



**Friends of
the Earth**

Prioritised Motions to Conference 2008

Contents:

| Motion | Topic | Motion page no. | Background Information page no. |
|---------------|---|------------------------|--|
| | Procedural Motion proposed by the Board: the adoption of revised Standing Orders for Conference | 1-4 | n/a |
| 1 | Anti-Nuclear Power (previously titled "Nuclear Waste") <i>(amended)</i> | 5 | 7-8 |
| 2 | Peak Oil and Fossil Fuel Prices <i>(plus amendment)</i> | 5 | 8-9 |
| 3 | Waste and Recycling Campaigning <i>(plus amendment)</i> | 5-6 | 10 |
| 4 | Population <i>(plus amendment)</i> | 6 | 10-12 |
| 5 | Student and Youth Involvement | 6 | 12-13 |

Important notes – please read:

- Motions 1-5 are listed in the order that they were prioritised as a result of the prioritisation ballot. This is also the order in which the Motions will be debated at Conference.
- **Please ensure that you read this paper before the Motions debate so that you are fully informed to be able to participate in the debate. This is particularly important if you are the designated voting delegate for your group** (and you may wish to consult the rest of your group on their views for each Motion in advance of Conference so that you know which way to vote for each Motion).
- **Please also bring this paper to Conference as you will not be given a further copy.**
- Please note that the Board's procedural Motion will not be debated before being voted on. It will be proposed by the Board, then immediately voted on. All local groups have already been consulted on the proposed Revised Standing Orders, with two opportunities to comment on them in the run-up to Conference. The feedback received from groups has already been incorporated into the Revised Standing Orders by the Board and the version included in this paper is the final version.
- If Conference votes to pass the Revised Standing Orders, the rest of the debate will be governed by the newly-adopted Standing Orders. If not, the debate will revert to being governed by the existing Standing Orders – these can be viewed at <http://community.foe.co.uk/conference>

Procedural Motion proposed by the Board – the adoption of revised Standing Orders of Conference:

Standing Orders for Conference

Revised May 2008 – Final Version

Introduction

Friends of the Earth (the collective name for Friends of the Earth Trust and Friends of the Earth Limited) holds a Local Groups Conference every year. The Local Groups Conference observes the following guidelines:

- Every licensed Local Group can send a nominated representative to the Conference.
- Local Groups responding by the booking deadline are also guaranteed a second place at Conference, with up to four further places prioritised for each group. The organisers may be able to offer groups further delegate places if, after the booking deadline, places remain unfilled.
- Friends of the Earth staff may also attend the Conference.
- Local Groups have one vote at the Conference, which is exercised through their nominated representative. No representative may hold more than one vote. Board members and staff may not vote.
- The Chair of the Conference will be appointed by the Boards.
- The Conference shall receive a report from the Boards of the past year's work and their agreed plans.
- The Conference shall discuss Motions submitted by licensed Local Groups and any Motions submitted directly on behalf of the Boards at a Motions Debate.
- Motions put before the Conference shall be carried upon receiving the assent of a simple majority of votes cast excluding abstentions.
- As the final decision-making authority in Friends of the Earth Ltd and Friends of the Earth Trust rests with the Boards, Motions have an advisory function. The Boards will, however, undertake at the earliest opportunity to consider the Motions passed and take appropriate action. To this end, The Boards will each year appoint a “Friend of the Motions” who will monitor the response to and progress of successful Motions on behalf of the Boards.
- The Boards and the Friend of the Motions will provide a full report to the following Conference on staff actions taken in response to Motions and provide reasons for any non-implementation of Motions passed.
- A Conference Organising Committee of at least three nominated people and a Returning Officer will be established. Any queries or complaints from Local Groups regarding the Conference should be sent to the Returning Officer, care of the Capacity Building team at Friends of the Earth's Head Office.
- The Conference agrees to operate within the Standing Orders agreed by that Conference.
- A special Conference may be called by the Boards as and when deemed necessary. The Conference shall be governed by the same rules and procedures as laid down here for the Annual Conference.

Standing Orders for Conference

1. Conference Organisation

- 1.1. Each year the Conference Organising Committee will appoint a Returning Officer who will publish the procedure for the proposal of Motions to Conference (“Motions”) and Amendments to a Motion (“Amendments”). The exact dates will vary but the process and timetable shall include:
 - 1.1.1. A covering notice for Conference, Motions and Elections to Board to Groups – not less than 20 weeks prior to Conference;
 - 1.1.2. A closing date for submissions of Motions and Nominations to Board – not less than 12 weeks prior to Conference;
 - 1.1.3. A Draft Motions paper and Conference booking form circulated to Local Groups – not less than 10 weeks prior to Conference;
 - 1.1.4. A closing date for Amendments to Motions and Election ballot papers circulated to Local Groups – not less than 6 weeks prior to Conference;
 - 1.1.5. Any process and closing date for the prioritisation of Motions by groups eligible to propose them, including circulation of prioritisation ballot paper – not less than 2 weeks prior to Conference;
 - 1.1.6. Distribution of Conference papers including final Motions paper and an agenda – by beginning of Conference;
 - 1.1.7. Close of elections and announcement of Election and Motions debate results – at Conference.

2. Local Group Eligibility

- 2.1. A Motion or Amendment may only be Proposed or Seconded by a Licensed Friends of the Earth Local Group (a” Local Group”) and may not be signed on behalf of the group by a Staff or Board member. To propose a Motion or Amendment the Local Group must be of not less than 12 months continuous licensed standing;
 - 2.1.1. at the date that the Motion or Amendment is proposed or seconded and accepted by the Returning Officer and;
 - 2.1.2. at the date of the last day before the day of the Conference Motions Debate when the Motion or Amendment is Proposed or Seconded to Conference.

3. Voting

- 3.1. In all cases one voting representative is allowed for each licensed Local Group of one year's continuous standing as at the day before the date of the Motions Debate. The voting representative should be selected by their Local Group, accredited with Conference Organisation Team and receive their voting card before the start of the Motions Debate. No other individual or Local Group can vote. The voting representative may not be a Staff or Board member.

4. The Motions Process

- 4.1. A Motion will only be accepted if it is accompanied by up to five hundred words of background information covering the most important information relating to that Motion. Friends of the Earth staff may also subsequently provide up to five hundred words of additional background information to any Motion, to provide context and to highlight aspects of the Motion which will provide opportunities or issues for Friends of the Earth should the Motion be approved.
- 4.2. The Boards shall appoint a Chair of the Motions Debate (“Chair” or “Chair of Motions”).
- 4.3. The Chair shall have complete control of the procedure of the Debate, will guide the Returning Officer on

behalf of the Board, provide final judgment regarding the acceptability or otherwise of Motions and Amendments, will have the right to decide who shall speak and to rule speakers out of order, and when to take procedural Motions with the exception of a vote of “no confidence” in the Chair, and where the procedure is already covered by one of the following Standing Orders.

4.4. In addition to the Chair, the Boards shall also appoint a Deputy Chair of the Motions Debate (“Deputy Chair” or “Deputy Chair of Motions”), who must be from a different Local Group (if applicable) to the Chair. The Deputy Chair shall assume the role of the Chair in the following circumstances:

1. In the event of the Chair being unavailable to discharge their duties due to some unforeseen circumstances (e.g. illness), for the duration of the Motions Debate, or;
2. In the event of the Chair voluntarily resigning their duties, for the remainder of the Motions Debate, or;
3. In the event of a resolution for vote of no confidence in the Chair being submitted, for the duration of the vote, or;
4. Following a successful vote of no confidence in the Chair, for the remainder of the Motions Debate, or;
5. In the event of a real and/or perceived conflict of interest between the Chair and the Motion or Amendment which is to be debated, for the duration of the debate on that Motion or Amendment only.

In the unlikely event of the original Chair and the Deputy Chair both being unable to discharge their duties as a result of the circumstances listed above, the Motions Debate will be suspended whilst the Boards appoint a new Chair.

4.5. The notes and agenda published in advance of the Motions Debate shall include time limits for speeches. These limits may be amended by the Chair, if, in their opinion, the timetable demands it.

5. The Conduct of the Debate

- 5.1. Persons entitled to speak to Motions and Amendments shall include members of the Boards and staff of Friends of the Earth, its paid consultants, registered supporters of Friends of the Earth and members of Local Groups only. Any other person may only be heard if specifically invited to do so by the Chair of Motions.
- 5.2. Each Motion or Amendment is to be formally proposed and seconded by members of its proposing and seconding Local Group in person, although at the discretion of the Chair, a Motion may be accepted with only its proposing group present.
- 5.3. The Motion is to be introduced by a member of its proposing Local Group. Local Group Motions cannot be proposed by a Board or Staff Member.
- 5.4. If there are Amendments to the Motion, these are introduced, formally proposed and seconded, debated and voted on individually in the order indicated on the Motions Debate paper. At the discretion of the Chair, Amendments to the same Motion may be proposed and seconded as a block, and debated together, but will still be voted on in the order they appear on the Motions Debate paper. Only when all Amendments have been dealt with will the Motion as amended or otherwise be debated.
- 5.5. If there is opposition to a Motion or an Amendment, a speech against the Motion or Amendment is to be taken next.
- 5.6. Speeches for and against the Motion or Amendment are then to be taken until the issues have been debated sufficiently.
- 5.7. If after a Motion or Amendment has been proposed and formally seconded there is no-one who wishes to speak either in favour or alternatively speak against it, the Chair may at their discretion put the Motion to a vote without further debate.

- 5.8. If any opposition to the Motion or Amendment has been expressed, the seconder of the Motion or Amendment or his or her nominee (who may be the proposer) shall be given the opportunity to make a closing speech in which no new matter may be introduced.
- 5.9. A Motion or Amendment, once on the final agenda, may not be withdrawn except by leave of Conference.
- 5.10. Except as provided elsewhere, no-one shall speak more than once to any Motion or Amendment.
- 5.11. Procedural resolutions may only be submitted after opportunities have been given for speech for and against the Motion. They shall then be put to the vote with no debate:
 - 5.11.1. a Motion to refer back the resolution under debate;
 - 5.11.2. a Motion to move next business;
 - 5.11.3. a Motion that the resolution now be put to a vote;
 - 5.11.4. a vote of no confidence in the Chair.
- 5.12. Any person may raise a point of order concerning these Standing Orders and shall be entitled to be heard forthwith providing that they:
 - 5.12.1. State the Standing Order covering the matter they wish to raise;
 - 5.12.2. Do not speak for more than one minute.
- 5.13. When the seconder of a Motion or their nominee has spoken, no point of order may be raised until a vote has been taken.
- 5.14. In the event of the procedural resolution of a vote of no confidence in the Chair being submitted, all other business will be suspended whilst a vote is taken as to whether the Chair should continue to discharge their duties. Should the vote of no confidence be carried, the Chair will immediately resign their position and hand over to the Deputy Chair.

6. Emergency Motions

- 6.1. In exceptional circumstances Motions received after the Motions proposal deadline may be accepted by the Conference Organising Committee and the Chair of Motions as Emergency Motions, but only if in the opinion of that Committee and the Chair:
 - 6.1.1. the Motion is of a substantive nature;
 - 6.1.2. relates to events that have occurred after the original Motions deadline and;
 - 6.1.3. concerns a matter of substantial importance to a significant number of Local Groups.
- 6.2. No more than two Emergency Motions shall be debated. In the event of there being three or more such Motions accepted, there will be a prioritisation ballot which will be conducted during the conference Motions Debate.
- 6.3. In the event of an Emergency Motion being proposed or seconded by a Local Group of whom the Chair of Motions is a member, the Deputy Chair of Motions will decide, in conjunction with the Conference Organising Committee, whether or not to accept the Motion.

7. Other Matters

- 7.1. No changes will be made to the rules governing the running of the Local Groups Conference without consultation with Local Groups through the Local Groups Conference.

Motion 1 – Anti-Nuclear Power (previously titled “Nuclear Waste”)

Proposed by Barry & Vale Friends of the Earth

Seconded by West Cumbria & North Lakes Friends of the Earth

Amended by Liverpool Friends of the Earth

This Conference:

1. congratulates the Welsh Assembly Government in refusing to accept Westminster's policy for deep geological disposal of nuclear waste, as not meeting the requirement for isolation from people and the environment for hundreds of millennia, through instabilities of civilisations, geology and climate
2. calls on the Board of Friends of the Earth Ltd. to re-affirm that the lack of a solution to nuclear wastes, the proliferation of nuclear materials and capacity, as well as the potentially severe consequences of nuclear 'accidents', mean that the planned programme of new nuclear reactors is incompatible with sustainable development.
3. calls on the Board to consider how it can voice its view at national and international levels and assist local campaigns opposing nuclear dumps and nuclear reactors in their communities.
4. calls on the Board to note that the basic arguments against nuclear dump and nuclear power stations need to be drawn up centrally - with the help of anti-nuclear activists around the UK - endorsed by Friends of the Earth and used in publicity as opportunity arises. In particular Friends of the Earth's expertise in Planning law would be most useful in challenging the novel departures over volunteer communities and decision by the Major Infrastructure Commission.
5. asks the Board to consider increasing staff available to campaign on this issue.

Motion 2 – Peak Oil and Fossil Fuel Prices

Proposed by Banbridge & Mourne Friends of the Earth

Seconded by Norwich Friends of the Earth

This Conference urges the Board of Friends of the Earth Ltd. to consider amending its documented Climate Change Policy and Objectives to integrate and include the challenges presented by increases in the price of fossil fuels and/or peak oil so that:

1. A full understanding of increases in fossil fuels and/or peak oil is incorporated into the solutions for Climate Change;
2. Emphasis and support can be offered to local sustainable projects to build resilience while cutting carbon emissions;
3. The solutions to both climate change and increasing prices in fossil fuels/peak oil do not become mutually exclusive, thus creating factionalism and negating the impact of Friends of the Earth's future climate change campaign.

Amendment proposed by Islington Friends of the Earth

Add the following words to end of Motion:

This Conference further calls upon the Board of Friends of the Earth Limited to consider demanding, as a major ask of future climate-related, or other, international agreements, the avoidance or non-proliferation of alternatives to oil, such as coal-to-liquids, tar sands and biofuels, where any of these are, overall, environmentally worse than oil.

Motion 3 – Waste and Recycling Campaigning

Proposed by Nuneaton & District Friends of the Earth

Seconded by Derby & South Derbyshire Friends of the Earth

This Conference calls upon the Board of Friends of the Earth Ltd. to consider:

1. the importance of waste, its reduction, and recycling issues in attracting new members to Friends of the Earth and to respond to more media requests on waste and resources issues.
2. increasing media activity related to unsustainable use of resources.
3. recognising the urgency to act against the current incineration building programme that will obstruct the change from a wasteful to more resource-efficient country.
4. urgently increasing the number of staff allocated to the waste team.

Amendment proposed by Islington Friends of the Earth

Add the following words to end of Motion:

5. not implacably opposing in principle the incineration of non-recyclable waste that has had content with hazardous elements sifted out, particularly in the case of energy recovery via CHP, or where EU landfill reduction targets would make it very difficult to dispose of or process such waste any other way.

Motion 4 – Population

Proposed by Bracknell & District Friends of the Earth

Seconded by Reading Friends of the Earth

This Conference calls upon the Board of Friends of the Earth Ltd. to consider the promotion of the stabilisation, and ultimately the reduction, of the human population; both within the UK and, via the Friends of the Earth International network, globally, in line with depleting natural resources. As an initial first step, Conference proposes that the Board sets up a working group to formulate a persuasive policy which can be presented to Government and involves as many other interested parties as possible in these discussions (e.g. Optimum Population Trust, WWF, and Green Party et al). This Conference believes that the policy should include reference to the effects of overpopulation on Climate Change, the depletion of natural resources, the destruction of habitat, and political and economic imbalances, and calls upon the Board to thus come to an agreement on what is an optimum global population target figure, so as to enable the world population to achieve long term sustainability. Finally, this Conference asks the Board to then explore and come to an agreement on what would be the most appropriate methods to achieve this optimum population, and develop a strategy for the education and persuasion of the existing population.

Amendment co-proposed by Durham Friends of the Earth and Islington Friends of the Earth

Replace existing Motion text with:

This Conference calls upon the Board of Friends of the Earth Ltd to consider the ways in which global population growth is linked to resource depletion, climate change, habitat destruction, poverty and political instability; and explicitly to include population issues within its strategy development on these topics. This Conference urges Friends of the Earth Ltd to espouse and actively promote population stabilisation measures such as contraception and education, especially for women. At the same time, this Conference recognises that population growth is not the only factor and supports Friends of the Earth Ltd's existing efforts aimed at reduction of per capita consumption in the developed world.

Motion 5 – Student and Youth Involvement

Proposed by Milton Keynes Friends of the Earth

Seconded by South Bedfordshire Friends of the Earth

This Conference calls upon the Board of Friends of the Earth Ltd. to consider:

1. Establishing a strong and attractive profile within universities, colleges and schools (using co-branding, partnerships or otherwise)
2. Ensuring that days of action are promoted effectively to youth and student supporters (together with associated research/support materials)
3. Significantly raising the profile of Friends of the Earth among young people (as a unique and effective organisation that works for solutions at a local, regional and national level).
4. Engaging young people at a high level in Friends of the Earth (by means of reserved board positions or otherwise)
5. Ensuring that Friends of the Earth is seen as a natural destination for concerned young people when they leave education (by virtue of its reputation for expertise and campaigning successes within the national planning, parliamentary and legal systems, and its grassroots activism on local campaigns through the regional and local planning processes)
6. Exploring ways of connecting this work to that of Young Friends of the Earth Europe

Background Information

The following information has been provided to accompany the Motions

Motion 1 – Anti-Nuclear Power (previously titled “Nuclear Waste”)

Background information provided by Barry & Vale Friends of the Earth and West Cumbria & North Lakes Friends of the Earth

The Welsh and Scottish governments have rejected Whitehall’s position on nuclear waste. The Sustainable Development Commission (March’06: *Role of Nuclear Power in a Low Carbon Economy*) says nuclear waste must be effectively isolated from people and the environment for hundreds of millenia. The Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution (Flowers report 1976) required:

“demonstration beyond reasonable doubt that at least one method exists for the safe isolation of nuclear fission wastes for the indefinite future before committing future generations to the consequences.”

Whitehall (<http://nuclearpower2007.direct.gov.uk/docs/AnalysisDocument.pdf>):

- claims CoRWM’s recommending geological disposal was based on ‘sound science’ (it wasn’t and the government selected and distorted CoRWM’s* naïve package of recommendations)
- sidesteps technical appraisal by declaring its “belief” that geological disposal is a “viable” solution (the Environment Agency and IAEA list a dozen “key technical challenges”).
- says the “government *believes that the balance of ethical considerations* does not rule out new nuclear plants” and that it “*will need to be satisfied*” on nuclear waste disposal (ie. political rather than scientific or legally watertight decision).

The Welsh statement says:

- Whitehall does not provide substantial and convincing arguments to rebut concerns regarding long-term radioactive waste disposal and paramount security issues
- the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) and CoRWM2 do not “move the key issue of legacy and new nuclear waste sufficiently forward”
- spent fuel from a new nuclear power plant stored on site exacerbates security concerns.

(<http://new.wales.gov.uk/about/cabinet/CabinetMeetings/frommay2007/minutes/2007/1830958?lang=en>)

Friends of the Earth played a big part in winning the *Sellafield Inquiry decision* (1997) that deep disposal is unproven, with Cumbria’s fractured rocks presenting extra difficulties. Whitehall would over-ride the legal verdict with little new information and a suspect CoRWM process.

Security and safety (Welsh statement)

- increased risk of terrorist actions
- the nuclear pursuits of unfriendly states while nuclear capacity and materials proliferate
- possible accidents, with devastating consequences regionally, for very long times
- assurance that security risks of a new nuclear programme can be appropriately managed (by Office of Civil Nuclear Security) is not “a sturdy position” in today’s world.

Volunteer communities

- Whitehall is trying to bribe and bully communities to accept a deep geological disposal site
- CoRWM recommended “voluntarism”, prompted by the government and the industry, but never examined it critically
- Sustainable development does not allow any community to sacrifice its territory in return for benefits.

The legality is dubious and Friends of the Earth should be arguing the principle: the least bad solution for “legacy” nuclear wastes, but no creation of new nuclear waste.

Let’s *beware the new shape of government* - no longer to inform and win consent to a ‘solution’, but tell us they believe it, then marshal government bodies and nuclear industry experts to back their belief. In this situation, questioning and challenging becomes difficult – local activists need the support of Friends of the Earth as a whole, particularly our Rights & Justice team, against volunteer sites and individual power station plans.

*CoRWM = C’ttee on Radioactive Waste Management; article in Energy & Environment journal takes apart

Background information provided by the staff of Friends of the Earth

1. Where does this motion fit in relation to the strategic plan (primarily in reference to 2008-2013)?

We do not have any aims or objectives relating to nuclear power and nuclear waste dumps in the Strategic Plan. Our Climate Aim focuses on solutions to climate change (energy efficiency, renewables power, sustainable transport). We chose to do so because we couldn't focus both on real and false solutions without spreading ourselves too thinly and achieving nothing. It was a hard choice but chimed with views expressed at previous Conference debates and with the feedback which we received from groups into the strategic planning process. Obviously, by promoting other solutions we are undermining the case for nuclear power.

2. Operationally, what work has Friends of the Earth done, is doing or is planning to do in relation to this issue?

Friends of the Earth has opposed nuclear power and proposed nuclear waste dumps for many years. Recently, we have done very little. We have published research on the economics of nuclear power by former Guardian journalist Paul Brown and liaised with other NGOs who are working on this so that we can track developments. We have made it clear in all our relevant communications that we do not support nuclear power. This is the level that we plan to continue engaging.

Work on nuclear could be regionally significant and so could be prioritised through regional strategies that are being developed before the end of the calendar year. However, resources for region-specific campaigning on issues not included in the Strategic Plan are very limited. Careful decisions will need to be made as to where these resources are best focussed to achieve maximum impact. Groups in each region will be consulted on this process.

3. If Friends of the Earth was to address this, what would be the resource implications for existing work?

Campaigning on nuclear power and nuclear waste dumps needs a very significant resource. For example, Greenpeace has devoted considerable staff time and money at the problem but achieved little to date. This is because the nuclear industry is so entrenched within Whitehall and has vocal support from unions and businesses. It would therefore not be possible to make any impact with the part-time or full-time post suggested by the motion. If we were seriously wanting to defeat nuclear power we would need to dedicate as much effort as we did on The Big Ask. This would stop any solutions campaigning on climate change or biodiversity.

Motion 2 – Peak Oil and Fossil Fuel Prices

Background information provided by Banbridge & Mourne Friends of the Earth and Norwich Friends of the Earth

This Conference notes the significant impact that Friends of the Earth has had to date on the climate change debate and the fundamental role Friends of the Earth UK have had, and continue to have, on recent government policy in this regard.

This Conference further notes the objective by Friends of the Earth to develop regional low carbon communities, successful regional sustainable campaigns and the commitment to Sustainable Development within the Draft Strategic Plan (2008 – 2013)

In the fast changing arena of climate change, it is not enough to place emphasis on awareness campaigns in place of targeted and effective long term sustainable solutions. This is not just because the awareness campaigns (in their pure sense) are of limited value in a society well briefed on the realities of climate change. Sustainable campaigns help to move the sympathetic through the fear and disengagement phase and onto the more cathartic and hands - on solution, of regional sustainability and resilience.

Peak Oil and climate change are much more of a threat if they are viewed individually rather than together. Building Resilience especially at community level and cutting carbon emissions is the only solution to date that answers the diverse challenges of both climate change, together with massive increases in energy prices and/or peak oil.

In the absence of acceptance of the reality of peak oil and the lack of a national power down policy, solutions, as found for example in the 2005 Report by Robert Hirsch commissioned by the US Department of Energy may be pursued rigorously by energy starved governments. These include liquid coal, liquid gas, relaxed drilling regulations, mass production of biofuels, tar sands and other non conventional oils, etc.

This motion signifies that it is imperative that Friends of the Earth do not just recognise the economic significance and potential danger of energy price increases and/or peak oil and its relationship to Climate Change. This motion proposes that Friends of the Earth prioritise, within their future climate change strategy, solutions that are acceptable to both, so that damaging and potentially conflicting policy responses are successfully avoided.

Background information to the amendment submitted by Islington Friends of the Earth

Rising oil prices are greatly increasing interest in coal-to-liquids, tar sands and biofuels, whether we like it or not. We should be opposing adverse technological proliferation.

Coal-to-liquids projects are now planned or progressing in 10 countries including USA, Japan, Australia, China, India, Indonesia (<http://tinyurl.com/65cmg5>).

Biofuels are an international issue. High oil prices will make it profitable to deforest for palm oil so that vegetable oils can replace petroleum, even without fiscal incentives for bioenergy encouraging this. If the EU desisted from adverse agrofuel imports, others would move in to take our place unless there were international agreements to stop this.

Background information provided by the staff of Friends of the Earth

1. Where does this motion fit in relation to the strategic plan (primarily in reference to 2008-2013)?

There is an Aim within the Strategic Plan on climate change. The solution to climate change must be to reduce the consumption of fossil fuel (and halt deforestation). Friends of the Earth is therefore campaigning to secure the political and technology changes that will lead to this. The driver for this change is the devastation that will happen if climate change happens, as recognised by scientists (IPCC) and the majority of governments.

Peak oil is not within the plan because:

- a) Although the increase in oil prices is a powerful and useful driver to reduce consumption of oil, it can result in driving increased use of coal and exploration for new oils/alternative oils.
- b) There is no international scientific certainty on peak oil unlike on climate change. It is a complex field which requires expertise that Friends of the Earth does not possess, as well as information that is not publicly available (e.g. honest appraisals of remaining stocks)

The motion calls to help communities build resilience to peak oil but is not explicit about what this means. Friends of the Earth will run a campaign for low carbon communities which will aim to reduce carbon emissions within communities through greater energy efficiency, better transport options and the growth of renewable energy. This will reduce fossil fuel consumption within an area but will not insulate it from, for example, higher food prices or job losses associated with high oil prices (as seen in the 70s)

2. Operationally, what work has Friends of the Earth done, is doing or is planning to do in relation to this issue?

We will use and will continue to use the increased price of oil as a driver to reduce emissions alongside the climate change arguments for reduction of fossil fuel usage. We have done this most forcibly in recent press work on fuel prices. In addition we will point out that action on climate change is good for the economy and individuals, including because it build resilience to future oil price increases.

3. If Friends of the Earth was to address this, what would be the resource implications for existing work?

At the level described above, it will take no additional resources. However, if we were to focus a campaign around peak oil it would take significant resources as:

- a) The science is unclear and we would have to do significant amounts of research on this (we can not just accept others work unless it is recognised as strong science by media, politicians, industry and others)
- b) The public have just about understood climate change. Peak oil is a debate with much greater level of sceptics (including from industry experts). To win the argument would take much time and effort.

Focussing a campaign on peak oil shifts the attention away from climate change and therefore increases the chance that industry would respond by investing in coal, sand oils, coal tars, bio-fuels, etc. We would need to counter this.

Motion 3 – Waste and Recycling Campaigning

Background information provided by Nuneaton & District Friends of the Earth and Derby & South Derbyshire Friends of the Earth

This Conference notes and believes that:

- 1) Waste and recycling issues are a very important gateway for people joining Friends of the Earth.
- 2) The resources team in Friends of the Earth is less than 2% of the current staff and are overwhelmed with vital EU work.
- 3) Friends of the Earth is losing potential membership income as it has abandoned key activities on UK waste.
- 4) The average tonne of household waste incinerated or landfilled will lead to the equivalent of around 1 tonne of CO₂ emissions.
- 5) Local authorities are currently trying to procure around 40 waste incinerators on 25-30 year contracts. These will produce around 7 millions tonnes of CO₂ per year for decades.
- 6) The waste and resources team has been operating with only 2 staff. Even when it re-gains a third member, the team will have only the equivalent of 1.1 member of staff assigned to non-EU work.

Background information to the amendment submitted by Islington Friends of the Earth

Emissions of dioxins from incineration result from content that contains halogens, such as PVC, which can be sifted out. Likewise, batteries, electronics and other sources of heavy metals can be sifted out.

Energy from well-screened non-recyclable waste will often have a smaller ecological footprint than biomass from crops or forestry, and a far smaller ecological footprint than non-waste vegetable oil.

Background information provided by the staff of Friends of the Earth

1. Where does this motion fit in relation to the strategic plan (primarily in reference to 2008-2013)?

We have agreed an objective under the Sustainable Economies and Resource Use aim to “reduce the consumption of resources in the UK through: waste minimisation and securing levels of recycling in excess of national targets, at the local level and regional level; and through resource efficiency programmes at the regional and national levels.” Work toward this objective incorporates work on incinerators.

2. Operationally, what work has Friends of the Earth done, is doing or is planning to do in relation to this issue?

Friends of the Earth has long prioritised work addressing waste and recycling issues. Recent successes include the House Waste Recycling Act 2003, European Parliament commitments to higher recycling targets and the establishment of UK WIN – a network of groups opposing incineration. We have agreed a workplan in this area requiring more than three full time equivalent staff and a budget of £7000 over the next year – and are finalising exactly how this programme will be delivered.

3. If Friends of the Earth was to address this, what would be the resource implications for existing work?

The work called for in the motion is already being addressed – to an extent. Our priority, in this area, should extra resources become available, would be to allocate them to more work on resource consumption at the European level – as this is where we feel the greatest opportunities lie.

Motion 4 – Population

Background information provided by Bracknell & District Friends of the Earth and Reading Friends of the Earth

This Conference notes the following:

UK population

Forecasts suggest that the population of England will increase by a third over the next 50 years, to become the most crowded country in Europe. Yet this same population is expected, by the Climate Change Bill, to collectively reduce CO₂ emissions by 60-80%! Clearly, any increase will increase the difficulty of reaching CO₂ emission targets.

Global population

It took almost all of human history – until the early 1800’s – to reach a global population of 1 billion people on Earth, and today there are over **6.5 billion**. The population has grown by more since 1950 than in the previous **4 million** years! The UN predicts that we will reach approximately **9 billion** people by 2050.

“The overriding challenges facing our global civilisation as the new century begins are to stabilise climate and stabilise population. Success on these two fronts would make other challenges, such as reversing the deforestation of Earth, stabilising water tables, and protecting plant and animal diversity, much more manageable. If we cannot stabilise climate and we cannot stabilise population, there is not an ecosystem on Earth that we can save. Everything will change.”

(State of the World 2000, Worldwatch Institute.)

Global Warming is one of the greatest threats ever to confront the precious but fragile ecosystems that make our Earth habitable. It poses a significant threat to human health and security. We must address the root causes of this very real threat. Rapid and unchecked human population growth and the resulting increases in resource consumption lie at the heart of most, if not all, environmental problems. **Global warming is no exception.**

The unprecedented increase in human numbers is paralleled by the highest levels of fossil fuel consumption and greenhouse gas production in history. While industrial nations have been primarily responsible for high emissions in the recent past, the population growth of the developing world is clearly a major factor in future emission levels. Yet we must observe that the same numerical increase in population in the developed world will have a far more detrimental effect, because of their higher per capita consumption! Therefore, all national policies and international agreements on global warming must take population growth into account. How quickly the human population grows over the next few decades will have a direct and significant impact on the extent of global warming and its social, economic and environmental consequences.

It should be noted that for the past 60 years, fossil fuel based fertilisers and pesticides have been used extensively, producing high crop yields which have enabled this huge growth in population. The University of Reading Peak Oil study group has taken all the available data and predicted that we are likely to reach the peak of all oil production, worldwide, in the years 2011-2012.

Without oil, the current level of population is unsustainable. If we do not address the realities, the limits in the capacity of the world to feed itself, we will be facing a disaster of biblical proportions.

Background information to the amendment co-submitted by Durham and Islington Friends of the Earth

None provided.

Background information provided by the staff of Friends of the Earth

1. Where does this motion fit in relation to the strategic plan (primarily in reference to 2008-2013)?

Growing population is listed, alongside expanding consumption, in the Challenge Statement of the Strategic Plan, as one of the key trends that is driving ecosystem destruction. However, we have not included an aim or objective on population in the Plan. Nor are we planning a campaign on population. This is because we believe growing consumption to be the bigger and potentially more manageable part of the problem.

2. Operationally, what work has Friends of the Earth done, is doing or is planning to do in relation to this issue?

We have a long-standing position which we use to communicate to inquirers (see below) and have published a briefing on population. We have no plans to do further work on the issue.

3. If Friends of the Earth was to address this, what would be the resource implications for existing work?

Potentially substantial. We would first, as the motion envisages, have to agree a position. This might involve a staff member collating research and coordinating inputs over a period of about six months. It might prove particularly difficult to get agreement on an “optimum global population target figure” as this very much depends on one’s values and assumptions about what people consume. Any programme for the “education and persuasion of the existing population” would have to be a major undertaking if it was to be effective and could potentially consume a substantial share of the organisation’s resources.

Friends of the Earth’s position on population (for communication to inquirers)

Population growth puts pressure on the world’s natural resources. However, Friends of the Earth does not believe that it is the main cause of environmental degradation. The world’s richer nations, including the UK, are putting by far the greatest pressure on the world’s atmosphere, oceans and forests. The richest 20 per cent of people consume 86 per cent

of the Earth's resources and tend to have the lowest birth rates.

Climate change is a clear example of this. G8 countries make up 13 per cent of the world's population yet they account for 45 per cent of global greenhouse gas emissions – 65 per cent if historical emissions are taken into consideration. The average UK citizen emits 2.59 tonnes carbon dioxide per year, about half that of the average American, but over one hundred times the average emissions of citizens of many African countries. Climate change is being worsened by unsustainable use of resources like fossil fuels and the fuel-hungry ways in which we move food and other raw materials around the planet. Fast-growing economies such as India and China will simply replicate the damaging use of fossil fuels in industrialised countries unless urgent action is taken by the richest countries to take the lead on reducing carbon emissions. The critical issue is not population growth, but per-capita emissions.

There is not much time left to tackle climate change. Scientists say that levels of carbon emissions must peak and then decline within the next 10-15 years if we are to limit the change in temperatures to an increase of no more than two degrees centigrade. A rise of more than two degrees could lead to devastating environmental damage and human suffering.

Other environmental problems are also caused by over-consumption of resources:

- * in most towns and cities, air pollution that exceeds safe standards and damages health is largely the result of too many vehicles on the roads;
- * rainforest destruction is fuelled by illegal logging and mining for raw materials that make up everyday products;
- * farming practices that spoil the environment are encouraged by inequitable trade policies that favour intensive farming by big corporations over small-scale family farming.

Even if the world's population stopped growing today it would not remove pressures on the environment. Humanity already outstrips the planet's capacity to sustain us by 20 per cent. Nor would capping population do anything to tackle the gross inequalities in resource use between rich and poor.

The same is true of the UK's population. Within the UK we have limited environmental resources which need to be carefully managed now and in the future. Environmental pressures on rivers, air quality, open space and urban areas are a result of over-consumption of resources, unsustainable travel patterns and failure to respect environmental limits. There are limits, for example, to the amount of waste we can expect the Earth to deal with, or the amount of pollution we can emit into the atmosphere without harming our health.

Friends of the Earth's priority, therefore, is campaigning to reduce per-person climate emissions and resource use in countries like the UK, in order to protect the communities most affected by environmental problems.

For further information, see http://www.foe.co.uk/resource/briefings/immigration_population_and.pdf

Motion 5 – Student and Youth Involvement

Background information provided by Milton Keynes Friends of the Earth and South Bedfordshire Friends of the Earth

This Conference notes:

1. The success of Amnesty and People and Planet at engaging and effectively using young volunteers
2. The comparatively minor youth and student participation within Friends of the Earth, and the resulting high average age of Friends of the Earth activists
3. The importance of bringing new young members into Friends of the Earth and the green movement generally, to form the next generation of activists.
4. The unique and irreplaceable contribution to our work that young people make through their different perspective and knowledge

Background information provided by the staff of Friends of the Earth

1. Where does this motion fit in relation to the strategic plan (primarily in reference to 2008-2013)?

Staff welcome the thrust of this Motion and acknowledge the need to engage younger generations in Friends of the Earth's present and future work. We are continuing to develop our youth and education work and we anticipate that the strategic approaches we are now using to engage our priority audiences can also help us to build our profile with young people and encourage more of them to act with us. A substantially greater focus on young audiences is not

planned for the new Strategic Plan as there are other priority audiences who we anticipate can generate greater support for the organisation's work; however, much of what is stated in this Motion should be achievable over the coming five years through campaigns and other work already in the pipeline.

2. *Operationally, what work has Friends of the Earth done, is doing or is planning to do in relation to this issue?*

Our Shout about education programme for 11-13 years has engaged thousands of young people in our work over the past 5 years. Through their teachers, youth leaders and Friends of the Earth's Local Group Education Network, we offer young people the chance to participate in solutions and empower them to take action on the issues that are important to them and to us. An average of 1,725 educators sign up to Shout about each year and the activity pack is used in both schools and less formal education settings.

In recent years, through supporting local groups more fully, co-ordinating bigger nationwide campaigning and other work, the number of groups and the number of new people joining groups has increased considerably. For example, by improving the impact and accessibility of the campaigns we make available for local groups, our work has engaged many new people, a large number of whom seem to be younger.

Within our activism aim, staff are embarking on new work to expand Friends of the Earth's reach with young people (16+). And within our youth and education programme, we are testing a new approach to working with school aged audiences, to engage them in our agenda and specific campaigns (this testing phase will help to inform our youth and education programme in the coming years and could see us moving away from the Shout about model).

We are presently scoping the possibility of partnership work with various other organisations involved with youth audiences. Those new initiatives will be determined by which tactics can best deliver impact for each campaign on a case-by-case basis, within the context of attracting support to Friends of the Earth in a sustainable way over time. They may or may not therefore follow the exact lines suggested in the Motion, but are likely to move us towards those outcomes.

3. *If Friends of the Earth was to address this, what would be the resource implications for existing work?*

Many of the outcomes stated in this motion can be worked towards through work already in development, both within our youth and education work but also in our wider communications and activism work. To prioritise additional work on younger audiences and focus on all of the specific tactics noted in this Motion, would mean diverting activism and communications resources from engaging and mobilising higher priority audiences to support our campaigns and may require additional resource within the youth and education team.