Cement's pollution windfall from the EU ETS during 2008-2015

Agnes Brandt 30 November 2016



Cement and the EU ETS

- Cement is responsible for 5% of global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions
- The EU Emissions Trading System (EU ETS) the EU's main instrument to decarbonise cement has failed to deliver so far.

The EU ETS regulates about half of EU's CO2 by setting a limit on the total volume of GHG emissions that industry and power installations can emit ('cap and trade'). Currently, the cement sector receives allowances for free since it is considered to be at risk of "carbon leakage".

"Carbon leakage" refers to the hypothetical situation where companies transfer production to countries with weaker climate policies in order to lower their costs.

 Cement emissions have increased due to the EU ETS rather than decreased under the current rules*

*Sandbag, The Final Carbon Fatcat (03/2016); also: Cement exposed. What now for the ETS Fatcat (10/2016)

Five problems related to the current system of free allocation

- **1. No evidence for "carbon leakage"** or production displacement due to the EU ETS.
- 2. Current EU ETS rules over-subsidise industry pollution. Free allocation has resulted in significant profits for corporations.
- **3. European taxpayers are picking up the bill** as governments forego scarce public money.
- 4. Without a change of the rules, emission reductions of industry will stall over the next 15 years.
- 5. The Paris agreement will help level the playing field across the global economy



updated CE Delft report:* Industry earned a €25 billion pollution windfall under the EU ETS



- €7.5 billion windfall profits from surplus
- €0.8 billion windfall profits from offsets
- €16.8 billion windfall profits from cost-pass through

*CE Delft (forthcoming), Update of the calculation of additional profits of sectors and firms in the EU ETS 2008-2015



Windfall profits by countries

Industry profits from over-subsidising carbon pollution by country





Windfall profits by sector

Industry profits from over-subsidising carbon pollution by sector Between 2008-2015 carbon intensive industries in the EU profited by a total of €25 billion from Europe's flagship instrument for reducing CO, (EU ETS) IRON AND STEEL €8.4 Billion CEMENT €5.0 REFINERIES Billion €4.6 PETRO CHEMICAL Billion Billion *All figures are taken from the CE Delft (2016) report: 'Update of the calculation of additional profits of sectors and firms in the EU ETS 2008-2015'



The cement industry made €5 billion windfall profits from the EU ETS



- €2.7 billion windfall profits from surplus
- €0.1 billion windfall profits from offsets
- €2.1 billion windfall profits from cost-pass through

Example: Spain

Sector	Windfall profits from surplus	Windfall profits from offsets	Windfall profits from min. cost-pass through	Total windfall profits
Cement	€798 million	€17 million	€309 million	€1,124 million
Refineries	€133 million	€9 million	€473 million	€616 million
Iron and steel	€250 million	€14 million	€341 million	€605 million
Manufacturing of bricks	€177 million	€2 million	€39 million	€218 million
Petrochemicals	€34 million	€2 million	€54 million	€90 million

Windfall profits by sector in Spain 2008-2015

Company	Sector	Windfall profits from surplus	Windfall profits from offsets	Windfall profits from min. cost-pass through	Total windfall profits
ArcelorMittal	Iron and steel	€224 million	€13 million	€270 million	€507 million
Cemex	Cement	€273 million	€3 million	€63 million	€340 million
Portland Valderrivas	Cement	€125 million	€2 million	€43 million	€170 million
Lafarge	Cement	€94 million	€4 million	€32 million	€129 million
Holcim	Cement	€85 million	€0.07 million	€34 million	€118 million

Windfall profits by company in Spain 2008-2015



Example: Italy

Sector	Windfall profits from surplus	Windfall profits from offsets	Windfall profits from min. cost-pass through	Total windfall profits	
Cement	€516 million	€22 million	€357 million	€895 million	
Iron and steel	€8 million	€13 million	€596 million	€617 million	
Refineries	-€428 million	€10 million	€752 million	€333 million	
Petrochemicals	€126 million	€1 million	€74 million	€202 million	
Windfall profits by sector in Italy 2008-2015					

Windfall profits by sector in Italy 2008-2015

Company	Sector	Windfall profits from surplus	Windfall profits from offsets	Windfall profits from min. cost-pass through	Total windfall profits
ILVA	Iron and steel	€50 million	€6 million	€420 million	€476 million
Italcementi	Cement	€132 million	€6 million	€96 million	€234 million
Buzzi	Cement	€116 million	€4 million	€64 million	€184 million
Versalis	Petrochemicals	€92 million	-	€61 million	€153 million
Colacem	Cement	€79 million	€4 million	€62 million	€145 million

Windfall profits by company in Italy 2008-2015



Example: Ireland

Sector	Windfall profits from surplus	Windfall profits from offsets	Windfall profits from min. cost-pass through	Total windfall profits
Cement	€124 million	€1 million	€40 million	€165 million
Refineries	€3 million	€0.03 million	€11 million	€15 million
Lime	€10 million	€0.08 million	-	€10 million

Windfall profits by sector in Ireland 2008-2015

Company	Sector	Windfall profits from surplus	Windfall profits from offsets	Windfall profits from min. cost-pass through	Total windfall profits
CRH	Cement	€90 million	-	€22 million	€112 million
Quinn	Cement	€23 million	€1 million	€12 million	€36 million
Lagan	Cement	€10 million	-	€6 million	€17 million

Windfall profits by company in Ireland 2008-2015



Cement industry confirms profits made from the EU ETS



EU ETS has failed to promote cement decarbonization

because...

- 1. The current carbon price is too low to incentivize investments
- 2. Companies have been able to benefit from their pollution rather than making them pay
- 3. EU ETS promotes high cement emissions by incentivizing the use of a high-carbon input (clinker), rather than encouraging low-carbon alternatives



Europe has fallen behind in efficient cement production



Figure 3.4. Thermal energy consumption per region for grey clinker production. [MJ/t clinker.] Source: World Business Council for Sustainable Development (2015).

*taken from: Institute for European Studies, IES (2016), The Final Frontier -Decarbonising Europe's energy intensive industries

A forward-looking cement sector

...achieves emission reductions by

- Phasing out of older and inefficient production sites and modernization of plants
- **Substituting** high-carbon clinker to reduce process emissions (e.g. granulated blast furnace slag, fly ash material, even limestone itself)
- **Investing** in process innovations, such as calcium looping CCS technology which could capture more than 80% of the cement production emissions
- **Downstreaming demand reductions** that reduce the amount of concrete or cement that is actually needed.

*IES (2016), The Final Frontier - Decarbonising Europe's energy intensive industries



Making the EU ETS fit for purpose

Key recommendations

- \checkmark Deliver a carbon price that rewards green innovations
- End the free allocation of allowances to the sector to end profits from overallocation
- ✓ Introduce benchmarked border levelling in combination with 100% auctioning since it is the most effective approach to tackle the problem of 'carbon leakage' in the sector
- Replace clinker benchmarks with a cement benchmark to incentivise low-carbon clinker substitutes
- Invest more auctioning revenues in climate friendly innovation and support frontrunners that invest in breakthrough technologies



Thank you!



agnes.brandt@carbonmarketwatch.org www.carbonmarketwatch.org

@CarbonMrktWatch Garbonmarketwatch

