

Article 6 at COP29




Phase-Out, Don't Offset:

Meaningful climate action means ending fossil fuels and delivering on climate finance. Expanding the potential to pay to pollute with more climate-destroying emissions at COP29, instead of reducing emissions now, is a slap in the face of those on the frontlines of the climate crisis - who are facing and surviving increasing extreme weather events.

Carbon Markets Aren't Climate Finance:

Including revenues from carbon market credits, which allow big polluters to continue their business, as so-called innovative sources, is an insult to climate-vulnerable communities and would only exacerbate the climate crisis. Carbon markets are not a means for developed countries to avoid their climate finance obligations.

6.2 Potentially Worse than VCMs:

The current text of Article 6.2 would not ensure environmental integrity, and would potentially be worse than the current voluntary carbon markets (VCMs). The lack of transparency and accountability opens the door to activities that undermine the ability to achieve the Paris Agreement's goals, lead to environmental harm and human rights violations, including of the rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Trading carbon budgets must not fill the void of political will and need to drive emission reductions through ambitious NDCs. As designed in Article 6.2 of the Paris Agreement, the carbon market mechanism lacks the substance to guarantee benefits to achieve climate goals. Most likely it will help primarily those not willing to reduce emissions drastically in their NDCs - that instead will use cheap and dangerously theoretical emission budgets from someone's land to offset their responsibility to act.

Scandal after Scandal:

Study after study shows the fallacy of markets as a climate solution. A new research shows that very few carbon credits issued so far constitute real emission reductions. And nobody knows if the weak fossil fuel compensation rules developed at COP29 under the influence of thousands of fossil fuel and abatement technology lobbyists, will really help reduce emissions.

Fungibility of Carbon Budgets:

Trading carbon budgets between fossil fuel emissions and biogenic carbon pools will not solve the fact that we need to act on two fronts. We must reduce and end fossil fuel emissions in all sectors as soon as possible. We must also protect and restore the lost sequestration potential ecosystems in the wake of ongoing human destruction to stabilize the biogenic carbon flows. Assuming the continuation of fossil fuel emissions can be simply compensated with the restoration of ecosystems is, therefore, flawed right from the start.

Ecosystems Integrity:

So far, the tools, standards, and procedures under Article 6.4 offer too few guardrails to ensure the protection and restoration of nature. The door is wide open to risky activities as too little has been done to exclude dangerous carbon dioxide removal (CDR) technologies and non-ecological ecosystem-based CDR methods. Further guidance needs to be developed between climate and biodiversity science to define those CDR measures that do not conflict with the goals and targets of the other Rio Conventions and other multilateral agreements.

Human Rights at Risk:

Joint statement by UN human rights mandate holders denouncing the human rights and climate threats posed by the adoption of carbon market standards on the first day of COP29 without deliberations. In a nutshell: the UNSRs stress concerns regarding process, human rights, and effective climate action - calling on governments to "ensure that human rights are at the forefront of the formulation and implementation of standards applicable to carbon markets."

[🔗 Original statement](#)

Social media posts

- [LinkedIn](#)
- [Twitter \(aka X\)](#)

Holistically Review Risk and Impacts:

Before going forward with any activities under Article 6, mandate a holistic risk and impact assessment of planned Article 6 activities.