



6 December 2010

To the Head of the official delegation of Ukraine for UNFCCC negotiations.

Dear Sir/Madame,

On behalf of the Climate Action Network International I would like to clarify the situation with respect to the Fossil of the Day Award given to Ukraine, Russia, Australia and New Zealand on December 1 in response to the statement given by the National Environmental Investment Agency regarding the issue (which I understand was claiming that the fossil was given without basis and initiated by one person Irina Stavchuk).¹

Climate Action Network - International is a worldwide network of over 550 Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) working to promote government and individual action to limit human-induced climate change to ecologically sustainable levels.

With respect to the Fossil of the Day Awards, CAN has strict procedure for soliciting and confirming nominations. During United Nations climate change negotiations, members of the CAN-International meet every day. During these meetings the membership votes for countries collectively judged to have done their 'best' to block progress in the negotiations in the last days of talks. Based on the results of the voting the Fossil Award is given. The Fossil of the Day award cannot be decided by any single person as it is voted on by all members present at the meeting.

On 1 December, the Fossil of the Day was awarded to Ukraine, Russia, Australia and New Zealand, based on the statements made at the informal contact group on 30 Nov 2010 regarding their position of no flexibility regarding AAU carryover and that the existing provisions on this matter should remain.

We as the Climate Action Network are very concerned about the carry-over of surplus Assigned Amount Units (AAUs) from the 1st commitment period. Estimates place this surplus at 7 to 11Gt CO₂e, or roughly one third of current 2020 emissions reduction targets pledged by Annex I countries. Thus, surplus AAUs have the potential to undermine the environmental integrity and effectiveness of the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol.

We do reconfirm the statement that the huge Kyoto surplus in Ukraine and Russia arose from a mistake in the estimate of projected business-as-usual scenarios and not due to the implementation of effective climate change mitigation policies. When Kyoto

¹ See http://neia.gov.ua/nature/control/uk/publish/article?art_id=122700&cat_id=115630

Protocol targets were negotiated in middle 1990s it was difficult to estimate how economies in transition will develop. Based on the information provided at that time (and first national communication of Ukraine) by 2015 Ukraine could almost reach the level of emissions it had in 1990. The time showed that those estimations were mistaken since the current level of emissions in Ukraine is minus 54% from 1990 levels. These emissions reductions cannot be claimed as the result of the substantial national policies: based on the official information available, Ukraine still has not developed National climate change mitigation strategy.

CAN holds the position that if the issue of surplus AAUs is not adequately addressed, developed countries can continue on a business-as-usual pathway. CAN questions the continuation of international emissions trading as a mechanism after 2012 if the Kyoto surplus issue is not fully addressed.

We as CAN would like to invite the official Ukrainian delegation for a meeting to help better understand the position of Ukraine on the AAU surplus issue and discuss potential options which will bring us quite far in solving the AAU loophole issue. Please, let us know when you could be available for a meeting by this email: eva.filzmoser@cdm-watch.org

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'David Turnbull', written in a cursive style.

David Turnbull

Director, Climate Action Network - International

