Providing alternative marine fuels: Supply-chain sustainability considerations, required infrastructure, and how IMO can help

Bryan Comer, PhD, Marine Program Lead, ICCT

February 10, 2021 International Maritime Organization Symposium on alternative low-carbon and zero-carbon fuels for shipping



What to expect

Today, I'll do the following:

- Explain the basics of life-cycle analysis
- Outline three principles for evaluating the "sustainability" of alternative marine fuels
- Give an example of where green hydrogen infrastructure investments could support zero-life-cycle emission container shipping
- Conclude with a summary of what IMO can do to ensure policies promote sustainable alternative marine fuels









Life-cycle emissions: biofuel example

200

Three Principles for Evaluating the "Sustainability" of Alternative Marine Fuels

Principle 1: Consider CO₂e not CO₂

Principle 2: Consider GWP20 not just GWP100

Principle 3: Consider well-to-wake not tank-to-wake



Principles for Evaluating the "Sustainability" of Alternative Marine Fuels

Principle 1: CO ₂ e not CO ₂
Why? Some fuels are "zero-carbon" but not zero-GHG
Why is that important to IMO? IMO's initial GHG strategy aims to reduce GHGs by at least 50% from 2008 levels by 2050 and to phase them out completely
Some potential zero-carbon marine fuels still emit GHGs
Example: burning ammonia (NH ₃) does not emit CO ₂ but does emit nitrous oxide (N ₂ O), a potent and long-lived GHG
IMO regulations currently only regulate CO ₂
EEDI phase 4+ and the EEXI/CII could instead regulate CO_2e if the aim is to reduce GHGs

Principles for Evaluating the "Sustainability" of Alternative Marine Fuels

Principle 1: CO ₂ e not CO ₂	Principle 2: GWP20 not solely GWP100
Why? Some fuels are "zero-carbon" but not zero-GHG	Why? GWP20 reflects the global warming potential of climate pollutants over the next 20 years rather than the next 100 years
Why is that important to IMO? IMO's initial GHG strategy aims to reduce GHGs by at least 50% from 2008 levels by 2050 and to phase them out completely	Why is that important to IMO? IMO's initial GHG strategy aims to be consistent with the Paris Agreement temperature goals, which includes pursuing efforts to limit warming to +1.5°C
Some potential zero-carbon marine fuels still emit GHGs Example: burning ammonia (NH ₃) does not emit CO ₂ but does emit nitrous oxide (N ₂ O), a potent and long-lived GHG	2020 was <u>+1.3°C</u> compared to pre-industrial levels Reducing pollutants with high GWP20 helps avoid additional near-term warming
IMO regulations currently only regulate CO ₂ EEDI phase 4+ and the EEXI/CII could instead regulate CO ₂ e if the aim is to reduce GHGs	

Principles for Evaluating the "Sustainability" of Alternative Marine Fuels

Principle 1: CO ₂ e not CO ₂	Principle 2: GWP20 not solely GWP100	Principle 3: Well-to-Wake not Tank-to-Wake
Why? Some fuels are "zero-carbon" but not zero-GHG	Why? GWP20 reflects the global warming potential of climate pollutants over the next 20 years rather than the next 100 years	Why? The climate impacts of marine fuels go far beyond what comes out of the smokestack
Why is that important to IMO? IMO's initial GHG strategy aims to reduce GHGs by at least 50% from 2008 levels by 2050 and to phase them out completely	Why is that important to IMO? IMO's initial GHG strategy aims to be consistent with the Paris Agreement temperature goals, which includes pursuing efforts to limit warming to +1.5°C	Why is that important to IMO? IMO focuses mainly on TTW, which risks rewarding high life-cycle emission fuels
Some potential zero-carbon marine fuels still emit GHGs	2020 was <u>+1.3°C</u> compared to pre-industrial levels	Fuels with zero TTW emissions can have high WTW emissions
Example: burning ammonia (NH ₃) does not emit CO ₂ but does emit nitrous oxide (N ₂ O), a potent and long-lived GHG	Reducing pollutants with high GWP20 helps avoid additional near-term warming	Example: hydrogen (H_2) has zero TTW emissions, but if the H_2 is made from fossil fuels, it will have considerable WTW emissions
IMO regulations currently only regulate CO ₂		
EEDI phase 4+ and the EEXI/CII could instead regulate CO ₂ e if the aim is to reduce GHGs		

Example of green hydrogen bunkering infrastructure to achieve zero-life-cycle emission transpacific container shipping



Where to put green hydrogen refueling stations?



10

Expected demand of green hydrogen at ports



THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL SOURCE: https://theicct.org/publications/ZEV-port-infrastructure-hydrogen-2020

Green hydrogen storage considerations by port



Land requirements for on-site storage tanks

Less than 1% of Long Beach, CA port space would be needed for refueling structures

	Area Required for Refueling Spheres (m ²)	Percent of Area used in Port
ort of Long Beach	5,400	< 1%
ort of Shanghai	1,700	< 1%
ort of Hong Kong	2,000	< 1%
Keihin Ports	1,700	< 1%
Vancouver	700	< 1%

13

Source: https://theicct.org/publications/ZEV-port-infrastructure-hydrogen-2020

Picture Source: https://lbpost.com/news/business/development/port-of-long-beach-to-host-community-forum-on-master-plan-update

IMO could help ensure that policies promote sustainable alternative marine fuels by...

- 1. Replacing CO_2 with CO_2 e in proposed and existing IMO regulations
- 2. Calculating CO_2e based on GWP20 for regulations meant to align with Paris Agreement temperature goals
- 3. Regulating well-to-wake CO₂e emissions in policies that promote the uptake of alternative marine fuels



Acknowledgements

Thank you to Nikita Pavlenko and Elise Georgeff at the ICCT for contributing to this presentation.

Thank you to Pacific Environment for arranging for ICCT to present at this meeting.

Thank you to the IMO for coordinating this symposium.

Thank you all for your kind attention!



Questions or comments? Email: bryan.comer@theicct.org

