

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001705/25
to the Commission**
Sérgio Gonçalves (S&D), Johan Danielsson (S&D), Daniel Attard (S&D)
(29 April 2025)

Subject: ETS maritime surcharges

An analysis by the European Federation for Transport and Environment has raised concerns that major European container shipping companies may be imposing Emissions Trading System (ETS) surcharges on their customers that exceed the actual costs incurred under the EU ETS ⁽¹⁾. This practice could lead to significant windfall profits for these companies, with clients and final consumers bearing the inflated costs.

In the light of these findings, can the Commission clarify:

1. What measures are in place or under consideration to ensure that shipping companies' ETS surcharges accurately reflect their compliance costs, thereby preventing undue financial burdens on consumers?
2. How does the Commission assess the potential impact of such pricing strategies on the overall effectiveness of the EU ETS in reducing maritime emissions?
3. Is the Commission exploring or considering regulatory measures to prevent shipping companies from generating windfall profits at the expense of consumers through ETS-related surcharges?

Submitted: 29.4.2025

Answer given by Mr Hoekstra on behalf of the European Commission
(16 June 2025)

All sectors, including maritime transport, need to contribute to the EU climate neutrality goal by 2050 and the EU Emissions Trading System (ETS) is a key policy to achieve this objective.

While the ETS Directive ⁽¹⁾ allows for the transfer of the ETS costs from the shipping company to another entity operating the ship, it does not regulate the pass-through of costs to shippers.

The Commission's report ⁽²⁾ on the monitoring of the ETS extension to maritime transport shows that shipping companies typically pass ETS costs to shippers, with a limited impact on overall transport prices in 2024, estimated between 1% and 5% for deep sea container services.

A case study revealed that surcharges do not always reflect the EU ETS costs expected on specific routes, possibly due to shipping companies' strategies in redistributing costs among their lines.

Information to be published by 30 June 2025 in Thetis Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) ⁽³⁾ will detail ship level emissions reported by shipping companies under the ETS, possibly aiding shippers in their commercial discussions.

In terms of effectiveness, companies passing on the ETS costs would generally incentivise their consumers to shift towards greener alternatives.

At the same time, the ETS would continue incentivising investments in mitigation reduction solutions in synergy with other policies such as FuelEU Maritime ⁽⁴⁾.

The Commission will continue closely monitoring the implementation of the ETS extension to maritime transport, with reports due every two years.

The above-mentioned report should therefore be seen as the first step of an ongoing process providing the foundation for future analysis and for possible enhancements of the monitoring approach.

¹ https://www.transportenvironment.org/uploads/files/Briefing_ETS_WindfallProfits-1.pdf.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2003/87/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 October 2003 establishing a scheme for greenhouse gas emission allowance trading within the Community and amending Council Directive 96/61/EC (OJ L 275, 25.10.2003, p. 32).

⁽²⁾ COM(2025) 110 final — <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:52025DC0110>.

⁽³⁾ The dedicated Union information system developed and operated by the European Maritime Safety Agency that supports the implementation of Regulation (EU) 2015/757 — <https://mr.v.emsa.europa.eu/>.

⁽⁴⁾ Regulation (EU) 2023/1805 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 September 2023 on the use of renewable and low-carbon fuels in maritime transport, and amending Directive 2009/16/EC.