

The Impact of the Poland Foreign Trade On Its Real CO₂ Emissions

Bartosz FORTUŃSKI
University of Opole, Poland

Abstract: CO₂ emissions are a global problem. This means that nothing or very little will change if only particular countries are involved. The purpose of this paper is the attempt to show the real CO₂ emissions of the Poland as well as the impact of its trade on CO₂ emissions in other countries in the world and in the EU in 2015. This study was conducted on the group of countries that are the major emitters of CO₂ in the world including most of the EU members. Actual CO₂ emissions were achieved by applying the actual emission factor. This takes into account the transfer of CO₂ in export products and services as well as those imported by particular countries. It has turned out that the real CO₂ emissions in the Poland are significantly lower from the gross values which represent the CO₂ emissions in the particular countries. It is also important to indicate that isolated actions of a single country within the European Union itself do not deliver the intended global and regional target - positive changes in CO₂ emissions reduction. The approach presented in this paper significantly influences the level of realization of the UE energy policy objectives.

Keywords: the EU energy policy, CO₂ emissions, exports and imports of the Poland.

JEL codes: Q37, Q40, Q53, Q56

<https://doi.org/10.25167/ees.2017.44.33>

1. Introduction

We live in global world and as a consequence the activity of particular countries has direct or indirect impact on others. It does not mean therefore that all countries are functioning in the same way and following the same rules. Some countries are contributing significantly to reduction of global CO₂ emissions in energy sector bearing high costs in comparison with other countries, nonetheless it does not bring intended effects as real reduction of CO₂ emissions. This study is to

confirm the issue. Some countries' struggle with CO₂ emissions does not deliver on the other countries' struggle with this issue. Given that CO₂ emissions are global problem, the struggle of several countries does not change much in the global aspect. Fundamental question comes to mind whether in the activity of global changes should not be engaged all countries by introducing solutions that would require similar approach to the CO₂ issue.

The European Union (the EU) and Poland are occupying a leading position in terms of the value of international exchange (in 2016 the Poland was on the 19 position regarding global export and import). This means that Poland, regarding economic, depends on other countries the same way these countries depend on Poland. All actions planned and realized by the EU as well as Poland have international overtones. The EU and Poland, as the key economy of member state, may use its position in the international arena by implementation of its policy, encouraging other countries to achieve solutions in similar way. Poland with all members of the EU could achieve that with the use of relevant instruments.

The main purpose of this paper is the attempt to show the real CO₂ emissions in the Poland as the member of the EU, as well as the impact of trade on CO₂ emissions within its key trade partners. However, it is not about gross value of emissions but about the real volume with the regard to the CO₂ transfer in export and import products and services. Substantial element of this paper is to indicate that isolated actions like changes in the Poland energy industry will not bring intended targets till the moment when the level of other members of the EU involvement as well as the biggest world economies will not be similar.

2. Trade in Poland in 2015

In 2015 Poland was on the 23th position in the world export and the 20th position in the world import [AM]. The Poland total export reached USD 188 billion while the total import USD 195 billion. In this paper 65 biggest trade partners of the Poland were included. They were presented in Table 1. The Poland export to these countries is on the level of 94,77% (USD 178,167 billion) of total export of the country. In 2015, according to data from Table 1., Poland export to the EU countries was at the level of 74,65% (USD 140,35 billion).

It means that there are close connections between the Poland and the rest of the world (members of the EU mainly), however not so close as in the case of Germany – the biggest

THE IMPACT OF THE POLAND FOREIGN TRADE ON ITS REAL CO2 EMISSIONS

economy of the EU. Through its world position, Poland as a member of UE can influence its trade partners but not as well as the Germany.

Table 1. The Poland export in 2015 in USD billion.

| No. | Country | Export in billions of USD | No. | Country | Export in billions of USD |
|-----|----------------------|---------------------------|-----|-------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | Germany | 47,90 | 34 | Portugal | 0,702 |
| 2 | Great Britain | 12,90 | 35 | Ireland | 0,639 |
| 3 | Czech Republic | 11,40 | 36 | South Korea | 0,637 |
| 4 | France | 10,20 | 37 | South Africa | 0,575 |
| 5 | Italy | 9,50 | 38 | Egypt | 0,544 |
| 6 | Netherlands | 8,39 | 39 | Brazil | 0,515 |
| 7 | USA | 5,33 | 40 | India | 0,501 |
| 8 | Russia | 5,12 | 41 | Hong Kong | 0,488 |
| 9 | Spain | 5,05 | 42 | Algeria | 0,472 |
| 10 | Hungary | 4,86 | 43 | Kazakhstan | 0,370 |
| 11 | Sweden | 4,60 | 44 | Israel | 0,346 |
| 12 | Belgium | 4,47 | 45 | Vietnam | 0,241 |
| 13 | Slovakia | 4,39 | 46 | Malaysia | 0,205 |
| 14 | Austria | 3,34 | 47 | Argentina | 0,187 |
| 15 | Romania | 3,24 | 48 | Thailand | 0,186 |
| 16 | Turkey | 3,19 | 49 | Kuwait | 0,131 |
| 17 | Denmark | 2,96 | 50 | Azerbaijan | 0,125 |
| 18 | Ukraine | 2,77 | 51 | Chile | 0,116 |
| 19 | Lithuania | 2,67 | 52 | Pakistan | 0,113 |
| 20 | Norway | 2,61 | 53 | Uzbekistan | 0,111 |
| 21 | China | 2,23 | 54 | Indonesia | 0,106 |
| 22 | Switzerland | 1,92 | 55 | Qatar | 0,103 |
| 23 | Finland | 1,53 | 56 | Venezuela | 0,091 |
| 24 | Canada | 1,38 | 57 | New Zealand | 0,086 |
| 25 | Belarus | 1,19 | 58 | Colombia | 0,085 |
| 26 | Mexico | 1,10 | 59 | Peru | 0,080 |
| 27 | Japan | 1,04 | 60 | Philippines | 0,054 |
| 28 | Singapore | 1,04 | 61 | Iran | 0,049 |
| 29 | Bulgaria | 0,89 | 62 | Turkmenistan | 0,048 |
| 30 | Saudi Arabia | 0,80 | 63 | Bangladesh | 0,023 |
| 31 | United Arab Emirates | 0,78 | 64 | Ecuador | 0,019 |
| 32 | Greece | 0,72 | 65 | Trinidad & Tobago | 0,003 |
| 33 | Australia | 0,71 | | | |

Source: own study based on [AM].

The relation of the Polish export to its GDP in percentage terms is an important issue for the further considerations. The highest percentage of the Polish GDP is exported to Germany, Great Britain, Czech, France and Italy (Table 2.).

Table 2. Polish export in percentage of Polish GDP terms in 2015.

| No. ¹ | % of Ex | No. | % of Ex | No. | % of Ex | No. | % of Ex |
|------------------|---------|-----|---------|-----|---------|-----|---------|
| 1 | 10,04% | 18 | 0,58% | 35 | 0,134% | 52 | 0,024% |
| 2 | 2,70% | 19 | 0,56% | 36 | 0,134% | 53 | 0,023% |
| 3 | 2,39% | 20 | 0,55% | 37 | 0,121% | 54 | 0,022% |
| 4 | 2,14% | 21 | 0,47% | 38 | 0,114% | 55 | 0,022% |
| 5 | 1,99% | 22 | 0,40% | 39 | 0,108% | 56 | 0,019% |
| 6 | 1,76% | 23 | 0,32% | 40 | 0,105% | 57 | 0,018% |
| 7 | 1,12% | 24 | 0,29% | 41 | 0,102% | 58 | 0,018% |
| 8 | 1,07% | 25 | 0,25% | 42 | 0,099% | 59 | 0,017% |
| 9 | 1,06% | 26 | 0,23% | 43 | 0,078% | 60 | 0,011% |
| 10 | 1,02% | 27 | 0,22% | 44 | 0,073% | 61 | 0,010% |
| 11 | 0,96% | 28 | 0,22% | 45 | 0,051% | 62 | 0,010% |
| 12 | 0,94% | 29 | 0,19% | 46 | 0,043% | 63 | 0,005% |
| 13 | 0,92% | 30 | 0,17% | 47 | 0,039% | 64 | 0,004% |
| 14 | 0,70% | 31 | 0,16% | 48 | 0,039% | 65 | 0,001% |
| 15 | 0,68% | 32 | 0,15% | 49 | 0,027% | | |
| 16 | 0,67% | 33 | 0,15% | 50 | 0,026% | | |
| 17 | 0,62% | 34 | 0,15% | 51 | 0,024% | | |

Source: own study based on [AM].

In 2015 Poland imported products and services worth in total USD 195 billion. In this paper 65 trade partners of the Poland, who accounted for 95,69% of Polish import, were considered (Table 3.). During the period considered Poland imported mainly from the following countries: Germany, China, Italy, Russia and Netherlands. Polish import from the EU countries was at the level of 61,76% (USD 120,43 billion) in the considered period. Within the import area we can observe closer relations between Poland and countries that do not belong to the EU in comparison to its export.

¹ No. refers to No. of the countries from Table 1.

Table 3. Polish import in USD billions in 2015.

| No. | Country | Import in billions of USD | No. | Country | Import in billions of USD |
|-----|----------------|---------------------------|-----|----------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | Germany | 47,50 | 33 | Bangladesh | 0,8330 |
| 2 | China | 21,80 | 34 | Belarus | 0,7640 |
| 3 | Italy | 10,70 | 35 | Thailand | 0,7020 |
| 4 | Russia | 10,70 | 36 | Indonesia | 0,6590 |
| 5 | Netherlands | 7,60 | 37 | Portugal | 0,6220 |
| 6 | France | 7,51 | 38 | Argentina | 0,5790 |
| 7 | Czech Republic | 7,36 | 39 | Bulgaria | 0,5670 |
| 8 | Belgium | 5,45 | 40 | Mexico | 0,5150 |
| 9 | Great Britain | 5,20 | 41 | Greece | 0,4940 |
| 10 | US | 4,91 | 42 | Canada | 0,3840 |
| 11 | Spain | 4,34 | 43 | Israel | 0,3360 |
| 12 | Slovakia | 4,18 | 44 | Australia | 0,2960 |
| 13 | Sweden | 3,63 | 45 | Philippines | 0,2890 |
| 14 | Austria | 3,61 | 46 | Pakistan | 0,2670 |
| 15 | Hungary | 3,28 | 47 | South Africa | 0,2270 |
| 16 | South Korea | 3,23 | 48 | Saudi Arabia | 0,1790 |
| 17 | Turkey | 2,82 | 49 | Hong Kong | 0,1530 |
| 18 | Japan | 2,49 | 50 | Ecuador | 0,1520 |
| 19 | Norway | 2,46 | 51 | Egypt | 0,1330 |
| 20 | Denmark | 2,37 | 52 | Chile | 0,1300 |
| 21 | Ukraine | 1,97 | 53 | United Arab Emirates | 0,1240 |
| 22 | Switzerland | 1,76 | 54 | Colombia | 0,0900 |
| 23 | India | 1,72 | 55 | New Zealand | 0,0446 |
| 24 | Romania | 1,64 | 56 | Algeria | 0,0406 |
| 25 | Finland | 1,60 | 57 | Peru | 0,0338 |
| 26 | Ireland | 1,51 | 58 | Iran | 0,0321 |
| 27 | Vietnam | 1,46 | 59 | Uzbekistan | 0,0273 |
| 28 | Lithuania | 1,27 | 60 | Venezuela | 0,0224 |
| 29 | Kazakhstan | 1,02 | 61 | Qatar | 0,0176 |
| 30 | Singapore | 0,99 | 62 | Azerbaijan | 0,0120 |
| 31 | Malaysia | 0,94 | 63 | Trinidad & Tobago | 0,0001 |
| 32 | Brazil | 0,85 | 64 | | |

Source: own study based on [AM].

From the point of view of considered issue more significant is the data concerning Polish import from one of its main trade partners in the percentage terms in regard to GDP of particular partners (Table 4.). Slovakia, Czech Republic, Lithuania Hungary and Ukraine are the countries from which Poland imported the highest rate of their GDP in 2015.

Table 4. Amount of Polish import in the percentage terms of GDP of trade partners.

| No. | Country | % of GDP imported partner | No. | Country | % of GDP imported partner |
|-----|----------------|---------------------------|-----|----------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | Slovakia | 4,805% | 32 | Great Britain | 0,182% |
| 2 | Czech Republic | 3,978% | 33 | Thailand | 0,178% |
| 3 | Lithuania | 3,098% | 34 | Ecuador | 0,152% |
| 4 | Hungary | 2,711% | 35 | Argentina | 0,145% |
| 5 | Ukraine | 2,189% | 36 | Israel | 0,112% |
| 6 | Belarus | 1,415% | 37 | Philippines | 0,099% |
| 7 | Belgium | 1,198% | 38 | Pakistan | 0,099% |
| 8 | Bulgaria | 1,134% | 39 | India | 0,082% |
| 9 | Netherlands | 1,013% | 40 | Indonesia | 0,077% |
| 10 | Austria | 0,960% | 41 | South Africa | 0,072% |
| 11 | Romania | 0,927% | 42 | Japan | 0,057% |
| 12 | Denmark | 0,787% | 43 | Chile | 0,054% |
| 13 | Russian | 0,784% | 44 | Hong Kong | 0,050% |
| 14 | Vietnam | 0,756% | 45 | Brazil | 0,047% |
| 15 | Sweden | 0,733% | 46 | Mexico | 0,045% |
| 16 | Finland | 0,690% | 47 | Egypt | 0,040% |
| 17 | Norway | 0,637% | 48 | United Arab Emirates | 0,034% |
| 18 | Italy | 0,588% | 49 | Colombia | 0,031% |
| 19 | Kazakhstan | 0,554% | 50 | Saudi Arabia | 0,028% |
| 20 | Ireland | 0,534% | 51 | USA | 0,027% |
| 21 | Bangladesh | 0,427% | 52 | New Zealand | 0,026% |
| 22 | Turkey | 0,393% | 53 | Algeria | 0,025% |
| 23 | Spain | 0,364% | 54 | Canada | 0,025% |
| 24 | Singapore | 0,339% | 55 | Azerbaijan | 0,023% |
| 25 | Malaysia | 0,316% | 56 | Australia | 0,022% |
| 26 | Portugal | 0,313% | 57 | Peru | 0,018% |
| 27 | France | 0,311% | 58 | Qatar | 0,011% |
| 28 | Switzerland | 0,263% | 59 | Venezuela | 0,009% |
| 29 | Greece | 0,255% | 60 | Iran | 0,008% |
| 30 | South Korea | 0,235% | 61 | Trinidad & Tobago | 0,001% |
| 31 | China | 0,197% | 62 | Kuwait | 0,000% |

Source: own study based on [AM], [IEA, 2016], [WB].

The economies of the considered in this paper countries along with the Poland economy generated together, in 2015, 90,05% of world GDP. [WB] Poland and its main trade partners are significant emitters of CO₂ in the world.

3. The emission of CO₂ in Poland and its 63 main trade partners in 2015

The main aim of the European energy policy is to achieve the so-called 3 × 20% until 2020. This involves reduction of CO₂ by 20% in relation to 1990, the increase in participation of renewable energy industry to the level of 20% and improvement in the efficiency of energy use by 20% in comparison to 1990.

It should be also emphasized that indicated aims are interconnected. The improvement in the efficiency of energy use and the increase in participation of renewable energy industry influence significantly on reduction of CO₂ emissions. The reduction of CO₂ emissions could also mean the changes in other aims of the EU energy policy.

3.1. Gross emission

The reduction of CO₂ emissions is one of the priority of the EU energy policy. The assumption indicates the reduction of CO₂ within the members of the EU by 20% in comparison to 1990. It concerns also Poland. However, this assumption concerns only the EU and except the encourages there is no other possibility for the EU to convince other countries in the world to undertake similar actions.

Gross emission of CO₂ it is value of CO₂ emitted by country economy. Table 5. presents emission of Poland and its 63 trade partners. The biggest CO₂ emitters in 2015 were the following countries: China, USA, India, Russia and Japan. The EU members were responsible for 10,17% of world emission of CO₂ emissions in the period considered. It would rank the European Union on the third position among the biggest emitters of CO₂ in the world. In the same ranking Poland is on the twenty-first position.

Table 5. CO₂ emissions in MT and its share in world emission, in Poland and its 63 trade partners.

| Country | CO ₂ emission in MLN T | % of global emission | Country | CO ₂ emission in MLN T | % of global emission |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| China | 9153,90 | 27,32% | Algeria | 137,09 | 0,41% |
| USA | 5485,74 | 16,37% | Belgium | 111,53 | 0,33% |
| India | 2218,43 | 6,62% | Qatar | 111,10 | 0,33% |
| Russia | 1483,18 | 4,43% | Kuwait | 107,88 | 0,32% |
| Japan | 1207,79 | 3,60% | Philippines | 106,52 | 0,32% |
| Germany | 753,64 | 2,25% | Czech Republic | 98,63 | 0,29% |
| South Korea | 648,70 | 1,94% | Colombia | 97,27 | 0,29% |
| Iran | 630,19 | 1,88% | Turkmenistan | 92,62 | 0,28% |
| Saudi Arabia | 624,53 | 1,86% | Hong Kong | 91,24 | 0,27% |
| Indonesia | 611,43 | 1,82% | Chile | 90,11 | 0,27% |
| Canada | 532,47 | 1,59% | Israel | 74,40 | 0,22% |
| Brazil | 487,84 | 1,46% | Greece | 73,90 | 0,22% |
| Mexico | 474,22 | 1,42% | Bangladesh | 72,86 | 0,22% |
| Great Britain | 436,91 | 1,30% | Romania | 70,67 | 0,21% |
| South Africa | 436,51 | 1,30% | Austria | 62,82 | 0,19% |
| Australia | 400,22 | 1,19% | Belarus | 56,34 | 0,17% |
| Italy | 341,49 | 1,02% | Portugal | 52,54 | 0,16% |
| Turkey | 336,33 | 1,00% | Peru | 50,77 | 0,15% |
| France | 309,45 | 0,92% | Sweden | 47,76 | 0,14% |
| Thailand | 295,85 | 0,88% | Bulgaria | 45,15 | 0,13% |
| Poland | 295,85 | 0,88% | Hungary | 44,21 | 0,13% |
| Spain | 291,71 | 0,87% | Finland | 41,31 | 0,12% |
| UAE | 264,66 | 0,79% | Switzerland | 39,06 | 0,12% |
| Malaysia | 246,95 | 0,74% | Ireland | 38,63 | 0,12% |
| Egypt | 212,15 | 0,63% | Denmark | 37,63 | 0,11% |
| Netherlands | 210,12 | 0,63% | Ecuador | 37,08 | 0,11% |
| Singapore | 204,99 | 0,61% | Norway | 36,73 | 0,11% |
| Ukraine | 195,11 | 0,58% | New Zealand | 35,73 | 0,11% |
| Argentina | 189,99 | 0,57% | Azerbaijan | 32,04 | 0,10% |
| Kazakhstan | 184,78 | 0,55% | Slovakia | 31,15 | 0,09% |
| Pakistan | 179,48 | 0,54% | Trinidad & Tobago | 26,67 | 0,08% |
| Venezuela | 169,15 | 0,50% | Lithuania | 11,16 | 0,03% |
| Vietnam | 168,97 | 0,50% | | | |

Source: own study based on [IEA, 2016].

If all guidelines, in accordance with the provisions of the EU energy policy, concerning reduction

of CO₂ would be applied to all trade partners of Poland, then only 17 countries out of all analyzed in this paper countries, would achieve objectives concerning reduction of CO₂ emissions already in 2015. Among those countries there is Poland, because the emission mentioned below is the total CO₂ emissions and not only generated by power engineering.

Table 6. Achievement by Polish partners of guidelines CO₂ emission of the EU energy policy in year 2015.

| Country | % of CO ₂ emissions from 1990 | Country | % of CO ₂ emissions from 1990 |
|----------------|--|-------------------|--|
| Ukraine | 26,22% | Australia | 146,48% |
| Lithuania | 30,94% | Venezuela | 155,06% |
| Romania | 40,11% | Mexico | 176,68% |
| Slovakia | 56,79% | Argentina | 182,79% |
| Azerbaijan | 57,59% | Algeria | 197,79% |
| Belarus | 58,74% | Israel | 212,55% |
| Czech Republic | 61,02% | Hong Kong | 221,06% |
| Hungary | 61,31% | Colombia | 225,44% |
| Russia | 65,67% | Egypt | 238,11% |
| Denmark | 67,35% | Brazil | 247,33% |
| Bulgaria | 68,42% | Turkey | 249,84% |
| Great Britain | 73,67% | Turkmenistan | 256,48% |
| Finland | 74,60% | Peru | 259,03% |
| Germany | 75,12% | Philippines | 266,69% |
| Sweden | 76,75% | South Korea | 271,32% |
| Kazakhstan | 77,04% | Trinidad & Tobago | 276,40% |
| Poland | 79,09% | Ecuador | 281,60% |
| France | 84,08% | Chile | 283,64% |
| Italy | 85,41% | Pakistan | 289,64% |
| Belgium | 87,79% | Singapore | 293,51% |
| Switzerland | 90,23% | Saudi Arabia | 299,58% |
| Greece | 94,74% | UAE | 312,51% |
| USA | 106,29% | Iran | 323,15% |
| Austria | 110,44% | Thailand | 327,70% |
| Netherlands | 110,61% | India | 367,11% |
| Japan | 110,77% | China | 394,52% |
| Canada | 115,93% | Malaysia | 419,90% |
| Norway | 118,23% | Indonesia | 447,31% |
| Ireland | 124,81% | Bangladesh | 548,11% |
| Portugal | 128,04% | Kuwait | 561,33% |

| Country | % of CO2 emissions from 1990 | Country | % of CO2 emissions from 1990 |
|--------------|------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|
| New Zealand | 132,11% | Qatar | 701,99% |
| Spain | 135,10% | Vietnam | 945,38% |
| South Africa | 142,82% | | |

Source: own study based on [IEA, 2016].

3.2. Gross emission – after considering the Polish trade

Gross emission of CO₂ was determined as the CO₂ emissions of particular country diminished by emission exported in goods and services of the country plus emission imported in goods and services from the importing country. It means that emissions of CO₂ should be increased by net emissions of CO₂. The following formulas present method used to calculate net emissions of CO₂ and gross emissions of CO₂ for one country:

$$S_E = \left(\frac{E_x}{PKB} \right) \% \times E_b - \left(\frac{I_m}{PKB} \right) \% \times E_b$$

$$E_{rz} = E_b + S_E$$

S_E – net emissions of CO₂ of particular country;

E_b – gross CO₂ emissions of particular country;

E_x – export of particular country;

I_m – import of particular country;

PKB – gross domestic product at constant prices in EUR m;

$(I_m/PKB)\%$ – part of GDP of particular country that was exported to the EU;

$(E_x/PKB)\%$ – part of GDP of the EU which was exported to particular country;

$(I_m/PKB)\% \times E_b$ – exported CO₂ in goods and services to the EU;

$(E_x/PKB)\% \times E_b$ – exported CO₂ of the EU to the particular country in goods and services;

E_{rz} – actual CO₂ emissions. (Fortuński, 2016a)

Actual CO₂ emissions of the Poland during the period considered was significantly different from gross emission. In 2015 the Poland exported in goods and services 110,50 MT CO₂ in total and imported from their trade partners 78,44 MT CO₂. It means that the CO₂ balance was positive for Poland. Actual emissions of CO₂ in Poland have decline by 32,06 MT CO₂ with regard to gross emission in 2015. The actual emissions of CO₂ was at the level of 263,78 MT CO₂. The actual CO₂

THE IMPACT OF THE POLAND FOREIGN TRADE ON ITS REAL CO₂ EMISSIONS

emissions in Poland in 2015 comparing to 1990 was at the level of 70,52%. Taking into account the actual emission of CO₂ in 2015, Poland did achieve the intended objective of emission reduction by 20% and.

Net emission of CO₂ of Poland trade partners, which includes only the exchange with this country, was presented in the Table 7. China, Russia, Ukraine, India and Vietnam are the main net exporters of CO₂ to Poland in 2015. While: Germany, Great Britain, France, Italy and Czech Republic were the main recipients of the Polish net export of CO₂ in 2015. Taking into consideration only the EU countries included in this paper, it should be indicated that balance of CO₂ emissions is for the Poland positive and it amounted -57,89 MT CO₂.

Table 7. The Polish trade partners net emissions of CO₂

| Country | Net emissions | Country | Net emissions |
|-------------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------|
| China | -16,653 | Israel | 0,131 |
| Russia | -8,451 | Ireland | 0,190 |
| Ukraine | -2,553 | Egypt | 0,252 |
| India | -1,517 | Greece | 0,256 |
| Vietnam | -1,129 | Hong Kong | 0,257 |
| South Korea | -1,127 | Algeria | 0,259 |
| Kazakhstan | -0,795 | Portugal | 0,271 |
| Malaysia | -0,653 | Saudi Arabia | 0,323 |
| Thailand | -0,410 | Australia | 0,351 |
| Indonesia | -0,402 | United Arab Emirates | 0,394 |
| Bangladesh | -0,297 | Mexico | 0,469 |
| Argentina | -0,160 | Turkey | 0,656 |
| Pakistan | -0,107 | Finland | 0,664 |
| Philippines | -0,072 | Canada | 0,724 |
| Belarus | -0,059 | Switzerland | 1,088 |
| Singapore | -0,051 | Slovakia | 1,226 |
| Ecuador | -0,045 | Lithuania | 1,310 |
| Japan | -0,041 | Romania | 1,355 |
| Iran | -0,017 | Norway | 1,385 |
| Trinidad & Tobago | 0,002 | Belgium | 1,437 |
| Colombia | 0,023 | Austria | 1,468 |
| Chile | 0,023 | Denmark | 1,540 |
| Turkmenistan | 0,030 | USA | 1,812 |
| Peru | 0,041 | Hungary | 1,816 |
| South Africa | 0,041 | Spain | 2,070 |
| Bulgaria | 0,042 | Sweden | 2,503 |
| Venezuela | 0,042 | Netherlands | 3,074 |

| Country | Net emissions | Country | Net emissions |
|-------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| New Zealand | 0,044 | Czech Republic | 3,146 |
| Qatar | 0,052 | Italy | 3,886 |
| Uzbekistan | 0,069 | France | 5,365 |
| Azerbaijan | 0,070 | Great Britain | 7,207 |
| Kuwait | 0,081 | Germany | 19,064 |
| Brazil | 0,090 | | |

Source: own study based on [AM], [IEA, 2016], [WB].

It is worth to underline that the actions taken by Poland as well as some EU members in matters of implementing own energy power policy are insufficient. Despite the mentioned above fact, their effectiveness is increasing, what should allow, as a consequence, to achieve the EU energy policy objectives. However, their effectiveness is limited only to the territory of the EU. This can result from the fact that the EU energy policy is not being regarded as a sustainable development policy and is related to high costs. (Fortuński 2012, 2013, 2013a, 2016, 2016a, 2016b, Bogrocz 2008, Kaczmarek 2010, Kryk 2012, 2012a) It also indicates ineffectiveness of international agreements of reducing emissions of CO₂ such as Kyoto Agreement.

The effectiveness of this policy shows its weaknesses after taking into consideration actual emissions of CO₂. It was clearly presented that the issue of CO₂ emissions is a global problem. Benefits from isolated actions are more likely to be insignificant than it appears in statistics.

4. Conclusion

Poland themselves might be not regarded as a leader but the whole European Union is regarded as the leaders in the fight against global warming, fight for clean energy reduction of CO₂ emissions. Unfortunately, its actions are isolated what leads to the situation that even such economy as that of the Polish, which is strongly economically related to others through trade, is not able to change much within the issues. The EU and the Poland as one of the member state, leaders in world trade (19 position in international trade, 19 world economy in 2016) could use their position in international trade in order to achieve their own energy policy objectives, in particular reduction of CO₂ emissions. Trade is connected with big import of CO₂ hidden in goods and services imported to Poland and other members of the EU. Fortunately, it not affects disadvantageously on the actual emission of CO₂ in Poland, but in many UE member states affects. As a consequence,

CO₂ emissions in Poland did achieve already assumed reduction of CO₂ according to its energy policy in 2015. The results of research indicate that the CO₂ emissions is a global problem and actions of individual country or even union of countries are not able to change recent trends. It is required to consider by the EU the introduction of new instrument that would encourage the countries outside the EU to undertake effective actions towards reduction of CO₂ emissions.

For that purpose the new instrument could be introduced. It would be an ecology-energy tax. It would be applied by the EU for all trade partners, individual countries or groups of countries. Additionally, it would concern the volume in total of particular countries export to the EU.[TX]

Literature

- Bogrocz-Koczwarra, M.; Herlender, K. (2008). Bezpieczeństwo energetyczne a rozwój odnawialnych energii. *Energetyka* 3.
- Fortuński, B. (2012). „Wyniki” proekologicznego podejścia do energetyki w Unii Europejskiej w oparciu o model *EFQM*. In: Borys, T.; Rogala, P. (eds.). *Orientacja na wyniki we współczesnej gospodarce* 265: 113-125. Wrocław: Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu.
- Fortuński, B. (2013). *Wyzwania i problemy zrównoważonego rozwoju w energetyce światowej w kontekście polityki energetycznej UE*. In: Kryk, B. (ed.). *Handel wewnętrzny* 6: 299-309. Warszawa: IBRKK.
- Fortuński, B. (2013a). *Wykorzystanie wybranych surowców energetycznych w kontekście polityki energetycznej Unii Europejskiej*. In: Graczyk, A. (ed.). *Efektywne gospodarowanie zasobami przyrodniczymi i energią* 317: 13-22. Wrocław: Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu.
- Fortuński, B. (2016). *Polityka energetyczna Unii Europejskiej – 3x20. Diagnoza i perspektywy w kontekście zrównoważonego rozwoju*. In: Becla, A.; Kociszewski, K. (eds.). *Ekonomia środowiska i polityka ekologiczna* 453: 179-189. Wrocław: Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu.
- Fortuński, B. (2016a). *Wpływ handlu zagranicznego Unii Europejskiej na rzeczywista emisję CO₂*. In: Michalczyk, W. (ed.). *Ekonomia XXI Wieku* 3(11): 109-120. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu.
- Fortuński, B. (2016b). *Globalna sprawiedliwość a polityka energetyczna Unii Europejskiej*. In: Janikowska, O.; Słodczyk, J. (eds.). *Globalna sprawiedliwość*: 163-183. Opole: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.
- Bielecki, S.; Zalewski, P.; Fortuński, B. (2016). *Wybrane Problemy zarządzania energetyką*. Warszawa: Texter. [TX]
- IEA (2016). *CO₂ EMISSIONS FROM FUEL COMBUSTION Highlights (2015 Edition)*. Paris: OECD/IEA.
- Kaczmarek, M. (2010). *Bezpieczeństwo energetyczne Unii Europejskiej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.
- Kryk, B. (2012). Kontrowersje polskiej polityki energetycznej w kontekście realizacji wymogów unijnych. *Ekonomia i Prawo, t. XI Integracja i dezintegracja w sektorze realnym* 4: 151–166.
- Kryk, B. (2012a). *Wzrost efektywności energetycznej – wyzwanie inwestycyjne dla polskiego sektora energetycznego*. In: Dymek, Ł.; Bedrunka, K. (eds.) *Kapitał ludzki i społeczny w rozwoju regionalnym* I. Opole: Politechnika Opolska.
- <http://atlas.media.mit.edu/en/profile/country/deu/#Exports>. Accessed 15 September 2017.
- <http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/world-development-indicators>. Accessed 18 September 2017.

Wpływ handlu zagranicznego republiki federalnej Niemiec na jej rzeczywistą emisję CO₂

Streszczenie

Emisja CO₂ jest problemem globalnym. Oznacza to, że walka jedynie części krajów w tym obszarze niewiele zmienia. Celem niniejszego artykułu jest próba ukazania rzeczywistego poziomu emisji CO₂ na terenie Polski, jak również wpływ jej wymiany handlowej na emisję CO₂ w pozostałych państwach świata i UE w 2015 roku. Badanie zostało przeprowadzone na grupie państw będących głównymi emitentami CO₂ na świecie, w tym większości państw członkowskich UE. Poziom emisji CO₂ uzyskano przez zastosowanie wskaźnika emisji rzeczywistej. Jego wielkość uwzględnia transfer CO₂ w produktach i usługach eksportowych, a także importowanych przez poszczególne kraje. W wyniku jego zastosowania okazało się, że rzeczywisty poziom emisji CO₂ w Polsce jest odmienny od wartości brutto, które reprezentują wielkości emisji CO₂ na terenie danego kraju.

Słowa kluczowe: polityka energetyczna UE, emisja CO₂, eksport i import Polski.

Kody JEL: Q37, Q40, Q53, Q56

<https://doi.org/10.25167/ees.2017.44.33>