



To:

FRANS TIMMERMANS, Executive Vice President for the European Green Deal  
ADINA VĂLEAN, EU Commissioner for Transport

Brussels, 23/02/2022

**Object: Requesting publication of study on reducing aromatics in kerosene**

Dear Executive Vice President Timmermans, dear Commissioner Vălean,

The Commission supports arguments that the Refuel EU Aviation SAF blending mandate will help abate aviation non-CO2 climate impacts, as lower aromatics in SAF blends mitigates the formation of climate warming contrails. Increasing SAF blending in line with Refuel EU Aviation targets, will however take decades, as it depends first on meeting SAF's extremely high incremental costs. We want to urge the Commission to work together with the co-legislators on the compelling alternative – immediate action today on contrail warming by reducing aromatics and sulphur in kerosene forthwith. Airlines are able to reduce aromatics to 8% without any safety implications. The EASA non-CO2 scientific team already identified this option in March 2020, although their report was not published until late November that same year. The climate and air pollution arguments for acting on aromatics in kerosene today are set out in Annex 13 of the ReFuel EU Aviation proposal. Along with details on the far lower costs compared to SAFs.

However, one central piece of evidence for making the case for EU action is missing – a report “CE Delft Forthcoming” which was evidently already available in March 2020 when the EASA scientists finalised their report – almost two years ago now. It has come to our ears that, the report is part of the Horizon-funded project Jetscreen, but has been withheld from publication to date.

As we understand it, CE Delft Forthcoming is a modest but highly relevant study into the economics, refinery processes and both climate and societal costs and benefits of cutting aromatics in kerosene today. Doing so will also fulfil a key aviation objective of the Green Deal set out in November 2019 – improving air quality at EU airports. Moreover, the improved energy intensity of the cleaner fuel effectively pays to reduce the sulphur and lowers overall emissions. The EASA report recognises this. Similar studies by MIT/Ascent for the FAA and already published confirm these findings in the US context and calculate a very modest fuel cost premium of between 9-14% - compared to that for SAF.

Given that the findings of this study could be central to planned changes in future aviation fuel specifications, it is essential that the CE Delft Forthcoming report be published immediately. Failure

to do so, would amount to the suppression of Horizon work and hinders an informed debate on climate change mitigation in the co-decision process.

Sincerely,

Jutta Paulus, Greens/EFA - ReFuel EU Aviation shadow

Bas Eickhout, Greens/EFA - EU ETS Aviation shadow