

## **Nuclear Energy**

Recommendation to include Nuclear Energy and its effect  
in the SBSTTA consideration

### **Submission to the CBD**

March 15, 2013

Japan Civil Network for the United Nations Decades on Biodiversity  
(JCN-UNDB)

Whereas the aftermath of the explosion of the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Plants on the occasion of the East Japan Earthquake of March 11m 2011 has proved that the use of Nuclear Energy endangers life and its diversity, we, the Japan Civil Network for the United Nations Decades on Biodiversity (JCN-UNDB), requests SBSTTA to fully recognize and officially make recommendation on the scientific and technical needs to identify the effect of nuclear energy and its effect related to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

#### **Recommendation:**

Recognizing that “Sustainable energy for all” and the “Climate Change” are the key areas of consideration in the United Nations, and some parties of the CBD are also pursuing the solution in nuclear energy, we feel it is important that all the member stads of the United Nations and the parties of CBD are fully aware of the harmful effects and damage of nuclear energy on biodiversity therefore in implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

Some researches (\*1) identify the impact of nuclear power accidents and recommends that such scientific data should be well prepared and shared with the public since its effect is vital to all life on earth.

Most nuclear power plants are built in rural, biodiversity rich area where small farmers and fisher-people make their lives with rich natural bounty. They are the ones who live in harmony with nature and protect biodiversity. However, once accident happens, they will be the ones who are most affected. Not to mention, children, elderly, women, indigenous peoples and communities, vulnerable people would also need special

attention. Peoples are forced to leave from contaminated areas cannot continue their ordinary life any longer and it is said that people might not be able to enjoy lives in harmony with nature in such area for years.

That is largely against the vision stated in the Strategic Plan; "By 2050, biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystem services, sustaining a healthy planet and delivering benefits essential for all people."

While it has effects in all aspects of the strategic plan, some relevant Aichi Biodiversity targets are:

Target 3: Harmful subsidies, Target 7: Agricultures, Target 14: Ecosystem Services, and Target 19, Science and Technologies.

Also, statement made by the Indigenous peoples and local communities (ILCs) (\*2) and the reference of the statement by Fiu Elisara, Samoan Executive Director of the O le Siosiomaga Society and indigenous representative to the UN climate negotiations (\*3) at SBSTTA 16 (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/30) should be well noted.

We feel SBSTTA should play critical role in identification of scientific and technical needs on this topic and that recommendation should be well considered and accepted in the CBD agreement.

Farmers from Fukushima participated in COP11 of CBD in October 2012 and made such statement at Side event (see: Messages from Fukushima for the CBD/COP11) and received lots of attention and sympathy from the audience.

We hope parties of CBD to take the appropriate decision for our sustainable future based on full consideration on harmful effect of nuclear energy to biodiversity and all life on earth. It is a very urgent, important agenda of people of our age to consider. We need to protect life and the earth ecosystem for the future generations and appropriate decision needs to be made now.

\*1: "Consequences of nuclear accidents for biodiversity and ecosystem services"  
Wehrden, H. v., Fischer, J., Brandt, P., Wagner, V., Kümmerer, K., Kuemmerle, T., Nagel, A., Olsson, O. and Hostert, P. (2012), Consequences of nuclear accidents for biodiversity and ecosystem services. *Conservation Letters*, 5: 81–89. doi: 10.1111/j.1755-263X.2011.00217.x

Editor: Phil Levin, recommends the following points:

(1) fully incorporate risks for biodiversity and ecosystem services into policy debates; (2) develop a coherent information chain regarding such risks; (3) use proactive planning strategies to be prepared for potential accidents; and (4) develop a coherent research agenda on the consequences of nuclear accidents for biodiversity and ecosystem services”

\*2: “We challenge States to abandon false solutions to climate change that negatively impact Indigenous Peoples’ rights, lands, air, oceans, forests, territories and waters. These include nuclear energy, large-scale dams, geo-engineering techniques, —clean coal, agro-fuels, plantations, and market based mechanisms such as carbon trading, the Clean Development Mechanism, and forest offsets”.

\*3: For us in the Pacific, it is important to ensure that on top of being victims of the climate crisis, we do not want to become guinea pigs for new unproven technologies or old hazardous technologies such as nuclear power with the excuse that more technology is needed to fix the climate. As one colleague said here in Copenhagen, "It is totally irresponsible that negotiators are discussing the development and the transfer of technologies without any mechanisms to filter which ones can be useful and which ones will create more problems for peoples and the environment. We need immediately the inclusion and application of the precautionary principle on the issue of technology".

\* Other reference to identify the importance of addressing harmful effect of nuclear energy.

UN Special Rapporteur’s Press Statement

Press Release 12-058-E 26/11/2012

UN Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health. Mr Anand Grover.

“It is regrettable to note that the local residents were not aware of disaster management plans in the event of potential nuclear accident, in fact, local residents of Futaba city in Fukushima were led to believe by the Safety Agreement signed in 1991 that the TEPCO plant was safe and there would be no occasion for a nuclear accident.”