

## **Carbon removal actors calling for the clear distinction between emissions reductions and carbon dioxide removal**

Reductions and removals have different roles to play.

Differentiating emissions reductions and avoided emissions from carbon removals is needed to align with scientific recommendations. This should be incorporated in climate targets, climate policy and reflected via the establishment of different units/credit categories for (voluntary) carbon markets for effective climate action.

1. **Limiting the moral hazard**  
It presents a simple way to mitigate the moral hazard coming with carbon dioxide removal (CDR), as it makes for greater clarity over the role, foreseen share, and timing of removals alongside accelerated emissions reduction.
2. **Adding integrity to carbon markets**  
It adds further integrity to carbon markets and climate policy, as it allows for clarity and aligns with best practice concerning "net-zero", where carbon removal credits need to be singled out to counterbalance residual emissions.
3. **Responsible deployment**  
It provides a framework wherein carbon removals can be deployed in a responsible and just manner, in addition and complementary to vast and rapid emission reductions and avoidances.
4. **A question of scale**  
CDR urgently needs a dedicated framework with opportunities to scale the entire sector, as well as guardrails against a deployment that is incompatible with global sustainability objectives. A dedicated CDR framework allows to tackle these aspects in the most effective way.

In summary, it presents a scientifically sound framework to deliver on the temperature targets set within the Paris Climate Accord.

Supported by:



