Abolish the fNRB Concept – A Flawed Barrier to Climate Action

The fraction of non-renewable biomass (fNRB) is a theoretical construct that has no basis in on-ground reality. It was invented by policymakers who have never witnessed how biomass sourcing actually works in forest-dependent communities. This absurd concept artificially splits the climate benefits of biomass-saving projects (like cookstoves) into "renewable" and "non-renewable" fractions, as if saving half a ton of biomass only "counts" as half a ton of emissions reduced. This is scientific nonsense with disastrous consequences.

1. **fNRB Defies Basic Carbon Logic**

Biomass saved = emissions avoided. Period.

Whether the biomass comes from a "natural" forest or a plantation, **every ton saved reduces atmospheric carbon, and at this time of climate change each and every bit of effort to make this feasible is required from our end**. The current fNRB logic pretends that saving renewable biomass has no global impact—a claim that would collapse under peer review.

Example: If a cookstove saves 1 ton of biomass, fNRB claims only 0.07 tons (7% in India) "count." But the remaining 0.93 tons still isn’t burned—it’s either left standing (sequestering carbon) or used elsewhere (displacing other fuel). The UNFCCC ignores this systemic carbon benefit.

1. **Double Standard: Why Is fNRB "Regional" When Other Factors Are Global?**

Methane emissions use global default factors (e.g., livestock emissions are the same in India and Brazil).

Biomass carbon, however, is arbitrarily regionalized. If 1 ton of methane = 1 ton of CO₂e worldwide, why isn’t 1 ton of saved biomass = 1 ton of CO₂e avoided? This inconsistency reeks of political bias, not science.

**Hypocrisy:** The UNFCCC treats carbon as fungible in every other context (e.g., ERs are traded globally). Only biomass gets this irrational regional discount.

1. **fNRB Actively Harms Sustainability Efforts**

**Kills projects:** A 7% fNRB makes most cookstove initiatives unfinanceable, even though they demonstrably reduce deforestation pressure. And in India more than 40% of rural populations is still relying on the use of traditional mud cookstoves, using the forest biomass. We ourselves had witnessed women travelling 5 to 10kms one side every day just to collect firewood from the near by forest.

**Undermines trust:** When a farmer sees her stove project rejected because of an invisible "fNRB adjustment," she rightly questions whether the UNFCCC exists to fight climate change or bureaucracy.

1. **Demand: Scrap fNRB and Adopt Real-World Accounting**

We call on the UNFCCC to:

* Abolish fNRB and treat all saved biomass as emissions avoided.
* Audit past projects to retroactively credit those penalized by fNRB’s flawed logic.