

## Civil Society Open Letter - Gas Attack in EU Taxonomy

Dear President von der Leyen,

We are alarmed by a new proposal allowing fossil fuels into the EU Taxonomy.

**New technical criteria suggest that "gas back-up" does no harm to the environment, and therefore can be included as Sustainable for Finance under the EU Taxonomy. These are baseless claims and are opposed to the consensus climate science. Introducing fossil gas in the EU taxonomy is firmly against the recommendations of the Commission's Technical Expert Group and caves in to the demands of the gas lobby.**

The EU Taxonomy was conceived as a science-based gold standard to avoid greenwashing. With such a proposal the taxonomy itself would become a greenwashing tool.

Energy security and grid reliability are critical for Europe, but are also fully addressed by other EU policies and regulations, such as EU capacity mechanisms and back-up regulations. The purpose of the EU Taxonomy is to correctly label green finance: this sustainability labelling does not impact security and reliability, which are managed elsewhere.

**Early analysis shows that up to half of all EU gas plants are running below 2000 operational hours a year and thus could be included in the green taxonomy with the new proposal (based on data from [the EEA](#) on large gas turbines and engines reported to the EEA for the year 2019).**

These unwarranted proposals are in direct contradiction with President von der Leyen's Green Deal and the EU ambition for higher climate targets. They would also undermine and discredit the EU's global climate leadership.

With other countries developing competing taxonomies for sustainable investments, the EU Taxonomy can be a global gold standard, but including fossil gas in the EU Taxonomy will lower global ambition and set a precedent that could result in other countries labelling a broad range of fossil fuel investments as sustainable.

**For all of the above reasons, these gas lobby-promoted proposals must not be countenanced.** For the EU Taxonomy to have any sustainable value, the Commission's Delegated Act must be consistent with the independent Technical Expert Group's science-based recommendations.

We urge you to reconsider this change in direction and reject the proposal.

The undersigned remain ready to urgently exchange with you on this issue.

Yours sincerely,

**WWF European Policy Office,**



**Climate Strategy & Partners,**



**Climate Bonds Initiative,**



**Transport & Environment,**



**BirdLife Europe and Central Asia,**

