



# Stop Climate Chaos Scotland

## Climate Change (Scotland) Bill Briefing on Stage 2 amendments, Day 1

This briefing sets out Stop Climate Chaos Scotland (SCCS) views on the marshalled list of amendments. The table below lists the amendment number, SCCS comment on the amendment, and whether it should be supported. Amendments are in the same order as the marshalled list (although amendments we have not commented on are not listed). Where there is nothing in the far right column SCCS does not have a position - although we have still chosen to comment.

Amendment Number	SCCS Comment	SCCS Position
75 Patrick Harvie	The primary aim and logic of the climate change Bill should be to ensure Scotland plays its part in preventing dangerous climate change. Making this explicit as the founding principle would strengthen this aim. In addition, it could help future proof the Bill given climate science and global policy responses are ever changing and could leave the targets in Scotland's Bill inadequate as a result. It should be noted that the language is taken from articles 2 and 3(1) of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).	<b>Strongly Support</b>
76 Robin Harper	SCCS has campaigned for a 2050 target of at least an 80% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, and we welcome the inclusion of this wording in the Bill. The wording 'at least' is intentional because we do recognise that an 80% reduction only gives us a 50/50 chance of staying below a 2°C rise in global temperatures. The science is constantly moving and we may well need to look at a higher target as the science develops.	
1 Alison McInnes	This amendment provides for the Government commitment to move to a 2020 interim target	<b>Support</b>
2 Stewart Stevenson	Scientific research, including new research by the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, shows that a 2020 target of <i>at least</i> 42% is needed to give the best chance of avoiding dangerous climate change (under the differentiated responsibilities set out in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change). A weak 2020 target would mean larger cumulative emissions and increases the risk of	<b>Oppose</b>

	<p>not meeting the 80% 2050 target. (Making a Climate Commitment: Analysis of the first Report (2008) of the UK Committee on Climate Change, The Tyndall Centre, University of Manchester, March 2009 <a href="http://www.foe.co.uk/resource/reports/tyndall_climatereport_ccc2008.pdf">http://www.foe.co.uk/resource/reports/tyndall_climatereport_ccc2008.pdf</a>)</p> <p>A 34% target is also incredibly unambitious – research from SCCS suggests a business as usual scenario would deliver a 32% reduction in emissions. 2% above 'business as usual' is simply not acceptable for a 'world leading' Bill. One of the greatest strengths of the Climate Change Bill is the vision and international leadership it shows. Adopting a 42% 2020 target based on scientific evidence in advance of international climate talks is one of the most significant contributions Scotland can make to international agreement on the emissions cuts needed to avoid dangerous climate change.</p> <p>Finally, by relying on a target that is likely to shift in the future, the Bill is sending the wrong signal to Scottish businesses and forward-looking entrepreneurs who are seeking certainty in what is required of them. Business needs a clear investment framework. There is also the chance that the Government set annual targets and plan towards a 34% target, say up until 2015 for example, at which point the EU moves to 30% making the 2020 target unachievable. Indeed the later a 42% target is put in place, the more unachievable it becomes.</p>	
3 Alison McInnes	<p>The First Minister stated "that in every respect the legislation will be more ambitious than the Labour Government legislation". By simply following the targets outlined in the UK's Climate Change Act, the Scottish Government are not only backtracking on its initial ambitions but, given our unique renewables potential, running the risk of missing out on the economic benefits of a speedy transition to a low carbon economy.</p> <p>42% is at the bottom end of what is required for Scotland to play its part in averting dangerous climate change. By taking up this target unconditionally, Scotland could lay claim to a genuinely world-leading Bill; and helping influence crucial climate negotiations in Copenhagen later this year.</p>	<b>Strongly Support</b>
4 Stewart Stevenson	<p>SCCS believes the 2020 target should be unconditional if we are to truly show international leadership. We acknowledge the intentions behind this amendment but strongly recommend the Committee adopt the 42% target from the outset.</p>	
36, 37 Alison McInnes	<p>These amendments would move us to annual targets of at least 3% year-on-year. A top priority for SCCS and something our supplementary evidence to TICC suggests is fully achievable.</p>	<b>Strongly Support</b>

Supported by: Robin Harper		<b>Strongly Support</b>
38 Des McNulty	SCCS are unsure that this amendment offers any significant improvement on existing measures in the Bill and, as such, will not drive early action.	
39 Alison McInnes Supported by: Robin Harper	This amendment, together with amendments 36 and 37 above would move us to annual targets of at least 3% year-on-year from 2010. This is a top priority for SCCS and something our supplementary evidence to TICC suggests is fully achievable.	<b>Strongly support</b>
78 Robin Harper	SCCS has campaigned for annual targets of at least a 3% year-on-year reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, and we welcome the amendment providing for this in the Bill. Clearly, anything above 3% would serve to encourage early action faster which can only improve our chances of staying below a 2°C rise in global temperatures. To that extent therefore, we welcome this amendment.	
79 Patrick Harvie	SCCS supports this amendment which should be supported alongside amendments 83 and 84.  We do not understand why regard for the 2050 and interim targets under subsection 3, and the list of target-setting criteria under subsection 4, fall under different sections and not one over-arching 'target-setting criteria'. This is important given subsequent sections of the Bill 5(2) and 22(2) for example refer to the target setting-criteria. This amendment, along with amendment 83, would ensure that regard for 2020 and 2050 targets are amalgamated and accounted for under the over-arching target-setting criteria.  SCCS's preferred position is for amendments 79, 83 and 84 to be agreed to. However, should amendment 79 not be agreed to, we would recommend the Committee support amendment 80.	<b>Strongly Support</b>
5, 6 Stewart Stevenson	SCCS supports these amendment and welcomes this move of the interim target date from 2030 to 2020.	<b>Support</b>
80 Alison McInnes	SCCS supports this amendment (contingent on 79 falling). This amendment would ensure targets are set with reference to a fair and safe cumulative emissions budget between now and 2050.	<b>Support</b>

	<p>If we are serious about playing our part in preventing dangerous climate change, then targets need to be set with reference to a cumulative emissions budget to ensure we limit the total amount of emissions between now and 2050.</p> <p>While the Transport, Infrastructure and Climate Change Committee stage 1 report contains welcome recommendations for cumulative emissions reporting, there is still a need for a benchmark against which this reporting can be set against. This ties in with many of the contributions during the stage 1 debate, including:</p> <p>“We need to focus not only on how we are doing, with annual reporting to the Parliament, but on the consideration of cumulative targets. Everything that we do in the early years has an extra dividend. We are not just meeting a target; we are ensuring that those carbon emissions are not created in the atmosphere for generations to come. Surely we can all agree about that.” (Sarah Boyack)</p> <p>Including cumulative emissions within this section provides this benchmark. In this scenario the relevant body would specify a fair and safe cumulative emissions budget and then suggest annual targets that map a trajectory to meet this budget.</p> <p><b>SCCS’s preferred position is for amendments 79, 83 and 84 to be agreed to. However, should amendment 79 not be agreed to, we would recommend the Committee support amendment 80.</b></p>	
81, 82 Patrick Harvie	<p>These amendments would ensure the relevant body gave advice on the target-setting criteria. The relevant body as defined under section 5 (5), and currently indicated by the Scottish Government as likely to be the UK CCC, does not currently take account of the target-setting criteria as defined under section 4. This means there may be a disjoint between targets the relevant body proposes and targets Scottish Ministers set through the target setting criteria. It should be noted that section 38 of the UK Climate Change Act allows the Scottish Government to seek advice on climate change matters.</p>	<b>Support</b>
83 Patrick Harvie	<p>SCCS supports this amendment (contingent on 79 passing). See comments in response to amendment 79.</p> <p><b>SCCS’s preferred position is for amendments 79, 83 and 84 to be agreed to. However, should amendment 79 not be agreed to, we would recommend the Committee support</b></p>	<b>Support</b>

	<b>amendment 80.</b>	
84 Patrick Harvie	SCCS supports this amendment (contingent on 79 passing). See comments in response to amendment 79.  <b>SCCS's preferred position is for amendments 79, 83 and 84 to be agreed to. However, should amendment 79 not be agreed to, we would recommend the Committee support amendment 80.</b>	<b>Strongly Support</b>
85, 86 Patrick Harvie	While we support target-setting criteria taking account of the economy, we do not see why these specific aspects are singled out as particularly worthy	<b>Support</b>
40 Des McNulty	There are substantial opportunities in green jobs within Scotland, indeed the Government have estimated 16,000 within the next decade. Given this figure is based on a UK aggregate, SCCS believe we can go further and that jobs and employment opportunities should be central to the climate change agenda.	<b>Support</b>
87 Patrick Harvie	This amendment ensures the aforementioned groups are given due consideration within the target-setting criteria.	<b>Support</b>
88 Patrick Harvie	This amendment ensures the aforementioned aspects are given due consideration within the target-setting criteria.	<b>Support</b>
7 Stewart Stevenson	This amendment substantially weakens the Bill as it potentially allows Ministers to delay setting targets which would lead to uncertainty and defeats the purpose of providing a timeline for target setting in the first place.	<b>Oppose</b>
89 Patrick Harvie Supported by: Alison McInnes	While it is essential that we limit cumulative emissions between now and 2050, we recognize that this is a complex area and the relevant body must give advice on what targets map a suitable trajectory to limit cumulative emissions. It should be noted that this language is taken from that used in the Kyoto Protocol.	<b>Strongly Support</b>
90 Patrick Harvie	This would ensure advice from the relevant body is transparent and seen by MSPs and relevant stakeholders.	<b>Support</b>

91 Patrick Harvie	Like amendment 82, this would ensure the relevant body gave advice on the target-setting criteria.	<b>Support</b>
93 Patrick Harvie Supported by: Alison McInnes	This amendment follows the language used in section 22 of the Bill, which contains useful advice on various aspects. Given sections 22-27 will not come into force until a Scottish 'advisory body' is brought into force (see section 21), there is a need to bring this forward to ensure the 'relevant body' outlined in the earlier parts of the Bill gives advice on these issues.	<b>Support</b>
94, 95, 96 Alison McInnes	These group of amendments would improve transparency and accountability.	<b>Support</b>
43 Patrick Harvie	This amendment removes what seems to be a somewhat arbitrary provision to drop annual targets of a specified percentage.	<b>Support</b>
44 Patrick Harvie	The latest climate science is increasingly suggesting the need to move towards early and substantial action. This amendment would ensure Ministers can't arbitrarily weaken targets while allowing for targets to be modified downwards* if required by the latest science. * Note targets in section 4 are set by total volume of emissions – not by a percentage figure.	<b>Support</b>
98 Alison McInnes	SCCS supports this amendment (contingent on amendment 43 falling).  <b>Our preferred position is amendment 43, but should that be disagreed to, we would recommend the Committee agree to amendment 98 which would improve transparency and accountability.</b>	<b>Support</b>
45, 46 Patrick Harvie	We do not see the need for the provisions this amendment would remove. In addition, by allowing Ministers these powers there is a danger that targets in the climate bill could be compromised; thereby losing the certainty that the Bill offers to important actors.	<b>Support</b>
8 Stewart Stevenson	This amendment is required for the adoption if a 42% target after Copenhagen. Please refer to our comments on amendment 4.	
47, 48 Patrick	Please refer to our comments in response to amendments 45 and 46	<b>Support</b>

Harvie		
99, 100 Alison McInnes  49 Patrick Harvie	<p>These group of amendments would improve transparency and accountability.</p> <p><b>Our preferred position is for amendments 99 and 100 to be agreed to, as this gives stronger Ministerial accountability.</b></p>	<b>Support</b>
50 Des McNulty	<p><b>With regard to domestic effort this is our strongly preferred amendment and has the support of Scottish and Southern Energy.</b></p> <p>SCCS have campaigned vigorously for the Scottish Bill to demonstrate clear commitment and international leadership, by adopting the principle of 80% minimum reduction through domestic effort across the whole Scottish economy.</p> <p>As well as demonstrating the necessary political leadership, a significant added benefit from this commitment, will be to act as a major stimulus for investment in, and development of, the green energy supply chain in Scotland. This will contribute significantly, to aid sustainable economic recovery and provide additional economic, social and environmental benefits to Scotland. This is a major opportunity not to be missed.</p>	<b>Strongly Support</b>
125 Robin Harper	<p>This would build on amendment 50 and ensure that as we move towards a low carbon economy and a time in which credits are decreasing in availability and increasing in price (see UK Committee on Climate Change report) there is less flexibility within the Bill to meet targets through the purchase of credits.</p>	<b>Support</b>
9 Stewart Stevenson	<p>This seems to be a technical amendment to better define a time frame in relation to seeking a report from the relevant body, and while it allows for the potential to speed up the process of seeking advice on progress towards targets, <b>SCCS prefers amendment 101.</b></p>	
101 Alison McInnes	<p>This amendment would speed up the process of seeking advice on progress towards targets. <b>This amendment is preferred over amendment 9.</b></p>	<b>Support</b>
51, 52 Des McNulty	<p>These seem to be consequential to amendment 50 and would improve the advice given on progress towards meeting the domestic effort target.</p>	<b>Support</b>
102	<p>This amendment would future-proof the Bill with regards to which gases need to be accounted for.</p>	<b>Support</b>

Patrick Harvie		
126, 127 Robin Harper	SCCS supports these amendments (contingent on amendment 50 falling).  Our <b>favoured option is amendment 50</b> , but if it were to fall, this amendment, by redefining the net Scottish emissions account to include only credits purchased by the Scottish Government would deliver the same outcomes.	<b>Support</b>
10 Stewart Stevenson	This amendment would not have the same effect of driving domestic emission reductions as amendment 50. In addition, it should be noted that subsection (a) suggests that the limit (specified by Ministerial order in amendment 12) covers a 4 year period, not an annual target.	<b>Oppose</b>
128, 129 Robin Harper	SCCS supports this amendment (contingent on amendment 50 falling). See response to amendment 126 and 127.	<b>Support</b>
55, 56 Des McNulty	This amendment would help ensure that credits were genuinely additional and benefited sustainable development in the country which generated the credit.	<b>Support</b>
57 Des McNulty	This amendment, which is not contradictory to amendment 50, would ensure that the Scottish Government (not the ETS sector) could not buy credits to help meet its targets. This is in line with the Cabinet Secretary's announcements that the primary aim should be to reduce emissions domestically.	<b>Support</b>
58 Patrick Harvie	The inclusion of international aviation and shipping is another top priority for SCCS. We strongly support this amendment alongside amendment 103 below.	<b>Support</b>
11 Stewart Stevenson	This amendment, through (2B), introduces ambiguity into the future inclusion of aviation and shipping emissions.	<b>Strongly Oppose</b>
11A* Alison McInnes	This amendment removes the uncertainty referred to above.	<b>Strongly Support</b>
103 Patrick Harvie	This seeks to account for the greater climate change impact caused by emissions from aviation. Aviation emissions have a greater climate impact than the same emissions made at ground level. Emissions of nitrogen oxides, water vapour and particulates at altitude generate a number of chemical processes that combine to amplify the climate change effect of aviation by approx 1.9 times that of the same emissions at ground level.	<b>Strongly Support</b>

	<b>SCCS strongly supports this amendment, alongside amendment 58 above.</b>	
104 Patrick Harvie	While we recognise the intent behind this amendment is to ensure emissions are made domestically, SCCS believe that amendment 50 would ensure the correct balance between ensuring the majority of emissions are made in Scotland while providing some flexibility to meet targets.	
130 Robin Harper	SCCS supports this amendment (contingent on amendment 50 falling). See response to amendment 126 and 127.	<b>Support</b>
12 Stewart Stevenson	This amendment would not have the same effect of driving domestic emissions reductions as amendment 50.	<b>Oppose</b>
12A Des McNulty	This amendment, by referring to 'carbon units purchased by them' allows the Scottish Government to purchase emissions reductions up to 20% while failing to ensure an 80% domestic effort target across the whole of the Scottish economy. This is weaker than the advice of the UK Committee on Climate Change which recommended a 10% limit on credits purchased by Government.	<b>Oppose</b>
12AA, 12AB Alison McInnes	See comments in response to amendment 12A.  <b>SCCS therefore opposes these amendments for the same reasons as we oppose amendment 12A.</b>	<b>Oppose</b>
Alison McInnes 12C	This amendment would have a similar effect as amendment 50. If this passed we would welcome it, but hope that the date of implementation be brought forward at stage 3.  <b>SCCS therefore supports this amendment (contingent on amendment 50 falling and 12 being agreed to).</b>	<b>Support</b>
12E Alison McInnes	This would seem to be a consequential to amendment 12C.  <b>SCCS therefore supports this amendment (contingent on amendment 50 falling and 12C being agreed to).</b>	<b>Support</b>
12F Alison McInnes	This would ensure advice from the relevant body was sought before the limits set in amendment 12 were put in place.  <b>SCCS therefore supports this amendment (contingent on amendment 50 falling and 12 being agreed to).</b>	<b>Support</b>
13	SCCS opposes this amendment. See comments in response to amendment 12.	<b>Oppose</b>

Stewart Stevenson		
14 Stewart Stevenson	If amendment 13 is agreed to, this amendment would ensure Ministers sought advice before setting a limit on the use of carbon credits.	
106, 107 Patrick Harvie	In the event that an advisory body is set up under section 19(1) the process of setting annual targets suggests: the Scottish Government propose targets (section 22); the Committee comment on these (section 22); and the Scottish Government then sets its targets (section 4). SCCS believe that in order to guarantee the advisory bodies independence and ensure targets are set with relation to the science, the primary driver of the targets should be the advisory body; not the Scottish Government.	<b>Support</b>
108 Patrick Harvie	This amendment would ensure the advisory body actually give advice as to what they regard as suitable targets, as opposed to simply commenting on annual targets Ministers may already have decided on.	<b>Support</b>
109 Patrick Harvie	<b>SCCS supports this amendment (contingent on amendment 84 falling).</b> This amendment would ensure a Scottish advisory body have regard for a fair and safe cumulative emissions budget (see comments at amendment 80).	<b>Support</b>
110 Patrick Harvie	This amendment seems to be a consequential to amendment 106.	<b>Support</b>
60 Des McNulty	This would remove the seeking of advice from the advisory body. While we support amendment 50 specifying a domestic effort target of 80%, it is still right and proper for the advisory body to give advice on this area and, if thought wise suggest a higher target.	<b>Oppose</b>
61 Des McNulty	This amendment seems to be a consequential to amendment 50.	<b>Support</b>
Liam McArthur 133	This amendment has the potential to ensure the advisory body advices on suitable emissions performance of electricity generation.	
62, 63 Des McNulty	These amendments seem to be consequentials to amendment 50.	<b>Support</b>
113 Patrick Harvie	While we understand why Ministers may have to give guidance to the advisory body (section 26), in order to ensure the advisory body's independence we do not believe they need to, nor should give, directions to the advisory body.	<b>Support</b>

136 Cathy Peattie	Amendments 113 and 114 are our strongly favoured amendments, however were these to fall, we can see the benefits of directions being given by Parliament, not just by Ministers.	
114 Patrick Harvie	See comments in response to amendment 113 above.	
65 Des McNulty	This amendment seems to be a consequential to amendment 60.	<b>Support</b>
67 Des McNulty	This amendment seems to be a consequential to amendment 50.	<b>Support</b>
137, 138 Liam McArthur	These amendments have the potential to ensure reporting on the emissions performance of electricity generation.	
118 Cathy Peattie	This would improve transparency and accountability about Scotland's actual contribution to climate change. However, while cumulative emissions reporting is welcome, it will have no effect if the annual targets are set without sufficient regard to meeting a fair and safe cumulative budget between now and 2050. In this sense, amendment 80/84 is of far more importance.	<b>Support</b>
23 Stewart Stevenson	SCCS is curious as to how "requires to be adjusted" would be defined.	
68 Des McNulty	This amendment seems to be a consequential to amendment 50.	<b>Support</b>
119 Alison McInnes	This amendment would provide for sectoral contributions in important sectors.	<b>Support</b>
69 Des McNulty	This amendment seems to be a consequential to amendment 50.	<b>Support</b>
70 Shirley-Anne Somerville	This amendment would improve transparency about Scotland's actual contribution to climate change.	<b>Strongly support</b>
120 Cathy Peattie	While cumulative emissions reporting is welcome, and we recommend the Committee agree amendment 118, it will have no actual effect if the annual targets are set without sufficient regard to meeting a fair and safe cumulative budget between now and 2050.	<b>Support</b>

121 Cathy Peattie	See comments in response to amendment 120.	
71 Des McNulty	See comments in response to amendment 122 below.	
122 Patrick Harvie	These group of amendments to Section 34 all seek to improve the reporting process and involve parliament in it and are all welcomed by SCCS. Amendment 122 puts in place the model currently in use to ensure parliamentary consideration of the National Planning Framework, which we feel is an appropriate model. This would provide for immediate comment from Parliament as to the content of the reports and would require the subsequent Ministerial statement to have regard to any comments made. <b>Our preferred option is therefore amendment 122 which we feel is strengthened by amendment 122A, and 123.</b>	<b>Strongly Support</b>
122A* Alison McInnes	See comments in response to amendment 122 above	<b>Strongly Support</b>
72, 73 Des McNulty	See comments in response to amendment 122 above	
123* Alison McInnes	See comments in response to amendment 122 above	<b>Strongly Support</b>
74 Des McNulty	This would remove the enabling powers to place a charge on carrier bags.	
35 Stewart Stevenson	This amendment provides for the Government commitment to move to a 2020 interim target.	<b>Support</b>

For further information please contact:

**Gail Wilson**, Stop Climate Chaos Scotland Co-ordinator  
c/o RSPB Scotland, 25 Ravelston Terrace, Edinburgh EH4 3TP Tel: 0131 311 6500 Fax: 0131 311 6569  
Email: [gail.wilson@rspb.org.uk](mailto:gail.wilson@rspb.org.uk)

Stop Climate Chaos Scotland (SCCS) is a growing coalition of organisations campaigning on climate change. SCCS brings together environment, faith and development organisations, trade unions, community activists, and women's and students' groups.

**Stop Climate Chaos Scotland is a charity, registered in Scotland, no SC039643**