Emissions Trading in Germany – An Abstract.

EuPD Europressedienst

Fifth Annual Workshop on Greenhouse Gas Emissions Trading
Paris, September 27\textsuperscript{th}-28\textsuperscript{th} 2005
Agenda

- Part A – Europressedienst and EuPD Research – Who We Are
- Part B – Survey – An Overview
- Part C – Methodology and Sample
- Part D – Findings: An Excerpt
Agenda

- Part A – Europressedienst and EuPD Research – Who We Are
- Part B – Survey – An Overview
- Part C – Methodology and Sample
- Part D – Findings: An Excerpt
Europressedienst is an independent information service. Amongst others, it provides information and articles about current themes to media. At this connection, comparisons of products, sector overviews as well as excerpts of self-provided surveys take center stage.

Moreover, Europressedienst possesses an own national and international network of specialists, decision makers and media representatives in areas such as:

- management
- energy
- pharmacy and health
- finances and insurances

The network enables Europressedienst to access relevant primary and secondary data in a rapid and intense way.

EuPD Research is our own market research division that directly gathers primary data about current, economically related topics by order of media, institutions or companies. Our particularly skilled interviewer center in combination with a substantial knowledge management and the expert network lead to a methodological and goal-oriented proceeding. The main objective is to validate secondary data by means of primary data.
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Part B: Survey – An Overview

1. Objective
According to an increasing media interest, Europressedienst has decided to conduct an emissions trading survey from a company’s point of view. This survey focuses on experiences of concerned companies and aims at identifying strengths and weaknesses of the EU ETS (which is of particular importance for the legislative body), but it also points out opportunities and chances for companies.

2. Structure
The questionnaire contained nine parts and addressed a wide range of aspects concerning emissions trading and therefore offers profound knowledge and insights into companies strategies how to meet with new challenges given by the coming into effect of the Kyoto Protocol.

- Information
- Application
- Allocation
- Trading
- Project activities
- Reduction means
- Evaluation
- Political aspects
- Company data

2. Report
A detailed report including all mentioned aspects and moreover, detailed analyses (e.g. according to single sectors or specific differentiations between traders/non-traders) will be published in English and German in October 2005.
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Part C: Methodology and Sample

1. Course of Action
   - survey was addressed to all German companies or installations that are subjected to EU ETS (in total 1,849 facilities of energy industry and energy-intense industry
   - first full survey, unique in Germany
   - field time: July 4th – 29th 2005

2. Sample
   - 151 people replied for 357 installations
   - return rate according to companies: 14.1 percent
   - return rate according to installations: 19.3 percent
   - analysis on the basis of companies (not installations), however detailed examination of different sectors: energy-related installations vs. other installations and electric utilities in specific
   - similar distribution as universe
Part C: Methodology and Sample

The sample (according to installations) is composed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Universe (percent)</th>
<th>Sample (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>1,234 (66.7 percent)</td>
<td>271 (76 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>207 (11.1 percent)</td>
<td>16 (4.5 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulp and paper</td>
<td>127 (6.9 percent)</td>
<td>14 (3.9 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>89 (4.8 percent)</td>
<td>18 (5.0 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement, lime and sugar</td>
<td>116 (6.3 percent)</td>
<td>29 (8.1 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron and Steel</td>
<td>39 (2.1 percent)</td>
<td>4 (1.1 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refineries</td>
<td>37 (2 percent)</td>
<td>5 (1.4 percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,849 (100 percent)</td>
<td>357 (100 percent)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figures are based on company distribution (not installation).

Source: EuPD Research 2005

- Companies with energy installations: 40% (n = 151) 60% (n = 151) 64%
- Electric utilities: 25%
- Companies with other installations: 36%

Differences to 100% missing values = not specified
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How do you evaluate the option of emissions trading?

Source: EuPD Research 2005

- Very positive: 2% (Total n = 151), 5% (Companies with energy installations n = 96), 0% (Electric utilities n = 38), 3% (Companies with other installations n = 55)
- Rather positive: 26% (Total n = 151), 32% (Companies with energy installations n = 96), 30% (Electric utilities n = 38), 18% (Companies with other installations n = 55)
- Rather negative: 53% (Total n = 151), 50% (Companies with energy installations n = 96), 58% (Companies with other installations n = 55)
- Very negative: 0% (Total n = 151), 17% (Companies with energy installations n = 96), 15% (Electric utilities n = 38), 22% (Companies with other installations n = 55)

Differences to 100% missing values = not specified
Part D – Findings: An Excerpt
To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

- Emissions trading... causes extra costs for companies
  - 50% fully agree
  - 34% rather agree
  - 39% rather disagree
  - 16% fully disagree

- ...is not sufficient in its present form to protect the environment in an appropriate way
  - 30% fully agree
  - 24% rather agree
  - 27% rather disagree
  - 20% fully disagree

- ...leads to relocation, but does not cause a reduction of GHGs and therefore misses the point
  - 35% fully agree
  - 28% rather agree
  - 22% rather disagree
  - 38% fully disagree

Source: EuPD Research 2005

Total n = 151
  - Electric utilities n = 38
  - Energy inst. n = 96
  - Other Inst. n = 55

Differences to 100% missing values = not specified
Part D – Findings: An Excerpt
Do you trade with allowances?

Source: EuPD Research 2005

- Total n = 151
- Electric utilities n = 38
- Companies with energy installations n = 96
- Companies with other installations n = 55

Differences to 100% missing values = not specified
### Part D – Findings: An Excerpt

How satisfied are you with the allocation of allowances (traders vs. non-traders)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Traders n = 39</th>
<th>Non-traders n = 112</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather satisfied</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather not satisfied</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied at all</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences to 100% missing values = not specified

Source: EuPD Research 2005
Part D – Findings: An Excerpt
Did you make use of external consultants for the application of allowances?

Source: EuPD Research 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total n = 151</th>
<th>Electric utilities n = 38</th>
<th>Companies with energy installations n = 96</th>
<th>Companies with other installations n = 55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with consultation</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without consultation</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences to 100 % missing values = not specified
Part D – Findings: An Excerpt

Does your company conduct CDM- or JI-projects?

- **Yes, CDM-/ JI-projects:**
  - Total n = 151
  - Electric utilities n = 38
  - Companies with energy installations n = 96
  - Companies with other installations n = 55

- **No, CDM-/ JI-projects:**
  - Differences to 100% missing values = not specified

Source: EuPD Research 2005
Part D – Findings: An Excerpt
Which means of CO₂-reductions do you consider in the long-/short-term?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Long-term</th>
<th>Short-term</th>
<th>Considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>modernization</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investments</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changes in energy mix*</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utilization of renewable energies</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partial closure</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closure of existing plants</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shift in production levels</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EuPD Research 2005

Differences to 100% missing values = not considered or not specified

* Addressed to electric utilities only, n = 38
Part D – Findings: An Excerpt
How important are those measures for your company?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>High Importance</th>
<th>Medium Importance</th>
<th>Low Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in energy mix*</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of renewable energies</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial closure</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure of existing plants</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift in production levels</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EuPD Research 2005

Total n = 151
* Addressed to electric utilities only, n = 38
Differences 100% missing values = not considered nor not specified
First Emissions Trading Survey in Germany – an Extract

1. The majority of respondents evaluates emissions trading negatively. From companies’ point of view, emissions trading causes extra costs (administrational efforts, new employment, extensions of competencies).

2. Satisfaction and estimations vary among sectors and company size. Energy-related installations for example, evaluate emissions trading more positive than companies with other installations.

3. Most of the respondents do not actively trade with certificates, even though more than a half of interviewees is satisfied with the allocation of certificates. Huge trading experiences are not existent yet.

4. There is a big consulting potential for concerned companies regarding application, trading and other means of generating certificates (e.g. CDM- and JI-projects).

5. All mentioned aspects have a great effect on companies strategy and how they face emissions trading.
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