



## **Views on Nuclear Activities in the Flexibility Mechanisms**

**Prepared for COP 14, December 2008**

The nuclear industry is using the issue of climate change and energy supply as a vehicle to win political and financial support for its dirty and dying sector. However, the potential for nuclear power in climate protection is both very limited and problematic.

A scenario published in 2008 by the International Energy Agency (IEA) of the OECD illustrates that even a massive, four-fold expansion of nuclear power by 2050 would provide only marginal reductions (4%) in greenhouse gas emissions, when what we need, at a minimum is for global emissions to peak by 2015 with 50 - 85% cuts by 2050.

Further, this minimal contribution of nuclear power towards fighting climate change would come too late (long after 2020), with huge costs (US\$ 10 trillion to build 1,400 proposed new large reactors). And, it would seriously undermine global security and sustainable development by increasing the likelihood of serious hazards related to nuclear accidents, radioactive waste and proliferation.

These large costs and negative impacts make investments in nuclear energy an obstacle to the necessary development of effective, clean and affordable energy sources – both in developing and industrialised countries.

The greenhouse gas abatement potential of both efficiency and renewable sources is many times higher than that of nuclear power, both in absolute terms (the potential identified by IEA in 2008 is 10 times higher) but also relatively, in amount of carbon avoided per certain invested capital. And importantly: unlike nuclear power, those solutions can be implemented in a timely manner and without serious collateral hazards.

### **Policy recommendation:**

***Activities related to nuclear power must not be allowed to become eligible for the Kyoto Protocol's flexible mechanisms*** in order to avoid:

- Undermining climate protection by wasting time and taking resources away from more effective and clean solutions;
- Dumping this expensive and unsafe technology on developing countries who would be burdened with the associated economic and environmental impacts (accumulation of massive financial debts, increased dependency on foreign fuel and technologies, increased risk from reactor accidents and contamination); and
- Decreasing global security due to massively increasing volumes of radioactive waste for which there are no safe methods of disposal and which would also result in the undesirable proliferation of nuclear materials and technologies.

**Too little, too late, too expensive, and just too dangerous:**

**CAN Calls for Options to “Include Nuclear Activities”**

**in the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM)**

**and Joint Implementation (JI) to be removed.**