

<b>Committee:</b>	Stansted Airport Advisory Panel	<b>Agenda Item</b>
<b>Date:</b>	5 March 2007	<b>3</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Climate Change Working Party</b>	
<b>Authors:</b>	<b>Jake Roos, Energy Efficiency Surveyor, Roger Harborough, Planning Policy and Conservation Manager</b>	Item for information

---

### Summary

This report advises of the proceedings of a working party meeting on science and policy developments relating to climate change.

### Recommendations

The Working Party recommended that Members be kept informed of developments

### Background Papers

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Fourth Assessment Report, Working Group 1 paper "The Physical Science Basis" February 2007

The Future of Air Transport Progress Report, December 2006

The Eddington Transport Study, The Case for Action, December 2006

### Situation

The Climate Change Working Party met on 5 February. The purpose of the meeting was to brief Members on science and policy developments relating to climate change. The latest report of the Intergovernmental Panel of Climate Change was discussed. This report stated it was very likely (90% certainty) observed global warming is caused by human activities. The IPCC predict the world is likely to warm by 2.4 - 4°C on average by the end of the century unless emissions of greenhouse gases are cut dramatically.

IPCC findings also affected Stop Stansted Expansion's projection of emissions from Stansted - the Radiative Forcing Index used to reflect the added warming created by greenhouse gas emissions at altitude (i.e. aviation) was revised down from 2.7 to 1.9 due to uncertainty about the heat-trapping effect of vapor trails. Using the new RFI, SSE estimate that Stansted currently produces 5M tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e per annum at present. If operations expanded to 35mppa, this would increase to 7M tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e per annum. A second runway would mean an increase to 12M tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e per annum. For comparison, all non-aviation activities in the district produce 0.82 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e per annum according to Defra. Jake Roos used a presentation

prepared by Peter Riding for the SSE community conference to illustrate what would be necessary to 'offset' the amount of GHG emissions coming from an expanded airport.

The Eddington review was briefly discussed. Eddington said in his review of transport that the aviation sector should 'pay its full environmental costs'. The Stern Report and the Future of Air Transport Progress Report acknowledged this. However the majority of proposed measures for reducing emissions in the report, such as inclusion of aviation in the EU Emissions Trading Scheme, or renewing discussions on aviation fuel tax and the 1947 Chicago Convention through the ICAO, were not likely to be effective in holding emissions at the present level, much less reducing them, given the rate of aviation growth. The document did outline an 'emissions cost assessment' for proposed increases in airport capacity. Such a system could only be described as a demand reduction measure, so its proposal is promising, but without more details it is impossible to know how it would affect the expansion of Stansted.

Roger Harborough has written to the DfT for more detail, but this has not been forthcoming. He said the very existence of a proposal for an emissions cost assessment of airport capacity will give the Council extra leverage on the climate change issue at the appeal. It is now a matter of Government policy that Ministers should not make major decisions on airport capacity unless that decision is informed by an emissions costs assessment, and that mechanism is still to be developed.

There will be a consultation on the emissions cost assessment in the first half of 2007 according to the ATWP Progress Report. The meeting concluded with Members requesting that they are kept informed of developments.