

Letter from the Executive Board

Dear Participants

It is our pleasure to preside over this COP30 at BBI MUN-2025.

Usually, delegates ask us what the expectations of the Executive Board for a committee are, and to that, we would like to say that at the very least we expect everyone to take the issues under review seriously. We expect that while you have fun during research or deliberations on the issues, you do not undermine their relevance and that you debate them because they affect you as a citizen as well.

This guide has been prepared with the idea that it will brief you about the issues at hand and give you a good starting point for further research. So, we request you not to see it as an end in terms of preparation. Going beyond the scope of this guide during preparation is not only suggested but also necessary if you wish to perform well.

Good Luck! Hoping to see you all soon.

Regards

Executive Board

Note - Information contained in this research brief does not possess any evidentiary value, nor does it qualify as proof of the occurrence/non-occurrence or existence/ non-existence of any fact. The brief is meant only to provide the participants with a modicum of information upon which further research can be built and does not in any manner whatsoever reflect the views or political leanings of the Executive Board. The Executive Board shall maintain neutrality at all times and have no political affiliations.

How to prepare for the committee

One of the major misconceptions about the concept of MUNs is that you just research from the internet and speak in the committee. However that's not the only thing you do, you are required to research for the committee AND **ANALYSE** whatever you've studied. When it comes to the term analysis, a lot of people don't know what it means so for example:

You see someone's mark sheet and see that person has scored 90+ out of 100 in 4 out of 5 subjects, however in the 5th subject, the person has scored just 53 out of 100. The part till here is called your research, this is something you've found out by searching somewhere. When it comes to analysis, analysis means interpretation, now for example in the above example a good analysis would be finding out that the person gives more time to the 5th subject rather than spending so much time on other subjects, his/her marks in the individual subjects might fall a bit but he/she would improve overall because now that person would be scoring well in the 5th subject as well.

On an MUN level; analysis is a very important aspect when it comes to you playing the role of a delegate in a committee. Most delegates get confused by the term analysis and are not able to improve the quality of their analysis over time. In very simple words, "Analysis means interpreting the research you have from your perspective". The reason analysis is an essential aspect of a MUN is because without analysing the current research you can't progress towards development but can only dwell upon the already existing research.

Before that, let's understand what does your analysis include? When you start analysis, you need to keep the following things in mind:



- **Context**– What is the context of your analysis? Basically, what are you analysing? What is it related to?
- **Stakeholders**– Who/What are driving your research and playing a major role? Who are the relevant members of your research?
- **Impact**– What impact will your research have on the agenda? What role will it play on the stakeholders of the research you have regarding the agenda
- **Scope of Solution Space**– What all solutions can be formulated to tackle the problem?
- **Constraints within the solution**– The solutions formulated in the solution space would have a few constraints, what are those? And can they be tackled or is there any way around it?
- **Key Insights**– What is the final conclusion or key takeaways you have from the analysis you’ve done regarding your agenda?

The above are the key points which are included in the concept named “Analysis”. If you are able to find answers to the above points regarding your research you’ll have an easier time going with the research and trying to understand the agenda.

In simple language, analysis means interpreting and understanding what you’ve researched and being able to present it as an argument in the committee which will help in the flow of the debate.

So, for 2 days of the conference, you’ll be marked upon the following things:

- 1. Verbatim** - Research, Analysis, Foreign Policy, Guidance of Debate
- 2. Guidance of debate**- Being able to lobby in the committee and ensuring your points in the committee are creating good arguments and ensuring debate in the committee including in the unmoderated caucuses;
- 3. Foreign Policy** - Ensuring the fact that the statements made by a delegate in the committee in verbatim or chits are in line with their foreign policy; which basically means that your statements should not oppose something which high-positioned representatives have said of your state/country;

Valid source of proof in the committee

Evidence or proof from the following sources will be accepted as credible in the COP30:

- 1. State-operated News Agencies** – These reports can be used in support of or against the State that owns the News Agency. These reports, if credible or substantial enough, can be used to support or against any country as such but in that situation, they can be denied by any other country in the council. Some examples are,

- RIA Novosti (Russia) [<http://en.rian.ru/>]
- IRNA (Iran) [<http://http://www.irna.ir/en/>]
- BBC (United Kingdom) [<http://bbc.co.uk/>]

- Al Jazeera (Qatar) [<http://www.aljazeera.com>]
- Xinhua News Agency (PR China)[<http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/china/>]

2. Government Reports:

These reports can be used in a similar way as the State Operated News Agencies reports and can, in all circumstances, be denied by another country. However, a nuance is that a report that is being denied by a certain country can still be accepted by the Executive Board as credible information. Some examples are,

- Government Websites like the State Department of the United States of America [<http://www.state.gov/index.htm>] or the Ministry of Defense of the Russian Federation [<http://www.eng.mil.ru/en/index.htm>]
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of various nations like India [<http://www.mea.gov.in/>] or People's Republic of China [<http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/>].
- Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Reports <http://www.un.org/en/members/> (Click on any country to get the website of the Office of its Permanent Representative.)
- Multilateral Organizations like the NATO [<http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/index.htm>], ASEAN [<http://www.aseansec.org/>], OPEC [http://www.opec.org/opec_web/en/], etc.

3. UN Reports:

All UN Reports are considered credible information or evidence for the Executive Board of the COP30.

NOTE — Sources like Wikipedia [<http://www.wikipedia.org/>], Amnesty International [<http://www.amnesty.org/>], Human Rights Watch [<http://www.hrw.org/>] or newspapers like the Guardian [<http://www.guardian.co.uk/>], Times of India [<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/>], etc. are typically not accepted as PROOF/EVIDENCE. However, they can be used for better understanding of any issue or on rare occasions, be brought up in debate if the information given in such sources is in line with the beliefs of a Government. Further, the information submitted as evidence citing reportage from sources such as specified in this note may be at best, treated as having significance in terms of persuasive value - e.g. to cement one's assertions, but never as a binding, indisputable fact.

Introduction

The phenomenon of greenwashing has evolved from isolated corporate deceptions to a systemic issue embedded in international climate agreements. Coined in the 1980s by environmentalist Jay Westerveld, greenwashing refers to the deceptive use of green marketing to promote the perception that an



organization's products, aims, or policies are environmentally friendly. This practice distracts from genuine action, delaying the transition to sustainable practices amid escalating climate crises.

International climate agreements, from the 1992 Earth Summit to the 2015 Paris Agreement, have aimed to curb greenhouse gas emissions and foster global cooperation. However, these pacts have increasingly been criticized for enabling greenwashing by governments and corporations through vague commitments, loopholes in reporting, and reliance on unverified offsets. For instance, net-zero pledges often mask continued fossil fuel expansion, with over half of major companies' commitments lacking alignment with lobbying efforts.

Compounding this is the marginalization of tribal and ethnic stewardship. Indigenous Peoples manage approximately 25% of the world's land, safeguarding 80% of global biodiversity and significant carbon stores. Their traditional knowledge offers resilient strategies against climate change, yet agreements often overlook or exploit these contributions, leading to land dispossession and cultural erosion.

This background guide traces greenwashing's growth, highlights key agreements, emphasizes Indigenous roles, analyzes current challenges with expanded case studies, and outlines detailed stakeholder positions. Delegates should aim to propose mechanisms for transparency, Indigenous inclusion, and enforceable commitments.

Historical Background

Origins of Greenwashing

Greenwashing's roots trace back to the environmental movement of the 1960s and 1970s, but the term emerged in 1986 when Westerveld critiqued hotels' towel-reuse programs as superficial. By the 1980s, amid disasters like Chernobyl and Exxon Valdez, corporations began using green imagery to deflect scrutiny. Oil giants like Exxon knew about climate change as early as 1959 but engaged in disinformation campaigns.

In international arenas, greenwashing manifested in early agreements. The 1972 Stockholm Conference introduced environmental diplomacy, but commitments were non-binding, allowing nations to claim progress without action.

Common Greenwashing Tactics



- **Greenlighting:** Highlighting select green activities to distract from other environmentally harmful behaviors.
- **Greencrowding:** Joining sustainability initiatives to dilute responsibility and progress happens at the slowest pace.
- **Greenshifting:** Shifting responsibility from producers to consumers, deflecting accountability.
- **Greenlabelling:** Using disputed eco-labels and certifications, sometimes without genuine adherence to standards.
- **Greenrinsing:** Frequently revising and pushing back green targets, delaying substantive transparency.
- **Greenhushing:** Concealing environmental goals to evade scrutiny or criticism.

Techno-Fixes and Carbon Markets

Greenwashing is perpetuated through support for “techno-fixes,” such as carbon capture and storage (CCS) and hydrogen solutions that enable polluters to maintain business operations with minor tweaks, often exaggerating their effectiveness. Carbon trading allows companies and governments to buy their way to lower emissions on paper while actual reductions remain unachieved.

Evolution in Early Climate Agreements

The 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), established at the Rio Earth Summit, aimed to stabilize greenhouse gases. However, it lacked enforcement, enabling developed nations to greenwash emissions through offsets.

The 1997 Kyoto Protocol introduced binding targets for developed countries, but loopholes like carbon trading allowed continued pollution. The U.S. signed but never ratified, citing economic concerns, while corporations lobbied against it.

Indigenous rights were minimally addressed; the Protocol's vulnerability concept ignored specific Indigenous impacts.

Indigenous Stewardship in Historical Context

Indigenous Peoples have stewarded lands for millennia, with practices like controlled burns preventing wildfires and enhancing biodiversity. Colonialism disrupted this, but movements like the 1970s American Indian Movement reclaimed rights.

In climate talks, Indigenous participation began in 2000, advocating for rights inclusion. Yet, early COPs marginalized them, treating knowledge as ancillary.

Historical Exclusion

Climate agreements rarely secure meaningful participation for Indigenous, tribal, and ethnic communities, despite their proven stewardship and vulnerability to climate impacts. Token inclusion and lack of explicit rights recognition restrict true involvement in policy and practice.

Negative Impacts

Tribal land and resources are often exploited under the pretext of green transitions, such as large-scale solar and hydrogen projects displacing communities and straining local ecosystems. Water use, raw material extraction, and territorial encroachment have all increased with the expansion of greenwashing practices.

Calls for Justice

Global alliances of Indigenous and ethnic groups demand direct involvement in climate negotiations, the application of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), and the adoption of traditional knowledge in climate solutions.

Key International Climate Agreements and Greenwashing Instances

Paris Agreement (2015)

The Paris Agreement marked a shift to voluntary Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), but this flexibility fostered greenwashing. Many pledges rely on offsets, with 80% of emissions covered by net-zero claims often unsubstantiated.

Article 6's carbon markets have been contested by Indigenous groups for enabling "carbon colonialism."

COP Meetings: From COP21 to COP29



COP21 (Paris) strengthened Indigenous roles via LCIPP. However, subsequent COPs like COP26 saw greenwashing in fossil fuel pledges.

COP28 in 2023 signaled the "beginning of the end" of fossil fuels, but Indigenous advocates criticized it for sidelining their voices. COP29 in 2024 approved carbon markets despite Indigenous calls for moratoriums, exacerbating greenwashing concerns. As of 2025, preparations for COP30 emphasize Indigenous inclusion, but challenges persist.

Corporate and Governmental Greenwashing Examples

Volkswagen's emissions scandal exemplifies corporate deceit. Governments like India's push coal expansion while claiming green credentials.

Net-zero pledges by oil firms like BP rely on offsets, not reductions.

Role of Tribal and Ethnic Stewardship

Traditional Knowledge and Climate Resilience

Indigenous practices interpret climate impacts creatively, blending tradition with technology. In the Arctic, Inuit knowledge predicts weather; in Amazonia, Indigenous lands store vast carbon.

Integration in Agreements

The UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007) mandates conservation rights. UNFCCC's LCIPP facilitates knowledge exchange.

Case studies: U.S. tribes leading adaptation; Australian First Nations in stewardship.

Challenges: Land Threats and Exclusion

Industrial development threatens 50% of Indigenous lands. Green projects like offsets displace communities.

Current Challenges and Case Studies



Rising Greenwashing Trends

As of 2025, greenwashing litigation has surged, with claims focusing on net-zero statements and carbon offsets. Regulatory divergence drives ESG lawsuits, and new laws in countries like Canada introduce private rights of action against misleading claims. Indigenous Peoples remain sidelined in global climate efforts, as highlighted in a 2025 UN report, exacerbating vulnerabilities.

Carbon markets, formalized at COP29, are criticized as "carbon colonialism," enabling greenwashing while displacing Indigenous communities. Indigenous leaders advocate for moratoriums on such mechanisms, viewing them as false solutions.

Expanded Case Studies on Greenwashing

- 1. Apple's Carbon Offsets Lawsuit (2025):** In August 2025, a greenwashing lawsuit targeted Apple's sustainability claims, questioning the validity of its carbon offsets. The case revealed how tech giants use low-quality offsets to support "carbon neutral" labels without substantial internal reductions, highlighting cracks in corporate accountability. This litigation underscores the need for verifiable standards in international agreements, as offsets often fail to deliver promised emissions reductions, affecting Indigenous lands used for offset projects.
- 2. Adidas Climate Neutrality Judgment (2025):** In March 2025, a German court ruled against Adidas for failing to substantiate its "climate neutrality by 2050" claims, deeming them misleading. The company relied on vague offsets and future technologies, a common tactic in fashion greenwashing. This case illustrates how international treaties like the Paris Agreement enable such ambiguity, with NDCs allowing unproven pledges that indirectly impact Indigenous stewardship by promoting land-intensive offset schemes.
- 3. Procter & Gamble Class Actions (2025):** On May 28, 2025, five class-action lawsuits were filed against P&G in U.S. federal courts over greenwashing in product marketing. Claims focused on misleading environmental benefits, such as "sustainable sourcing," without evidence. This reflects broader trends in consumer goods, where UNFCCC-linked corporate commitments mask supply chain harms, including deforestation in Indigenous territories.
- 4. Shell and Delta Airlines Carbon Offsets Scandals:** High-profile cases involving Shell and Delta highlight greenwashing through offsets. Shell's aggressive climate claims relied on low-quality offsets, while Delta faced scrutiny for similar practices. These examples show how Article 6 of the



Paris Agreement facilitates "greenwashing" by allowing emissions trading that displaces Indigenous communities without consent, perpetuating environmental injustice.

5. **Sustainability-Linked Loans (SLLs) in Finance (2025):** A 2025 analysis critiqued SLLs as potential greenwashing tools, where banks offer favorable terms tied to vague ESG goals. Case studies revealed minimal real changes, raising flags about financial instruments under UNFCCC frameworks that fund projects encroaching on Indigenous lands.
6. **Fashion Industry Greenwashing under International Law:** A 2025 review noted the absence of binding treaties regulating fashion greenwashing, relying on national enforcement. Examples include fast-fashion brands claiming "sustainable" lines while polluting, linked to global agreements that fail to enforce supply chain transparency affecting ethnic groups in sourcing regions.

Expanded Case Studies on Tribal and Ethnic Stewardship

1. **Swinomish Indian Tribal Community (Pacific Northwest, USA):** The Swinomish Tribe has developed comprehensive climate adaptation plans addressing sea-level rise and traditional food changes. Their strategies integrate traditional knowledge with scientific data, assessing impacts like shellfish contamination. This case demonstrates how Indigenous stewardship can enhance resilience, yet UNFCCC agreements often overlook such localized efforts, leading to funding gaps.
2. **Karuk Tribe Climate Adaptation Plan (California, USA):** The Karuk Tribe's plan exemplifies co-stewardship, incorporating cultural burns to mitigate wildfires. Collaborating with federal agencies, they've restored ecocultural practices, reducing fire risks and preserving biodiversity. However, greenwashing in state-level climate policies has delayed recognition, highlighting the need for Indigenous veto rights in agreements.
3. **Indigenous Communities in California: Climate Justice Approach:** Multiple tribes in California use climate justice frameworks for adaptation, focusing on sovereignty and cultural preservation. Case studies show resistance to green energy projects that displace communities, emphasizing consent and knowledge integration. This contrasts with international pacts that prioritize market-based solutions over Indigenous rights.
4. **Arctic Indigenous Peoples and Nature-Based Solutions (2024-2025):** Inuit and other Arctic groups leverage traditional knowledge for NbS against climate change. Examples include community-led monitoring of ice melt, offering data superior to satellite observations. Yet, carbon market expansions threaten these lands, illustrating greenwashing's intersection with stewardship exclusion.



5. **Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Tribes (USA, 2025):** A 2025 report on tribal and environmental justice in the Delta highlights stewardship in water management amid climate vulnerabilities. Tribes advocate for co-governance, but greenwashing in infrastructure projects undermines efforts.
6. **Global Indigenous Resistance to Carbon Markets:** In 2024-2025, Indigenous groups protested COP29's carbon market approvals, citing displacement. Case studies from Latin America show ethnic groups blocking mining for "green" transitions, emphasizing liberation from climate-induced loss.

These cases reveal systemic challenges: greenwashing erodes trust in agreements, while Indigenous stewardship provides proven solutions but faces exclusion.

Bloc Positions

Bloc positions in UNFCCC COPs reflect geopolitical, economic, and cultural divides. Indigenous groups form a unified caucus, while nation-states align in coalitions. Below are detailed positions, informed by recent developments up to 2025.

- **Indigenous Peoples' Caucus (IIPFCC):** Representing global Indigenous voices, this bloc advocates for rights-based approaches, rejecting carbon markets as "false solutions" and "carbon colonialism." At COP29 (2024), they condemned market approvals as threats to territories, calling for moratoriums and full participation in decision-making. They emphasize Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) in all climate actions, critiquing greenwashing that exploits their lands for offsets. In 2025, they push for decolonizing agreements, integrating traditional knowledge as core to resilience. Positions include demanding direct finance access and veto powers over projects.
- **Developed Nations (e.g., USA, EU, Canada):** These countries advocate market-based solutions like carbon trading but face accusations of greenwashing through unsubstantiated NDCs. The EU supports Indigenous inclusion via LCIPP but prioritizes economic transitions. The USA, under recent policies, promotes co-stewardship agreements with tribes domestically but internationally resists binding Indigenous vetoes, fearing delays in green energy. Canada introduced anti-greenwashing laws in 2024-2025, requiring proof for claims, yet Indigenous groups criticize them for impacting First Nations' advocacy. Overall, this bloc favors voluntary commitments, often sidelining Indigenous demands for sovereignty.
- **Developing Nations (e.g., India, Brazil, China - G77+China Bloc):** This large bloc demands equity and climate finance from developed nations, highlighting historical emissions



responsibilities. Brazil, hosting COP30 in 2025, emphasizes Amazon Indigenous stewardship but faces internal greenwashing in deforestation policies. India critiques Western greenwashing while pursuing coal-dependent growth, supporting Indigenous rights rhetorically but prioritizing development. China advocates technology transfers, aligning with Indigenous calls against offsets but using markets domestically. The bloc pushes for Common But Differentiated Responsibilities (CBDR), integrating Indigenous knowledge selectively.

- **Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) and Least Developed Countries (LDCs):** Vulnerable to climate impacts, AOSIS demands ambitious targets and loss/damage funds, supporting Indigenous positions on anti-greenwashing due to shared displacement risks. They critique carbon markets for enabling polluter delays, aligning with Indigenous moratorium calls.
- **Latin American Independent Association for Climate (AILAC):** This progressive bloc of Latin American states pushes for ambitious mitigation while respecting Indigenous rights. They advocate governmentality in UNFCCC, balancing markets with equity, but Indigenous critics note insufficient FPIC enforcement.
- **African Group of Negotiators (AGN):** Africa seeks adaptation finance and rejects greenwashing in transitions, supporting Indigenous stewardship as key to biodiversity. They highlight mining threats to ethnic groups, calling for just transitions.

Delegates should navigate these positions to build coalitions, addressing greenwashing through transparency and elevating Indigenous stewardship.

Questions a Resolution Should Answer (QARMA)

1. How to define and penalize greenwashing in NDCs and corporate pledges?
2. What mechanisms ensure Indigenous FPIC and veto in climate projects?
3. How to enforce net-zero without reliance on unverified offsets?
4. What funding models integrate Indigenous knowledge into global adaptation?
5. How to monitor and litigate against carbon colonialism in markets?
6. How to align bloc interests for equitable, anti-greenwashing policies?