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**International Coalition for Sustainable Aviation (ICSA) ...**

- Formed in 1998 to represent the environmental NGOs at ICAO CAEP

- Brings together NGOs working on global aviation environmental issues and those representing communities around airports. Members include T&E, AEF, and ICCT

- Actively participates in working groups, workshops, steering group and plenary meetings of CAEP

- Role – to highlight local and global environmental issues and pressures, and aviation’s role; to seek and encourage solutions

- Links to other NGO networks around the world to get regional perspectives and non-sectoral views. This presentation is supported by WWF International, WWF Australia, Friends of the Earth Canada and the Arab Climate Alliance.
The challenge …

The scientific evidence of climate change and the economic cost of delayed action are widely understood and require no introduction.

The existence of GIACC is testament to the need, and urgency, for ICAO to deliver an effective and timely response that addresses aviation’s contribution to greenhouse gas emissions.

We recognise the political complexities of the challenge. Nevertheless, the forecast growth in projected greenhouse gas emissions from the sector requires ICAO to be ambitious to maintain its leadership role, setting measurable objectives, commitments and timetables.
What constitutes leadership that will meet global expectation?

• **Relevance**: The setting of an absolute emissions target for the aviation sector. An absolute emissions target is necessary to demonstrate progress towards the ultimate goal of stabilising greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere. Target should be short to medium term and needs to establish baseline.

• **Setting the pace**: demonstrating ICAO’s value and purpose by matching and going beyond the ambition being shown by states and parts of industry. For example:
  - Aviation Climate Deal Group net emissions reductions
  - IATA carbon neutral growth

• **Timing**: an agreement this year in time for Copenhagen, and a realistic timetable for action

• **External involvement and communication**
Measures – fuel efficiency goals versus fuel efficiency standards

• There is no certainty that aspirational efficiency targets for national fleets will reduce GHG emissions.

• ICAO should recommend efficiency or GHG emission standards for new aircraft to be enforced by member states with reporting requirements back to ICAO.

• Action on emission standards for aircraft has been promoted by both the US FAA and the UK – ICAO should take the opportunity to work on a standardised approach.

• Market-based measures such as emissions trading can also be expected to promote efficiency.

• ICSA supports the CAEP WG3 effort to establish a long-term technology goal (LTTG). The technology goals established should be used to set fuel efficiency or GHG emission standards for aircraft.
Measures - alternative fuels

Sustainably produced alternative fuels may play a role in a comprehensive, long-term strategy to control GHG emissions.

Little evidence to show that such fuels will significantly reduce emissions within the next 15 years.

Many alternative fuels are likely to have higher GHG intensity than petroleum-based jet fuel because of emissions associated with direct and indirect land-use change, the use of carbon-intensive feedstocks, or the consumption of large quantities of energy for processing.

ICSA calls on GIACC to include a statement recognising these factors, including a requirement that any alternative fuel or biofuel targets set by ICAO must be based upon lifecycle emission reduction rather than volumetric requirements.
Measures – a global ETS

Despite calls for a global ETS, ICAO rejected the opportunity to work on such a scheme in 2004.

But a global ETS has many advantages:

• An ETS is well-suited to aviation given the need for immediate GHG emissions reductions and the time lag between policies to promote efficiency and the development of new technologies.

• An ETS can help aviation finance emissions reductions in other sectors through open trading, and later will provide certainty that sectoral goals are met if efficiency and operational measures fail to generate the anticipated emission reductions.

• If a global scheme is to be seriously considered in the future, ICAO needs to identify any prerequisite steps now.
Measures - addressing non-CO2 effects

GIACC’s mandate focuses narrowly on CO₂ emissions from international aviation, but ICAO also has the responsibility to consider steps to address the non-CO₂ climate impact of aviation.

A 2006 CAEP report on NOx LTTGs report recognized:
- the need for faster reductions of aircraft NOx emissions due to their climate impact;
- it stressed that action on NOx should have almost equal priority with action to reduce CO2 emissions.

While ICAO remains insistent that goals will not be the basis for standards or other policy measures, ICSA calls on ICAO to:
- to immediately strengthen regulatory standards for new aircraft;
- examine and recommend operational and market-based cruise NOx measures for the existing fleet which alongside other initiatives could act as incentives for industry to adopt new technology.
Common but differentiated responsibilities - special consideration

• ICAO has a track record of taking into account the needs of developing countries when considering environmental protection. For example the Chapter 2 phase-out.

• A similar approach has been put forward at IMO where measures may be based only on routes or cargos to and from Annex 1 countries or exempting maritime trade between non-Annex 1 countries

• ICSA calls on GIACC to examine the potential application of differentiating action by blocs of countries; delayed or conditional entry. Would investment in CDM or the use of revenues from market-based measures towards mitigation and adaptation in developing countries provide suitable compensation for global participation?
Alternatives being debated in UNFCCC

- The concept of ‘compensation differentiation’ involves developing countries participating in global or near-global sectoral policies, which in turn raise revenue for climate protection in developing countries.

- Gaining some momentum at UNFCCC as an appropriate way to tackle global sectors such as aviation and shipping.

- Some developing states have spoken in favour of levies on international transport. The Maldives on behalf of the group of 50 Least Developed Countries (LDCs) has submitted a proposal for a flat levy on all air tickets, from all countries, with the proceeds to fund adaptation work. The LDCs argue that the proposal conforms to the principle of CBDR, but at the level not of the country but of the individual – since only globally wealthy individuals undertake international air travel.
Summary

Only a significant, absolute emissions reduction goal is likely to meet the expectation of the international community and demonstrate leadership. Failure to do so will see other bodies and/or countries take action to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions from international aviation.

No shortage of potential policy options available – innovative ideas are surfacing in both IMO and UNFCCC. ICAO needs to summon the political will present in individual member states to act.

All issues under discussion, including CBDR, can be resolved in the near future provided ICAO takes the first step and recommends an absolute emissions reduction goal this year.

The members of ICSA look forward to continuing to work constructively within ICAO and its constituent bodies to identify efficient and equitable measures to reduce GHG emissions.