

Checklist for CDM sink negotiators



Dear delegate,

We would like to draw your attention to our serious concerns regarding the CDM sink negotiations at COP-9.

First of all, accounting for sinks and consequently allowing higher fossil fuel emissions does not help to mitigate long-term climate change. However, now that the CDM rules for the first commitment period are under negotiation, we must turn our attention to the immediate environmental and social impacts of sink projects.

The issue is not whether the rules will provide an opportunity for some projects with biodiversity benefits. Rather, the necessity is that sound rules must be in place so that all projects contribute “to the conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use of natural resources”, as stipulated in the Marrakech Accords. Kyoto’s credibility is at stake if unsustainable projects are supported in its name, such as industrial plantations on lands already claimed by local people with monocultures of non-native tree species. After the long-term climate concern seems to have been overridden, it is now of highest priority

to ensure that the Kyoto Protocol does not become a subsidy system for environmentally disastrous tree factories.

On the reverse side of this page, we highlight our most urgent concerns regarding specific issues in the current negotiation text.

Thank you in advance for your help to design a better future,

*Sincerely,
Greenpeace International*

Contact at COP-9:

Steve Sawyer
Greenpeace International
ssawyer@diala.greenpeace.org
mobile: +31 6 535 04715

Malte Meinshausen
Greenpeace International
malte.meinshausen@diala.greenpeace.org
mobile: +41-79 54 22 841

Steven Guilbeault
Greenpeace International
steven.guilbeault@yto.greenpeace.org
mobile: + 44-7801-857-526



Dear Delegate, did you succeed in the CDM sinks negotiations? Can you tick all the boxes below?

Ruled out invasive alien species and GMOs?

An environmental treaty that subsidizes invasive alien species and GMOs threatens its public support.

Included at least "Appendix E"?

How could host countries, credit buyers, stakeholders and the public assess a project's social and environmental impacts without consistent information on what these impacts are? The already watered down "Appendix E light" outlines the absolute minimum information necessary, without touching sovereignty concerns of host countries.

Rejected Canada's "insurance approach" on the permanence issue?

Of the options currently being put forward to address permanence, the tCER (or rCER) approach is the most effective as it requires ongoing monitoring and liability for any re-emission of credited sequestration. Proposals that allow these provisions to expire clearly undermine environmental integrity. Choosing both 'temporary credits' and the 'insurance approach' is a false compromise. Going beyond the mere accounting: include incentives for long-term project design, such as a minimum project lifetime requirements (different from crediting periods).

Ensured meaningful additionality tests to exclude projects that would have happened anyway.

Furthermore,

Excluded 'positive' leakage? Ensured a 100% default leakage assumption?

Exclude 'positive' leakage because it can't be verified. Assume 100% leakage in the absence of adequate analysis and take due account of 'shifted activities'.

Kept the 1990 base year for reforestation projects?

Required that all GHGs are accounted for, not just CO2?

Secured geo-referenced location of projects?

Secured early stakeholder participation and 60 days commenting period?

Didn't allow fast-tracking of sinks (nothing > 100 ha is "small!")?

Required truthful baselines?
Prospective land use and other key factors should be taken into account in the baselines. Natural regeneration has to be part of the baseline.

Best regards,
Greenpeace