

FuelEU Maritime, Finland's written comments on the non-paper WK 3260/2022 INIT (Annexes I and II)

Part I

Article 9

- In the SWP on 11 March, we commented that in the case of article 9.1c, we would still rather see the part "or that are produced from food and feed crops shall be considered to have the same emission factors as the least favourable fossil fuel pathway for this type of fuel" deleted. We have reiterated our view and we think that this provision could be accepted if it is specified to mean "high indirect land-use change-risk feedstock". This definition is taken from a delegated regulation given under the RED Directive, namely Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2019/807.

Article 14

- In article 14 and Annexes I and II, the term "fugitive emissions" has been replaced with the term "fugitive and slipped emissions". We would like to hear the definitions for them. It would be also necessary to define them in Article 3.
- Particularly, we would like to know if whether "slipped fuel" means for instance methane slip from the engine or the evaporation of the fuel from the fuel tank before the fuel is fed to the engine.

Annex I

- Finland notes that there is an extra $CO_{2eqWt,i}$ in one sentence on page 4.

Annex II

- Table in Annex II: Finland proposes that the definition of term E for liquid biofuels in column 4 is given also before or within the table. Regarding this term E , it would be also relevant to refer to RED II Annex V C already in the table.
- We wonder why it is relevant to use the lower caloric value (LCV) in the context of FuelEU Maritime proposal, when RED and RED II use the low heating values (LHV) instead. In particular, would it be possible to confirm whether these have the same numerical value? If the LCV and the LHV have the same numerical value, why is it necessary to use a different term in FuelEU Maritime proposal and in RED?

Part II

Question 1 / GWP: Would you rather maintain IPCC AR6 values or refer to the Directive (EU) 2018/2001?

- Finland would rather refer to the RED Directive instead of maintaining IPCC AR6 values.

Question 2 / BDN: Would you prefer option 1 or option 2 above? Do you see any other option?

- Regarding the bunker delivery note, Finland would prefer Option 1, which is completing the BDN under existing MARPOL Annex IV regulation. In Finland's view, including an annex to the BDN could be a feasible option. The Commission mentioned this option in the SWP on 11 March.
- In addition, Finland is of the view that the WtT emission factor should be given in terms of gCO_{2eq}/MJ instead of gCO_{2eq}/g_{fuel} .

Question 3 / Liquid biofuels pathways: Would you prefer option 1, option 2 or option 3 above? Do you see any other option?

- As regards the three options given in the non-paper of the presidency, Finland prefers option 2.
- When comparing options 1 and 2, Finland prefers option 2 because in our view, it is better to refer to RED instead of giving numerical values within the FuelEU Maritime proposal.
- Finland does not support option 3 as it does not take into account the tank-to-wake CH₄ and N₂O emissions and because it would not allow applying Equation 1 in Annex I.
- Finland would like to remind that it has proposed another option in documents WK 2423/2022 and WK 13311/2021. The proposal is to modify the values presented in Table 1 of Annex II in such a way that the well-to-tank emissions value (column 4) is similar to RED (E) and CO₂ tank-to-wake emission factor (column 6) is zero. All other information in Table 1 of Annex II would remain as proposed by the Commission.
- Finland underlines that this is a technical proposal that could be combined with the given option 1 or the given option 2. It would give the same GHG intensity index (Equation 1 in Annex I) as the given option 1 or 2.

Question 4 / RFNBO: Would you prefer, in the meantime, to rely on JEC study numerical values, as proposed in the Commission proposal, or make reference to the upcoming delegated act?

- Finland's preference is to refer to the upcoming delegated act.
- According to Finland's understanding, it is possibly necessary to have similar kind of considerations on RFNBOs pathways as in the case of liquid biofuels pathways. Does the Presidency or the Commission have further information or comments on this?

Question 5 / wind propulsion and reward factor: Would you agree to use EEDI/EEI Guidelines to define more precisely P_{Wind} and P_{Tot}? If yes, the Presidency welcomes any concrete proposal for amendments. Do you have any other suggestion on this provision?

- Finland has earlier mentioned that EEDI/EEI guidelines would be an option to specify the P_{Wind} and P_{Tot}. The available effective power of wind assisted propulsion systems could be determined on the basis of MEPC.1/Circ.896, 2021 Guidance on treatment of innovative energy efficiency technologies for calculation and verification of the attained EEDI and EEI.



Council of the European Union
General Secretariat

Brussels, 18 March 2022

**Interinstitutional files:
2021/0210 (COD)**

WK 4037/2022 INIT

LIMITE

TRANS
MAR
ENV
ENER

IND
COMPET
ECO
RECH
CODEC

This is a paper intended for a specific community of recipients. Handling and further distribution are under the sole responsibility of community members.

WORKING DOCUMENT

From:	General Secretariat of the Council
To:	Working Party on Shipping
N° Cion doc.:	10327/21 INIT + ADD1-3
Subject:	Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL on the use of renewable and low-carbon fuels in maritime transport and amending Directive 2009/16/EC - Comments from the Member States - Finland

Delegations will find, attached, comments from **Finland** on the above mentioned subject.