Maersk's decarbonization journey

Status, key learnings and challenges...

Maria Strandesen Head of Future Fuels Maersk Energy Transition





Shipping is responsible for 3% of global emissions

833 million ton of CO₂/year

* According to the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) Classification: Public



Maersk's GHG Emissions Footprint For 2022



 (1,000 tonnes C0₂e) (2021: 6,468)
 ■ Purchased goods and services: 3,821 (1,000 tonnes C0₂e) (2021: 3,158)

Δ

Maersk decarbonisation targets on the way to 2040



(*) Operated on renewable electricity and/or green fuels



Read more: Sustainability | Committed to Sustainable Logistics | Maersk

Classification: Public

5

Decarbonising inland logistics

UTO -

MAERSK

Maersk Decarbonisation Journey

Decarbonising Inland Logistics & Air Freight



Classification: Public

Decarbonising ocean operations





How do we intend to reach our longterm reduction targets (ocean only)?



First methanol container ship delivered in September 2023





Laura Maersk being christened by Ursula von der Leyen, Sep. 2023 in Copenhagen. To be operated in the Baltics.



In total 25 methanol ships ordered by Maersk to be delivered 2024-2026. World-wide orders are at 200+ methanol fueled ships

- Dual fuel engines
- □ All ships to replace existing capacity
- □ All newbuildings to be able to run on green fuels
- Looking at introducing green chartered vessels

There are currently 204 confirmed methanol fueled ships





The first in a series of 12 methanol containerships launched in the water Oct 2023. 16.200 TEU.



Maersk's top priority fuels (ocean only)

(Pyrolysis/HTL oils)

Bio/e-methanol

(e-ammonia)



Bio/e-methanol: Why do we see it as one of our main future fuels – and what are the challenges?

1) Why?

Best overall feasibility profile due to: engine maturity, low toxicity, easy handling, multiple production pathways, easy storage, high energy denisty, simple fuel, regulation in place, suitable for fuel cells – and reasonable production costs!

2) Challenges?

- Carbon dependency hence we have looked into it and found:
 - Pot. volumes of biogenic CO2 world wide: 1.38 bio. tons/year → i.e.sufficient however availability of affordable ren. electricity in same locations (sweet spots) may pose a challenge.
 - □ DAC: tecnologies being matured → price expected to drop to appr. 200 USD/ton in 2030
 - \Box DOC: technologies being matured \rightarrow price expectations at up to a factor 10 less than DAC
 - □ At CO2 capture cost at 45 USD/ton CO2 e-ammonia production costs equals e-methanol*
 - □ Need fast scale up of ren. Electricity/green H2 production
- □ <u>Market price developments</u> uncertain and depends on
 - Other sectors relying on methanol to decarbonise
 - □ Speed of production capacity buildup

* assumed handling/logistic costs of methanol at 75 USD/ton and ammonia at 100 USD/ton



Bio/e-methanol: Why do we see it as one of our main future fuels – and what are the challenges?

1) Why?

Best overall feasibility profile due to: engine maturity, low toxicity, easy handling, multiple production pathways, easy storage, high energy denisty, simple fuel, regulation in place, suitable for fuel cells – and reasonable production costs!

<u>All-e-fuels:</u> Maersk would need 7 × DK power consumption as renewable power

All-Bio: 200 × Maersk would use all sustainable feedstock!

- DAC. technologies being matured > price expected to drop to appr. 200 05D/ torrin 2000
- □ DOC: technologies being matured \rightarrow price expectations at up to a factor 10 less than DAC
- At CO2 capture cost at 45 USD/ton CO2 e-ammonia production costs equals e-methanol*
- □ Need fast scale up of ren. Electricity/green H2 production
- Market price developments uncertain and depends on
 - Other sectors relying on methanol to decarbonise
 - □ Speed of production capacity buildup

* assumed handling/logistic costs of methanol at 75 USD/ton and ammonia at 100 USD/ton



E-ammonia: Why do we see it as a potential future fuel – and what are the challenges?

1) Why?

Cheap e-fuel. No carbon-dependency. Energy density sufficient. Production tech well-known. Engine being developed. Regulatory work ongoing.

2) Challenges?

- Safety issues we are investigating this through numerious external projects
 - Technical ship design
 - Safety management systems
 - Potential spills

LCA

May be issues with operational limitations at selected ports (not allowing SIMOPS, or some ports will not allow us to bunker ammonia if the port is close to a city, etc.)

-SK

- □ Needs fast scale up of ren. electricity/green H2 production
- Market price uncertain
 - □ Not yet clear how many sectors will utilize ammonia in decarbonisation efforts

Pyrolysis/HTL oils: Why do we see these as potential future fuels- and what are the challenges?

1) Why?

□ Seems to be a potentially cheaper replacement of biodiesel. Fairly mature production technologies. High energy density. No need for new engines/fuel systems. Scalable (feedstock agnostic), pot. use as pilot fuel for methanol ships (and pot. ammonia ships), less competition, <u>negative emission</u>. <u>Blendable with heavy fuel oil</u> → enabling us to utilized it to decarbonise existing fleet (i.e. Help us comply with ship-individual regulations).

2) Challenges?

- □ Poor quality of raw pyro/HTL oil → i.e. what combi of pyro/HTL process and upgrading provides the cheapest pyro-oil just about good enough to blend into HFO at x%?
- □ How can we scale pyro/HTL oils fast enough?





Difficult oil quality ...is nothing new to Maersk

We are used to utilize poor quality oil!

➢ HFO: High viscosity, sulfur, impurities, aromatics, acidity, ...

Few hard requirements for new drop-in fuels:

- Flash point: Above 60°C
- Miscibility: Prefered fully miscible in HFO
- Stability: At least 9 months storage
- Pour point: Below 30°C

A general challenge & an imperative for success: securing adequate supplies of cost competitive green fuel



MAERSK

(1) MOUs signed – still require final validation and contracting

18

Classification: Public

Maersk evaluates all new fuels on a 'well-to-wake' life cycle basis



19

MAERSK

Classification: Public

How much can we rely on our customers to support the decarbonisation of the transport sector?

Where are customers today?

Level 1: Explorers

- Acknowledge that sustainability in logistics is important
- Are defining their sustainability logistics priorities
- Are seeking information/guidance from suppliers on sustainability
- May be willing to invest in sustainable logistics options over time, but need guidance

35% of our top 200 customers

Level 2: Risk managers

- Have basic minimum
 sustainability requirements
- Have integrated sustainability parameters into logistics decisions
- Engage with industry forums (e.g., Clean Cargo)
- Are considering investing in sustainable logistics options

45% of our top 200 customers

Level 3: Implementers

- Have ambitious sustainability strategy integrated with logistics
- Have sustainability parameters integrated into logistics decisions
- Contribute financially to industry sustainability investment
- Are willing to invest in sustainable logistics options

15% of our top 200 customers

Level 4: Leaders

- Are visible first-movers interested in sustainable transformation
- Have high interest in long-term partnerships and co-innovation
- Engage in long term partnerships and investment
- Exhibit high willingness to invest in long-term sustainable logistics transformation

5% of our top 200 customers

Customers are at differing levels of maturity. We can help them wherever they are.



Ocean ECO Delivery: strong and expanding demand





Countries with Ocean ECO Delivery customers

 \rightarrow On the horizon: End-to-End challenge 🔀 M



Classification: Public

Regulatory drivers of progress

APM TE

A level regulatory playing field is key to achieving full decarbonisation

Five critical policy levers for a level regulatory playing field to achieve full decarbonisation





Thanks

