The key characteristics would be early action and having a long-term vision. That long-term vision would provide a binding, unambiguous strategy and a timetable for reducing aviation’s GHGs which should leave no doubt about ICAO’s leadership, and will help to explain to the general public and other UN institutions what aviation’s role is in a low carbon society (that keeps overall temperature increases at below 2 degrees above pre-industrialised levels by 2050).

The latter must be defined through targets. To inform this process, ICAO needs to work closely with IPCC and UNFCCC to understand the scenarios and trajectories that set out what is necessary from a scientific perspective. I am pleased to learn from the presentation from the Director of the Air Transport Bureau that these discussions are already underway. But we also need to understand what the aviation industry is capable of, realistically, in terms of technology and alternative fuels. Although we have projections on what may be achieved, it would be helpful to subject these to independent assessment in much the same way as the CAEP process has benefitted from an Independent Experts process in relation to NOx and fuel burn.

Recently, the UK has undertaken a similar analysis of aviation’s GHG emissions out to 2050. In summary, the Committee on Climate Change, advisors to Government on climate change issues, assessed and reported on the industry’s ability to achieve a target of keeping its emissions to at or below 2005 levels by 2050 using technology, bio-fuels, the role of telecommunications and modal shift. The outcome showed that the aviation industry may need to grow at a slower rate than forecast to meet the target. However, other sectors will need to work even harder to reduce their emissions (making a 90% reduction in CO2 below 1990 levels) in order to achieve the UK’s binding target of an 80% cut below 1990 by 2050 across the economy. The Committee believes aviation’s more relaxed target is reasonable given the relative difficulties of long-lead times and high abatement costs inherent in the sector. Whether or not this is equitable treatment, it does prove that it is realistic to have different trajectories for different sectors, all contributing to an overall climate objective.

Without such a process at the global level, it will be difficult to assess accurately what a long-term climate target for aviation can deliver. When setting these long-term targets, it is important that aviation commits to what is necessary to demonstrate a fair contribution to reducing emissions, and does not rely solely on forecast efficiency improvements. Targets should not be either convenient or arbitrary. It is widely acknowledged that technology and operations alone will not be able to keep pace with demand, so targets are likely to require access to the carbon markets to ensure compliance. The preference would be for a global trading scheme, with auctioning of permits. It is important that there are funds available, to be applied in full compliance with ICAO’s principles, towards tackling climate change in areas where its impacts are most keenly felt.

It will take time to develop such a scheme, so early action by states should be encouraged to ensure that there is no net increase in aviation emissions. So while we put the necessary architecture of a global scheme in place – including its administration - we should also encourage what is happening at a regional level (in terms of planned or emerging actions). Nevertheless, identifying the key elements of a global scheme should be a high priority for ICAO in order that any regional schemes can, as far as possible, be complimentary.
We must also promote and deliver all available improvements within the sector and make this industry as efficient as it can be, eliminating all subsidies and helping to reduce excess capacity. We support the introduction of aircraft CO2 standards (correctly applied) to help achieve this result.