

## **Notes from the side event on**

### **Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) & Sustainable Development: Are they truly sustainable?**

**- Insights from India**

**02nd December 2014**

**16:45- 18:15 hrs.**

**Room Maranga( 130)**

#### **Nafisa Goga D'souza:**

- General introduction CDM globally
- CDM reality at grassroot level, very upsetting outcomes
- Introduced the speakers

#### **Raman Mehta**

- Presented the study taken up by vasudha foundation
- Methodology involving Field visits and interviews conducted with communities
- selection projects, 10states and 8 sectors
- Indicators focused on to assess sustainability claims, 4 parameters of wellbeing examined
- SD benefits poorly defined, poor delivery of SD benefits
- Land acquisition biggest issue-not sufficient compensation and resettlement plans
- Numerous recommendations outlined and indentified: crediting period, within country check list sd benefits , transparency in the process, greater participation locals, land issues have to be treated differently, capacity building needs to be part of CDM

#### **Ajita Tiwari Padhi**

- Suffers from architectural design
- Resource loss very significant aspect
- Land loss under CDM: loss under international framework
- Biomass: inadequate effluent treatment and health implication, wind: forest land,hydro: loss of agriculture, solar: water food print
- No safeguard to address this- results in land grabs
- Stakeholder consultation, disregard people's concerns, despite concerns projects have been registered
- Accountability problems, sustainable developmentd indicators in India: very open articulation, random commitments made by CDM project holders, no

monitoring systems available in CDM, 2% no clear to where these CER percent goes

- Close policy gaps
- Energy issues, need to focus on local India

### **Eva Filmsoszer**

- Not so much desire anymore for CDM... poor climate targets
- CDM mechanism to be looked at from an experience perspective
- NMM and NAMA put SD more on the forefront, not only mitigation anymore that matters
- Adaptation and SD need to be in the picture now
- INDCs: what type of information shall be provided? – CDM best source of lessons
- Sd lessons has been little explored so far
- any sort of CER only look at emission reduction
- Countries own decision if project contributes to sd
- Slowly EB is establishing work plan to look into sd element and monitoring
- EB adopted SD tool, good step but has it's flaws in changing current situation and the actual showing of effects—voluntary!, no public participation
- Need for monitoring not only relevant for CDM, but for other mechanisms as well
- Public participation: far too weak, national legislation and CDM rules need now to be taken into account when carrying out LSC- decided last week
- But not linked yet to international legislation
- Grievance mechanism lacks in the CDM
- We need to make sure rules being improved
- We have to more looking at CDM experience, not only just the CDM anymore
- Need coherent framework in climate change convention to include communities, HR, public participation

### **Siddharth D'souza**

- Presented an alternative as in the VER framework highlighting Laya's experience
- This delivers on furthering SD
- LAYA project: about 4000 families
- Carbon saving not much
- Project registered in 2012- surplus will be shared with community (70%) insurance system or community fund
- Asking for : incentivize carbon projects for the poor, ensure profits are shared with community

### **Discussion from the floor**

- Question of accountability corporate sector- should be one learning from CDM
- DNA: question, DNA under-staffed , objective of sd overall missing
- Peoples participation crucial, enforcing rules! Enforce good rules that are already there- only possible with public participation