National Technical University of Athens
Laboratory for Maritime Transport

SHIP EMISSIONS STUDY

Prepared by:

National Technical University of Athens
Laboratory for Maritime Transport

Prepared for:

Hellenic Chamber of Shipping

May 2008

ADMINISTRATIVE

Document history

Version	Date	Authors	Comments
v1.0-v6.0	13-20/04/2008	H. N. Psaraftis C. A. Kontovas	Pre-draft report
v7.0	23/04/2008	H. N. Psaraftis C. A. Kontovas	Draft report
v8.0	15/05/2008	H. N. Psaraftis C. A. Kontovas	2nd draft
v9.0	19/05/2008	H. N. Psaraftis C. A. Kontovas	3rd draft
v10.2	26/05/2008	H. N. Psaraftis C. A. Kontovas	Final version

Document classification
Confidential. Upon approval of document by the Hellenic Chamber of Shipping, classification status is downgraded to 'public'.

Disclaimer
Use of any knowledge, information or data contained in this document shall be at the user's sole risk. Neither the National Technical University of Athens nor any of its Laboratories, their officers, employees or agents shall be liable or responsible, in negligence or otherwise, for any loss, damage or expense whatever sustained by any person as a result of the use, in any manner or form, of any knowledge, information or data contained in this document, or due to any inaccuracy, omission or error therein contained.

The Hellenic Chamber of Shipping shall not in any way be liable or responsible for the use of any such knowledge, information or data, or of the consequences thereof.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ADMINISTRATIVE 2
TABLE OF CONTENTS 3
1. PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT 4
2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY 4
3. FORESEEN TASKS 4
4. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 5
5. REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE 9
6. ALGORITHM THAT OUTPUTS EMISSIONS PER TONNE-KM 11
7. RUNNING OF SCENARIOS 15
8. RUNS OF WORLD FLEET DATABASE 18
9. PASSENGER VESSELS AND VESSELS LESS THAN 400 GRT 23
10. COMPARISON WITH OTHER STUDIES AND OTHER MODES 25
11. CONCLUSIONS 27
12. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS 27
13. REFERENCES 27
ANNEX A: Detailed charts of world fleet database analysis 29

1. PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

The purpose of this document is to report the results of the study on ship emissions conducted by the National Technical University of Athens (Laboratory for Maritime Transport) for the Hellenic Chamber of Shipping (HCS).

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of this study have been twofold: (a) develop a web-based tool for calculating the exhaust gas emissions (CO_2, SO_2 and NO_x) of specific types of ships under a variety of operational scenarios, and (b) produce various statistics of CO_2 emissions, based on data from the world fleet database.

The web tool is the analog of what some airlines have available on their web sites (tool available on-line) and of what some container lines have available for their customers (tool not available on-line). The web tool will be freely available on-line, at the address **http://www.nee.gr** .

The analysis of CO_2 emissions of the world fleet database has produced various statistics of CO_2 emissions for various ship types and size brackets under a variety of scenarios. Such statistics may be useful for supporting specific policy recommendations on this subject, before the IMO and/or other bodies.

3. FORESEEN TASKS

To fulfill the study's objectives, the following tasks were foreseen:

Task 1: Review of literature and other sources for latest emissions figures as functions of (indicatively): bunker consumption, fuel type, engine type, horsepower, etc. Decide which will be used.

Task 2: Collection and processing of data for ships, routes, bunkers, and generally scenarios to be examined. Data to be solicited by HCS and to be supplemented independently.

Task 3: Based on Tasks 1 and 2, development of algorithm that outputs emissions per tonne-km depending on scenario.

Task 4: Running of scenarios.

Task 5: Adapt, upload and test tool on web.

Task 6: Runs with Lloyds Fairplay database (including estimating variables that are not in database) and output plots and other statistics.

Task 7: Write and submit final report.

4. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Task-wise, the results of the study can be summarized as follows.

<u>Task 1:</u> Review of literature and other sources for latest emissions figures as functions of (indicatively): bunker consumption, fuel type, engine type, horsepower, etc. Decide which will be used.

The literature on the subject of this study (including both scientific work and regulation-related documents- IMO and others) is immense. MEPC 57[1] alone had some 65 submissions. Complete reviews of all these documents were not foreseen by the study and thus are not encyclopedic. Still, we collected and studied a large number of such documents by focusing (a) on relations linking parameters such as bunker consumption, engine type and horsepower, to produced emissions of various exhaust types, (b) on data that can be used as inputs for our study (for instance, bunker consumption for various ship types) and (c) on various other reported statistics (for instance, bunker consumption).The latest documents that were reviewed were related to very recent submissions to MEPC 57 and to BLG 12[2].

The documents that were reviewed are outlined in Section 5 of this report.

Perhaps the most basic results as regards how emissions were calculated can be summarized as follows:

(a) CO_2 emissions do not depend on type of fuel used or engine type. One multiplies total bunker consumption (in tonnes per day) by a factor of 3.17 to compute CO_2 emissions (in tonnes per day).
(b) SO_2 emissions depend on type of fuel. One has to multiply total bunker consumption (in tonnes per day) by the percentage of sulphur present in the fuel (for instance, 4%, 1.5%, 0.5%, or other) and subsequently by a factor of 0.02 to compute SO_2 emissions (in tonnes per day).
(c) NO_x emissions depend on engine type. The ratio of NO_x emissions to fuel consumed (tonnes per day to tonnes per day) ranges from 0.087 for slow speed engines to 0.057 for medium speed engines.

More details are in Section 6.

<u>Task 2:</u> Collection and processing of data for ships, routes, bunkers, and generally scenarios to be examined. Data to be solicited by HCS and to be supplemented independently.

[1] MEPC: IMO's Marine Environment Protection Committee. MEPC 57 is the committee's 57th session, held in London on March 31- April 4, 2008.
[2] BLG: IMO's Subcommittee on Bulk Liquids and Gases. BLG 12 is the subcommittee's 12th session, held in London, on February 4-8, 2008.

For the purposes of this study, HCS solicited from its members and provided to NTUA a variety of data, and said data was subsequently analyzed so as to be used both for the web tool and for the statistical analysis of the world fleet database.

The response to the HCS solicitation was very good. Some 28 member companies responded, providing data for over 350 ships and covering a broad spectrum of ship types and sizes. On the down side, data collected was of non-homogeneous quality, and quite some time was spent to sift through it. Some companies provided details, some not. Format was also non-homogeneous. As a result, data was missing in many instances, including:

- Times in port (loading, discharging).
- Type of fuel used, at sea and in port.

To alleviate these deficiencies, contact was made with selected companies to collect the missing data. Search through the internet and other sources (such as Clarksons) was also made to complement data that was (and still is) missing.

In addition to the above, and for the purposes of developing the web tool, representative routes for a variety of ships and operational scenarios were collected.

To protect the identity of data providers, raw data collected in this task will not be included in this report and will not be made public.

Task 3: Based on Tasks 1 and 2, development of algorithm that outputs emissions per tonne-km depending on scenario.

The results of Task 1 and the data of Task 2 were used here, and this algorithm has been completed, both for the web tool and for the statistical analysis of the world database. The difference between the two is that in the former case a specific trade route is used as an input (to be chosen by the user among a set of prespecified routes), while in the latter case the percentage of sea-to-port time within one year is used as an input. For passenger vessels, emissions were computed on a passenger-km basis (number of passengers being used on a nominal basis). Full details are provided in Section 6 of this report.

Task 4: Running of scenarios.

From the data of over 360 ships collected by HCS, a sample of 26 ships were selected to be part of the web tool, covering a spectrum of major ship types and sizes. For each, a variety of scenarios is available to be run, and appropriate input data have been uploaded on the web system that hosts the web tool. The scenarios generally assume separate fuel consumptions at sea and port (both loading and discharging) and separate fuels for main and auxiliary engines. For uniformity and comparability purposes, ships are assumed 100% loaded at one leg of the route and in ballast at the other. The user can choose among specific trade routes or can enter his/her own ship. More details are provided in Section 7 of this report.

Task 5: Adapt, upload and test tool on web.

The web tool can be run in two modes:

(a) run scenarios on prespecified ships and routes, and
(b) run scenarios on user-defined ships and routes.

No data entry is necessary for mode (a), except user selection as regards ship and route. By contrast, all necessary input should be entered in mode (b).

A version of this tool exists already and resides on the NTUA web site (address: www.martrans.org/emis). The tool has been reasonably debugged and tested. No company or ship names have been divulged. The tool will be further installed on the HCS web site (www.nee.gr). Details and use instructions (help section) are provided on line.

<u>Task 6:</u> Runs with Lloyds Fairplay database (including estimating variables that are not in database) and output plots and other statistics.

The analysis of the world fleet database (source: Lloyds Fairplay) was extensive and has produced CO_2 emission statistics for the following ship types, broken down in several size brackets for each type: bulk carriers, crude oil tankers, container vessels, product/chemical carriers, LNG carriers, LPG carriers, reefer vessels, Ro-Ro vessels and general cargo ships. A separate analysis was carried out for small vessels under 400 GRT and for passenger vessels. The main output of the analysis for each ship type and size bracket has been the ratio of emitted grams of CO_2 per tonne-km of transported cargo in a year. Another output has been the total CO_2 produced per size bracket for the above ship types. All this has been estimated under a variety of scenarios as regards sea-to-port time, ship speed and fuel consumption at sea and in port. Some sensitivity analysis of these results has also been conducted.

It should be mentioned that whereas the Lloyds-Fairplay ship database (Lloyds Maritime Information Services, 2007) includes some 100,293 vessels greater than 100 GRT. 49,748 of these are either non-commercial or non self-propelled ships, including barges, dredgers, drilling ships, fishing vessels, fire-fighting vessels, ice-breakers, offshore vessels, tugs, naval vessels, and a variety of others. The analysis carried out concerns the rest of the database (50,545 vessels) and includes cargo and passenger vessels. This subgroup represents 95% of the total gross tonnage of the ocean-going fleet and is mostly relevant for the IMO as the provisions of MARPOL's Annex VI concern commercial ships of 400 GRT and above and oil tankers of 150 GRT and above.

This subgroup of the fleet was further broken down into major categories of ships such as bulk carriers, crude oil carriers and containerships, among others (see Section 8). A number of vessels (4,925) were left out of the analysis either because of insufficient data (for example no registered engine horse power), or because they did not belong to any major category (for example non-crude oil tankers such as sulphur tankers, water tankers, other unspecified tankers, non-dry bulk carriers, livestock carriers and others). With these vessels excluded, our analysis was carried out using data from 45,620 vessels. As the 4,925 vessels that were left out are typically of very small size, it is speculated that their effect on overall emissions statistics, should they be eventually included in the analysis, would be very small.

Details of this analysis plus selected charts are included herein in Sections 8, 9 and 10 of this report and to Annex A thereto.

<u>Task 7:</u> Write and submit final report.
Task completed.

The remainder of this document provides more details on the study.

5. REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

The literature on the subject of this study (including both scientific work and regulation-related documents- IMO and others) is immense. MEPC 57 alone had some 65 submissions. Complete reviews of all these documents were not foreseen by the study and thus are not encyclopedic. Still, we collected and studied a large number of such documents by focusing (a) on relations linking parameters such as bunker consumption, engine type and horsepower, to produced emissions of various exhaust types, (b) on data that can be used as inputs for our study (for instance, bunker consumption for various ship types) and (c) on various other reported statistics (for instance, bunker consumption). The latest documents that were reviewed were related to very recent submissions to MEPC 57 and to BLG 12.

The following documents were our main references as regards relationships between fuel consumption, fuel type, engine type (on the one hand) and exhaust emissions (on the other):

<u>IMO documents:</u>

IMO (2000), "Study of Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Ships". Study by Marintek, Econ Centre for Economic Analysis, Carnegie Mellon University and DNV.

IMO (2007a), "Input from the four subgroups and individual experts to the final report of the Informal Cross Government/Industry Scientific Group of Experts," Note by the Secretariat, BLG 12/INF.10.

IMO (2007b), "Report on the outcome of the Informal Cross Government/Industry Scientific Group of Experts established to evaluate the effects of the different fuel options proposed under the revision of MARPOL Annex VI," Note by the Secretariat, BLG 12/6/1.

IMO (2008a), "Future IMO regulation regarding green house gas emissions from international shipping," Submitted by Denmark, Marshall Islands, BIMCO, ICS, INTERCARGO, INTERTANKO and OCIMF, MEPC 57/4/2.

IMO (2008b), "A mandatory CO2 Design Index for new ships," Submitted by Denmark, Marshall Islands, BIMCO, ICS, INTERCARGO, INTERTANKO and OCIMF, MEPC 57/4/3.

IMO (2008c), "Development of an index for CO2 emissions per unit shipping capacity in actual operational conditions," Submitted by Japan, MEPC 57/4/11.

IMO (2008d), "A mandatory CO2 Design Index for new ships," Submitted by Denmark, MEPC 57/INF.12.

<u>Other documents:</u>

Corbett, J. J., and H. W. Köhler (2003), "Updated emissions from ocean shipping," J. Geophys. Res., 108.

Corbett, J. J., and H. W. Köhler (2004), "Considering alternative input parameters in an activity-based ship fuel consumption and emissions model: Reply to comment by Øyvind Endresen et al. on 'Updated emissions from ocean shipping'," J. Geophys. Res., 109.

Endresen, Ø., E. Sørgard, J. K. Sundet, S. B. Dalsøren, I. S. A. Isaksen, T. F. Berglen, and G. Gravir (2003), "Emission from international sea transportation and environmental impact," J. Geophys. Res., 108.

Endresen, Ø., E. Sørgard, J. Bakke, and I. S. A. Isaksen (2004a), "Substantiation of a lower estimate for the bunker inventory: Comment on 'Updated emissions from ocean shipping' by James J. Corbett and Horst W. Köhler," J. Geophys. Res., 109.

EMEP/CORINAIR (2002), "EMEP Co-operative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long Range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe, The Core Inventory of Air Emissions in Europe (CORINAIR), Atmospheric Emission Inventory Guidebook," 3rd edition, October.

As a result of these references, emissions in this study were calculated as follows. We used fuel consumption as the main input, as opposed to horsepower, since fuel consumption data was the main input data that was solicited and received.

(a) CO_2 emissions do not depend on type of fuel used or engine type. One multiplies total bunker consumption (in tonnes per day) by a factor of 3.17 to compute CO_2 emissions (in tonnes per day)[3].
(b) SO_2 emissions depend on type of fuel. One has to multiply total bunker consumption (in tonnes per day) by the percentage of sulphur present in the fuel (for instance, 4%, 1.5%, 0.5%, or other) and subsequently by a factor of 0.02 to compute SO_2 emissions (in tonnes per day)[4].
(c) NO_x emissions depend on engine type. The ratio of NO_x emissions to fuel consumed (tonnes per day to tonnes per day) ranges from 0.087 for slow speed engines to 0.057 for medium speed engines[5].

Having said that, horsepower information was also used occasionally, in the event actual fuel consumption was not available. In this case, fuel consumption was computed indirectly, as proportional to the total kilowatt-hours (kWh) consumed, with the coefficient of proportionality taken on a case by case basis.

[3] The 3.17 CO_2 factor is the empirical mean value most commonly used in CO_2 emissions calculations based on fuel consumption. See EMEP/CORINAIR (2002) Table 8.1. According to the IMO GHG study (IMO, 2000), the actual value of this coefficient may range from 3.159 (low value) to 3.175 (high value), that is, the maximum variation differential is about 0.5%.
[4] The 0.02 SO_2 factor is exact and comes from the chemical reaction of sulphur and oxygen to produce SO_2.
[5] NO_x emissions factors are empirical. See EMEP/CORINAIR (2002) Table 8.2.

6. ALGORITHM THAT OUTPUTS EMISSIONS PER TONNE-KM

The approach for computing emissions per tonne-km is straightforward.

Assume a ship that carries a cargo payload of W (tonnes) from point A to point B, which are L kilometers apart, going laden from A to B at speed V (km/day) and returning empty on ballast at speed v (km/day). W is a function of ship's deadweight and its capacity utilization, and the ship's deadweight is an upper bound to it. If cargo quantities and speeds are given in units different from the above (eg, short tons or knots), appropriate conversions are made. Ship spends time T (days) loading at port A and time t (days) discharging at port B.

Assume also the following known fuel consumptions (all in tonnes per day):

At loading port, G
At sea, laden, F
At discharging port, g
At sea, on ballast, f.

In essence, both F and f are functions of speeds V and v respectively, a cube law applying in each case. That is, F is proportional to the cube of V and f is proportional to the cube of v. The coefficients of proportionality are not the same, as ship sails laden in the first case and on ballast in the second case. As all fuel consumptions are assumed known, the cube law will not be used here, as its use would only be if variations on fuel consumption versus speed were to be studied (which is not the case).

Alternatively, both F and f can be considered functions of the horsepowers that are for sailing laden and on ballast at speeds V and v respectively. Coefficients of grams of fuel spent per kWh exist and are provided by the engine manufacturers, but such coefficients will not be used in our study except in cases fuel consumption information is missing. So unless otherwise noted, we shall assume that fuel consumptions are known.

Based on the above, it is straightforward to compute the following variables:

Transit time from A to B (days): L/V
Transit time from B to A (days): L/v
Total fuel consumption per round-trip (tonnes): GT + FL/V + gt+ fL/v
Total tonne-km's carried per round-trip: WL
Total CO_2 produced in this round-trip: 3.17(GT + FL/V + gt+ fL/v)
CO_2 per tonne-km for this round-trip: 3.17(GT + FL/V + gt+ fL/v)/WL
= 3.17[(GT+gt)/L + F/V+ f/v]/W

Tonne-km's for this scenario are computed by multiplying the amount of cargo carried on the laden part of the trip by the appropriate distance. Zero tonne-km's are registered in the ballast leg of the trip (although obviously this leg, plus times in port, do count as far as exhaust gases are concerned).

One can see that CO_2 per tonne-km is a decreasing function of distance L, which makes sense since the less the ship travels, the more time it spends fuel without hauling cargo (something that increases its per tonne-km emissions). It is also a decreasing function of the speeds V and v, but this is misleading, as F and f are cubic functions of these speeds. In that sense, CO_2 per tonne-km is a quadratic function of ship speed.

The calculations for SO_2 and NO_x are similar, using appropriate coefficients that depend on the quality of all fuels used during the round-trip and on the type of engine (see (b) and (c) in Section 5).

The above algorithm is the one used in the web tool, where route input is part of the data and the assumption is that the ship travels full in one direction and empty in the other. In case of a triangular route, the calculations become a bit more involved, but the philosophy remains pretty similar. For uniformity and comparability purposes, no such routes have been examined in the context of the web tool.

The analysis of emissions (CO_2 only) for the world's ship database is in the same philosophy, but slightly different. Here we did not have information on parameters L, T and t, but only aggregate information on percentages of sea-to-port times through the year. In this case we assume that we are given again the ship's payload W, and we assume the ship to be operational during a period of D days per year (where D is a user input $\leq$365). Then we assume to know s, the fraction of D the ship is at sea ($0\leq s\leq 1$). Then the fraction of D the ship is at port is p = 1-s.

Then,
Sea days in a year: sD
Port days in a year: pD
(and idle days in a year: 365-D)

In the analysis of the world ship database, and for each ship type and size bracket combination, an average fuel consumption of F (tonnes/day) was assumed for the sea voyage, and an average fuel consumption of G (tonnes/day) was assumed in port. An average speed of V was assumed for the sea voyage, and an average cargo capacity utilization of w ($0<w<1$) is assumed for all sea legs. If a ship travels full in one direction and empty on ballast, then w=0.5, but in case of triangular routes w could be higher than 0.5.

Then we would have (for the specific ship under consideration):

Sea kilometers in a year (km): sDV
Total fuel consumption in a year (tonnes): (sF + pG)D
Total CO_2 in a year (tonnes): 3.17(sF + pG)D
Total tonne-km's in a year: (wW)(sDV)
CO_2 per tonne-km: 3.17(sDF + pDG)/wWsDV = 3.17(sF+pG)/wWsV
= 3.17[F +(p/s)G]/wWV

Total tonne-km's here are computed by multiplying the average payload carried by the ship when at sea (wW) by the total sea kilometers traveled by the ship in a year (sDV). Note that in the absence of trip distance information, it is impossible to know the total amount of cargo hauled in a year by a ship, although the equivalent tonne-km's can be estimated. In fact, one can have two identical ships A and B, with ship A engaged in a trade with trip distance double that of ship B. If fractions s and p are the same for both ships, both would register the same tonne-km's in a year, but the total amount of cargo carried by ship A would be half of that carried by ship B.

Some more observations are in order: First, it is interesting to see that, as much as total CO_2 emitted is an increasing (in fact, linear) function of D (days per year the ship is operational), the total CO_2 emitted *per tonne-km* is independent of D (which is probably not a surprise). Second, as much as total CO_2 emitted is –as expected- an *increasing* function of the sea-to-port time ratio (s/p), the *per tonne-km* emissions statistic is a *decreasing* function of that ratio. This is similar to the previous result that CO_2 emitted *per tonne-km* is a decreasing function of trip distance L. If this result looks counter-intuitive, it is not, since while in port the ship on the one hand produces emissions that are lower than those produced at sea (on a per day basis), on the other hand in port the ship hauls zero cargo, thus produces zero tonne-km's, and this is what is the decisive factor.

As before, an inverse relationship with speed V is seen, but this is again misleading as F is a cubic function of V, therefore overall the CO_2 produced per tonne-km is a quadratic function of speed.

In addition to the above, we could also compute other statistics on a fleet or size bracket basis, such as total bunkers consumed, total CO2 produced, and others (see also next section).

In case of pure passenger vessels, W should be replaced by the passenger number and statistics should be in terms of CO_2 per *passenger-km*.

More difficult is the issue what should be the denominator for Ro-Pax vessels, which carry a combination of passengers, private cars, buses, motor-bikes, and trucks carrying cargo. Theoretically, both calculations can be performed, one with W being the cargo payload, and one with W being the passenger number. However, such ships are typically used in a mixed mode, making virtually impossible to apportion CO_2 emissions among passengers, and among each of vehicle categories being carried, including trucks carrying cargo. A fortiori, doing this on a per tonne-km basis is practically impossible and maybe even meaningless. On top of that, it turned out that in the analysis of the Lloyds Fairplay database there was difficulty of obtaining reliable and representative fuel consumption data for this category of ships. As a result of all this, no per tonne-km statistic was produced for passenger ships. However, this was done for the specific Ro-Pax cases uploaded on the web tool, separately for cargo (CO_2 per tonne-km) and separately for passengers (CO_2 per passenger-km).

It should also be mentioned that for any specialized category of ships, different emissions statistics can conceivably be produced. For instance, for containerships one can compute grams of CO_2 per TEU-km and for car carriers grams of CO_2 per car-km, where “car” is the unit for a private car. For uniformity and comparison purposes, no such statistics were produced in this study, but this would be possible if specialized analyses in these or other sectors are conducted.

7. RUNNING OF SCENARIOS

There have been two distinct categories of runs. One concerned those based on the web tool and the other was based on the world ship database.

The web tool currently incorporates the following categories of ships, each further broken down into size sub-categories and typical routes as follows (Table 1):

Table 1: Web tool: categories and sizes of ships and typical routes

Ship Category	**Size Category**	**Typical Routes**
Dry Bulk Carrier	Handysize	US Gulf-Rotterdam
	Handymax	Newcastle-Japan
	Panamax	Tubarao-Rotterdam
	Post-Panamax	Queensland- Japan
	Capesize	
Containership	Feedermax	Hong Kong- Kaohsiung
	Handysize	Thessaloniki-Gioia Tauro
	Sub-Panamax	
	Post-Panamax	
Crude Oil Carrier	Small Tanker	Skikda-Lavera
	Aframax	Ras Tanura-Singapore
	Suezmax	Sidi Kerir-Lavera
	VLCC	Ras Tanura-Rotterdam
LNG	26,000 DWT	Salalah-Houston
	75,000 DWT	Altamira-Rotterdam
LPG	10,000 DWT	Puerto Bolivar-Rotterdam
	52,000 DWT	Salalah-Houston
Reefer	7,000 DWT	Puerto Cortes-Tampa
	10,000 DWT	Puerto Cortes-Rotterdam
Chemical/Product	5,850 DWT'	Milford Heaven-Wilhaven
	19,000 DWT	Sidi Kerir-Lavera
	45,000 DWT	Ras Tanura-Singapore
Ro-Ro Carrier	10,000 DWT	Jacksonville-Hong Kong
	27,000 DWT	Rotterdam-New York
Ro-Pax	6,480 DWT	Patra -Ancona
	1,475 DWT	Pireaus-Paros

This table is only indicative and can be expanded in the future. All routes (including those for containerships) are assumed laden on one leg and on ballast on the other. Although obviously for some categories of vessels (for instance, container vessels) this assumption is factually not valid, in the web tool it was made only for uniformity and comparison purposes. An extension of the web tool to cover cases of routes with multiple port stops and the ship being partially full in all legs or sailing triangular routes would be straightforward. Such extension would take as input the entire route sequence, the distance of each leg, the port time in each port stop and the ship's capacity utilization (from 0 to 100%) on each route leg.

Below are sample outputs of some of the scenarios that were run:

a) Handysize Bulk Carrier sailing from US Gulf to Rotterdam

NATIONAL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS
LABORATORY FOR MARITIME TRANSPORT

Ship Emissions Calculator

VESSEL DETAILS

SELECT SHIP TYPE	Dry Bulk Carrier	**SELECT SHIP SIZE**	Handysize BC	Slow Speed Engine
ROUTE	US Gulf-Rotterdam	TRIP DISTANCE	3539 nm	6568 km
PAYLOAD (tonnes)	25000	DWT (tonnes)	27000	

OPERATIONAL DETAILS

			FUEL OIL		DIESEL OIL	
STATE	**TIME (days)**	**SPEED (knots)**	**S %**	**Consumption (tonnes/day)**	**S %**	**Consumption (tonnes/day)**
SEA LADEN	11.34	13	3.5	24	1.5	0
SEA BALLAST	11.34	13	3.5	24	1.5	0
PORT (loading,discharging)	4		3.5	4.5	1.5	0

EMISSIONS

	CO2	SO2	NOx
ROUNDTRIP EMISSIONS KG PER tonne TRANSPORTED	71.32	1.57	1.96
ROUNDTRIP EMISSIONS GRAMS PER LADEN tonne-MILE	20.15	0.45	0.55
ROUNDTRIP EMISSIONS GRAMS PER LADEN tonne-KM	10.86	0.24	0.30

DETAILED RESULTS

TOTAL BALLAST-LADEN DISTANCE		nm	7,078.00			
LADEN tonne-MILES		tonne*nm	88,475,000.00			
TIME IN PORT		days	4.00			
TRIP DURATION	SEA-LADEN	days	11.34	**EMISSIONS**		
TRIP DURATION	SEA-BALLAST	days	11.34	**CO2**	**SO2**	**NOx**
TOTAL RTRIP DURATION		days	26.69	tonnes	tonnes	tonnes
CONSUMPTION FO	SEA LADEN	tonnes	272.23	862.97	19.06	23.68
CONSUMPTION DO		tonnes	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CONSUMPTION FO	SEA BALLAST	tonnes	272.23	862.97	19.06	23.68
CONSUMPTION DO		tonnes	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CONSUMPTION FO	PORT	tonnes	18.00	57.06	1.26	1.57
CONSUMPTION DO		tonnes	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL FUEL CONSUMPTION	SEA	tonnes	544.46	1,725.94	38.11	47.37
TOTAL FUEL CONSUMPTION	PORT	tonnes	18.00	57.06	1.26	1.57
TOTAL FUEL CONSUMPTION	PER RTRIP	tonnes	562.46	1,783.00	39.37	48.93

b) VLCC Crude Oil Carrier sailing from Ras Tanura to Rotterdam

VESSEL DETAILS

SELECT SHIP TYPE	Crude Oil Carrier	**SELECT SHIP SIZE**	VLCC	Slow Speed Engine
ROUTE	Ras Tanura-Rotterdam	TRIP DISTANCE	11170 nm	20732 km
PAYLOAD (tonnes)	275000	DWT (tonnes)	300294	

OPERATIONAL DETAILS

STATE	TIME (days)	SPEED (knots)	FUEL OIL S %	FUEL OIL Consumption (tonnes/day)	DIESEL OIL S %	DIESEL OIL Consumption (tonnes/day)
SEA LADEN	33.24	14	3.5	80	1.5	0
SEA BALLAST	33.24	14	3.5	80	1.5	0
PORT (loading,discharging)	4		3.5	72	1.5	0

EMISSIONS

	CO2	SO2	NOx
ROUNDTRIP EMISSIONS KG PER tonne TRANSPORTED	64.63	1.43	1.77
ROUNDTRIP EMISSIONS GRAMS PER LADEN tonne-MILE	5.79	0.13	0.16
ROUNDTRIP EMISSIONS GRAMS PER LADEN tonne-KM	3.12	0.07	0.09

DETAILED RESULTS

TOTAL BALLAST-LADEN DISTANCE		nm	22,340.00			
LADEN tonne-MILES		tonne*nm	3,071,750,000.00			
TIME IN PORT		days	4.00			
TRIP DURATION	SEA-LADEN	days	33.24	**EMISSIONS**		
TRIP DURATION	SEA-BALLAST	days	33.24	**CO2**	**SO2**	**NOx**
TOTAL RTRIP DURATION		days	70.49	tonnes	tonnes	tonnes
CONSUMPTION FO	SEA LADEN	tonnes	2,659.52	8,430.69	186.17	231.38
CONSUMPTION DO		tonnes	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CONSUMPTION FO	SEA BALLAST	tonnes	2,659.52	8,430.69	186.17	231.38
CONSUMPTION DO		tonnes	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CONSUMPTION FO	PORT	tonnes	288.00	912.96	20.16	25.06
CONSUMPTION DO		tonnes	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL FUEL CONSUMPTION	SEA	tonnes	5,319.05	16,861.38	372.33	462.76
TOTAL FUEL CONSUMPTION	PORT	tonnes	288.00	912.96	20.16	25.06
TOTAL FUEL CONSUMPTION	PER RTRIP	tonnes	5,607.05	17,774.34	392.49	487.81

8. RUNS OF WORLD FLEET DATABASE

The Lloyds-Fairplay world fleet database (2007) was broken down by ship type and size bracket as follows (Table 2).

Table 2: Break down of world fleet database

Vessel type DWTx1000	Number of vessels
Small Vessels 0-5'	517
Coastal 5-15'	236
Handysize 15'-35'	1,774
Handymax 35'-60'	1,732
Panamax 60'-85'	1,383
Post-Panamax 85'-120'	98
Capesize >120'	722
Total Dry Bulk	**6,462**
Feeder 0-500 TEU	363
Feedermax 500-1000	757
Handysize 1000-2000	1,143
Sub-Panamax 2000-3000	689
Panamax 3000-4400	568
Post Panamax >4400	712
Total Container	**4,232**
Small tanker 0-10	115
Handysize 10-60	240
Panamax 60-80	177
Aframax 80-120	648
Suezmax 120-200	332
VLCC/ULCC >200	516
Total Crude oil	**2,028**
LNG 0-50	29
LNG >50	221
Total LNG	**250**
LPG 0-5	651
LPG 5-20	235
LPG 20-40	68
LPG >40	135
Total LPG	**1,089**

Vessel type DWTx1000	Number of vessels
Reefer 0-5	508
Reefer 5-10	358
Reefer >10	225
Total Reefer	**1,091**
Product, chemical 0-5'	3125
Product, chemical 5'-15'	1407
Product, chemical 15'-25'	430
Product, chemical 25'-40'	643
Product, chemical 40'-60	705
Product, chemical >60	238
Total Chemical	**6,548**
RO-RO excl. Pax 0-5000	932
RO-RO excl. Pax 5-15	674
RO-RO excl. Pax 15-25	342
RO-RO excl. Pax 25-40	51
Total RO-RO	**1,999**
General Cargo 0-5	9,009
General Cargo 5-15	3,014
General Cargo 15-35	816
Total General Cargo	**12,839**

SUBTOTAL: 36,538 vessels

Other categories

Vessels 0-400 GT	**6,281**
Passenger Vessels (>400GT)	**2,801**

TOTAL : 45,620 vessels

The "base-case" scenario is presented in Table 3 below, which shows the selected size brackets for the examined vessel categories. For each ship type and size bracket, sea and port fuel consumption figures have been collected from shipping companies operating ships within these brackets and from other sources. We believe that the use of real data for this part of the input provides an advantage over studies that use only modeling to estimate fuel consumption and emission statistics (more on this later).

Table 3: Base case scenario: Emissions statistics

		Average Ship										per size bracket		
Typical Vessel types and sizes per vessel segment	Number of vessels in size group	Payload	Speed	Sea days %	Port days %	cargo capacity utilization at sea	Total CO2, yr (tonnes)	**Total bunkers, YR**	Total tonne-kms, yr	gr CO2 PER TONNE-KM		total CO2 per size bracket (million)	% of total	Total billion MT-km per size bracket
Small Vessels 0-5'	517	1,937	12	70	30	60%	4,717	1,488.00	139,158,763	33.9		2.44	1.60	72
Coastal 5-15'	236	9,895	12	70	30	60%	10,641	3,356.80	710,876,741	15.0		2.51	1.70	168
Handysize 15'-35'	1774	24,876	14	70	30	60%	18,513	5,840.00	2,084,935,872	8.9		32.84	21.70	3,699
Handymax 35'-60'	1732	43,522	14	70	30	60%	22,804	7,193.60	3,647,781,825	6.3		39.50	26.20	6,318
Panamax 60'-85'	1383	68,469	14	70	30	60%	27,095	8,547.20	5,738,689,444	4.7		37.47	24.80	7,937
Post-Panamax 85'-120'	98	87,129	14	80	20	60%	37,066	11,692.80	8,345,885,855	4.4		3.63	2.40	818
Capesize >120'	722	160,425	15	80	20	60%	45,202	14,259.20	16,464,276,593	2.7		32.64	21.60	11,887
Total Dry Bulk	**6462**						166,037		37,131,605,092	4.5		151.03		30,898
Feeder (0-500)	363	5,169	13	70	30	70%	14,810	4,672.00	469,332,853	31.6		5.38	2.00	170
Feedermax (500-1000)	757	9,873	16.5	70	30	70%	22,773	7,184.00	1,137,846,685	20.0		17.24	6.40	861
Handysize (1000-2000)	1,143	19,515	20	70	30	70%	37,279	11,760.00	2,726,036,069	13.7		42.61	15.80	3,116
Sub-Panamax (2000-3000)	689	34,088	20	70	30	70%	58,328	18,400.00	4,761,738,206	12.2		40.19	14.90	3,281
Panamax (3000-4400)	568	47,907	21	70	30	70%	94,502	29,811.20	8,030,486,625	11.8		53.68	19.90	4,561
Post Panamax(>4400 TEU)	712	75,190	24	70	30	70%	155,000	48,896.00	14,404,444,807	10.8		110.36	41.00	10,256
Total Container	**4,232**						382,693		31,529,885,245	12.1		269.45		22,246
Small tanker (0-10)	115	3,159	12	80	20	50%	6,289	1,984.00	216,120,361	29.1		0.72	0.70	25
Handysize (10-60)	240	37,841	14.5	80	20	50%	32,664	10,304.00	3,128,483,055	10.4		7.84	7.40	751
Panamax (60-80)	177	64,838	15	80	20	50%	36,113	11,392.00	5,545,193,472	6.5		6.39	6.00	981
Aframax (80-120)	648	97,921	14.7	80	20	50%	46,460	14,656.00	8,207,170,707	5.7		30.11	28.30	5,318
Suezmax (120-200)	332	146,099	15	80	20	50%	51,329	16,192.00	12,495,006,794	4.1		17.04	16.00	4,148
VLCC/ULCC (>200)	516	279,208	15	80	20	50%	85,615	27,008.00	23,879,106,183	3.6		44.18	41.60	12,322
Total Crude oil	**2,028**						258,469		53,471,080,573	5		106.00		23,545
LNG (0-50)	**29**	23,588	17	80	20	50%	52,167	16,456.50	1,902,263,069	27.4		1.51	7.60	55
LNG (>50)	**221**	71,099	19	80	20	50%	83,400	26,309.00	6,408,488,501	13.0		18.43	92.40	1,416
Total LNG	**250**						135,567		8,310,751,570	16.3		19.94		1,471
LPG (0-5)	**651**	2,012	13	80	20	50%	6,137	1,936.00	130,496,886	47.0		4.00	26.80	85
LPG (5-20)	**235**	9,069	15	80	20	50%	17,093	5,392.00	678,646,370	25.2		4.02	26.90	159
LPG 20-40	**68**	25,764	16	80	20	50%	29,194	9,209.60	2,056,555,856	14.2		1.99	13.30	140
LPG (>40)	**135**	48,904	17	80	20	50%	36,356	11,468.80	4,147,643,575	8.8		4.91	32.90	560
Total LPG	**1,089**						88,780		7,013,342,687	12.7		14.91		944
Reefer (0-5)	**508**	2,060	13	80	20	60%	9,363	2,953.60	203,228,700	46.1		4.76	22.30	103
Reefer (5-10)	**358**	6,827	17.5	80	20	60%	25,838	8,150.80	906,791,981	28.5		9.25	43.40	325
Reefer (>10)	**225**	11,512	20	80	20	60%	32,410	10,224.00	1,747,605,300	18.5		7.29	34.20	393
Total Reefer	**1,091**						67,611		2,857,625,981	23.7		21.30		821
Product, chemical 0-5'	3125	2,009	11.5	70	30	60%	8,651	2,729.10	142,654,101	60.6		27.04	20.80	446
Product, chemical 5'-15'	1407	8,230	13	70	30	60%	15,953	5,032.50	660,522,652	24.2		22.45	17.30	929
Product, chemical 15'-25'	430	18,083	14.4	70	30	60%	26,571	8,382.00	1,607,649,695	16.5		11.43	8.80	691
Product, chemical 25'-40'	643	32,443	15	70	30	60%	44,668	14,091.00	3,004,401,819	14.9		28.72	22.10	1,932
Product, chemical 40'-60	705	43,512	14.7	70	30	60%	42,053	13,266.00	4,513,046,136	9.3		29.65	22.80	3,182
Product, chemical >60	238	78,339	15	70	30	60%	45,401	14,322.00	8,291,118,437	5.5		10.81	8.30	1,973
Total Chemical	**6,548**						183,298		18,219,392,840	10.1		130.08		9,153
RO-RO (excl. Pax) 0-5000	932	1,729	13	70	30	60%	8,394	2,647.80	138,768,467	60.5		7.82	18.20	129
RO-RO (excl. Pax) 5-15	674	9,334	17	70	30	60%	28,532	9,000.50	979,619,744	29.1		19.23	44.90	660
RO-RO (excl. Pax) 15-25	342	17,605	18	70	30	60%	38,981	12,296.80	1,956,459,426	19.9		13.33	31.10	669
RO-RO (excl. Pax) 25-40	51	27,680	19	70	30	60%	48,726	15,371.00	3,246,941,650	15.0		2.49	5.80	166
Total RO-RO	**1,999**		15.4				124,632		6,321,789,286.69	19.7		42.87		1,624
General Cargo (0-5)	9,009	2,138	11	70	30	60%	3,943	1,244.00	145,225,951	27.2		35.53	42.60	1,308
General Cargo (5-15)	3,014	7,549	13	70	30	60%	10,872	3,429.80	605,853,976	17.9		32.77	39.30	1,826
General Cargo (15-35)	816	19,570	14	70	30	60%	18,477	5,828.80	1,691,497,286	10.9		15.08	18.10	1,380
Total General Cargo	**12,839**						33,293		2,442,577,212	13.6		83.37		4,515
GRAND TOTAL	**36,538**							**Total CO2 (million tonnes per year)=**				**838.95**		
							Bunker Consumption (million tonnes per year)=					**264.65**		

One critical source of uncertainty in this analysis concerned the values of sea-to-port time ratios (s/p) that were used for the above type-size combinations. In reality, these ratios may vary even within the same ship type and size category, and the only way to ascertain them with precision would be to perform an analysis of all ship movements worldwide. As this was way outside the scope of our study, we took both parameters s and p as best estimates, after discussions with industry representatives and perusal of other sources. In our study these ratios ranged from 70/30 to 80/20, depending on ship type and size, and parameter D (operational days per year) was assumed equal to 320 days. Even though the per tonne-km emission statistics do not depend on this value, the absolute emissions statistics have a linear relationship with it, and it is our conjecture that the assumed value of 320 days overestimates D (and therefore the absolute levels of fuel consumption and emissions). In fact, Corbett et al (2004) and

Endresen et al (2004) in their activity-base calculations (see Table 4) use a parameter D that varies from 240 to 300 days. So our calculations are more conservative. But even in an extreme scenario of uniformly assuming 355 operational days per year, total CO2 emissions from cargo vessels would rise 10% versus ours.

Table 4: Summary of Engine Running Days (from Endresen et al (2004), Corbett et al (2004))

Summary of Cargo Ship Engine Hours and Days at Sea, in Port, and Laid Up, Derived From *Endresen et al.* [2004a]

	Values Taken From *Endresen et al.* [2004a]				Values Derived From *A* Through *D*				
Vessel Size, dry weight	Engine Hours *A*	In-Service Days *B*	Port Calls *C*	Days in Port $D = C \times 1.5$	Engine Running Days $E = A/24$	Days When Engines Not Running (in Port) $F = B - (A/24)$	At-Sea Days $G = B - D$	Laid Up Days (Not in Service) $H = 360 - B$	Maximum Sea Days (~5 Days Laid Up) $I = 360 - D$
<5,000	4000	240	100	150	167	73	90	120	210
5,000–100,000[a]	5000	270	60	90	208	62	180	90	270
>100,000[b]	6000	300	35	53	250	50	247	60	307
Fleetwide averages[c]	5840	300	70	105	243	57	210[c]	60	255

It is also clear that alternative assumptions on fractions s and p (of sea and port time) would produce different results on all of the statistics of Table 3. However, sensitivity analysis on the s/p ratio has revealed negligible changes in the *CO2 per tonne-km* statistics of the larger size vessel categories, and larger (but still small) changes in the smaller size categories, irrespective of ship type. For instance, varying this ratio even outside the above range from 60/40 to 90/10 in the Capesize bulker category would only reduce its CO_2 per tonne-km emissions from 2.8 to 2.7 gr/tonne-km respectively, whereas doing the same in the Handy-size bulker category would reduce this figure from 9.1 to 8.6 gr/tonne-km. As noted earlier, increasing the s/p ratio reduces CO_2 per tonne-km emissions.

Of course, the apparent lack of sensitivity of the per tonne-km emissions statistics on the s/p ratio does not hold for the statistics on the absolute quantities of total bunkers consumed and total CO_2 emitted. These are sensitive to the assumed values of sea and port times, all of them being increasing functions of the s/p ratio. Therefore the values of these statistics in our study should be interpreted with caution if the intent is to use them to estimate total world bunker consumption or global CO_2 emissions of the world fleet. However, we were able to cross check some annual bunker consumption figures with industry representatives for various types of ships, and, as a result, we have a reasonable degree of confidence on bunker consumption figures for several types of ships (most notably bulk carriers, crude oil carriers and container vessels).

In all ship categories, maximum payload was assumed equal to 95% of DWT, and several average capacity utilizations (w) when at sea were assumed, ranging from 70% for container vessels to 50% for tankers. The 50% figure for tankers means that the ship spends half of its sea time full and half empty (on ballast), while higher figures (60%) are possible for bulk carriers due to possible triangular routes and for container vessels (70%) due to the nature of the container trades. Again, statistics of Table 3 depend on the assumed values of these capacity utilizations. In terms of sensitivity analysis, changing the figures of capacity utilization (w) was found to change the CO_2 per tonne-km figures uniformly (down for increasing utilization), with no change in the relative standing among ship categories.

Various charts from Table 3 can be produced. These are shown in Annex A. A sample is shown below.



Fig. 1: Emissions statistics, bulk carriers



Fig. 2: Emissions statistics, containerships



Fig. 3: CO2 emissions per vessel category

As expected, faster ships (such as containerships) emit more (both in absolute levels and per tonne-km) than slower ships. Similarly, smaller ships emit more per tonne-km than larger ships. Another observation is that tankers and bulkers are pretty similar with respect to emissions statistics, although tankers generally have slightly higher CO_2 per tonne-km figures both because of higher port fuel consumption and lower capacity utilization than bulkers.

Perhaps the most interesting observation is the degree of dominance of the container sector in terms of both higher CO_2 per tonne-km figures as compared to the other two ship types, and, overall quantity of bunkers consumed and CO_2 emissions produced per size bracket. The top size category of container vessels is seen to produce CO_2 emissions comparable on an absolute scale to that produced by the entire tanker fleet.

9. PASSENGER VESSELS AND VESSELS LESS THAN 400 GRT

A special effort to calculate emissions from passenger vessels and from those below 400 GT was made. The reason these were treated separately was lack of reliable and representative information on fuel consumption and other data, as will be seen below.

A number of 6,281 vessels below 400 GT were identified. These were treated as a homogenous group, assuming an average fuel consumption of 210 gr/kWh and 300 operational days per year (of which 180 at sea). The fuel consumption figure was taken from BLG 12/6/1 and is supported by Endresen (2004) and Corbett and Köhler (2004).

The case of passenger ships was more difficult. A total fleet of 2,801 vessels was broken down into three basic categories: cruise vessels, multihulls and general Ro-Pax vessels. We assumed a fuel consumption of 160-180 gr/kWh (which is a typical fuel consumption for medium speed and high speed main engines according to engine manufacturers) and 300 operational days per year (of which 240 at sea). Based on this, the total CO2 emissions of this part of the fleet were calculated, based on the total recorded horsepower for these ships (as per Lloyds – Fairplay database).

In trying to cross-reference this information, we also obtained data from two Greek Ro-Pax shipping companies, operating modern ferries in the Adriatic and Aegean seas. Actual fuel consumption figures were on the order of 120 to 160 gr/kWh, some 12-25% lower than the ones assumed above. By contrast, annual days at sea were higher (as high as 270, as opposed to 240, i.e. about 12% higher), and we were unable to distinguish operational time in port (in which the ship's auxiliary engines are running) from idle time in port (in which there are no emissions). All this made us decide to use the latter figures only for the web tool, and not as representative ones for the world fleet analysis.

With all these caveats, we are in a position to say that, based on the methodology, information and assumptions outlined above, aggregate estimates of total CO_2 emissions and bunker consumption are as follows (2007):

Table 5: Emissions estimates

Type of Vessels	Number of Vessels	CO2 emissions (million tonnes/yr)	Bunker consumption (million tonnes/yr)
Cargo Vessels (Annex VI)	36,538	839.95	264.97
Vessels below 400 GT	6,281	9.82	3.10
Passenger Vessels	2,801	93.67	29.55
Total	**45,620**	**943.44**	**297.62**

One can immediately see that the contribution of the small vessel group to total emissions is negligible (order of 1%). If alternative assumptions are made, it is speculated that this percentage will not change that much.

The contribution of passenger vessels is much higher, on the order of 10%. However, this number can change depending on the actual scenario. In terms of sensitivity analysis, if the number of assumed operational days per year increases from 200 to 320 (and the s/p ratio remains the same) emissions of passenger vessels will rise to about 150 million tonnes per year, or about 15% of the total. Total bunkers will then rise to about 315 million tonnes per year, or slightly less than 6% more than the base-case value computed above. Given the wide variety of passenger ships and trading patterns across the globe, we feel it is impossible to be precise on the fuel consumed (let alone the average values of D and s/p) without access to detailed bunker consumption and ship movement information.

Equally speculative is any attempt to calculate CO_2 emissions per tonne-km from these numbers. Perhaps the only one that we can venture (with all caveats listed above) is the one for vessels below 400 GRT, which is about 67.7 gr/tonne-km, higher than any other ship type/size combination examined (as expected). For passenger vessels, any aggregate per tonne-km figure would likely be misleading, or even meaninglesss, as cruise ships (that carry no cargo) are different from Ro-pax ships (that carry a mixture of passengers, vehicles and cargo), or multi-hull ships (that may or may not carry cargo). However, the web tool calculates such statistics for the specific ships and routes that are examined.

10. COMPARISON WITH OTHER STUDIES AND OTHER MODES

In trying now to compare our estimates on global fuel consumption and overall emissions with those of similar studies that estimate these figures, it is not surprising to see that this task is anything but straightforward. Such a comparison was not foreseen in this study anyway, but it might be possible to cover it if it was a straight task. However, the basis of such a comparison (for instance, the fleet whose emissions are studied, the year for which the emissions estimate is made, and a variety of other parameters) varies across studies, and one would have to look carefully at all of the assumptions, modeling and others, of these studies to be able to compare them properly, both against each other and against ours. Suffice it to say that wide differences exist even among expert estimates of global fuel consumption, and even within the IMO expert group study (BLG 12/6/1 and BLG 12/INF.10) different databases of the fleet were given by the various parties who were engaged in the study, and some adjustments were necessary to achieve compatibility.

Still, we can venture showing some results of other studies. Table 6 shows bunker consumption estimates of years 2000 and 2001 projected to 2007 as given by BLG 12/INF.10.

Table 6 - Comparison of Bunker Consumption Results of Various Studies (from BLG 12/INF.10)

Study	Scope	Reference year	Result (mill tons)	Projected to 2007, incl. boiler consumption (mt)
Endresen *et al*; September 2003	All Int. Ships GT>100	2000	193	282 *
Corbett & Köhler; October 2003	All Int. Ships GT>100	2001	289	405 **
Eyring, Köhler, *et al*; 2005	All Int. Ships GT>100	2001	280	393
EnSys 2007		2001	278	391

* -23 mt for ships 100-400 GT ships; +19 mt for aux engines

** -41 mt for Navy ships; -40 mt for 100-400 GT ships.

BLG/12/6/1 itself estimates global fuel consumption for 2007 at **369 million tonnes**, using quite a few modeling assumptions. This is a figure that is about 24% higher than our base-case estimate and about 17% higher than our highest estimate. But a detailed comparison of the differences among all of these studies (including ours) requires additional analysis.

A last word concerns comparison with emissions of other modes. Although again such comparison, if properly conducted, can be quite involved, we cite here some figures:

Table 7: Emissions statistics across different modes (source: Maersk Line[6]).

Mode	CO_2 (gr/tonne-km)	SO_2 (gr/tonne-km)	NO_x (gr/tonne/km)
Boeing 747-400	552	5.69	0.17
Heavy truck	50	0.31	0.00005
Rail-diesel	17	0.35	0.00005
Rail-electric	18	0.44	0.10
S-type container vessel (11,000 TEU)	8.35	0.21	0.162
PS-type container vessel (6,600 TEU)	7.48	0.19	0.12

The reason a direct comparison of these results with our results is not straightforward is that is not clear what detailed set of assumptions were made (for instance, what was the assumed value of capacity utilization of all modes, if less than 100%). However, both results give the appearance to be compatible with one another. The CO_2 per tonne-km figure we have calculated for the top-tier containership size bracket (Post-Panamax, ships above 4,400 TEU) is 10.8 gr/tonne-km, assuming a capacity utilization of 70% (the equivalent figure for 100% capacity utilization would be 7.56 gr/tonne-km). For the VLCC/ULCC class this figure is 3.6 gr/tonne-km (capacity utilization 50%) and for the Capesize bulker class it is 2.7 gr/tonne-km (capacity utilization 60%). Based on these figures, a heavy truck produces per tonne-km more than 18 times CO_2 than a Capesize bulker and a 747 jumbo jet produces more than 200 times CO_2. But the ratios for SO_2 and NO_x emissions are different and all merit further investigation. A more comprehensive comparison may help put the discussion on priorities as regards emissions reduction across transport modes on a proper perspective.

[6] Maersk Line (2007), Brochure: "Constant Care for the Environment".
The source of Table 7 is the Swedish Network for Transport and the Environment.

11. CONCLUSIONS

The authors of this report believe that the study has fulfilled its terms of reference. There is no question that the subject of this study is of non-trivial complexity, at least as documented by the extent of related activity at IMO/MEPC and elsewhere. A possible advantage of this study over others that try to predict emissions on a global basis is that, in addition to modeling, it also uses real data collected from industry. Any limitations of this study mainly concern the availability and quality of the data that was used. In order to perform a more in-depth and accurate analysis, it is clear that additional information is necessary, including ship movements on a world-wide basis and accurate bunker consumption figures for the world fleet.

The results of the study and this final report can form the basis for an IMO/MEPC submission, if so decided.

12. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We want to thank the shipping companies that provided data for our study. These are, alphabetically,

ANDRIAKI SHIPPING CO LTD
AEOLOS MANAGEMENT SA
ALPHA TANKER
BLUE STAR FERRIES
ANANGEL SHIP. ENTERPRISES SA
CARRAS HELLAS SA
CELEBRITY CRUISES
CENTROFIN MANAGEMENT INC
CHANDRIS HELLAS INC
COSTAMARE
DANAOS SHIPPING CO LTD
EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN MARITIME
EASY CRUISE
ELETSON CORP.
EUROPEAN PRODUCT CARRIERS
FAFALIOS SHIPPING
HALKIDON SHIPPING COPR
HELLENIC SEAWAYS
KRISTEN NAVIGATION
MINERVA MARINE INC
NEDA MARITIME
NEPTUNE LINES
NEREUS SHIPPING SA
SKYROS SHIPPING
SPRINGFIELD SHIPPING CO
SUPERFAST FERRIES
TSAGARIS PROS
TSAKOS HELLAS
VASSILIOS SHIPPING CO

13. REFERENCES

Corbett, J. J., and H. W. Köhler (2003), “Updated emissions from ocean shipping,” J. Geophys. Res., 108.

Corbett, J. J., and H. W. Köhler (2004), “Considering alternative input parameters in an activity-based ship fuel consumption and emissions model: Reply to comment by

Øyvind Endresen et al. on 'Updated emissions from ocean shipping'," J. Geophys. Res., 109.

Endresen, Ø., E. Sørgard, J. K. Sundet, S. B. Dalsøren, I. S. A. Isaksen, T. F. Berglen, and G. Gravir (2003), "Emission from international sea transportation and environmental impact," J. Geophys. Res., 108

Endresen, Ø., E. Sørgard, J. Bakke, and I. S. A. Isaksen (2004a), "Substantiation of a lower estimate for the bunker inventory: Comment on 'Updated emissions from ocean shipping' by James J. Corbett and Horst W. Köhler," J. Geophys. Res., 109.

EMEP/CORINAIR, (2002) "EMEP Co-operative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long Range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe, The Core Inventory of Air Emissions in Europe (CORINAIR), Atmospheric Emission Inventory Guidebook," 3rd edition, October.

EnSys (2007), Energy & Systems, "Analysis of impacts ob global refining & CO_2 emissions of potential MARPOL regulations for international marine bunker fuels", EnSys Energy & Systems.

Eyring, Köhler et al(2005), "Emissions from international shipping: 1. The last 50 years" , J. Geophys. Res., 110.

MARPOL regulations for international marine bunker fuels, September 2007
IMO (2000), "Study of Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Ships". Study by Marintek, Econ Centre for Economic Analysis, Carnegie Mellon University and DNV.

IMO (2007a), "Input from the four subgroups and individual experts to the final report of the Informal Cross Government/Industry Scientific Group of Experts," Note by the Secretariat, BLG 12/INF.10.

IMO (2007b), "Report on the outcome of the Informal Cross Government/Industry Scientific Group of Experts established to evaluate the effects of the different fuel options proposed under the revision of MARPOL Annex VI," Note by the Secretariat, BLG 12/6/1.

IMO (2008a), "Future IMO regulation regarding green house gas emissions from international shipping," Submitted by Denmark, Marshall Islands, BIMCO, ICS, INTERCARGO, INTERTANKO and OCIMF, MEPC 57/4/2.

IMO (2008b), "A mandatory CO2 Design Index for new ships," Submitted by Denmark, Marshall Islands, BIMCO, ICS, INTERCARGO, INTERTANKO and OCIMF, MEPC 57/4/3.

IMO (2008c), "Development of an index for CO2 emissions per unit shipping capacity in actual operational conditions," Submitted by Japan, MEPC 57/4/11.

IMO (2008d), "A mandatory CO2 Design Index for new ships," Submitted by Denmark, MEPC 57/INF.12.

ANNEX A: Detailed charts of world fleet database analysis




CO2 percentage per ship category
LPG
1.78%
General Cargo
9.93%
LNG
2.37%
Containerships
32.08%
Crude oil
12.65%
Reefer
2.61%
Product/Chemical
15.49%
Dry Bulk
17.98%
Ro-Ro (excl. Pass)
5.10%

Dry Bulk Carriers



Containerships



Crude Oil Carriers



LPG Carriers




LNG Carriers
Total CO2 (million tonnes per year)
Tonne-Km (billions per year)
CO2 per tonne-km (in grams per year)
CO2 per tonne-km (in grams per year)
Total CO2 (million tonnes per year)
Tonne-km (billions per year)
1,416
27.4
18.43
13.0
1.51
55
LNG (0-50)
LNG (>50)
Ship Categories (DWTx1000)


Reefers
Total CO2 (million tonnes per year)
Tonne-Km (billions per year)
CO2 per tonne-km (in grams per year)
CO2 per tonne-km (in grams per year)
Total CO2 (million tonnes per year)
Tonne-km (billions per year)
393
46.1
325
28.5
18.5
103
9.25
7.29
4.76
Reefer (0-5)
Reefer (5-10)
Reefer (>10)
Ship Categories (DWTx1000)



Chemical/Product Carriers
Total CO2 (million tonnes per year)
Tonne-Km (billions per year)
CO2 per tonne-km (in grams per year)
60.6
24.2
16.5
14.9
9.3
5.5
27.04
22.45
11.43
28.72
29.65
10.81
446
929
691
1,932
3,182
1,973
Product, chemical 0-5'
Product, chemical 5'-15'
Product, chemical 15'-25'
Product, chemical 25'-40'
Product, chemical 40'-60
Product, chemical >60
Ship Categories (DWTx1000)
CO2 per tonne-km (in grams per year)
Total CO2 (million tonnes per year)
Tonne-km (billions per year)



Chart Background
Ro-Ro (excl. passenger)
Total CO2 (million tonnes per year)
Tonne-Km (billions per year)
CO2 per tonne-km (in grams per year)
60.5
29.1
19.9
15.0
7.82
19.23
13.33
2.49
129
660
669
166
RO-RO (excl. Pax) 0-5000
RO-RO (excl. Pax) 5-15
RO-RO (excl. Pax) 15-25
RO-RO (excl. Pax) 25-40
Ship Categories (DWTx1000)
CO2 per tonne-km (in grams per year)
Total CO2 (million tonnes per year)
Tonne-km (billions per year)


General Cargo Vessels
Total CO2 (million tonnes per year)
Tonne-Km (billions per year)
CO2 per tonne-km (in grams per year)
CO2 per tonne-km (in grams per year)
Total CO2 (million tonnes per year)
Tonne-km (billions per year)
35.53
1,308
27.2
32.77
1,826
17.9
15.08
1,380
10.9
General Cargo (0-5)
General Cargo (5-15)
General Cargo (15-35)
Ship Categories (DWTx1000)


CO2 emissions per vessel category (million tonnes)
Small Vessels (0-5) 2.44
Coastal (5-15) 2.51
Handysize (15-35) 32.84
Handymax (35-60) 39.5
Panamax (60-85) 37.47
Post-Panamax (85-120) 3.63
Capesize (>120) 32.64
Feeder (0-500) 5.38
Feedermax (500-1000) 17.24
Handysize (1000-2000) 42.61
Sub-Panamax (2000-3000) 40.19
Panamax (3000-4400) 53.68
Post Panamax (>4400 TEU) 110.36
Small tanker (0-10) 0.72
Handysize (10-60) 7.84
Panamax (60-80) 6.39
Aframax (80-120) 30.11
Suezmax (120-200) 17.04
VLCC/ULCC (>200) 44.18
LNG (0-50) 1.51
LNG (>50) 18.43
LPG (0-5) 4.00
LPG (5-20) 4.02
LPG 20-40 1.99
LPG (>40) 4.91
Reefer (0-5) 4.76
Reefer (5-10) 9.25
Reefer (>10) 7.29
Product/chemical (0-5) 27.04
Product/chemical (5-15) 22.45
Product/chemical (15-25) 11.43
Product/chemical (25-40) 28.72
Product/chemical (40-60) 29.65
Product/chemical (>60) 10.81
RO-RO (excl. Pax) (0-5) 7.82
RO-RO (excl. Pax) (5-15) 19.23
RO-RO (excl. Pax) (15-25) 13.33
RO-RO (excl. Pax) (25-40) 2.49
General Cargo (0-5) 35.53
General Cargo (5-15) 32.77
General Cargo (15-35) 15.08

BULK CARRIERS

Distribution of Total CO2 emissions



Distribution of Tonne-Km



CONTAINER VESSELS

Distribution of Total CO2 emissions



Distribution of Tonne-Km



CRUDE OIL CARRIERS

Distribution of Total CO2 emissions



Distribution of Tonne-Km



LNG CARRIERS

Distribution of Total CO2 emissions



Distribution of Tonne-Km



LPG CARRIERS





Ro-Ro (excluding passenger)

Distribution of Total CO2 emissions



Distribution of Tonne-Km



PRODUCT/CHEMICAL CARRIERS

Distribution of Total CO2 emissions



Distribution of Tonne-Km



GENERAL CARGO

Distribution of Total CO_2 emissions



Distribution of Tonne-Km