The methods described in this document were created while BSR managed the Clean Cargo Secretariat. Smart Freight Centre committed to apply these methods to Clean Cargo carriers' 2021 emissions performance data as a part of the transition plan implemented to integrate Clean Cargo into Smart Freight Centre during 2022. While these methods reflect the branding of Clean Cargo as managed by BSR, the methods were implemented by Smart Freight Centre for the calculation of 2021 carrier greenhouse gas emission intensities.
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1. Objectives

1.1 Introduction

The pressure on shippers, logistics providers, and container carriers to monitor, report, and reduce CO\(_2\) emissions continues to increase. Shippers, who own the cargo, freight forwarders, and container carriers all wish to show their customers, investors, and others their commitment to responsible operations and to reducing their environmental impacts. The need for a platform to develop common industry specific solutions like a common CO\(_2\) emissions calculation methodology is crucial in order to fulfill these ambitions.

The Clean Cargo Working Group (CCWG) provides such a global business-to-business platform for shippers, freight forwarders, and container carriers. CCWG is dedicated to improving environmental performance in container shipping by developing standardized methodologies to measure environmental impacts and easy-to-use tools that meet the needs of shippers, freight forwarders, and carriers and enables them to measure, evaluate, and reduce environmental impacts.

With CCWG methodologies and tools, container carriers can report their CO\(_2\) performance to shippers and freight forwarders in a credible and comparable format based on the only recognized industry standard for calculating CO\(_2\) emissions from container shipping—the CCWG CO\(_2\) emissions calculation methodology ("CCWG CO\(_2\) methodology").

CCWG currently comprises around 40 leading multinational shippers, freight forwarders, and container carriers who have access to the best high-quality environmental dataset in the container shipping industry. The dataset represents more than 85 percent of global container capacity.

This methodology report provides details about the CCWG CO\(_2\) methodology to enable CCWG members, as well as non-members, to understand the CO\(_2\) data calculations and ensure proper application of the CO\(_2\) data.

1.2 Objectives with the CCWG CO2 Methodology

The general objective of the CCWG CO\(_2\) Methodology is as follows: to establish a robust and user-friendly industry standard on how to collect, calculate, and use CO\(_2\) emission data for ocean container transportation based on actual (primary) operational and static data directly from container carriers, including fuel consumption and distance travelled, as well as other factors defined in table 1 on page 6.

CCWG promotes the establishment of ONE common standard for the calculation of CO\(_2\) emissions for ocean container transportation. Today the CCWG CO\(_2\) methodology is the only existing and broadly recognized industry standard suitable for this purpose. One common CO\(_2\) methodology a) enables high-quality and credible CO\(_2\) calculations, b) avoids confusing and contradictory CO\(_2\) calculations, and c) avoids double reporting for carriers and frees up additional resources for performance improvements.

Applying the CCWG CO\(_2\) methodology provides credibility to the following:

1. **Describing and explaining how CO\(_2\) emission factors are calculated** and how the CCWG CO\(_2\) methodology is aligned with internationally recognized standards such as the GHG Protocol supply chain guideline,
the European EN 16258 standard, and IMOs EEOI guidelines (chapter 2).

2. **Ensuring standardized and comparable CO₂ emission calculations for shippers and carriers** (chapter 3), which encompasses:
   » Calculation of CO₂ emissions from transporting individual or groups of shipments;
   » Calculation of absolute CO₂ footprint for shippers.

3. **Benchmarking carrier’s CO₂ performance** (chapter 4), which:
   » Enables shippers to make informed buying decisions in their supply chains and drive further improvements among container carriers;
   » Enables container carriers to make informed decision-making to improve their performance.

CCWG recognizes that this methodology must be sensitive to developments in the industry, so the Group continues to work with industry, academia, and scientists to support the evolution of this standard.

1.3 Basic Principles

While the CCWG CO₂ methodology is based to the extent possible on central principles of internationally recognized standards such as the GHG Protocol supply chain guideline, the European EN 16258 standard, and IMOs EEOI guidelines, it is tailor-made for the container shipping sector.

The basic principles include:
» CO₂ emission calculations should be credible, verifiable, comparable, and as precise as possible, yet simple and practical for carriers and shippers to apply and follow;
» Total CO₂ emissions related to container transportation must be captured (including emissions from empty back haul sailing/repositioning of containers) and allocated to full containers;
» Allocation must to the extent possible be based on capacity-limiting factors, which for container ships can be defined in container (TEU) capacity and Dead Weight Tonnage (DWT) restrictions;
» Comparability of vessel performance is the main objective.

1.4 Boundaries

The current CCWG CO₂ methodology covers container transportation on ocean-going container vessels. It is not applicable to non-containerized cargo transported in bulk, break-bulk, tank, Ro-Ro, and ferry vessels.

For calculation of emissions from other transportation modes, reference is made to the Global Logistics Emissions Council (GLEC). The CCWG is a member of the GLEC, an initiative that unites like-minded groups specializing in CO₂
calculations for other transportation modes aiming to ensure comparable CO₂ calculations across the transportation supply chain.

The CCWG CO₂ methodology only includes CO₂ emissions and no other GHG emissions (CO₂ equivalents: CO₂e). Given that all relevant energy consumption from ocean container transportation stems from fuel combustion on vessel engines, CO₂ emissions is an appropriate approximation of total GHG emissions.

The CCWG CO₂ methodology includes CO₂ emissions from tank-to-wheel (TTW, or tank-to-propeller) though not well-to-wheel (WTW, including upstream emissions/energy from “production” of fuel and infrastructure). Detailed global factors for all transport modes to adjust TTW data to include upstream emissions from oil production as well as transport infrastructure are not yet aligned and therefore remain complex to implement at this stage. The CCWG CO₂ methodology may be adjusted in the future to include WTW emissions once consensus across all transport modes is established through processes such as GLEC. At this time, CCWG CO₂ data may be adjusted to include WTW emissions by individual users. In such cases respective users are to specify adjustments and ensure that the adjustments are transparent.

IMO provides default global average WTW CO₂ data for Heavy Fuel Oil (HFO) and Marine Diesel Oil (MDO). CCWG recommends using these adjustment factors in case a user wants to include WTW emissions. The WTW adjustment factors can be applied by multiplying the TTW CO₂ emissions by the WTW adjustment factor:

- HFO well-to-wheel adjustment factor = 1.086 g CO₂ WTW / g CO₂ TTW
- MDO well-to-wheel adjustment factor = 1.212 g CO₂ WTW / g CO₂ TTW

1 CCWG are experts in ocean transportation and not necessarily experts in goods transportation on other transportation modes. Therefore CCWG is working on aligning the CCWG CO₂ methodology with other initiatives specializing in CO₂ calculations for other modes. This will enable credible CO₂ calculations across the whole transportation supply chain instead of only focusing on ocean transportation. This will also enable CCWG members to access high-quality data for all transportation modes.

2 Source: Second IMO GHG Study 2009.

3 Based on content of fuel-mix data derived from the 2012 reported data set from CCWG carriers, an appropriate average well-to-wheel adjustment factor = 1.088g CO₂ WTW / g CO₂ TTW.
2. CO₂ Emission Factors: The CCWG CO₂ Measurement

2.1 Emission Factor Definition

To calculate CO₂ emissions from the transportation of a specific container or from a specific amount of cargo a relative CO₂ measure is needed — an emission factor. An emission factor is a relative measure for how much CO₂ is emitted per cargo unit transported a certain distance. The cargo unit for container shipping is the transport of a container, and the relative measure used by CCWG is the standard TEU container (see TEU definitions in section 3.3). Emission factors in the CCWG CO₂ methodology are expressed as grams of CO₂ emissions per container transported 1 kilometer (g CO₂/TEU-KM).

2.2 From Raw Data to a Vessel Specific Emission Factor

The CCWG CO₂ methodology distinguishes between regular containers (dry) and refrigerated containers (reefer) because there is a significant difference between the energy used for propulsion of dry containers and the energy used for propulsion and cooling of reefer containers. The calculation formulas for calculating a vessel-specific emission factor for both dry and reefer containers are as follows:

\[
CO₂\text{ dry} = \frac{\text{IMO Carbonconversion factor} \times (\text{Total fuel consumption} - \text{Total reefer fuel consumption})}{(\text{dist. sailed} \times \text{vessel TEU capacity})} \\
CO₂\text{ reefer} = CO₂\text{ dry} + \frac{\text{IMO Carbonconversion factor} \times \text{Total reefer fuel consumption}(**) \times \text{dist. sailed} \times \text{reefer TEU capacity}}{(**) \times \text{vessel TEU capacity}}
\]

\( CO₂\text{ reefer} = CO₂\text{ dry} + \frac{\text{IMO Carbonconversion factor} \times \text{Total reefer fuel consumption}(**) \times \text{dist. sailed} \times \text{reefer TEU capacity}}{(**) \times \text{vessel TEU capacity}} \)

*Total reefer fuel consumption = reefer TEU capacity * reefer consumption per year (const.) * \( \frac{\text{days vessel operated}}{365} \)

Table 1: Definitions for criteria and advised sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Factor / definition</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| IMO carbon conversion factor | Heavy fuel oil (HFO): 3114 g CO₂/kg  
                                      Diesel/gas oil (MDO/MGO): 3206 g CO₂/kg | IMO                                   |
<p>| Total fuel consumption (in metric tons) | All types of fuel consumed on all vessel engines (main engine, auxiliary engines, and boilers) both at sea and during port stay for the respective full reporting year | Reported in operators reporting system aligned with the vessels logbook |
| Distance sailed            | Total distance sailed (km) at sea and in ports for the respective full reporting year | Reported in operators reporting system aligned with the vessels logbook |
| Vessel TEU capacity        | The maximum (nominal) number of TEU a vessel can carry defined as &quot;The MAXIMUM number of TEU capable of being loaded onto a specific ship while at STATUTORY summer draft, and complying with the SOLAS safe visibility regulation (Chapter V &quot;Safety of navigation,&quot; Regulation 22 &quot;Navigation bridge visibility&quot;). | General Agreement, Capacity Plan or other approved vessel documents |
| Reefer TEU capacity        | Number of reefer plugs on the vessel* number of TEU per reefer plug, where:          |                                       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Reefer consumption per year</strong></th>
<th><strong>Number of TEU per reefer plug</strong> = 1.9 TEU/reefer plug</th>
<th>CCWG carrier average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A constant defined as:</strong> 1914 kg/reefer year = 3.8 KW* 0.23 Kg/KWh* 365 days* 24 h/day* 25%, where:</td>
<td>3.8 KW is the average energy consumption per reefer container 0.23 Kg/KWh is a conversion constant 25% is the average reefer plugs utilization per year</td>
<td>CCWG carrier average Conversion constant CCWG carrier average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCWG carrier average</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number of days the vessel is in service during the year</strong></td>
<td>Reported in operators reporting system aligned with the vessels logbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Days vessel operated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For inclusion of utilization data see section 3.2

### 2.3 Data Collection

All carriers submit data annually according to a standardized reporting format coordinated and overseen by the CCWG secretariat, which is responsible for conducting high-level quality checks of the submitted data. The data submission covers the full reporting year and all vessels (owned and charter) operated by the carrier, excluding spot charter vessels hired for less than six months. Carriers report the following raw data per vessel:

- Vessel name/IMO number
- Total fuel consumption split into HFO and MDO
- Actual distance sailed over ground as per logbook
- Nominal TEU capacity (see TEU definition in section 3.3)
- Number of reefer plugs on the vessel
- Days vessel operated
- Trade lane on which vessel is deployed on December 31 of the respective reporting year (e.g., Asia-North Europe) (see section 2.5 for more details)

In addition, all carriers submit the yearly average vessel utilization data per trade lane. This data is used to calculate the industry average utilization factor (see section 3.2).

### 2.4 Data Verification

The CCWG has developed a “Procedure and Guidance” document to verify the raw data that is reported and which contributes to the calculation of the CO₂ and SOx emission factors. The verification guidelines follow general principles of independent verification and have been developed in collaboration with Lloyds Register, with input from Bureau Veritas and DNV GL (formerly known as Det Norske Veritas and Germanische Lloyd). The scope and boundaries of the audit include:

- The full operated fleet, including both owned and charter vessels, and excluding spot charter vessels hired for less than six months.
- Review of internal processes and systems used by the company to report the data and sample testing the transfer of that data from company systems to the CCWG reporting template.
The verification does not cover the calculations of specific CO\textsubscript{2} emissions, because several other factors may influence this calculation (see chapter 3 for more details on specific CO\textsubscript{2} calculations).

The baseline requirement for third parties interested in undertaking this verification work is to be a ship-classification society with experience undertaking such verification.\(^4\) All carriers must disclose whether reported data has been verified or not and which verification company has issued the verification. Carriers are required to submit their verification statement to the CCWG secretariat. CCWG members are able to access verified carrier data from the secretariat.

2.5 Aggregated Emission Factors

The vessel-specific emission factor calculated for each vessel is the most detailed emission factor calculated, but it is not suited for shippers. Shippers have no information about which vessel carries any given container. Instead, the shippers have information about the port of departure and the port of arrival, as well as the trade lane (e.g., Asia-North Europe). As a result, a trade lane-aggregated emission factor is more suitable for shippers.

A main objective of the CCWG CO\textsubscript{2} methodology is to ensure comparability between CO\textsubscript{2} data. Nonetheless, all vessels cannot and should not be compared. Vessels on different trade lanes serve different purposes and operate under different circumstances, including vessel size limitations or commercial issues. Therefore individual vessel CO\textsubscript{2} performance across different trade lanes can vary significantly and cannot easily be compared. Vessels on the same trade lane, however, operate under identical operational and commercial circumstances and in principle deliver the same service to the shipper. Therefore the CO\textsubscript{2} emission performance of these vessels can be compared directly.

In light of this, the CCWG has defined 25 trade lanes, which include the main trade lanes in the world (see trade lane definitions in annex 1). The trade lane average emission factor represents the average CO\textsubscript{2} performance of all vessels from a given carrier sailing on a trade lane (e.g., Asia-Europe). When a carrier submits data to the CCWG, individual vessels are divided into a trade lane in order to calculate the trade lane average emission factors.

The principle for calculating the aggregated emission factors from a group of vessels (e.g., all vessels on a given trade lane) is straightforward: \textit{Include all relevant vessels and weight the vessel-specific emission factors according to TEU*km.}

Carriers serve many shippers who are not part of the CCWG. Hence most CO\textsubscript{2} calculations do not go through CCWG, but directly from the carrier to the shippers. As the objective of the CCWG CO\textsubscript{2} methodology is to standardize CO\textsubscript{2} emission calculations across all shippers, freight forwarders, and shippers, it must be stressed that all carriers should follow the CCWG CO\textsubscript{2} methodology and the above principle for calculating aggregated emission factors when reporting to shippers, including non-CCWG members. Indeed this guarantees the comparability of CO\textsubscript{2} calculations. This also applies if carriers calculate and

\(^4\) Classification societies interested in participating should contact the CCWG secretariat for more details.
monitor aggregated CO₂ emissions factors for specific services and use these in CO₂ calculations for shippers.

### Table 2: CO₂ emission factors provided by CCWG to CCWG members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission factors</th>
<th>How it is calculated</th>
<th>When this emission factor can be applied</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel-specific emission factor</td>
<td>The specific performance of the individual vessel.</td>
<td>Carriers can benchmark the performance of individual vessels in their fleet. Not relevant for shippers because they do not know the specific vessel the cargo is transported on.</td>
<td>Should only be used by carriers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrier-specific trade lane average emission factor</td>
<td>Average of all vessels operated by the carrier sailing on a specific trade lane weighted according to the TEU*km per vessel.</td>
<td>This information is highly relevant to shippers and should be used to calculate CO₂ emissions from shipments as well as to benchmark trade lane performance between carriers.</td>
<td>(Can be provided by individual CCWG carriers to non-CCWG members.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry average per trade lane</td>
<td>Average of all vessels operated by all carriers sailing on the respective trade lane weighted according to the TEU*km per vessel.</td>
<td>This is the industry average performance per trade lane. This serves as the baseline for benchmarking of carrier performance. This baseline is useful for both carriers and shippers who want to benchmark performance.</td>
<td>Only CCWG can calculate the Industry averages per trade lane. The CCWG CO₂ trade lane averages are publicly available <a href="#">here</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.6 CO₂ Data for Vessel Sharing Agreements (VSA’s)

A typical container carrier fleet consists of both owned and charter vessels. Furthermore different container carriers share vessels in Vessel Sharing Agreements (VSA’s) to optimize their networks. A service offered by a carrier often includes VSA’s. As a result, containers transported with a specific carrier can either be transported on an owned vessel, on a charter vessel, or on a vessel from a competitor as part of a VSA. Carriers already have CO₂ data for owned and charter vessels, but not for VSAs.

Therefore VSAs represent a complex issue when calculating CO₂ emissions from container shipping. In order to ensure a common and credible approach, all carriers in CCWG should follow the below criteria:

1. VSA partners should aim to share vessel-specific emission factors with their VSA partners and apply this data to the CO₂ calculation. Furthermore it is recommended that carriers in a VSA ensure identical emission factors for the services they share.

2. In case it is not possible to get CO₂ data from a VSA partner, the carrier should estimate CO₂ performance based on CO₂ data from a vessel of similar size operated at similar speed. In most cases vessels on a trade lane have similar sizes and operate at a similar speed and can therefore stand in for the missing VSA data. Hence the carrier is able to use its own trade lane average to represent the missing VSA CO₂ data.

The CCWG is working on integrating VSA CO₂ data into its methodology. (VSA CO₂ data is not currently integrated into CCWG reporting.)
2.7 Slot Charter Agreements and Feeder Services

When a container carrier does not have any vessels sailing to a specific region, it is common practice to purchase container slots on another carrier’s services. This is called a Slot Charter Agreement. In this case the carrier does not have any CO₂ data representing the actual vessel and/or service and is dependent on data from an external carrier.

It is also common practice in container shipping to use feeder services to call smaller ports, typically either at the end or at the beginning of a container transport. The feeder service can be owned by the carrier, where the feeder vessels are operated by the respective carrier. In this case the carrier already has the emission factor. In other cases the feeder service can be subcontracted and operated by another company, and hence the user is dependent on data from the subcontractor.

In both cases, the user is dependent on an external company. As part of the CCWG CO₂ methodology, CO₂ data for both Slot Charter Agreements and feeder services are to be included in the CO₂ calculations. In order to ensure a common and credible approach, all carriers in the CCWG should follow one of the following criteria:

1. Obtain emission factors from the slot charter partner and/or subcontracted feeder operator for a given container and apply this data in the CO₂ calculation, provided the CO₂ data is of satisfying quality.
2. In case it is not possible to obtain the data from the slot charter partner and/or the subcontracted feeder operator, the carrier should estimate CO₂ performance based on CO₂ data from a vessel of similar size operated at similar speed.
3. In case it is not possible to obtain the data from the slot charter partner and/or the subcontracted feeder operator and if the carrier does not own vessels of the same size operated at an estimated similar speed, the carrier should use the most appropriate trade lane industry average emission factor.⁵

For shippers conducting this calculation, if the location of the transhipment is unknown, the main trade lane emission factor from the first port of loading to the last point of discharge can be applied.

⁵ “Intra Europe,” “Intra Asia,” and “Intra Americas” trade lanes represent the industry average CO₂ performance for feeder services in the region and are therefore the most relevant industry average emission factors for feeder services.
3. How to Use the CO2 Emission Factors

As part of the CCWG CO2 methodology, the CCWG wishes to ensure common and consistent use of the CO2 emission factors and hence to make possible credible and comparable CO2 calculations and benchmarking. In principle all CO2 emission calculations should be conducted in exactly the same way in order to guarantee comparable CO2 emission calculations between carriers. However, due to the complexity of this issue, and to the fact that there are many ways to use the CO2 emission factors, this is not always possible. Only accurate guidance can avoid misguided data use.

The following presents the basic principles of how to use CO2 emission factors to calculate CO2 emissions from container shipments and of how to comply with the CCWG CO2 methodology. This description should ensure a common, consistent, and comparable calculation approach for all users. The CCWG remains aware that, notwithstanding these guidelines, there are different ways to apply the CO2 emission factors and to calculate CO2 emissions. This brings to the fore the utmost importance of transparency when conducting individual CO2 calculations.

Calculations of CO2 emissions for shipments are in principle carried out by multiplying the emission factors with the number of TEUs transported and the distances sailed—a straightforward method. However other factors and assumptions influence the CO2 emission calculation. Therefore it is crucial that all CO2 data users, especially carriers, make explicit how the CO2 calculations are conducted and which assumptions are used in the CO2 calculations, as per section 3.1 below. This will provide a transparent calculation approach across all users, and will make clear whether CO2 data from different carriers can be compared or not. Benchmarking of actual CO2 emissions is possible only if all conditions in the Carbon Calculation Clause are equal.

3.1 Basis of Reporting Carbon Emissions: The Carbon Calculation Clause

A “Carbon Calculation Clause” is mandatory as part of all CO2 calculations that follow the CCWG CO2 methodology. The Carbon Calculation Clause must include the following:

1. Which kind of emission factors are applied for: Owned vessels, charter vessels, VSA’s, Slot Charter Agreements and feeder services? (See sections 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7.)
2. Which emission factors are used in the CO2 calculations: Vessel-specific emission factors or trade lane average emission factors? (See section 2.5.)
3. Whether the CO2 emission factors have been verified or not and which verifier has issued the verification. (See section 2.4.)
4. Whether the CCWG utilization factor of 70 percent is applied. (See section 3.2.)
5. From which sources are the distances used in the CO2 calculations identified?
   Are the distances based on:
   - Shortest distance between port of departure and port of arrival?
   - Actual distance sailed (including port schedule and transhipments)?
   Is the CCWG distance adjustment factor of 15 percent applied in the calculation? (See section 3.3.)
6. Whether the CCWG TEU conversion factors are applied. (See section 3.4.)
7. Whether transhipments (including feeder services) are included. (See section 3.5.)
8. Whether an approach other than the standard TEU=10 ton is applied and why. (See section 3.7.)

3.2 Utilization Factor

In recent years, it has become clear that the previous CCWG CO₂ methodology, which was based on nominal (maximum) capacity of vessels, did not fully account for actual emissions. To address this, the CCWG has collected average vessel utilization data from carriers. Utilization data is the average percentage of container slot occupied with containers. Including utilization data in the CO₂ calculations is a better approach that more accurately reflects the actual number of containers transported. This approach is also better aligned with international standards on CO₂ emissions calculations for transportation.

The CCWG secretariat collects anonymous annual utilization information on each of the 25 trade lanes from carriers. The main criteria for the utilization information collected from carriers can be found in annex 2 together with the aggregated utilization data.

The analysis of the utilization data shows that the average utilization across all the largest trade lanes is close to 70 percent, with some variation from year to year. As a result, the CCWG has adopted 70 percent as an appropriate representative average of the global average utilization. This is also identical with IMO and WSC recommended average utilization.

The 70 percent utilization is a pragmatic solution to a very complex issue. It can be applied across all trades and in all CO₂ calculations and increases the accuracy of the CO₂ calculations compared to using 100 percent utilization (nominal capacity). It also ensures a common and comparable approach across carriers.

**In order to apply the 70 percent utilization factor the user should divide the CO₂ emission factors based on nominal capacity by 70 percent.**

3.3 Distance Adjustment Factor

When calculating CO₂ emissions for a shipment the “shortest” distance from load port to discharge port is most often identified through a web-based distance calculator and subsequently applied. The accuracy of this method depends on vessels always following the shortest feasible route between load and discharge port. This, however, is often not the case as vessels call several other ports between discharge and arrival port according to the service schedule. Furthermore, vessels often deviate from the shortest route between two ports due to currents, weather, and other factors.

Consequently, and since CO₂ emission factors are based on the actual distance sailed, it is necessary to adjust the “shortest” distance in the CO₂ calculations to ensure alignment with the actual distance sailed. However, the complexity of using actual sailed distance for every port pair combination in the CO₂ emission calculation is much too high; not only are there thousands of port pair combinations but vessel routings often change.

As a result, CCWG members are currently conducting several analyses to identify distance adjustment factors to reflect the difference between the shortest distance and the actual distance. We aim to apply a distance adjustment factor to
all CO₂ emission calculations over time, which will be used by multiplying the “shortest” distance.

The analyses to date indicate that the difference between the shortest distance and the actual distance on all the largest trade lanes is around 15 percent across trades, with some variation from trade to trade. Fifteen percent as a distance adjustment factor across all trade lanes is a pragmatic solution to a very complex issue. In addition, using a single global adjustment factor across all trade lanes will increase the average accuracy of the CO₂ calculations compared to using the shortest distance. It will also ensure a common and comparable approach across users. **To apply such a distance adjustment factor, the user should multiply the shortest distance used in all CO₂ calculations by 15 percent, including distances for VSA’s, Slot Charter Agreements and feeder services.** (See annex 3 for more details.)

The CCWG will pursue its analyses to investigate whether 15 percent is a reasonable distance adjustment factor in the coming years, resulting in many potential adjustments.

### 3.4 TEU Conversion Factor

There exist different sizes of containers. When using containers other than a TEU the CO₂ calculation must include a conversion factor to reflect this. The unit used when identifying the nominal capacity of container vessels is TEU (10-foot-equivalent). In general the CCWG considers a FFE (40-foot-equivalent) as two TEUs.

The standard container height behind the TEU vessel capacity is 8 feet 6 inches. The vessel intake of high cube (HC) 9-foot-6-inch containers is less than for the 8-foot-6-inch standard containers, and because a significant amount of containers delivered today are HC 9-foot-6-inch containers, this configuration is highly relevant to the calculation of CO₂ emissions. The following conversion factors from container sizes to TEU equivalents are used in the CCWG CO₂ methodology and should be applied in all CO₂ emission calculations. The conversion to TEU equivalents is carried out by multiplying the different containers in question by the conversion factors below:

**Table 3: TEU conversion factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Container size</th>
<th>TEU conversion factor (TEU equivalents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20' ST (TEU 8’6”) + 20’ HC (only a small minority)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40’ ST (FFE 8’6”)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40’ HC (FFE 9’6”) + 45’ and 48’</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ST = Standard, HC = High Cube. The 20’ HC as well as 45’ and 48’ represent only a small minority of containers.)

### 3.5 Volume vs. Weight

The CCWG CO₂ methodology considers all containers to have an equal average cargo net weight of 10 ton per TEU as a default figure, which represents an approximate CCWG average. Using an equal average cargo net weight of 10 ton per TEU as a default figure is a pragmatic solution to a complex issue.

In some cases the 10-ton per TEU assumption is not appropriate. In such cases another approach is acceptable only if the user clearly describes the method...
employed to deviate from the TEU=10 ton and explains the rationale for using a different approach. This is included in the overall reporting, as per the Carbon Calculation Clause.

3.6 Transhipments

Transhipments (when a container is loaded from one vessel to another including feeder service) are to be included in CO₂ calculations. Consequently, users must apply the specific emission factors before and after the transshipment. CO₂ emissions from the terminal handling are not available and are considered insignificant, which explains why terminal handling is not included. Emissions from reefer containers while at terminal are not considered either.

3.7 Examples of How to Calculate CO₂ Emissions Based on CCWG Emission Factors

A shipment covering five 40-Foot-Equivalent High Cube containers (FFE HC) is transported from Shanghai, China to Bergen, Norway.

Identify the CO₂ performance: Carrier X is responsible for the shipment. The shipment is transported on a main service from Shanghai to Rotterdam operated by Carrier X. All vessels on the service are operated by Carrier X and consist of five owned vessels and five charter vessels. No VSA CO₂ data is used in the calculation. Carrier X has had their CO₂ data verified by an external verification company, Verifier Y.

From Rotterdam to Bergen Carrier X use a subcontracted feeder service. The feeder service is not operated by Carrier X, but Carrier X did not manage to get CO₂ performance data from the feeder company. Therefore, Carrier X has to estimate the CO₂ performance for the feeder service based on performance of similar vessels sailing at the same speed.

» Carrier X’s trade lane emission factor on Asia-North Europe is 45 g CO₂/TEU km.
» The feeder service CO₂ performance is estimated to be 90 g CO₂/TEU km. This is based on the CO₂ performance of a vessel of similar size operated an estimated similar speed operated by Carrier X.

Identify the transported distance: The web-based distance calculator dataloy.com is used to identify the distance:
» From Shanghai to Rotterdam = 19,668 km
» From Rotterdam to Bergen = 1,007 km

Utilization data: CCWG utilization average of 70 percent utilization is applied in the CO₂ calculation.

TEU conversion: five FFE HC container corresponds to five* 2.25 TEU/FFE HC = 11.25 TEU

The CO₂ calculation: The calculated CO₂ emissions for the shipment:
» (45 g CO₂/TEU km* 11.25 TEU* 19,668 km) / 70% = 14.2 ton CO₂
» (90 g CO₂/TEU km* 11.25 TEU* 1,007 km) / 70% = 1.5 ton CO₂
Total: 14.2 ton CO₂ + 1.5 ton CO₂ = 15.7 ton CO₂
Carbon Calculation Clause:

Carrier X states that the CO\textsubscript{2} calculation is based on the CCWG CO\textsubscript{2} methodology. Therefore as the final step Carrier X issues a Carbon Calculation Clause:

1. CO\textsubscript{2} emission factors are based on owned and charter vessels, but do not include VSA or Slot Charter Agreement CO\textsubscript{2} data. CO\textsubscript{2} data for subcontracted feeder services is estimated based on vessels operated by Carrier X.
2. CO\textsubscript{2} emission factor for operated vessels is based on trade lane average emission factors. Emission factor for foreign feeder vessels is based on estimates from vessels from Carrier X operated vessels.
3. The data behind the CO\textsubscript{2} emission factors have been externally verified by Verifier Y.
4. The CCWG utilization factor of 70 percent has been applied in the CO\textsubscript{2} calculation.
5. Dataloy.com has been used as the source for the estimated distances used on the calculation. The distances are based on shortest distance between departure and arrival ports. The interim CCWG distance adjustment factor of 15 percent has not been applied in the calculation.
6. The CCWG TEU conversion factors have been applied in the CO\textsubscript{2} calculation.
7. Transhipments including feeder services are included in the calculations.
8. The standard approach of TEU=10 ton applies for the calculation.

3.8 A Simple Guide to Calculate the Absolute CO\textsubscript{2} Footprint for Shippers

When a shipper wants to calculate its company CO\textsubscript{2} footprint, it may use the CO\textsubscript{2} trade lane average emission factors. The method is straightforward:

1) Map your trade lanes.
2) Identify the number of containers on each trade lane (conversion into TEU’s).
3) Identify the distance traveled on each port pair per trade lane.
4) Multiply the relevant trade lane average emission factors with the number of containers and the identified distance.
5) Sum up the trade lane CO\textsubscript{2} emissions.
6) If you state that the calculations follow the CCWG CO\textsubscript{2} methodology, you must explain how your calculations are conducted according to the Carbon Calculation Clause (section 3.1).
While in practice the calculation is somewhat more complex, a simplified example is provided below:

**Table 4: Simplified example**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade lanes</th>
<th>Number of containers (TEU)</th>
<th>Distance traveled (km)</th>
<th>CO₂ emission factors (g/TEU km)</th>
<th>CO₂ emissions (ton)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia-North Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Shanghai-Rotterdam</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Hong Kong-Bremerhaven</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia-US WC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Hong Kong-Long Beach</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe-Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Rotterdam-Lagos</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total company CO₂ emissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>242</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. How to Ensure Proper Benchmarking of Carrier Performance

With reference to the explanation in section 2.5, specific vessel performance is not relevant for the shipper or the logistic provider, whether for CO₂ calculations or for benchmarking of carrier CO₂ performance. On the other hand, the trade lane performance is highly relevant for this purpose.

Indeed, average trade lane performance for the carrier is important for informed decision-making for shippers and freight forwarders and hence must be the foundation for benchmarking performance between carriers.

The CCWG CO₂ trade lane averages represent the industry average performance on respective trade lanes and therefore forms an industry baseline against which the carriers trade lane performance can be benchmarked.

Hence a shipper and a freight forwarder should compare individual carrier performance per trade lane to the trade lane average performance.

For an example please see the CCWG publication “How to Calculate and Manage CO₂ Emissions from Ocean Transport” here
Annex 1: Trade Lane Definitions

Table 5: List of defined trade lanes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Asia-Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Asia-South America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Asia-Oceania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Asia-North Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Asia-Mediterranean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Asia-North America EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Asia-North America WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Asia-Middle East/India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. North Europe-North America WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Mediterranean-North America WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Europe (North &amp; Med) - Middle East/India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Europe (North &amp; Med) - Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Europe (North &amp; Med) - Oceania (via Suez/via Panama)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Europe (North &amp; Med) - Latin America/South America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. North America-Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. North America EC-Middle East/India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. North America-South America (EC/WC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. North America-Oceania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. South America (EC/WC) - Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Intra-Americas (Caribbean)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Intra-Asia*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Intra-Europe*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* “intra” trade lanes are primarily made up by feeder services sailing within the region. This means that the “intra” trade lanes represent the industry average feeder service CO₂ performance in the region. CCWG is in the process of further refining the “intra” trade lanes in order further to improve the approach.

Selecting trade lanes for carriers reporting vessels to the CCWG:

- Vessels should be reported based on the string they were on as of December 31. If the vessel is no longer in use or idling it should be reported based on the last string on which it operated.
- If the vessel is on a string that contains multiple trade lanes, each trade lane in the string should be reported for the vessel.
- A vessel should be included on specific trade lanes as follows:
  - A vessel operates on intra-regional trade lanes (intra-Americas, intra-Asia, intra-Europe) if 75 percent or more of a vessel’s port calls are within that region.
- A vessel’s string endpoints (turnaround points) should be included.
- Regions containing more than 20 percent of a vessel’s total port calls should be included.

### Table 6: Definition of what countries and ports are in each region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade regions</th>
<th>Countries in the region</th>
<th>Sample ports in the region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Africa</strong></td>
<td>Angola, Cameroon, Kenya, Namibia, Nigeria, Somalia, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania, Mauritanian, The Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Cape Verde, Guinea, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Togo, Benin, Gabon, Sao Tome &amp; Principe, Equatorial Guinea, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mozambique, Madagascar, Seychelles, Comoros, Mauritius</td>
<td>Luanda, Douala, Mombasa, Tripoli, Cape Town, Durban, Dakar, Douala, Walvis Bay, Port Elizabeth, Dar es Salaam, Mogadishu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asia</strong></td>
<td>Japan, Korea, China, Taiwan, Philippines, Vietnam, Malaysia, Cambodia, Thailand, Indonesia, Singapore, Burma, Brunei, East Timor, Philippines, Russia (Pacific)</td>
<td>Singapore, Shanghai, Yantian, Dalian, Busan, Hong Kong, Shekou, Surabaya, Kobe, Port Kelang, Manila, Kaohsiung, Laem Chabang, Ho Chi Minh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediterranean/Black Sea</strong></td>
<td>Italy, Spain, Portugal, France (Mediterranean), Greece, Turkey, Russia, Ukraine, Libya, Slovenia, Croatia, Montenegro, Albania, Bulgaria, Romania, Russia (Black Sea), Georgia, Cyprus, Syria, Lebanon, Israel, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, Malta, Gibraltar</td>
<td>Gioia Tauro, Algeciras, Lisbon, Odessa, Istanbul, Novorossiysk, Genoa, Barcelona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle East/India</strong></td>
<td>Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, India, United Arab Emirates, Oman, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Qatar, Kuwait, Iraq, Egypt, Jordan, Djibouti, Sudan, Yemen, Eritrea, Iran, Maldives</td>
<td>Port Qasim, Nhava Sheva, Jeddah, Jebel Ali Dubai, Salalah, Colombo, Mina Sulman, Chittagong, Port Said, Chennai, Bandar Abbas, Aqaba, Shuwaikh, Swakin, Latakia, Abu Dhabi, Hodeidah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North America EC/Gulf</strong></td>
<td>Canada (East Coast), United States (East Coast and Gulf Coast), Cuba, Haiti, Dominican Republic, Bahamas, Caribbean island nations</td>
<td>Miami, Savannah, Charleston, Houston, Newark, Montreal, Toronto, Veracruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North America WC</strong></td>
<td>Canada (West Coast), United States (West Coast), Mexico (West/Pacific Coast)</td>
<td>LA / Long Beach, Oakland, Tacoma, Vancouver, Lazaro Cardenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Europe</strong></td>
<td>Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Netherlands, Belgium, United Kingdom, France (Atlantic), Russia (North European), Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Germany, Ireland</td>
<td>Rotterdam, Bremerhaven, Antwerp, Felixstowe, Gothenburg, Copenhagen, Le Havre, Oslo, Vyborg, Hamburg, Southampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South America (incl. Central America)</strong></td>
<td>Guatemala, Honduras, Belize, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Panama, Colombia, Venezuela, Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, Chile, Peru, Ecuador, Guyana, French Guiana, Suriname</td>
<td>Itaquai, Itai, Santos, Rio Grande, Parangau, Buenos Aires, Buenaventura, Iquique, Antofagasta, Callao, Guayaquil, Valparaiso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oceania</strong></td>
<td>Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Pacific island nations</td>
<td>Auckland, Melbourne, Sydney, Adelaide, Brisbane, Fremantle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2: Main Criteria for Reporting Aggregated Utilization Data Collected from Carriers

Main criteria for the utilization information collected from carriers:

» It should be calculated based on the two key limiting factors and be an average of these. The limiting factors are:
  - Utilization of TEU slots (See section 3.4 for TEU definitions) and
  - Deadweight restrictions.

» It should be based on a round-trip average (meaning that CO₂ emissions are an average from both head haul and back haul).

» It should be based only on full containers (i.e., not include empties — meaning that CO₂ emissions from empty back haul sailing and repositioning of containers will be allocated to full containers).

» It should include lost slots from oversized cargo.

» It should consider all slots on operated vessels only (i.e., exclude VSA slots on other carriers’ vessels).

Where fewer than three carriers have reported on a trade lane, the global weighted average is applied.