and the Energy Efficiency Directive.

This consultation focuses on the [EU Emissions Trading System \(EU ETS\)](#), a key tool for reducing greenhouse-gas emissions and achieving the EU's climate targets. The EU ETS is a cap-and-trade system that currently governs 41% of the EU's emissions, covering power and heat generation, energy-intensive industrial sectors and aviation within the European Economic Area and to/from Switzerland. The Communication on stepping up the EU's 2030 climate ambition explicitly indicates the need to revise the EU ETS in light of the aforementioned more ambitious target. This includes the extension of the EU ETS to new sectors, such as the maritime sector, which is a sector that requires a basket of measures to ensure its fair contribution to the climate neutrality goal by 2050. Furthermore, emissions trading system could be expanded to road transport and buildings, and potentially all fossil fuel use.

**This public consultation invites citizens and organisations to contribute to the assessment of how to translate the increased EU 2030 emission reduction ambition into an upgraded, more ambitious, workable and realistic ETS. The results of the consultation (which will be summarised and published) will inform the Impact Assessment, accompanying the Commission proposal for revising the ETS.** There are additional parallel public consultations on the review of the LULUCF Regulation, of the CO2 Emissions Performance Standards for Cars and Vans and of the Effort Sharing Regulation.

## Guidance on the questionnaire

---

This public consultation consists of some introductory questions related to your profile, followed by a questionnaire. **Please note that you are not obliged to respond to all questions in the questionnaire.**

The Commission already held an [open public consultation on the 2030 Climate Target Plan](#), which was open for 12 weeks from 31 March to 23 June 2020. Many high-level questions related to the increased climate ambition were asked in the context of that consultation. **The present questionnaire therefore focuses on more specialised and detailed questions on the ETS design required to best achieve the revised target.**

At the end of the questionnaire, you are invited to provide any additional comments and to upload additional information, position papers or policy briefs that express the position or views of yourself or your organisation.

The results of the questionnaire as well as the uploaded position papers and policy briefs will be published online. Please read the specific privacy statement attached to this consultation informing on how personal data and contributions will be dealt with.

In the interest of transparency, if you are replying on behalf of an organisation, please register with the register of interest representatives if you have not already done so. Registering commits you to complying with a Code of Conduct. If you do not wish to register, your contribution will be treated and published together with those received from individuals.

## About you

---

### \* Language of my contribution

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech
- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Irish
- Italian
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Maltese
- Polish
- Portuguese

- Romanian
- Slovak
- Slovenian
- Spanish
- Swedish

\* I am giving my contribution as

- Academic/research institution
- Business association
- Company/business organisation
- Consumer organisation
- EU citizen
- Environmental organisation
- Non-EU citizen
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Public authority
- Trade union
- Other

\* First name

Emmanuel

\* Surname

DESPLECHIN

\* Email (this won't be published)

desplechin@epure.org

\* Organisation name

*255 character(s) maximum*

ePURE - European Renewable Ethanol

\* Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

*255 character(s) maximum*

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

32591134448-30

\* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

- |  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan                      | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti                            | <input type="radio"/> Libya            | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin                                 |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands                    | <input type="radio"/> Dominica                            | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein    | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon                    |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania                          | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic                  | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania        | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines             |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria                          | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador                             | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg       | <input type="radio"/> Samoa  |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa                   | <input type="radio"/> Egypt                               | <input type="radio"/> Macau            | <input type="radio"/> San Marino                                   |
| <input type="radio"/> Andorra                          | <input type="radio"/> El Salvador                         | <input type="radio"/> Madagascar       | <input type="radio"/> São Tomé and Príncipe                        |
| <input type="radio"/> Angola                           | <input type="radio"/> Equatorial Guinea                   | <input type="radio"/> Malawi           | <input type="radio"/> Saudi Arabia                                 |
| <input type="radio"/> Anguilla                         | <input type="radio"/> Eritrea                             | <input type="radio"/> Malaysia         | <input type="radio"/> Senegal                                      |
| <input type="radio"/> Antarctica                       | <input type="radio"/> Estonia                             | <input type="radio"/> Maldives         | <input type="radio"/> Serbia                                       |
| <input type="radio"/> Antigua and Barbuda              | <input type="radio"/> Eswatini                            | <input type="radio"/> Mali             | <input type="radio"/> Seychelles                                   |
| <input type="radio"/> Argentina                        | <input type="radio"/> Ethiopia                            | <input type="radio"/> Malta            | <input type="radio"/> Sierra Leone                                 |
| <input type="radio"/> Armenia                          | <input type="radio"/> Falkland Islands                    | <input type="radio"/> Marshall Islands | <input type="radio"/> Singapore                                    |
| <input type="radio"/> Aruba                            | <input type="radio"/> Faroe Islands                       | <input type="radio"/> Martinique       | <input type="radio"/> Sint Maarten                                 |
| <input type="radio"/> Australia                        | <input type="radio"/> Fiji                                | <input type="radio"/> Mauritania       | <input type="radio"/> Slovakia                                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Austria                          | <input type="radio"/> Finland                             | <input type="radio"/> Mauritius        | <input type="radio"/> Slovenia                                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Azerbaijan                       | <input type="radio"/> France                              | <input type="radio"/> Mayotte          | <input type="radio"/> Solomon Islands                              |
| <input type="radio"/> Bahamas                          | <input type="radio"/> French Guiana                       | <input type="radio"/> Mexico           | <input type="radio"/> Somalia                                      |
| <input type="radio"/> Bahrain                          | <input type="radio"/> French Polynesia                    | <input type="radio"/> Micronesia       | <input type="radio"/> South Africa                                 |
| <input type="radio"/> Bangladesh                       | <input type="radio"/> French Southern and Antarctic Lands | <input type="radio"/> Moldova          | <input type="radio"/> South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Barbados                         | <input type="radio"/> Gabon                               | <input type="radio"/> Monaco           | <input type="radio"/> South Korea                                  |
| <input type="radio"/> Belarus                          | <input type="radio"/> Georgia                             | <input type="radio"/> Mongolia         | <input type="radio"/> South Sudan                                  |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Belgium               | <input type="radio"/> Germany                             | <input type="radio"/> Montenegro       | <input type="radio"/> Spain  |
| <input type="radio"/> Belize                           | <input type="radio"/> Ghana                               | <input type="radio"/> Montserrat       | <input type="radio"/> Sri Lanka                                    |
| <input type="radio"/> Benin                            | <input type="radio"/> Gibraltar                           | <input type="radio"/> Morocco          | <input type="radio"/> Sudan  |
| <input type="radio"/> Bermuda                          | <input type="radio"/> Greece                              | <input type="radio"/> Mozambique       | <input type="radio"/> Suriname                                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Bhutan                           | <input type="radio"/> Greenland                           | <input type="radio"/> Myanmar/Burma    | <input type="radio"/> Svalbard and Jan Mayen                       |
| <input type="radio"/> Bolivia                          | <input type="radio"/> Grenada                             | <input type="radio"/> Namibia          | <input type="radio"/> Sweden                                       |
| <input type="radio"/> Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba | <input type="radio"/> Guadeloupe                          | <input type="radio"/> Nauru            | <input type="radio"/> Switzerland                                  |
| <input type="radio"/> Bosnia and Herzegovina           | <input type="radio"/> Guam                                | <input type="radio"/> Nepal            | <input type="radio"/> Syria  |
| <input type="radio"/> Botswana                         | <input type="radio"/> Guatemala                           | <input type="radio"/> Netherlands      | <input type="radio"/> Taiwan                                       |
| <input type="radio"/> Bouvet Island                    | <input type="radio"/> Guernsey                            | <input type="radio"/> New Caledonia    | <input type="radio"/> Tajikistan                                   |
| <input type="radio"/> Brazil                           | <input type="radio"/> Guinea                              | <input type="radio"/> New Zealand      | <input type="radio"/> Tanzania                                     |
| <input type="radio"/>                                  | <input type="radio"/> Guinea-Bissau                       | <input type="radio"/> Nicaragua        | <input type="radio"/> Thailand                                     |

British Indian Ocean  
Territory

- |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> British Virgin Islands              | <input type="radio"/> Guyana                               | <input type="radio"/> Niger   | <input type="radio"/> The Gambia                              |
| <input type="radio"/> Brunei                              | <input type="radio"/> Haiti                                | <input type="radio"/> Nigeria   | <input type="radio"/> Timor-Leste                             |
| <input type="radio"/> Bulgaria                            | <input type="radio"/> Heard Island and<br>McDonald Islands | <input type="radio"/> Niue  | <input type="radio"/> Togo                                    |
| <input type="radio"/> Burkina Faso                        | <input type="radio"/> Honduras                             | <input type="radio"/> Norfolk Island                                    | <input type="radio"/> Tokelau                                 |
| <input type="radio"/> Burundi                             | <input type="radio"/> Hong Kong                            | <input type="radio"/> Northern Mariana<br>Islands                       | <input type="radio"/> Tonga                                   |
| <input type="radio"/> Cambodia                            | <input type="radio"/> Hungary                              | <input type="radio"/> North Korea                                       | <input type="radio"/> Trinidad and Tobago                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Cameroon                            | <input type="radio"/> Iceland                              | <input type="radio"/> North Macedonia                                   | <input type="radio"/> Tunisia                                 |
| <input type="radio"/> Canada                              | <input type="radio"/> India                                | <input type="radio"/> Norway  | <input type="radio"/> Turkey                                  |
| <input type="radio"/> Cape Verde                          | <input type="radio"/> Indonesia                            | <input type="radio"/> Oman  | <input type="radio"/> Turkmenistan                            |
| <input type="radio"/> Cayman Islands                      | <input type="radio"/> Iran                                 | <input type="radio"/> Pakistan  | <input type="radio"/> Turks and Caicos<br>Islands             |
| <input type="radio"/> Central African<br>Republic         | <input type="radio"/> Iraq                                 | <input type="radio"/> Palau   | <input type="radio"/> Tuvalu                                  |
| <input type="radio"/> Chad                                | <input type="radio"/> Ireland                              | <input type="radio"/> Palestine   | <input type="radio"/> Uganda                                  |
| <input type="radio"/> Chile                               | <input type="radio"/> Isle of Man                          | <input type="radio"/> Panama  | <input type="radio"/> Ukraine                                 |
| <input type="radio"/> China                               | <input type="radio"/> Israel                               | <input type="radio"/> Papua New Guinea                                  | <input type="radio"/> United Arab Emirates                    |
| <input type="radio"/> Christmas Island                    | <input type="radio"/> Italy                                | <input type="radio"/> Paraguay  | <input type="radio"/> United Kingdom                          |
| <input type="radio"/> Clipperton                          | <input type="radio"/> Jamaica                              | <input type="radio"/> Peru  | <input type="radio"/> United States                           |
| <input type="radio"/> Cocos (Keeling)<br>Islands          | <input type="radio"/> Japan                                | <input type="radio"/> Philippines                                       | <input type="radio"/> United States Minor<br>Outlying Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Colombia                            | <input type="radio"/> Jersey                               | <input type="radio"/> Pitcairn Islands                                  | <input type="radio"/> Uruguay                                 |
| <input type="radio"/> Comoros                             | <input type="radio"/> Jordan                               | <input type="radio"/> Poland  | <input type="radio"/> US Virgin Islands                       |
| <input type="radio"/> Congo                               | <input type="radio"/> Kazakhstan                           | <input type="radio"/> Portugal  | <input type="radio"/> Uzbekistan                              |
| <input type="radio"/> Cook Islands                        | <input type="radio"/> Kenya                                | <input type="radio"/> Puerto Rico                                       | <input type="radio"/> Vanuatu                                 |
| <input type="radio"/> Costa Rica                          | <input type="radio"/> Kiribati                             | <input type="radio"/> Qatar   | <input type="radio"/> Vatican City                            |
| <input type="radio"/> Côte d'Ivoire                       | <input type="radio"/> Kosovo                               | <input type="radio"/> Réunion   | <input type="radio"/> Venezuela                               |
| <input type="radio"/> Croatia                             | <input type="radio"/> Kuwait                               | <input type="radio"/> Romania   | <input type="radio"/> Vietnam                                 |
| <input type="radio"/> Cuba                                | <input type="radio"/> Kyrgyzstan                           | <input type="radio"/> Russia  | <input type="radio"/> Wallis and Futuna                       |
| <input type="radio"/> Curaçao                             | <input type="radio"/> Laos                                 | <input type="radio"/> Rwanda  | <input type="radio"/> Western Sahara                          |
| <input type="radio"/> Cyprus                              | <input type="radio"/> Latvia                               | <input type="radio"/> Saint Barthélemy                                  | <input type="radio"/> Yemen                                   |
| <input type="radio"/> Czechia                             | <input type="radio"/> Lebanon                              | <input type="radio"/> Saint Helena<br>Ascension and<br>Tristan da Cunha | <input type="radio"/> Zambia                                  |
| <input type="radio"/> Democratic Republic<br>of the Congo | <input type="radio"/> Lesotho                              | <input type="radio"/> Saint Kitts and Nevis                             | <input type="radio"/> Zimbabwe                                |
| <input type="radio"/> Denmark                             | <input type="radio"/> Liberia                              | <input type="radio"/> Saint Lucia                                       |   |

**Type of organisation (please select the option that fits best):**

- Private enterprise
- Professional consultancy, law firm, self-employed consultant
- Trade, business or professional association
- Non-governmental organisation, platform or network
- Research and academia
-

- Social partners
- National, regional or local authority (mixed)
  - Other

**Please indicate the economic sector you are active in (as an individual or as an organisation)**

- Agriculture, Hunting and Forestry
- Financial Intermediation
- Fishing
- Real Estate, Renting and Business Activities
- Mining and Quarrying
- Public Administration and Defence
- Manufacturing
- Education
- Electricity, Gas and Water Supply
- Health and Social Work
- Construction
- Other Community, Social and Personal Services
- Wholesale and Retail Trade
- Activities of Private Households as Employers
- Hotels and Restaurants
- Extraterritorial Organisations and Bodies
- Transport, Storage and Communications
- Other

If other, please specify:

Renewable energy

**If you are a civil society organisation or a public administration, please indicate your main area of focus or your area of competence:**

*1000 character(s) maximum*

**\* Publication privacy settings**

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

- Anonymous**  
Only your contribution, country of origin and the respondent type profile that you selected will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.
- Public**  
Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

## A. The Contribution of EU ETS to the overall climate ambition for 2030

The Commission has proposed to increase the net economy-wide target to reduce greenhouse gas emissions ('GHG') domestically by at least 55% by 2030 compared to 1990. Currently, consistent with the EU-wide GHG emission reduction target of 40% in 2030 (compared to 1990), the ETS Directive puts a cap on emissions to ensure that the sectors covered by the EU ETS will reduce their emissions by 43%, as compared to 2005, by 2030. To achieve the increased economy-wide target, also the ETS's contribution will have to be increased and changes to fundamental aspects of the EU ETS may be required, including the cap on emissions and the measures in place to protect against the risk of carbon leakage.

### 1. With the increased 2030 GHG reduction ambition of at least 55%, what should be the current EU ETS sectors' contribution to the increased 2030 target (i.e. without the accounting for the possible inclusion of new sectors)?

- The current ETS sectors should increase their current ETS contribution (compared to 2005) in line with the new target. Based on cost-efficiency considerations as calculated in the Impact Assessment accompanying the Communication on stepping up the EU's 2030 climate ambition ([table 26](#)), the current ETS sectors should contribute around -63% compared to 2005
- The contribution of the current ETS sectors should be more than what their potential for cost-efficient emissions reductions would indicate
- The contribution of the current ETS sectors should be more than 43% reductions (compared to 2005) but less than what their potential for cost-effective emissions reductions would indicate
- Other

Please specify:

*1000 character(s) maximum*

In order to meet the higher climate ambitions set in the Climate Target Plan, the emissions reduction target for sectors covered by the ETS should be increased. According to the EEA Report No 13/2020, the level of ambition displayed by Members States – either with existing or additional measures – will not be enough to achieve the current ETS 2030 target. Even more, even with those planned measures, Member States would still fail to achieve the previously EU overall target of 40% GHG emissions reduction in 2030: the contribution of both policies should be increased.

### 2. A strengthened EU ETS 2030 ambition can be achieved through different combinations of policy options. Considering the current EU ETS sectors, please rate the following aspects in terms of relevance? Please rate from 1 (not important) to 5 (very important):

	1	2	3	4	5
Strengthen the cap through the increase of the linear reduction factor	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Strengthen the cap through a one-off reduction ('rebasement of the cap')	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A combination of increasing the linear reduction factor and a one-off reduction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cancelling allowances held in the Market Stability Reserve (MSR) [The Market Stability Reserve is further explained in section E of this survey]	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Maintain the increased feeding rate of the MSR after 2023	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Early application of a strengthened cap (e.g. 2023 instead of later)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other, please specify in the box below	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### 3. In view of a strengthened ETS cap and thus a decreasing absolute volume of allowances available for auctioning and free allocation, how should the total cap be divided?

- The current auction share of 57% should be maintained
- The auction share should be increased and free allocation decreased
- Other

## B. Addressing the risk of carbon leakage

---

*Current rules foresee the continuation of the free allocation until 2030 based on updated benchmark values. In the European Green Deal, the Commission announced it would propose, for selected sectors, a Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism should differences in levels of ambition worldwide persist, as the EU increases its [climate ambition](#). Such measure would be an alternative to the measures that address the risk of carbon leakage in the EU's Emissions Trading System. Furthermore, an increased ambition for the EU ETS and hence a lower cap of allowances under the ETS would impact the amount of allowances available for free allocation in any case.*

### 4. Do you believe the current carbon leakage framework addressing direct carbon costs, consisting of free allocation, should be maintained, amended or replaced? Multiple answers are possible

- The current carbon leakage protection framework should be maintained without changes
- The current carbon leakage protection framework should be modified by targeting the support even more to the sectors most at risk
- For selected sectors, the current carbon leakage framework should be replaced by a Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism
- Free allocation should be made conditional to beneficiaries carrying out investments for reducing their GHG emissions
- Other measures to further incentivise GHG reductions should be introduced

Please explain your answer:

*1000 character(s) maximum*

All possible options to reinforce a level playing field by free allocation or by additional policy instruments must be assessed. The current framework does not sufficiently address the risk of carbon leakage under the EU ETS. A complementary Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism could be effective in addressing the risk of carbon leakage while ensuring a level playing field between EU and third-countries producers. However, such a mechanism should only take the form of a tax applied to imports at the EU border on a selection of products whose production is in sectors at high risk of carbon leakage. All other design options, including an extension of the EU ETS to imports or a carbon tax at consumption level applying to both EU production and imports, would risk adding burden on EU producers.

*EU ETS benchmark values reflect the average emission intensities of the 10% best installations covered by the ETS per product. These benchmark values will be updated for the periods 2021–2025 and 2026–2030 by considering the actual improvements of the installations' performances. However, the annual update*



rate is limited to a value between 0.2% and 1.6% per year. The annual update rate reflects the improvements in each sector between 2007–2008 and 2016–2017 and results in a reduction of the benchmarks applied for calculating the free allocation received by each installation.

**5. In view of the likely lower amount of allowances available for free allocation, (due to increased ETS target) which of the following aspects in relation to the benchmark-based allocation do you consider most relevant? Please rate from 1 (not important) to 5 (very important):**

	1	2	3	4	5
Modified method to determine benchmark values to ensure faster incorporation of innovation and technological progress (e.g. by not limiting the annual reduction rate for each benchmark when updating benchmark values)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Additional product benchmarks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Revised definitions of product benchmarks to incentivise innovation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased transparency regarding benchmark values and process via mandatory publication of underlying data by industry	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other, please specify in the box below	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*Member States can compensate certain electro-intensive sectors for the indirect costs passed on through electricity prices (indirect cost compensation, the ETS Directive currently states that Member States should limit the amount they spend on indirect cost compensation to 25% of their auction revenues. This compensation is subject to State aid rules and as such not granted in all countries. Multiple responses possible.*

**6. Should the approach to indirect cost compensation be modified?**

- Yes, the rapidly on-going decarbonisation of the electricity production in the EU will sufficiently reduce indirect costs and therefore, indirect cost compensation can be gradually phased out
- Yes, indirect cost compensation should be further harmonised in Europe, sectors exposed to the risk carbon leakage due to indirect costs should be compensated equally regardless of the Member State where they are active
- Yes, the approach to indirect cost compensation should remain the same, but additional requirements should be set to ensure that Member States granting it do not spend more than a given percentage of their auctioning revenues on it
- No, Member States should maintain flexibility to grant indirect cost compensation or not, subject to State Aid control

## C. An increasing role for emissions trading

---

*An expansion of emissions trading could include emissions from fossil fuel combustion in road transport and buildings. Depending on the administrative systems chosen, the portion of industry currently not included in the ETS could also be brought in. The Commission will look, inter alia, at the option to cover all emissions of fossil fuel combustion under the ETS, while taking into account potential effects on existing EU legislation in this field.*

*In the context of the impact assessment work for the Communication on stepping up the EU's 2030 climate ambition, difficulties emerged as to regulating emitters themselves in a number of sectors being examined for possible ETS application in the same manner as in the current ETS sectors (downstream approach), because these emitters number in the millions and are often private persons. Instead, entities further up the supply chain such as the fuel distributors or tax warehouses could be regulated and be required to monitor and report emissions as well as surrender allowances (upstream approach).*

*The EU ETS has shown that the development of a new market requires setting up functioning monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) and can benefit from transitional arrangements for market and price stability reasons, before being gradually integrated into the existing system. Transitional arrangements for an extension of ETS scope would allow for setting up gradually the required regulatory framework and administrative capacity.*

**7. Carbon pricing alone does not address all barriers to the deployment of low and zero emissions solutions. Which other policies should be deployed when extending the use of emissions trading to emissions from buildings, road transport or all fossil fuel combustion? Please rate from 1 (not important) to 5 (very important):**

	1	2	3	4	5
Polices addressing energy performance of buildings, the energy savings obligation, or other energy efficiency policies to be specified in the box below	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
CO2-standards for cars and vans	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Transport policies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Renewable energy policies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Energy taxation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Other, please specify in the box below	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Please specify:

*1000 character(s) maximum*

All the policies listed above should urgently be deployed. The climate and renewable energy targets of some of those policies, including the RED, must be increased for better alignment with the EU higher climate ambitions. Others, such as the ETD and CO2 standards for cars and vans must be revised in order to integrate the CO2 content and the biogenic content of fuels, thus better reflecting the real environmental performance of biofuels.

However, these actions should not be conditioned by the extension of the ETS to road transport, and their revision should be carried out independently.

**8. Emissions trading for road transport and buildings or all fossil fuel use could be integrated into the existing EU ETS so that there would be one single system covering emissions from all these sectors. If the new sectors are integrated into the current EU ETS such integration would be (multiple answers are possible):**

- Positive, because it would capture the emissions under the cap and facilitate more cost-effective abatement by increasing abatement options

- Positive, because including buildings into an extended EU ETS would provide a level playing field for all modes of heating and cooling
- Positive, because including fossil fuels used in road transport into an extended EU ETS would provide a level playing field for all modes of road and rail transport, including electric rail which is already subject to indirect carbon pricing
- Positive, because setting a separate ETS for road transport and/or buildings or all fossil fuel use would lead to higher administrative costs for administrations and regulated entities
- Positive, because including emissions from all fossil fuel use into an extended EU ETS would provide a uniform carbon price signal for all industries
- Negative, because there could be an insufficient price signal for the transport and building sector to decarbonise
- Negative, because the new sectors are too different from the current sectors and abatement effort will mainly materialise in the current ETS sectors
- Negative, as the integration of the new sectors in the current ETS might disrupt and undermine the stability of the current ETS
- Other

Please specify:

*1000 character(s) maximum*

In a single ETS there would be a single carbon price. In this system, price of allowances would increase (lower cap, more sectors), but would still remain insufficient to actually incentivise reductions in the road transport sector. Indeed, the carbon abatement cost of road transport solutions remains significantly higher: even the most cost-efficient solutions – biofuels– still range in the hundreds of EUR/tCO<sub>2</sub> abated, ruling them out as viable options for fuel suppliers. The burden of emission reduction would be shifted to current ETS sectors: emission reduction may happen but mainly in the industrial/energy sector. Depending on the emissions ceiling, price of allowances could increase up to 70-80 EUR/tCO<sub>2</sub>, raising fuel costs by about 20 cts/l which would be passed onto consumers, impacting average to low-income households and lower GDP MS. In order to be socially acceptable, this change of policy framework requires complementary measures addressing distributional changes.

**9. A separate EU-wide emissions trading system for road transport and buildings or all fossil fuel use could be established as a parallel system to the current EU ETS. Flexibilities could be built in, e. g. to allow partial fungibility between the allowances of the separate systems. What is your preferred design option for the relationship between these two systems:**

- Both systems should stay independent and no relationship between them should be established
- One-way flexibilities between the systems will increase cost-efficiency
- Two-way flexibilities between the systems will increase cost-efficiency
- Other

Please specify:

*1000 character(s) maximum*

Contrary to the all-in-one approach, a separate ETS system for road transport would result in carbon allowance price levels around 200-250 EUR/tonne CO<sub>2</sub>, de facto allowing the deployment of solutions despite higher carbon abatement costs in transport. However, it would imply that the impact on the fuel price paid for by the consumers are much higher, as high as 50-60 cents/litre. A possible remedy of this problem would be to allocate some of the ETS revenues to the deployment of renewables solutions, or to combine the extension of ETS with a revamping of the ETD in

which the volumetric tax is replaced by a CO2 tax base. Such taxation could help to incentivise the use of renewable fuels and provide consumers with less-costly low-carbon fuel alternatives. However, this may likely be insufficient to bridge the gap between solutions, as the spread in the carbon abatement costs of the road transport decarbonisation solutions remains wide.

**10. Establishing a separate EU-wide emissions trading system for road transport and buildings or all fossil fuels will require choosing its main features. Which of the following aspects of the new ETS do you consider should be similar to the current ETS in order to allow for a later integration? Please rate from 1 (very similar) to 5 (very different):**

	1	2	3	4	5
The level of ambition for emissions reduction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The linear reduction factor	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Provisions to address distributional aspects, i.e. how revenues are divided and used	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Provisions to address carbon leakage issues in the energy intensive industry where appropriate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Monitoring, reporting and verification rules	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The infrastructure to be used (e.g. the use of the existing EU ETS infrastructure such as the Union Registry)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Application of the market stability provisions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**11. Emissions trading for road transport and buildings or all fossil fuels could be gradually integrated into the existing EU ETS. Should the ETS revision already determine when and how such integration will take place?**

- Yes, the market needs certainty and legislation should determine that integration will happen at a specific time within , e.g., 5 years from its entry into force
- Yes, the legislation should foresee a review to determine whether and when integration is desirable
- No, in view of the risks associated the legislation should not foresee such integration
- Other

Please specify:

*1000 character(s) maximum*

A direct inclusion of road transport in the existing ETS is not suited to decarbonise the road transport sector because it gives too much leeway to operators to achieve their objective whilst a successful decarbonisation policy in transport must ensure a total coherence of actions between car manufacturers, fuel suppliers and retailers. A separate ETS for road transport would seriously disrupt the existing growing synergy between stakeholders. The situation would be worse should transport be integrated in a single ETS.

## D. Extension to Maritime greenhouse gas emissions

*While CO2 emissions from EU's international maritime transport are being monitored, reported and verified under the dedicated EU MRV System, they are not covered by the EU ETS or other EU climate legislation, contrary to the EU's international commitment to economy-wide action under the Paris Agreement.*

*In line with the European Green Deal communication, the Commission will assess carbon pricing options to ensure that the price of waterborne transport reflects the impact it has on climate. In addition, the Commission will consider including at least intra-EU maritime transport in the EU ETS, as stated in the communication on stepping up Europe's 2030 climate ambition, to ensure the sector contributes to the emission reductions needed.*

*As carbon pricing will not be able to address all barriers to the deployment of low and zero emissions solutions, a basket of other complementary policy actions at EU level are needed to trigger further investments in clean energy technologies and infrastructure. The existing legislative framework, the ongoing reviews and announced revisions of other related pieces of legislation, including on mobility, transport fuels, or Energy Taxation Directive, will be taken into account to ensure synergies of instruments. Due to the international nature of maritime transport, international cooperation is desirable, notably at the International Maritime Organization.*

**12. What is your opinion on the most appropriate measure to put a price on GHG emissions from EU maritime transport activities?**

- Extension of the EU ETS to cover maritime transport
- A specific ETS system just for maritime transport
- A tax at EU level on GHG emissions from maritime transport
- Other

**13. Decarbonisation of the maritime transport to ensure its fair contribution to EU climate targets will require a basket of measures across different policy areas, including putting a price on carbon emissions from shipping. Do you think that EU carbon pricing measures in the maritime sector (such as an ETS or a tax on GHG emissions from maritime transport) should be combined with EU emission standards for ships (notably technical or operational carbon intensity standards)?**

*at most 1 choice(s)*

- Yes
- No, emission standards are sufficient and should be implemented alone
- No, carbon pricing is sufficient and should be implemented alone
- I do not know

**14. The impacts of EU carbon pricing for the maritime sector, in particular its environmental effectiveness, will directly depend on the design elements for the selected measure. Please select the most appropriate design option for a EU carbon pricing policy for maritime transport under each of the categories listed below.**

**Regulated Entities**

- Carbon price should be paid by ship commercial operators
- Carbon price should be paid by ship owners
- Other

## Exemptions

- The International Maritime Organisation has energy efficiency measures (the Energy Efficiency Design Index for new ships and the Ship Energy Efficiency Management Plan for existing ships) in place for ships of 400GT and above. Therefore, only ships below 400 GT should be excluded.
- In line with the EU MRV System for shipping, ships below 5000 GT should be excluded, as they are only responsible for about 10% of emissions.
- Other

## Geographical scope

- Emissions from intra-EU (from an EU port to another EU port) and extra-EU voyages (departing and incoming between an EU port and a port outside the EU) should be addressed by carbon pricing
- Emissions from intra-EU voyages (from an EU port to another EU port) should be addressed by carbon pricing

## Type of emissions covered

- In line with the EU MRV System for shipping, only CO<sub>2</sub> emissions should be accounted for, as they are responsible for 98% of all GHG emissions from maritime transport.
- Not only emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>, but also of methane, nitrous oxide and black carbon emissions should be accounted for in view of their important increase over the 2012-2018 period.
- Other

**15. The Climate Target Plan Impact Assessment presented various scenarios where the extra-EU scope of the maritime sector is included in the EU GHG target. In line with these scenarios, if the EU were to apply carbon pricing to emissions from extra-EU voyages, on which basis should this be done? (select one option)**

- Departing journeys only (from an EU port to a port outside the EU)
- Incoming journeys only (from a port outside the EU to an EU port)
- 50% of both the incoming and the outgoing journeys
- 100% of both the incoming and the outgoing journeys

## E. Market stability

---

*Since its introduction, the Market Stability Reserve (MSR) has reinforced the stability of the EU ETS. The MSR is a rule-based instrument placing allowances in or releasing allowances from the reserve in case the total number of allowances in circulation ('the surplus') is above or below pre-established thresholds. The rhythm of placement in the reserve, ('the intake rate'), is 24% per year until 2023 and 12% from 2024. As planned for in the legislation, the Commission is reviewing the functioning of the Market Stability Reserve, to assess whether it has achieved its objectives and whether it remains fit for purpose in an ETS with higher climate ambition.*

**16. Has the MSR delivered on its main objective (the stability of the ETS), and is it likely to fulfil its goals in the future, or should its structure or parameters be changed?**

- Yes, the approach has worked well and should not be changed
- Yes, the approach has worked well and should be continued, but parameters (e.g. volume-based thresholds, intake rate) should be modified
- Yes, the approach has worked well but a carbon price floor is necessary

- Yes, the approach has worked well but should be improved to be able to react faster to address unexpected demand or supply shocks
- No, the approach did not work well and it should be reconsidered in the future
- Other

**17. Should the MSR thresholds (minimum of 400 and maximum of 833 million allowances) used to determine whether allowances are placed in the MSR or released, be kept as they are? Please explain your answer.**

- The thresholds as they are fit for purpose
- The thresholds should be increased
- The thresholds should be reduced

Please explain your answer:

*1000 character(s) maximum*

**18. Should the MSR intake rate be kept as it is or should it be increased or decreased?**

*at most 1 choice(s)*

- The MSR intake rate should be kept at 24% and fall back to the level of 12% as of 2024 as per current regulation
- The MSR intake rate should be kept at 24% beyond 2023
- The MSR intake rate should be higher than 24%, in order to reduce the surplus faster
- The MSR intake rate should be decreased, to lower than 12% from 2024 onwards
- Other

**19. Current regulation determines that as a long-term measure to improve the functioning of the EU ETS, and unless otherwise decided in the first review of the MSR in 2021, from 2023 onwards the number of allowances held in the reserve will be limited to the auction volume of the previous year. Holdings above that amount will lose their validity. Do you believe this invalidation rule should be kept in place? Please explain your answer.**

- Yes, the rule should remain in place
- No, the rule should be abolished
- Yes, the rule should remain in place but be amended please explain how in the box

**20. At the moment, emission allowances for aviation are not taken into account for the calculation of the EU ETS surplus and therefore do not influence the amount of allowances fed into or released from the MSR. Should aviation allowances and emissions be taken into account in the future?**

- Yes
- No

You may explain your answer:

*1000 character(s) maximum*



*The review of the EU ETS Directive for Phase IV (2021-2030) introduced, in Article 12(4) of the ETS Directive, the option for Member States to cancel voluntarily emission allowances corresponding to electricity generation capacity in their territory that was closed following national measures.*

**21. Should voluntary cancellation of allowances become mandatory for Member States that implement national measures to close fossil fuels power plants or other measures that substantially reduce demand for allowances, for instance by promoting breakthrough technologies or banning polluting technologies?**

- No, it should be left to the Member State to decide what to do with the resulting allowances
- Yes, these allowances should be cancelled proportionally, taking into account the emissions of the replacing power generating technology
- Other, for instance placing the allowances in the MSR.

## F. Revenues

---

*Emissions trading raises revenues for public authorities that can be re-invested in the economy, leading to better overall economic outcomes. A small percentage of revenues is allocated to the EU Modernisation and Innovation Funds to support low-carbon investments. However, the largest share of the revenues are for the Member States. The majority of these revenues are currently reported as being used for climate-related purposes. The review will address the current rules in place, also taking into account that as new sectors are possibly added to the ETS, revenues may increase and at the same time there is a need for ETS revenue to contribute as an own resource of the EU budget .*

**22. In your opinion, how should the ETS revenue be used? (Multiple answers are possible)**

- Facilitating just transition and the social impacts of the climate transformation
- Addressing social and distributional impacts related to the review of ETS
- Energy efficiency, in particular the renovation of buildings
- Low-carbon and zero-emissions mobility
- Support for clean investments in ETS sectors
- Providing financial incentives for consumers to buy more climate friendly goods and services, including more fuel efficient vehicles/ vehicles not using fossil fuels
- More support to innovation
- Lowering taxes such as labour taxation and increasing transfers to EU citizens, in particular low-income households

**23. Are stricter rules necessary to ensure Member States spend their ETS auction revenues in line with climate objectives?**

- Yes, the ETS Directive should require Member States to spend more revenues on climate-related purposes
- Yes, the ETS Directive should require that Member States spend ETS revenues in a way compatible with the climate neutrality objective ('do no harm')
- No, Member States should be free to determine how they want to spend the revenues, taking into account that 50% should be used for climate-related purposes.

## G. Low-carbon support mechanisms

---



Currently, the Innovation Fund is funded by 325 million allowances from the free allocation share, 75 million allowances from the auction share, 50 million allowances from the MSR monetised in 2020 and the leftover allowances from the NER300 programme. The monetisation of these allowances is expected to generate around EUR 10 billion until 2030 depending on the carbon price.

#### 24. What should be the size of the Innovation Fund?

- The size of the Innovation Fund should remain unchanged
- The size of the Innovation Fund should increase by using more allowances from the auction share
- The size of the Innovation Fund should increase by using more allowances from the free allocation share
- The size of the Innovation Fund should increase significantly regardless of the source of allowances.  
Please indicate by how much (e.g. double or triple) in the box

Please specify your answer:

1000 character(s) maximum

The ETS Innovation Fund has been effective in redirecting ETS revenues to low carbon investments. This can also benefit innovation and new process integration (e.g. Carbon Capture and Utilisation) for transport fuels production. As the first call was heavily oversubscribed, more money would enable the EU to meet its climate goals.

#### 25. Currently the ETS Directive foresees that the maximum funding rate for projects financed by the Innovation Fund is 60% of the relevant costs. Should this rate be changed?

- No, some of the risk of innovation has to be borne by the project proponent
- Yes, it should be increased to allow better risk-sharing for risky and complex projects
- Yes, it should be increased but only in case of competitive bidding (e.g. Carbon Contracts for Difference)
- Other

#### 26. Should additional supporting instruments be introduced to support full market deployment of low-carbon products through the Innovation Fund? For example, as Carbon Contracts for Difference, whereby beneficiary projects would be guaranteed a fixed carbon price in case the ETS price is not high enough.

at most 1 choice(s)

- Yes, additional support (e.g. covering the gap in operating revenues) is needed to create markets for low-carbon products
- No, the existing support is sufficient

The Modernisation Fund is a dedicated funding programme to support 10 lower-income EU Member States in their transition to climate neutrality by helping to modernise their energy systems and improve energy efficiency. Currently, the Modernisation Fund is funded by 2% of the total cap, e.g. around 285 million allowances. Beneficiary Member States had the opportunity to transfer their solidarity allowances and the allowances available to them under Article 10c of the ETS Directive to the Modernisation Fund. The total size of the Modernisation Fund after such transfers is around 645 million allowances. The monetisation of these allowances is expected to generate around EUR 14 billion until 2030 depending on the carbon price.

#### 27. What should be the size of the Modernisation Fund?

- The size of the Modernisation Fund should remain at 2% of the cap
-

The size of the Modernisation Fund should remain unchanged as an absolute amount

- The size of the Modernisation Fund should increase
- Other

*The ETS Directive has complex rules on the types of investments to be financed under the Modernisation Fund. There is a general provision that investments have to be consistent with the 2030 climate and energy framework and the Paris Agreement. No support from the Modernisation Fund shall be provided to energy generation facilities that use solid fossil fuels, but there are exceptions. There are two types of investments that can be funded by the Modernisation Fund (priority and non-priority), subject to different approval processes (simple and straightforward for priority projects and more complex for non-priority ones). Investments in gas are allowed as non-priority ones, both for power generation and infrastructure. Investments for certain just transition purposes are allowed and there are overlaps with the Just Transition Fund.*

**28. Should the types of investments that can be financed by the Modernisation Fund be streamlined and the coherence with the Green Deal be enhanced? (Multiple answers are possible)**

- No, the investments that can be supported by the Modernisation Fund should remain unchanged.
- Yes, the exception for financing coal-fired district heating in certain Member States should be removed
- Yes, the Modernisation Fund should be allowed to finance only non-fossil fuel based heating and cooling systems
- Yes, the Modernisation Fund should be allowed to finance only priority projects to simplify the administration
- Other

## H. Concluding questions

---

**29. Are there other key aspects which you did not find reflected in the questions and you would like to comment upon?**

*1000 character(s) maximum*

The extension of ETS to road transport and buildings would negatively impact all remaining sectors in the ESR despite the challenge of meeting the 2020 target (cf. CERRE- Feasibility and impacts of EU ETS scope extension). ESR targets must be maintained as they are the sole legally binding targets for MS to reduce emissions in these sectors.

The ETS would disrupt the synergy needed between fuel suppliers/OEMs, hamper the reduction of GHG in transport and increase fuel prices, and create social discontent. ETS is not compatible with the carbon abatement cost of road transport and a separate ETS would require certain framework conditions to mitigate the increase of fuel prices, such as a recast of the ETD, with no guarantee of success. Keeping the existing legislation incl. RED II, FQD and ESR is a safety net that the EU should not phase out without good reasons. Only relying on the ETS would shift the burden on certain sectors, creating distributional concerns between and within MS.

**If appropriate, please upload any additional materials such as concise position papers or policy briefs that express the position or views of yourself or your organisation:**

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

If your organisation is not registered, you can register now [here](#)

## Contact

CLIMA-ETS-REVISION-OPC@ec.europa.eu