

Open Letter - Gas Attack in Taxonomy

Dear President von der Leyen,

Vice-President Timmermans and Dombrovskis,

Commissioner McGuinness,

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

This new proposal drafted by the European Commission suggests that fossil gas does no harm to the environment, and therefore could be included as Sustainable for Finance under the EU Taxonomy. These are baseless claims and are opposed to 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, just transition, and grid reliability are critical for Europe, but are also fully addressed by other EU policies, funds, and regulations. The purpose of the EU Taxonomy is to correctly label green finance: this means following the best scientific evidence on an activity's environmental impact.

Counting gas as green ignores the significant environmental effects of methane, whose impact on climate change is up to 84 times greater than CO₂ in a 20-year timeframe. This means if only 3% of the gas leaks, it can cause more warming than coal.¹ Furthermore, many European gas companies do not properly measure methane emissions in their supply chain and are not seizing the available opportunities to reduce these emissions.² We have no time for false solutions. This is why neither coal-to-gas nor cogeneration (CHP) should be included in the Taxonomy.

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.

¹ Climate Bonds Initiative, (2021), *The Hidden Emissions from Gas-Fired Power*. Available [here](#).

² Dezem, V., (2021), *European Gas Is a Long Way From Tackling Methane Leaks*. Available [here](#). Research by Deutsche Umwelthilfe, urgewald (2021), *Market survey: methane emissions from natural gas companies*. Available [here](#).

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,

Scientists:

[Redacted signature block containing 20 horizontal bars of varying lengths]







Financial Institutions/Associations



[Redacted text block]

Civil Society

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

1. Introduction

2. Background

3. Methodology

4. Results

5. Discussion

6. Conclusion

7. References

8. Appendix

9. Acknowledgments

10. Contact Information

11. Declaration of Interest

12. Funding Sources

13. Author Contributions

14. Data Availability

15. Ethics Statement

16. Conflicts of Interest

17. Supplementary Materials

18. Correspondence

19. Peer Review

20. Publication Details

21. Copyright

22. Reprints

23. Distribution

24. Archiving

25. Open Access

26. Citations

27. Abstract

28. Keywords

29. Subject Headings

30. Indexing

31. Bibliography

32. References

Response	Percentage
Yes	85%
No	15%

Response	Percentage
Good	45%
Not good	55%

Response	Percentage
Yes	65%
No	35%

Response	Percentage
Yes, the U.S. should take action to protect the environment	85%
No, the U.S. should not take action to protect the environment	15%



Response	Percentage
Yes	85%
No	15%

Response	Percentage
Yes	85%
No	15%

Response	Percentage
Yes	85%
No	15%

Government	Percentage
Current government	75%
Previous government	25%

Government	Percentage
Current government	85%
Previous government	15%

Response	Percentage
Yes	85%
No	15%

Gender	Percentage of respondents vaccinated
Females	85%
Males	75%

1. **Introduction**
The purpose of this study is to investigate the effects of various factors on the growth of a specific plant species.

2. **Methodology**
The study was conducted using a controlled experiment in a greenhouse setting.

3. **Results**
The results show that the growth rate of the plant species is significantly affected by the amount of light and water.

4. **Discussion**
The findings of this study suggest that optimal growth conditions for the plant species are achieved with a combination of high light and moderate water levels.

5. **Conclusion**
The study concludes that the growth of the plant species is highly dependent on the environmental factors tested.

6. **References**
The following references were consulted during the research process:

7. **Appendix A**
Detailed data tables and graphs are provided in the appendix.

8. **Appendix B**
A list of the equipment and materials used in the experiment is included.

9. **Appendix C**
A glossary of terms used in the study is provided.

10. **Appendix D**
A list of the authors and their affiliations is included.

11. **Appendix E**
A list of the funding sources for the study is provided.

12. **Appendix F**
A list of the acknowledgments is included.

13. **Appendix G**
A list of the contact information for the authors is provided.

14. **Appendix H**
A list of the references is included.

15. **Appendix I**
A list of the figures and tables is provided.

16. **Appendix J**
A list of the supplementary materials is included.

11/11/2016

114

11/11/2019

11/11/2016

11/11/2016

© 2006 The Authors

© 2006 The Authors
Journal compilation © 2006 Blackwell Publishing Ltd

11/11/2019

© 2006 The Authors
Journal compilation © 2006 Blackwell Publishing Ltd



Response	Percentage
Yes, the current system is the best way to run the country	65%
No, the current system is not the best way to run the country	35%

Response	Percentage
Yes, the U.S. should take action to address climate change	85%
No, the U.S. should not take action to address climate change	15%

Response	Percentage
Yes, the U.S. should take action to reduce global warming	83%
No, the U.S. should not take action to reduce global warming	16%

Response	Percentage
Doing a good job	65%
Not doing a good job	35%

Response	Percentage
Yes	75%
No	25%

Response	Percentage
U.S. should take more action to protect the environment	85%
U.S. should take less action to protect the environment	15%



Signatories: 226