



# CLIMATE CRISIS AND STATE RESPONSE IN INDIA

ROUNDTABLE ON REVIEW OF  
KEY POLICIES AND ACTIONS

2-3 NOV 2011, NEW DELHI

BEYOND COPENHAGEN

**BJVJ**



**MISEREOR**  
DIE HILFswerk



CLIMATE CRISIS AND STATE RESPONSE IN INDIA  
NOVEMBER 2011  
NEW DELHI, INDIA

Compiled by : Jyotishman Kalita  
With Inputs from : Ajay K Jha, Aparna Sareen, Mausumi Chetia and Soumya Dutta  
Edited by : Sharad Joshi

For Beyond Copenhagen Collective, India

Design and Layout : Harsh Vardhan (harsh1456@gmail.com)

© Copyright This Publication can be reproduced for non commercial purposes citing and acknowledging the Writers and the Publisher (Details mentioned here)

Published by  
**PUBLIC ADVOCACY INITIATIVE FOR RIGHTS AND VALUES IN INDIA (PAIRVI)**  
G-30, First Floor, Lajpat Nagar-III, New Delhi-110024  
Ph. +91-11-29841266, | Fax: +91-11-29841266  
Email: pairvidelhi@rediffmail.com, pairvidelhi1@gmail.com  
Web: www.pairvi.org | Blog: beyondcph.blogspot.com

Supported by  
**MISEROR-IHR HILFSWERK (GERMANY)** and **OXFAM India**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Beyond Copenhagen coalition, a collective of 40 odd organizations concerned about the impacts of climate change on communities in India, has been engaging with the climate change crisis for the last three years both with different climate change impacted communities in diverse geo-cultural regions of India, and also with the policy makers & implementers in India and in many international fora. Over the past three years, BCPH has organized several public hearings to get the truth about real impacts on dry-land farmers, Himalayan communities etc. BCPH also repeatedly raised & projected the many climate related issues the small-holder farmers are facing, the need to support them to adapt to the increasingly severe impacts of an increasingly unpredictable climate, and the critical necessity of going positively ahead with an international Climate Justice Tribunal in the last two Conference Of Parties (COP) in Copenhagen & Cancun and in many other national & international climate conferences / meetings. We have also attempted to build up linkages with a large no of groups in India & in South Asia, who are working in various related sectors. Another area of focus for BCPH has been the constant engagement with the State & political entities. As part of these efforts, BCPH organized several interactions with leaders of political parties and diplomatic staff from several embassies. The other major engagement is with the process of formulating the crucial State Action Plans on Climate Change (SAPCC) in several states, and the efforts to open up and democratize the process & contents of these SAPCCs.

As a part of these engagements, BCPH has been involved in some form or the other with the SAPCC processes in the states of Manipur, Madhya Pradesh, Uttarakhand & Bihar, while playing some role in the processes in Nagaland, Assam, Uttar Pradesh etc. We have also organized workshops for senior & mid-level media people on climate change issues & the states role, as well as provided regular updates from many climate change mega & other conferences for many media groups to use freely as per their requirements. The process of engaging with the SAPCCs is very important as these are coming up as overarching plans covering many sectors, are mostly being driven by foreign & westernized consultants, being pushed & funded by non-credible agencies like the World Bank and other EU country groups, and the participation of civil society or people's groups are minimal or non-existent. What is alarming is that even the state legislatures are not aware of what is happening in the SAPCC processes and how & what is being prepared as their climate action plans.

In this background and with its SAPCC engagement experience, BCPH organized a 2-day round table consultation at the India International Centre in Delhi, on Nov.2 & 3, 2011. Among those who took part were three categories of people 1) those groups & individuals who have seriously engaged with both the climate change issue and the National & State action plans in various states and/or various sectors; 2) those engaged with the climate change issues but not with the state actions in national or state levels; and 3) those coming from various climate impacted regions in India thus feeling the impact first-hand, but not necessarily aware of the national & international climate change discourses & actions. The participation level was very good, exceeding 65 on the 1<sup>st</sup> day, and the discussions were on many aspects of a) the physical & indirect impacts of climate change, b) the national & international scene in terms of the Govts positions and actions internationally, and c) the national action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC), its eight missions, and the various SAPCCs and their consequences.

The inaugural session tried to give a brief but significant political-economical perspective to the whole climate change-climate crisis discourse, with BCPH Convenor Vijay Pratap pointing out the essentially political nature of the underlying problems. Following this, in the first technical session, the discussion started after a presentation on the Mission on Sustainable agriculture by Prof Suman Sahai, Director gene

campaign. Dr Sahai brought out the clearly techno-centric nature of this mission document and the lack of understanding of the realities of small-holder/ rain-fed agriculture in India. This was followed by a presentation on this mission (along with aspects of NAPCC) by Dr A R Nambi from M S Swaminathan Research Foundation (MSSRF).

In the next session, various observed impacts of climate change on different agro-climatic zones and sectors were highlighted by many persons who came from or/and worked in these regions. These include Assam : Mr. Ranjan Baruah, Bihar : Mr. Ranjan Kumar Singh (NIDAN), Chhattisgarh: Mr. Prateek Pandey, Gujarat : Mr. Nagraj Adve, Manipur : Mr Nobo Khimbam, Kerala & Karnataka : Mr. Shree Padre, Rajasthan : Mr ashok Mathur and Ms. Mausumi Chetia, Tamilnadu : Prof. A R Nambi (MSSRF), Uttar Pradesh : Dr. K K Singh (GEAG) & Alok Kumar (SAATHI), Uttarakhand : Mr. Tarun Joshi (Van Panchayat), Madhya Pradesh: Mr. Sanjay Jothe (TARU) & others. Several previously unknown changes induced by a changing climate came to light through their reporting.

In the 3rd technical session conducted by the BCPH climate change group convenor Soumya Dutta, discussions took an intense form after a presentation on the NAPCC by Himanshu Thakkar, coordinator of South Asian network of dams Rivers & People (SANDRP). This was followed by an analysis of the National Water Mission under NAPCC by Shri Thakkar. Mr Raman Mehta, Sr Climate advisor in DFID also presented a picture of the positions & role of the Indian state in various international negotiations. This was followed by an in-depth analysis of the Green India Mission (one of the eight national missions under NAPCC) and how it links with India's forests, forest dwelling people and the role of big-money & carbon trading in manipulating /distorting the pro-people forest agenda, by Souparna Lahiri of National forum of Forest people & Forest Workers (NFFPFW). He also took the participants through a tour of the various forest legislations and how the GIM links up or subverts the progressive ones.

Day 2 started with a brief recap of the discussions of the first day, while a consensus emerged that all the groups collectively should come out with a brief position paper for civil society with a call to the Govt of India and its provincial governments, to respect people's wisdom, to do credible studies of actual ground level climate impacts and to prepare any climate plans in full & transparent consultation with all stakeholders. Brief but meaningful interventions were made by Dr Surjit Singh Director of IDSS, Rajasthan, Prof. Sanjay Bhatt of Delhi university's Dept of social Work, and Jai Sen who pointed out the role & actions of the corporate in the context of climate change crisis, and also the trend & possibility that the democratic spaces in our societies are increasingly being cornered by these money-powers. Soumya Dutta also highlighted the dominance of northern NGOs and increasingly BINGOs in the discourse and decision making regarding climate actions. A sub-group within the participants took responsibility of coming out with some brief position papers / statements in 1-2 weeks time.

The next session started with renowned journalist Shri Praful Bidwai analyzing the NAPCC and its two missions on energy the Jawaharlal Nehru National solar Mission and the national Mission on Enhanced Energy efficiency. This again brought out the totally alien & unrealistic planning process behind these missions, which again were done without any public consultation worth its name. Followed by this, Soumya Dutta made a presentation on India's energy scene, the Integrated Energy Policy and how these are in conflict with many directions of the JN-National Solar Mission. He also brought out the rooted-in-the-last-century and for-profit-only characters of these two energy missions, and how these have been prepared without any understanding of either the energy reality of the Indian poor, or even w/o keeping the IEP in consideration or without differentiating between energy & electricity. A few aspects of climate

finance and its linkage with the climate justice issue was also highlighted.

The coordinator of BCPH, Shri ajay Jha then took up the process of preparation & content formulation of the SAPCCs, with an overview drawn from our collective experience gained from these engagements in several states. The head of one of the key groups in BCPH, CECOEDECON, Shri Sharad Joshi brought in the perspective of collective action to tackle the enormous challenges ahead and also brought out key areas of work needed by the larger collective. Several of our fraternal organizations from Manipur, Assam etc also highlighted their efforts to democratize the state's planning and actions around the climate crisis for the vast majority of India's & south-Asia's vulnerable poor people.



## **CONTENTS**

CHAPTER 1: CLIMATE CHANGE AND RESPONSE	PAGE 01
CHAPTER 2: UNEARTHING THE GAPS: AN OVERVIEW OF THE NAPCC	PAGE 03
CHAPTER 3: WITHIN THE NAPCC- CONCERNS AND CALAMITIES	PAGE 05
CHAPTER 4: THE STATE ACTION PLANS ON CLIMATE CHANGE- A CRITIQUE	PAGE 12
CHAPTER 5: IMPLICATIONS OF CLIMATE CHANGE	PAGE 14
CHAPTER 6: POSITION OF INDIA IN INTERNATIONAL NEGOTIATIONS	PAGE 18
CHAPTER 7: CALL	PAGE 20

## **CHAPTER 1: CLIMATE CHANGE AND RESPONSE**

Climate Change is perhaps the greatest threat faced by our generation now and in times to come climate change will no longer remain a threat- it will turn into a global catastrophe. Climate Change, defined in specific scientific terms, is true to the nature of the geophysical evolution of earth. It explains the gradual changes in the earth's temperature, land mass, water bodies and atmosphere considered and compared over a period of time. As, such, it may not look as big as a problem it is today, but considering the rapid growth of industries in the past couple of centuries, associated with the population boom as well as the extensive exploitation of resources, climate change has attained gigantic proportions in the making of a calamity.

Describing this calamity in its very terminology, it can well be said that the global increase in temperature, brought about by rapid rise in the atmospheric carbon- dioxide is the root of all problems. In the last 50 years alone, from 1960 to 2010 the atmospheric carbon dioxide has risen from about 314 ppmv to 384 ppmv. The chief reason for this sharp increase is the increasing trend of emissions that have gone unchecked by the developed countries and now followed in the same tune by the developing counties. The change as an impending problem was realised long ago, but nothing much has been done on a global scale in terms of practical implementation. The issue has been addressed at the global level, no doubt, ranging from the first earth summit in 1992 to Johannesburg to Kyoto to Bali to Cancun to Copenhagen to the upcoming conference in Durban. In all the cases, the developed countries, led by the USA, have found some way or the other to snowball the issue to a stalemate and to their own advantage. Their strategy is simple- first, to suggest a way to adapt to climate change in such a way that the global emission rate can be controlled without reducing their emission and without having to adapt; and second, to suggest ways to mitigate the problem, but with the maximum burden of the process of mitigation dumped on the developing and the underdeveloped nations.

There is a longer chain of reasons and intentions associated with such a kind of approach, but it is essential to clear up the nature of approach first. Climate Change is not any one off incident that affects only a select class of the population: it is a problem that targets each and every living being on the planet as well all associated biological forms on which life depends. As such, it is mandatory that any policy or action on the global scale must include all the people and not carter to a select few based on pseudo- economic numbers. This, in total, is the required approach to this global problem. So far all the attempts to find a solution have failed to address this all important part of the problem. This has arguably been a major failure in the global level.

India has been a part of these negotiations from the start and considering certain economic principles, India too now feels 'responsible' to address climate change. To compliment the global negotiations, India has planned a gradual lowering of emissions. Interestingly, through there was no external pressure for such an act, India has volunteered for lowering emissions and adopting a plan to combat Climate Change. For this purpose the government of India announced a National plan called the National Action Plan on Climate Change or the NAPCC on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2008. It was also proposed that each and every state come up with State Action plans (SAPs) based on the differential geo- climatic zones of the states to complement the NAPCC. At the very outset this might seem to be positive development, but there are bigger, darker issues behind such and implementation. Even before these issues are considered in the document to follow, some approaches in India's domestic position must be considered.



Considering the fact that India is still a developing country and more than 70% of the population still depend on an economy that is climate based, such a planned approach is needed. Also considering that the UNEP has placed India as one of the 27 countries highly vulnerable to climate change and its effects, such a plan becomes mandatory. Here lies the difference: such a plan is required, but not the NAPCC. The NAPCC, or any other plan for that matter must be guided by what the majority of the Indian population needed, and not be guided by the logic to sustain 'rapid economic growth' as the very first sentence of the plan suggests. Moreover, a careful study of the plan is sure to throw up the general idea behind the policies undertaken. All policies give the underlying logic that mitigation, following the lines thrown by the developed countries, is the underlying principle whereas; India's approach should be more towards adaptation to suit the majority of the population who trust their subaltern voices to be heard in their parliament.

This is the biggest irony of all. In a nation with 1.2 billion people and certified as the largest democracy of the world, such an important plan is adopted outside the parliament, in a closed door process. Irony alone, this is the beginning of a saga of deprivation, betrayal, suffering and hopelessness brought about by Climate Change and compounded by the NAPCC and the SAPs.

Any attempt to respond to such a situation must, therefore, also be equally forceful in terms of ideas, expression and eloquence. Behind such a response is a trumpet of a billion Indian voices; and hopes. The Beyond Copenhagen Coalition is the manifestation to articulate these voices. The Beyond Copenhagen coalition organised a roundtable conference on Climate Change and State Response in India on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2011 at the India International Centre, New Delhi. The prime focus of the conference was to judge the way in which the National Action Plan on Climate Change, in effect, worked at the grass root levels. The agenda was to discuss in detail five major thrust areas out of the eight outlined in the NAPCC and determine their effect on the most vulnerable section of the Indian population. Given the murky history of the formation of the NAPCC, such a critical discussion and on such a scale was long overdue. The discussion was to be supported by experience cum evidence of people represented from different states of India. In effect, such evidence would corroborate what the critics of the dodgy NAPCC have been stressing all along- the Government had rain shadowed a huge mass of the population in the pretext of some flimsy economic numbers.

## **CHAPTER 2: UNEARTHING THE GAPS: AN OVERVIEW OF THE NAPCC**

The NAPCC starts at the very outset that India needs a comprehensive strategy to sustain its rapid economic growth as well as address the problem of climate change. Released on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2008, the NAPCC mentions its vision to “create a prosperous, but not wasteful society, an economy that is self-sustaining in terms of its ability to unleash the creative energies of our people and is mindful of our responsibilities to both present and future generations.” If this seems to be very rhetorical, what follows is even more so- “Finally, our approach must also be compatible with our role as a responsible and enlightened member of the international community, ready to make our contribution to the solution of a global challenge, which impacts on humanity as a whole.” These visions immediately set forward an analysis of what the plan proposes to do at the domestic level and what exactly is the government's position in the international stage. Five aspects of the plan have been considered in the chapters that follow, but before that a critique is required of the way that the plan was formulated and what are the expectations of the people regarding the plan.

There is a very basic necessity before the formation of any policy on Climate change- the fact that political boundaries, the basis of formation of any policy, are very different from ecological boundaries and this exactly took the effort of drafting an Action Plan beyond the mandate of political bodies. This would imply the initial need of involving local bodies and people working with climate change in the drafting of any plan, which was not followed by the government and rather a plan was drafted by involving political bodies alone. This kind of an approach would suggest a multitude of inferences, the chief being the exclusion of the people most likely to be effected by climate change. This would also suggest a political vacuum in the actual process of decision making other than the relative ignorance of the political bodies in decision making. The process and the implicative did not understand the issue on a valid level. Rather, it would also appear as if the whole process reeked of '*not required to understand*' at all. The indicators point to culture of consumerism; only pursuing a non feasible pseudo American economic policy, driven by the political elite. There appears to be a consensus among these classes without taking into account the subaltern voice.

A large part of the blame would lie with this government and the one before that for following party mandates alone and not taking into account the whole cultural context while dealing with a sensitive issue like climate change in the Indian panorama. Even the main opposition party seems to be wholly ineffective while responding to the problems and the policy changes. The same can be said of State politics too, without any positive suggestions to make and without any productive inputs from the most deprived sections of the population.

A discussion would bring out the technicalities of the issue, but it is quite important to settle our approach to the issue as well. Many people who romanticise the issue of climate change do not, in fact, realise that the ecological crisis is in fact a traditional crisis. The resource people in the conference in fact proved the fact soon after, but the fact remains that climate change has altered the normal life and culture of the voice less Indian. Hence there can be formed a strong case for the panoramic view of the cultural and historical context of India in formulating any Action Plan. There needs to be a democratic process in the knowledge system also, which would ensure such a concept of inclusive decision making. There is evidence of critical search among the intelligentsia, which is a positive sign, but the need of the hour is to deconstruct the international and national policies to bring in justice for the subaltern people.

The problem has moved beyond the scope of emission alone and it now includes a lot more of economic, civic, social, administrative and business affiliates. It has now become a problem of survival,

superseding the environmental concerns alone. A part of this interrelation lies in the fact that the world has slowly realised that climate change is liable to uproot the very specific roots of civilisation by altering settlement and sustainable activities of the grass root people as well as the people dependent on them. A very specific and comprehensive step was required that could encompass all the administrative steps to be taken to combat climate change as well as take care not to destroy the space of the indigenous people. These qualities not only apply at the national or the state level but also work up to the whole human race world wide as well. The gravity of the situation calls for a change in attitude, when it is required that the phenomenon of climate change be now considered as 'Climate Crisis'

The NAPCC was supposed to be India's draft in response to international negotiations. Even if India feels the responsibility of addressing the global phenomenon of climate change, it is also mandatory that the government take valid and instrumental steps in the relative domestic policies. India's domestic position is largely shaky. India's international position does not reflect India's domestic position and such a mix up with respect to such a serious matter can be catastrophic in the long run. The Government clearly avoided transparency in the formulation of the NAPCC and the fact bears considerable weight age that the draft proposal languished for three and half years before gaining Cabinet approval. This time period could have more than easily accommodated a large scale involvement of the Civil Society Organisations in the process of consultation before forming the Plan. Moreover, the major thrust areas of the NAPCC do not include anything new in terms of innovative policy making. Barring the National Mission on Energy Efficiency, all others involving issues like agriculture, water etc. repeat already existing policies of the government. The only addition seems to be in glorious use of fancy language, exotic vocabulary and ingenious abbreviations. Somehow, as the following report will prove, the use of the sweet adjectives above is justified.

### **CHAPTER 3: WITHIN THE NAPCC- CONCERNS AND CALAMITIES**

To provide for all the reservations associated with the NAPCC, it is required to present in full measure the specific problems associated with the eight main attributes of the plan. Each of the eight come with additional clauses that complicate the matter at the grass root level. Some of these clauses are unrealistic to the point that they are very unrealistic and do not take into consideration specific qualities of the nature of the Indian people and traditions. Some are unrealistic due to the fact that they are over ambitious. But the biggest problem is the fact that most of the clauses do not take into account the welfare of the small and marginal farmers and the forest dwellers. In the following parts five of the eight thrust areas are discussed in detail to provide for a proper and valid critique of the Plan.

#### **NAPCC on Agriculture: Harvesting a calamity**

Agriculture, as agencies, farmers and Civil Society bodies have been stressing all along, needs the maximum attention and effort in any policy that is formulated, either in the process of adaptation or mitigation. In the NAPCC, agriculture finds mention, but in very vague terms. Some principal areas of interest and concern have been let out to freeze. Dr. Suman Sahai, renowned expert on gene sciences and agriculture expressed that the direct impact of Climate Change, read 'Crisis', is liable to be on the agricultural outputs. Without doubt, the region of South Asia and Africa stand to be the strongest impact zone of Climate Change. Simply put, there is not enough scope to address food security in the long run. For the better part of the NAPCC, the focus has been on sources of renewable energy. A large part of the fund has been allocated to the mission on solar energy, whereas, it is arguably the fact that India's contribution in the solar energy sector is negligible. It is more important to focus on the immediate crisis than to fund an improbable sector for the future with indeterminable outcomes. By emphasising more on the prediction of the Solar Mission and ignoring the realistic problem of the agriculture sector, the Government has already muddled the approach. This could very well suggest that agriculture and sectors associated with it do not come in the domain of thinking of the policy makers.

The fundamental flaw in the NAPCC with regards to agriculture is that the plan has no connection to India's contemporary challenges in food security. The discussion in the planning process has to be complimented with an actual problem first, and not with a predicted problem. The NAP, in that sense is more a technological plan. There is a relative importance given to transgenic crops. Now, it is important to repeat here the context of the Indian panorama stressed earlier. The use of genetics in agriculture is still a very primitive technology. A lot of ground has to be covered in terms of technicalities before it can be applied in practical use and form a mainstay of agricultural economics. It is technology of the laboratory now should remain so. Considering India's large population and the cultural- traditional ethos associated with agriculture, there is no saying what the use of transgenic crops in the consumption system might spell out in the near future. Leave alone that, there is no correct estimation now of what transgenic technology may do to land and land use pattern. Yet, the use of transgenic technology finds a strong mention in the Government's part in agriculture in the NAPCC. This in itself suggests a very primitive and immature decision on the part of the government which was not properly thought through.

Secondly, we need to consider the continuum of possibilities and problems presented by the Plan's emphasis on Conservation Agriculture. Conservation Agriculture, in short, suggests the preservation of the fertility of the soil without tiling. This process, by definition, plants most of the focus on the use of chemical fertilizers. What it fails to explain, however, is the question that, by suggesting the use of chemical fertilizers, how does one imply economic viability or technological efficiency? Any school child could infer

that chemicals are not only a bane for the environment but also cost a great deal more than traditional fertilizers. Now, considering the Government has a super wand to address these two issues, we need to ask if the change planned by conservation agriculture will come easily and what would be the cost, in time, for the small farmers. Will the small farmers be able to use it without hampering their livelihood or basic economics? Will the small farmer be able to hold on to traditional and cultural ethos of farming, feasible till now notwithstanding the Climate Change? If the answers to these questions are negative, then the emphasis on Conservation Agriculture in the NAPCC is based on false grounds. If the answers to these questions are positive and the beneficiaries of the step are the small farmers, then we may have a deal at our hands.

What we anticipate and what we expect must ultimately be the backbone of any policy that is in effect relative to our existence. Therefore, plans cannot be based on feasibility alone. If there is climate change, the farmer and his/ her land has to bear the consequences anyway. Take into consideration the very nature of Indian agriculture. Everybody knows that it is in function weather choosing. Rainfall change has had a huge impact on agricultural patterns and productions. Rainfall change and its effect on agriculture is a two faceted problem affecting rain fed agriculture. First, Climate Change has affected the time scale of rainfall. Earlier, the twentieth of June was more or less the exact date for the beginning of the rains. This schedule has been grossly tampered with and the ultimate effect is that it jeopardises the complete planning process of farming. There is not enough information available to the farmers on the schedule of rainfall (consider this in the light of the immense applause we have granted to India's technological advances) and this has increased the huge financial losses already incurred by the farmers.

Secondly there has been a reduction in the amount of rainfall. Earlier, it was the case that there would be rainfall for at least a hundred days, but now the number of days have fallen by at least 15%. Added to that we have to deal with unequal distribution of rainfall; in many cases we find huge rainfall over very short periods of time, which effectively wash out the planted crops. In the other scenario, we find long dry spells which in effect dry out the saplings. In any case, the crop cycle is misbalanced and the crop selection is altered as it is hugely setting based. Moreover, the crop variety has been dealt a heavy blow and it is the case that some varieties may be lost forever. Animal husbandry, so intimately related to agriculture, is at the receiving end of the extended problem. These are some of the vulnerabilities that must be address in the NAPCC and which pertain to the section of population most likely to be effected by Climate Change.

If these enumerate our basic problems, then we can locate our position in the international arena with expectation and ease. Turns out, it is not so easy after all. For starters, the UNFCC does not include agriculture in its scope of important sectors. But the problem is closer home than it appears. The government must realise that agriculture is not merely an occupation; it is not an economic sector but a survival sector. All the efforts must be directed towards this end. In spite of all these foreknowledge the government seems not prudent enough to push for agriculture at the global level. It must be the first effort of the government to solve the problems pertaining to its own agricultural sector. Even then, we find our government only eager to tow the lines of the developed countries and not root for agriculture. A 2 degree increase in temperature in the near future may result in catastrophic events. In any case, survey results have shown that this increase may go well beyond the nominal 2 degrees. It no longer remains a question of reduction of emission or incremental reduction of agricultural production. It goes way beyond that.

Some fundamental things, like the fundamental problems seem to be working against our position. Why is it that we have to adapt at the national level, which may to some extent be justified, but go for mitigation at the international level? Is there any pressing need to please the international community and let the people suffer? Moreover, the funds for adaptation are not easily available. Looking into this matter through the lens of corruption, it is better not to waste our time on fanciful pursuits: we would be hoping for

too much anyway. India is currently at a powerful level in the global scale but by not negotiating agriculture, it is letting the powerful position and the privilege go waste. This same scenario happened two decades earlier during the GATT and WTO negotiations but India was at a relatively weaker position then. But now, with all the global attention, power and 'growing economy', if the government is not willing to negotiate agriculture, it never will.

Having made the social assessment of the policy on agriculture, we need to posit our arguments in the light of the technicalities of the actual document. This would involve finding out certain gaps in the policy that would go forward in supporting the position held on agriculture. Dr. A.A Nambi of the M.S Swaminathan Research Foundation made a presentation on the National Mission on Sustainable Agriculture highlighting the numerous features of the Mission as well as their relative shortcomings. The Mission gives emphasis on the productivity of agriculture as well as the quality of the products with all associated link to land use, water use, fisheries and livestock. The Mission also considers problems like pest control, considering the fact that pests have a high adaptability rate to climate change. The Mission aims to attain food security and equitable access to food resources in the process of transforming agriculture into a climate resilient production system. In addition the Mission aims to correlate traditional knowledge, information technology, geospatial and biotechnology for developing effective technologies to meet the challenges of climate change. It also gives attention to the related service sectors that would facilitate the growth of agriculture as an industry. The National Agricultural Innovation Project (NAIP) and the National Initiative on Climate Resilient Agriculture (NICRA) among other schemes come under this Mission covered under a massive budgetary allocation of 1,08,000 Crore Rupees.

As the reservations have been argued on the basis of logical evidence, the mission has also to offer some technical gaps; the foremost among them being uncertainties regarding the management of the programme. For starters, there is not adequate information and data regarding several aspects of the plan. Whereas the thrust should be on 'local food production for local consumption', the plan adopts a more pan India view. The scope should at least have been determined by the agro climatic zones. Moreover, as stressed earlier, the transgenic technology is still primitive to be applied on a large scale. In addition to the core sectors, associated sectors like delivery and storage and post harvest management have not been fully addressed. The key to such a system is the horizontal, farmer to farmer extension, which finds minimal attention. Though enough has been said about the need for cross linkages, the 'how' part is missing. Water, the most important prerequisite to agriculture, is entailed in a more complex mess. As part of National Water mission there is a proposal to optimize water use through market regulations, including pricing, "differential entitlement and pricing", which might in the long run lead to privatization of water resources and market friendly regulations on use of natural resources. In such a scenario, the chair of the small farmer will be floating on impoverishment, without legs.

### **The Green India Mission: Sowing red spots**

The forests present an interesting problem. How does one define a forest? A school kid's definition is probably the finest. But the government seems to think otherwise. If the Green India Mission is to be considered even at face value, one would find interesting new knowledge that would confuse the school kid and give any adult serious doubts about her/ his basic education. For starters, the Government considers plantations, like the rubber plantations in Tripura and the upcoming ones in Assam, as a part of the forests. There is a reason for this new corpus of enlightenment. No one has benefitted from the forests as much as the administration has, right from the start of systematic exploitation of forest resources in the times of the English and before that, for the pillars of the princes. Now there is the added pressure of reduction of emission, increasing forest cover and not to forget the "challenge of sustaining its rapid economic growth". We sincerely hope that the government does not offer lunar land to the indigenous inhabitants of the forest

in exchange of their birth right next.

The interesting problem set alone, we need to focus more critically on the Green India Mission, seen as an integral part of the NAPCC. By intention, the GIM suggests that the Mission aims at addressing climate change by: (a) enhancing carbon sinks in sustainably managed forests and other ecosystems; (b) enhancing the resilience and ability of vulnerable species/ecosystems to adapt to the changing climate; and (c) enabling adaptation of forest dependant local communities in the face of climatic variability. Further, the document makes four more interesting comments, (I) **Holistic view to “greening” (broader than plantations)**: The scope of greening will not be limited to just trees and plantations. Emphasis will be placed on restoration of ecosystems and habitat diversity; (II) **Integrated cross-sectoral approach to implementation**: The Mission would foster an integrated approach that treats forests and non forest public lands as well as private lands simultaneously, in project units/ sub-landscapes/sub-watersheds. Drivers of degradation e.g. firewood needs and livestock grazing will be addressed using inter sectoral convergence (e.g. livestock, forest, agriculture, rural development, energy etc.); (III) Gram Sabha and its various committees/groups including JFMCs, CFM groups, Van Panchayats, etc. would be strengthened as institutions of decentralized forest governance. Likewise, the Mission would support revamping/strengthening of the Forest Development Agencies and (IV) The Mission would set up a cell within Mission Directorate to coordinate REDD Plus activities in the country.

These might in fact sound to be positive developments. But there are deeper concerns that we must address. Souporno Lahiri of AID presented an interesting presentation that precisely addressed these salient features of the Mission and what we must expect from them. There are certain gaps in the formulation of the GIM. Before the formulation of the draft of the act, no public consultation was attempted by the government. The whole process, like many of the other missions of the NAPCC was a predominantly closed door process. By the time the draft was approved by the Cabinet in 2011, it had already been incorporated into India's REDD +. The REDD+ matter, for that purpose, presents another dimension of the problem altogether. To quote Ajay k. Jha of PAIRIVI, “It is alleged that more than 17% of CO2 emission comes due to deforestation and subsequent release of carbon. Quantum of CO2 emission is more than emission of transport all over the world and second only to industries.” The REDD program aims at providing recognition and financial assistance to developing nations to reduce deforestation with certain binding conditions, of course. Some countries, including India included the clause of “sustainable management of forests” and “enhancement of forest carbon stocks” to promote a forestation and re forestation in REDD and call it REDD +. The chief problem in this whole matrix is that it considers forests as economic resource alone and fails to address the identity and concerns of the original forest dwellers. This, in effect makes it valid to judge the whole process as very unfair.

One of the chief features of the Mission is to increase the density of forest cover in India by at least 10 million hectare in the next decade. This figure includes both forest and non forest areas. This aim, in fact, validates the commercial use forest and non forest areas in the pretext of a colour and may be considered as simply an excuse to hide deforestation. Just green cover over land does not make it a forest or increase the density of forest cover. There is much more to the forests than the revamping of a definition or making a plan. At some point of time the difference between a plantation and a natural forest will be lost while the Government gains accolades for increasing the green cover over the map of India. The REDD+ strategy and India's position on REDD is not much different from direct exploitation and forestry will remain an apology for not exploiting an available resource. The truth is, the forests of India and its people are at the mercy of the Indian Law while the Government is being rewarded financially for buttering the international community.

The point of democratic decentralisation is complex in its formation and implementation. Within the Forest Rights Act there is the provision for the Forest Management Committee, which has no legal

standing what so ever. Moreover, if there is community forest management there can be no space for Joint Management Committees. It is in fact, interfering in the democratic functioning of a local body. The provision in the act is a pretext to include private players and corporate to step in the management of the forest and pursue an agenda of profit alone. In addition, the step to create 'Youth Foresters' amongst the youth of the forest is a step further in creating divides amongst the original dwellers. It is highly likely that this step hides some ulterior political motive in the long run. It is conclusive that the FRA is, in effect, a condition of implementation of REDD to be proved to the global community.

The whole Mission is clouded in doubt. By its form, it has taken the approach of 'adaptation of landscape' and this is indeed sad, seen from the Indian cultural heritage. The Mission is talking of all kinds of restoration without any data or trend of history or practical feasibility. Sooner or later, by technical pretexts, forms of agriculture like shifting agriculture or jhoom may be hampered by the administration with regards to a plan, and not taking into consideration the livelihood of the people who depend on cultures like this. The resultant effect is that the forest dwellers are pushed further back as their land is captured for 'a-forestation'. The rest, we all know.

### **Water: The Coleridge Paradox**

In the formulation of a policy for the water resources, there is a perennial problem- the amount of uncertainty associated with water cycles, water use and water resources themselves. The point in focus is that India being a vast country with variable eco systems, it is problematic to map accurately all the data related to water. On the administrative front, the problem crops up with the poor knowledge base on water resources. There already are the natural water cycles and these cycles are being disturbed by the green house gas emissions. On top of that the science of relating emissions with water availability and demands is unsure of the future as it is anybody's guess what the future trajectory of the emissions will be. The availability of water in India is closely linked with the monsoons and it becomes difficult to predict how the monsoons will behave in different regions and under different emission rates. Some of the known impacts of climate change on water resources can be described broadly as the change in the patterns and onset of the monsoons. There is a chain of events linked directly to such changes, beginning with the rise in temperatures, the melting of the glaciers leading on to a rise in the sea level which itself comes with associated problems like submergence of landmass, displacement of people living near water bodies, coastal erosion, salinity ingress and mangroves destruction. Even the river flow patterns and spring discharges are changing. Groundwater, the lifeline of water use in India, is looking at a reduction in required levels as recharge rates are decreasing with the rapid increase in the demand for groundwater.

The National Water Mission has formulated a four faced strategy to deal manage the vulnerability of the water resources. First, it attempts to assess the impact of climate change and change accordingly the policies and practices related. Thirdly, it attempts the measures for mitigation and accordingly the measures for adaptation. What has happened in reality is that the NWM has ended up being a 'big ticket' solution for building large dams, big storages and interlinking rivers. Though the NWM refers to small 'stakeholders' and also testifies to processes of participation and inclusion etc, nothing of note has yet taken place. More than solutions, some aspects of the mission like the emphasis on big storages, regulation without rights based regime and desalinization have in fact posed more problems than answers. Groundwater, the lifeline for a majority of the Indian population as well as industry does not receive as much attention as it should have. Ironically over 85% of India's rural and about 55% of urban and industrial water supply comes from groundwater sources. As it stands, this dependence on ground water is liable to continue for a long time to come.

Since the NWM was drafted in February 2008, it took twenty six months to finally receive cabinet approval. The climate change issue had in fact come as an opportunity for the Government of India to



rework its existing strategies and policies based on past experience. The NWM could have worked to make the previous policies, plans and projects more participatory and transparent. The Mission could have had clauses for the protection of wetlands, water bodies and ground water reserves and could have associated with the agricultural policy to define new dimension of planning and action. Instead, the mission has concentrated wholly on hydro power projects and large storage facilities. This is both an over ambitious process and an unfruitful venture. This is not conjecture, analysis or activism speaking- this argument is supported by statistical data. An analysis of all the hydropower projects of India show that 89% of the projects generate at BELOW the design capacity; in fact 50% of the under-performing projects generate at below the 50% of design energy. The same is the case with big irrigation projects. The government has not learnt from past mistakes- over the period of 1991-92 to the period of 2008-09 it has invested 180000 crores on big irrigation projects, yet there is a decline of over 1.1 M ha in canal irrigated areas. In the same period the area irrigated by ground water has gone up from 24694 thousand Hectares to 38576 thousand Hectares. The comparison is clear and so is the failure of the NWM.

### **The National Solar Mission and Integrated Energy Policy**

The National Solar Mission, in its very sense admits that coal based power will remain the mainstay of India's power house till 2030. In contrast, solar power and its decentralized harnessing process provide for far better options. Even the present trend of energy consumption says that a large part of India still survive on traditional renewable energy sources (76% of the rural households use firewood and only about 15% rural households have access to LPG or kerosene). In such a case, the strong continuum with coal and the extensive centralized approach to harnessing solar energy and the large money matters associated with both is sure to raise some questioning eyebrows. Therefore, the issues like REDD+ already discussed in the part for the GIM may be seen as pretexts to the creation of large markets and displacing the forest dwellers. It can also be analysed as a present fact that the area in India which provides for the maximum resources for energy conversion are also the areas which have very less access to electricity. This is nothing but ironical and the government still thinks of exploiting these very people.

Most government policies and plans focus in centrality on electricity. But it must be noted that there is much more to the energy sector than just electricity. Proper attention must be given to the comprehensive energy sectors. It is generally proved that the poorer and less urbanised a community or society is, the less is the share of electricity in its energy basket, where energy forms less than 20% of our energy basket. The IEP is still gunning for coal, big hydel projects and nuclear projects which could have huge impacts on the people and the environment. It is a false assumption that the increase in electricity generation will automatically lead to the availability of electricity for all. This again is proved by statistics. In 1996 the installed electricity capacity was 81, 100 MW whereas 52% of the Indian population was without electricity. By 2011, the installed electric capacity had risen to 1, 70000 MW, but the percentage of people without electricity had fallen by only 11% to reach 41%. The more than two fold rise in the installed capacity is not reflected in the lowering of its efficient use. The poor people in the areas most endowed with resources are the most deprived lot and this call for the idea of equitable access and affordability- two core issues ignored by the NSM.

The Integrated Energy policy aims to deliver a growth of 8% through 2031 and this means that India's power generation would have to increase to 778095 MW and the pressure on the annual coal requirement would be 2040 mt. In compliment, the Jawaharlal Nehru National Solar Mission proposes grid connected solar power generation to 1000 MW by 2013 and plans to reach an ambitious figure of 10,000 MW by 2017. Even at this rate the share of solar power will be very small as predicted, till upto 2032 at least. Even supposing that this ambitious figure reaches any logical conclusion, the facts also have to be considered that solar power is comparatively expensive, solar power has a very low conversion efficiency

and grid losses are high in India. In such a case, considering the possibilities provided by solar power to ease the pressure on thermal power, the government should have taken a decentralised approach for tapping solar energy, but ironically only 10% of this energy is decentralised. The amount of investment that has gone into making an unrealistic project work at higher expenditure suggests either some corporate agenda or short sightedness on the part of the government.

The IEP can be seen to give preference over the JN- NSM and it makes the government's design on thermal, hydro and nuclear power quite clear. Comparing a few statistics, even if the full hydro electricity potential of India is realised, which would come to 1,50,000 MW, the contribution to the energy mix would be only 5-6%. Similarly, even if a 20-fold increase takes place in India's nuclear power capacity by 2031-32, the contribution of nuclear energy to India's energy mix is also, at best, expected to be 5-6%. By concentrating on grid based solar power the government seems to be talking a very ambitious step and increasing losses to the exchequer.

#### **CHAPTER 4: THE STATE ACTION PLANS ON CLIMATE CHANGE- A CRITIQUE**

The NAPCC, as adopted in June 2008, is expected to lead the way the formulation of the State Action plans on Climate Change. In the eight declared missions and the problems that persist with them, it can also be observed that there is a lack of inter ministerial coordination in the functioning of the NAPCC. In such a scenario, a similar lack of coordination can also be observed at the state levels. As of June 2010, two years after the implementation of the NAPCC, only six states (Delhi, Himachal Pradesh, Haryana, Uttarakhand, Chandigarh and Karnataka) had come up with the draft plans for the respective SAPs. It has already been observed that the NAPCC was constructed without any prior consultation from the Civil Society Organisations, but to its 'credit', the Central Government did organise a consultation workshop on 19th August 2010 for the benefit of the states to formulate their action plans. Ironically only 14 representatives from the states participated in the consultation and it was decided that the states would submit their action plans by 31st March 2011. As of July 2011, only 14 states have submitted their draft plans so far and the rest have asked for an extension of the deadline to 30th September 2011.

The states of Maharashtra, Bihar, Tamil Nadu, Kerala and Madhya Pradesh are some of the defaulters. Among the many reasons for not having submitted the SAPs, the states of Tamil Nadu and Kerala have claimed a change in the governments for the delay whereas in the case of other states there can be observed severe disagreement on the allocation of Central funds to support the implementation of the SAPs. There is a disparity of demands as it can be seen that the state of Bihar has asked for an implementation fund of Rs. 30 Lakh whereas West Bengal has asked for Rs.5 Crores. The government has already made clear that it would provide with an amount of Rs 10 lakh to each state to implement the plan. The case of Gujarat presents an altogether novel version of the story. The state has no draft action plan yet, but it has already sanctioned an amount of Rs.13, 000 Crore to a process of adaptation.

Continuing with the mystery of the NAPCC, the SAPs are also clouded in a series of uncanny happenings. Only some of the SAPs are available in the public domain for the access and study of concerned people and the process of the formulation of the SAPs have been highly secretive in each step. The SAPs of the states of Orissa, West Bengal, Karnataka, Uttarakhand, Delhi and Rajasthan are available in the public domain. In other states any attempts to lay hand on the plans have been largely unsuccessful. Talking of information, even the MoEF or the nodal departments in the states have no information regarding the process and timeline of the formation of the plans. Like the NAPCC, the consultation with experts, affected communities and Civil Society Organisations have not taken place. Where such consultations have taken place, they can be described only as token consultation. In this regard, Manipur did a Usian Bolt- the state government arranged for a consultation with the CSOs for half a day and still managed to form an SAP with will eight important thrust areas! Such speed is exemplary. That aside, the SAPs give no reference as to how and which recommendation have been considered and incorporated.

Most of the initial documents and drafts of the SAPs do not have targets, timelines, and financial allocations and do not prescribe the period of operation. An example in case is Rajasthan which has clearly stated that there are no physical and financial targets as the actions proposed in the SAP fall within two planning periods, namely the 11th and 12th plan. Karnataka's SAP only talks extensively about actions taken and proposed by various departments like the PWD, Housing and Urban Development etc, but do not provide any details on agriculture or related fields. It can be inferred from the available SAPs that the states seem to entrust a high caliber of importance and thrust on coal based power. In many cases the targeted power generation is much beyond the capacity or the necessity of the state. Most of the states propose to increase their power production by 10 times to 50 times depending mainly on fossil fuels. Take for example

Orissa, which will attempt to raise its power production from 3000 MW to 60,000 MW whereas the peak demand for power is not more than 4000 MW. The proposed 15 fold increase is liable to increase carbon emission by a similar rate, by almost 13 times. Similarly, Uttarakhand plans to increase its power production from 1600 MW to 80,000 MW and Madhya Pradesh from 5500 MW to 60,000 MW. In any case, this substantial increase in power production will have serious consequences on the environment.

Apart from power, water seems to be a main concern of the SAPs, but the approach has been largely negative. Most of the states like Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and Uttarakhand are still obsessed with the idea of river linkage which is both unrealistic and unnecessary considering there is an attempt to reduce pressure on the environment, not increase it by tampering with the environment's delicate balance. In Karnataka, the concerned department dealing with water issues is utterly clueless on the mission on water and has not taken any step to mention. Smaller states like Manipur are seriously considering exploration of ground water resources and it is no secret that there is an attempt to privatize the water resource. What implication this step has for the marginal people, everybody can imagine. Agriculture is another area where the SAPs need to work more. Even if most of the states recognize agriculture as a core area of importance, they have taken up policies which work in the reverse and may affect agriculture negatively and will also endanger food security. While Madhya Pradesh proposes a set of actions to improve agriculture including "modernization of agriculture: biotechnology, seed replacement increased use of fertilizers", Manipur's SAP talks about modern scientific agriculture without any prior attention to what this modern scientific technology looks like or where it is going to come from. West Bengal and Rajasthan propose "zero tillage agriculture" and Rajasthan includes "exploring carbon sequestration potential of carbon deficient soil" and "increased use of biotechnology". Orissa has also given extensive treatment to agriculture in the plan but interestingly, it has failed to allocate a single Rupee to agriculture!

Forestry, 'considered' extensively in the Green India Mission also finds regular mention in the SAPs, but here too, forestry is considered with the same apathy, disdain and complete inconsideration of the original forest dwellers or regard to the natural ecological balance. Himachal Pradesh, the first state to declare itself as a carbon neutral state has set up a Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) cell, followed by Orissa, Rajasthan, Manipur and Uttarakhand. These states, following CDM procedures plan afforestation and plantation in nongovernmental, community and private lands. Many states have also proposed to put up agro fuel plantations, with Karnataka planning to plant 1.5 crore saplings including bio diesel plants between 2010 and 2015. The implications of these steps on the original forest dwellers and the natural balance of the forests are at a great threat. If anything, these measures directly point towards the commercialization of the forests and also look forward to maximum exploitation of the forests in the pretext of increasing forest cover. In doing so, these measures of the SAPs are going to eat out the lives of the forest dwellers from the inside.

The SAPs, following the NAPCC do not talk at all about increasing access and equity in energy water or natural resources. They can also be seen as completely insensitive to gender concerns within the problems that have come up due to climate change. In proving a point of the concern for the people, these plans never for once mention the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Population (UNDRIP). Many of these states receive funds from international organizations like the World Bank, UNDP, GIZ etc and it can be formulated how these states plans are influenced by international climate change politics, led by the developed nations. The reality is that most of the SAPs formulated are actually plans without any mapping and vulnerability assessment of regions or sectors. Some of the states are talking about the LEED Design buildings and 'low carbon green expressways', despite having an equally effective GRIHA 4 Code. The bottom line is that the states do not have much vision in the missions on energy efficiency, industries, health, livelihoods and urban planning. In doing so, they have completely ignored the concerns of the people likely to suffer the most as a result of climate change.

## **CHAPTER 5: IMPLICATIONS OF CLIMATE CHANGE**

Before taking into account the implications of the climate crisis and the role of the NAPCC we need to take into account some perspectives that have emerged around the context of climate change. Arguments on a theoretical basis are any day the stepping stone of a deconstructive approach, but we need to consider scenarios as well implications of such serious matters.

Noted journalist Praful Bidwai, associated with climate change issues for a long time has expressed the fact that India is responsible for a large share of the emissions as well as falls under the most vulnerable category of nations to be affected by climate change. Most of this emission is contributed by the elite class with the expendables of industry and luxury. Whereas in contrast, just to posit some figures, we find acute lack of electricity in the villages, with only about 14% of all Indian villages with access to electricity. By definition, the government has absolute responsibility to look after this section of the people. Instead we find long measures of mitigation in the line of the developed nations which do not take into account the welfare of the village people. If at all any mitigation is required, it should be in the mitigation of luxury. The Government has to curb the consumption in luxury, mitigate the production of luxury goods and curb elite consumption.

GDP-ism seems to be the new religion of India. The very presumption that the NAPCC is not possible to implement without rapid growth is a corrupted idea. This, at any cost, does not provide any solution for poverty. In spite of all the planning and missions of the past six decades or more, all the problems of poverty persist. Even when the government endorses a figure of about 8% to be current GDP growth rate of the Indian economy, there is hardly any attention to the fact that in the last period of eight years, the employment growth rate has been only 8%. The figures presented do not actually translate into practical experience. If at all there is the requirement of adaptation, there should have been considerable investment in the same. Instead we find a falsehood of investment in the 2.4% of fund allocation to the MGNREGA, which is seen as an adaptation strategy. This is not justified. All the concerns are addressed to wealth creation and material welfare. Where the poor farmer stands is nobody's concern. The NAPCC, therefore, ends up conforming to the contemporary trend of growth with the tragic presence of a lot of holes in the plan itself.

Even the formulation of the Plan seems to be engulfed in sorts of farce. First of all, the mission would not have even existed had it not been for external pressure. Had the Northern block not pressurised the Indian Government, we would still be looking at nothing but the words National, Climate and Change. Couple that with the amount of secrecy bestowed to the plan in its articulation and the total lack of public consultation, and one has the perfect democratic plan for 1.2 billion people. Given that we have accepted the plan as a part of our obedience to our constitution, we can still take part in the fun. The website still says that the plan is the "final draft", when; in fact the Cabinet has already enforced it. The concerned departments are not even bothered to revise the documents or update their public portal. On top of that if we are expecting any critical evaluation or examination, we are fooling ourselves. Satires aside, consider the fact that there are only two women in the Prime Minister's committee on Climate Change. This happens at a time when we find women all over the world witnessing a great awakening and at the context where we do know that women are arguably the biggest sufferers of climate change. Apart from that there is only one representative from the Civil Society in a group where 25 of the 26 members are from in and around Delhi. Apparently, Rattan Tata is qualified to be the sole representative of the rest of India.

Professor Surjeet Singh of Rajasthan stressed that the policy makers tend to get carried away by things that that are happening internationally and therefore, in our policy making we find that concepts and

facts are held to be universally applicable. Instead, everybody associated with the 'people' of India realise that when it comes to our panorama, we need to be more specific and definite. Some of our problems come precisely from faults at the level of policy making. If this continues to be trend of governance, than we could be looking at a people's movement soon in the future. The solutions that are taking form are at the contractual basis only and this means that we are looking into a matrix of profit, private benefit and local deprivation. There is an evident gap in understanding as well as the initial data that comes in. In addition, there is the need to include the urban community too, which stands to suffer as much as the rural community. Women, equal part of the sufferers must be given a stronger position in these policies than is usually given.

Jai Sen, eminent activist has painted an even grimmer picture that is likely to happen if the present trend of events continues unchecked. Speaking strictly in historical terms, one of the finest things that have happened is that the number of people being involved with any event has increased drastically. The people are now seeing the change take place; it is a change that is neither linear nor predictable. The rate of migration has increased considerably in the last two decades and it has led to system of competition for resources that does not take into count themes like justice and rights of the indigenous people. An issue like Climate Change and the way that the government has been approaching it is not within the domain of the federal government. The issue must be addressed at the local level first and only then we can take an approach at the holistic national approach, not the centralised national approach.

At some point of time, we may even be looking at the collapse of the state as gradually the hold of the Central Government weakens over the states and the people as the corporate are beginning to strengthen their hold over all fields of economy and governance. Internationally this can be catastrophic and we must also consider the possibility of a nuclear war in the near future. The pursuit of oil and other related resource is not likely to be mitigated in the near future. What we see now in the business warfare among the corporate may as well be translated in to contemporary versions of competition between warlords. In such a scenario, the role of the Civil Society Organisations has become very complicated. Their role has so far been confined to social movements, but it is also true that social movements are the precursors to all political movements.

There are certain things that can be done to work against the dominating power structure. The possibility of lobbying against the power structure may be a slippery business. Instead we must look into the possibility of building other centres of power. The kind of lobbying that exists now works relatively better in the case of a leftist leaning government, but the scene now is such that we may even be looking at a power shift towards the right. In such cases, there can be no consensus of the steps to take, but it can definitely be assured that we build a people to people solidarity and also look forward to solidarity across borders.

The scenarios and the implications that we have discussed in this section are reflected back in the actual state response to the NAPCC. Of course, these are the initial times of the implementation of the plan, but the trend of events reported do not differ in term of contents and the level of suffering and crisis have an uncanny sense of commonality in cause- effect relationship. The only thing that seems to differ is the relative experience of the people which is expected considering the different ecological zones that the reports belong to. The report from Gujarat, posits a grim picture, mainly concerning the water resources of the state, impacting directly the agriculture and therefore the lifestyle of the people. Without the access to wells as a source of water, dew formation is the main source of moisture for agriculture in the region. A sharp decrease in the winter temperature has resulted in the lowering of the dew formation directly hitting the production of wheat and maize. There has also been a big increase of pests in the area.

Rainfall patterns in the state have changed, with fierce but short spats of rain or excessively long periods of rain. There has been a rise in summer temperatures and decrease in dairy products. Quite logically, large scale agricultural migration can be observed and this is changing the demographic as well as

the ecological profile of the area. In Orissa, things seem to be similar, with rainfall being the severely hit. Western Orissa faced severe drought after fifteen years and a massive population of the small farmers having to struggle to make ends meet. Added to this poignant situation, there are the MNCs eager to get their hands into the aluminium resources of the state. More than that, the MNCs have involved themselves in the politics of the state. The Government has talked of forest conservation, but the reverse seems to be happening.

Madhya Pradesh is looking into an alarming rate of ground water depletion. Water that was available at 30 to 40 feet has now dropped to about 500 feet. Decreasing forest cover and receding rain have resulted in reduction of food production and increase in diseases. Like the days of the old, the barter system formed a mainstay of the local economy which is now lost to the market system. This not just an economic fact to be stowed away in the 'loss' section; rather, it is the loss of a culture. The crisis has come to points where the farmers have lost confidence on NGOs also who try to promote organic farming. They have developed serious trust issues after being repeatedly betrayed by the administration. Milk that used to flow freely has attained a new avatar in the powdered form. The health issues of the people are an added sector of problems.

Rajasthan is suffering from the constant events of defence activities mainly in the northern parts. Constant exercises and tests have driven the wildlife from their habitats, spread pollution and also disturbed the natural serenity of the area. There is rain but it has no effect owing to the lack of vegetation. The region is expounded in the model of development which has drastically increased the price of land as well as decreased the land nominally earmarked for agriculture. The culmination is the decrease in the agricultural value of land. As a result there is widespread migration and cross migration, changing the demographic profile of the area. The Corporate Companies involved have dreams of oil, marble and cement and the Aravalli range is as good as lost. Without the hills, without vegetation and water the black buck population is sharply decreasing. In the southern parts of Rajasthan, there is widespread lignite mining. In addition there is no water management and total lack of attention concerning animal husbandry. The tall grasses that sustained the animals are long gone. In an arid region like Rajasthan, animal husbandry can prove to be a viable alternative to agriculture. Instead we can see that the population of sheep has decreased and Rajasthan, once a large exporter of wool has now to import wool from China and New Zealand. The development masks the destruction.

Another significant response is that the women of Rajasthan are significant sufferers with additional attributes of suffering. The women have to migrate now along with the men in the no crop season as there is dearth of alternative domestic sustainability. This sets off a series of interlinking problems, starting with health as the women have to sweat it out in manual labour. Nutrition or associated requirements take a serious beating and in the case of pregnancies, the situation does not change at all. We all have a general idea about how labour is treated in the corporate world and we can estimate the plight of these women forced to migrate due to climate change. At the time of crisis or migration, people usually leave their culture behind, but patriarchy is more than a culture- it is a parasitic leech. This means that women do not change their food habits with migration or climate change. They are usually the last to eat in the family and in cases of food shortage; women are left behind with empty plates.

The scene in Indore, Madhya Pradesh, is not very different. The ground water percolation has decreased to an alarming level which has affected much of the non irrigated agriculture. Urban heat is growing due to constructions at a rapid level. Diseases are on the rise on the same scale, with 2009 seeing a major outbreak of dengue. Earlier it was the case that the area would be prone to malarial infection for at least 3 months of the year, which by itself speaks for the apathy of the concerned departments; but now the period has increased by 3 to 6 months more.

Uttarakhand has also reported depletion of water in the hills and infrequent rains. Whereas rain water harvesting has been taken up as an adaptation process, no practical scheme has so far been adopted. The traditional variety of crops 'system' has been wrecked and now there is no balance or solution for the farmers. Agriculture is taking the path to the markets directly and in any case this means that the farmer has no hold over her/ his products. Uttarakhand was at a time renowned for its broad leafed trees that helped in the conservation of water, but these trees are slowly dying out. This has massive implications on the wildlife of the area and the animals have also been forced to migrate and this poses a serious threat to human habitation. In short, the forest based economy is completely on the path of destruction. Apart from all these problems, a new situation is threatening the agriculture of the state. A new kind of grass, locally known as BARASIN is on the warpath like a weed and capturing the lands. This grass has no use value what so ever and is also likely to destroy the fertility of the soil, apart from its foul smell.

Assam has popped up a unique situation. The annual flood in the state, though carrying devastating effects has also become a part of the culture of the people. But since the last ten years, the flood cycle has changed considerably with some years recording even two or more flash floods. This had impacted the agricultural output of the state as well as the economic liability of the people. On top of that, there is an absurd cycle of draught in the state and this fluctuation between flood and drought has bought the small farmer to the knees. Recorded surface temperature has also increased in the past ten years and combined with Assam's humidity, the heat is actually starting to kill people. The NGOs that have tried to mitigate the situation were not helped by the authorities and any amount of data collected from authentic studies (which are rare, too) were not put in the public domain and strict secrecy was maintained. The benchmarks set by the State Action Plan are rather too old. Apart from these, Assam has now to cope up with rubber plantations that have come up in the pretext of increasing forest cover according to the NAPCC.

In Manipur activists working on Climate Change actually had to take the help of the RTI act to get hold of the SAP. There, the authorities of the State Government associated with the plan did not know either the head or tail of the plan and when pressed, came up with a two page absurd bullet styled plan document. They had apparently held a one day (repeat- one day!!) meeting to formally discuss the eight issues to be included in the plan and so went the story of the after events. The State Government has committed a grave betrayal by granting control of the Reserved Forest areas to private companies. The irony is that more than 90% of the people of the state depend on these forests. On top of that there has been no clear communication on the rehabilitation or compensation packages all the while so far. Leave alone that, the forest department did not have any data on the land use of the state all the while they tried to eradicate Jhoom farming in the pretext of mitigation.



## **CHAPTER 6: POSITION OF INDIA IN INTERNATIONAL NEGOTIATIONS**

India's position before the summit in Copenhagen can be said to be based on principles alone. India basically looked to focus on multilateralism. In doing so, India followed the carbon budget approach with two main rules of engagement; first being the common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR) principle outlined by the UNFCCC which can generally be accepted as a point of demarcation of equality between developed and developing nations. Even the CBDR principle, as outlined by the UNFCCC is under threat in the global arena because of the disinterest and apathy shown by the developed countries that are in fact responsible for the maximum emissions. In such a case, why the Government of India seeks to follow it is surprising. Second, there is the per capita principle, which again is not justified as the per capita income of every Indian is much lower than the ones of the developed nations, considered comparatively and also by granting that the rate is rising in India. The strong emphasis that the government laid on the CBDR principle was supported widely in the UNFCCC combined with the argument supported by historical responsibility. In relation to such an approach in the international arena, there were not much domestic measures to compliment the international stand, except for some ad hoc measures on the energy sector and the forests. In all this time, climate was never a direct focus.

At this back drop, the declaration of the NAPCC on July 30<sup>th</sup> 2008 changed the way in which India's international position was analysed. It provided a basic and 'specific' framework that would seek to manage implications of Climate Change in the domestic sector as well as give importance to the national development strategy. It was also the valid signal that the global community was waiting for to understand that India comprehended its responsibility and committed to action and shedding the tag that India was a nation "hiding behind the poor". The world had ignored, or thought it too mundane to consider what went into the making of the NAPCC and what would be its implications on the poor farmers and the people who depended directly on natural resources for survival or sustaining a culture. The NAPCC, in that light, can be seen only as a document to garner international praise and stress some of the core intentions of the government driven by the corporate sector and not as an action plan that promises utmost loyalty to the people.

The run up to Copenhagen saw the re election of UPA- 2 and the appointment of Mr. Jairam Ramesh at the helm of the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF). This period also marked India's aggressive involvement in international negotiations and India's approach can be summed up in the following comment, "proactive and constructive engagement towards finding solutions in trade and climate change"- which would define both a responsibility and a strategy. At a meeting in La'Quila soon after, India volunteered to meet the goal of limiting the rise in temperature below 2 degree Celsius for the first time in the history of the negotiations. This signified that the government of India was not only taking up the issue seriously at the global level to support global expectations, but it also committing to serious domestic action. Further, the government declared in Copenhagen that it would reduce its emission intensity from the 2005 levels by 20- 25% till 2020. It also marked a shift in the policy by not seeking any foreign aid in implementing these policies. India was instrumental in the formation of the BASIC but other than that the Government had also managed to bring back USA and China, two of the largest emitters, and laid down the International Consultation and Analysis as opposed to the Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV).

With this approach and leading onto Cancun the Ministry of Environment and Forests proposed to expand the international Consultations and Analysis of the ICA, which aimed to facilitate the sharing of views and to increase the transparency of mitigation actions and their effects. This was supposed to be positive action on increasing global cooperation and people hoped that the core issues of the Indian panorama would come to

the fore. Instead Ramesh deviated from the official statement and said that, “all countries must take a legally binding commitment in an appropriate legal form”. This led to a general uproar in the assembly and later Ramesh had to withdraw his statement. Even before going into Cancun, the government had, on June 30<sup>th</sup> 2010, introduced a “Carbon Tax” on coal to fund clean energy. This tax would be levied at the rate of Rs. 50 (or \$1) per ton of coal produced domestically or imported. This was expected to enrich the state coffers by \$500 million in the financial year 2010-2011 and the money was expected to fund research and projects in clean energy technologies that could go on to help the mitigation process.

The fallout post Cancun had immense effects on India's position in the international negotiations. The MoEF had written to the Prime Minister seeking to abandon the Kyoto Protocol and the G-77 and move towards MRV and ICA had tarnished India's image among the developing countries. There has been widespread negative reaction among the countries of South East Asia and Africa against this move and has been seen as India abandoning the G-77. Moreover, as India is seen in the paradoxical light of being both a rising superpower with all the attributes of a developing country very vulnerable to climate change, the south block expects India to voice the concern of the affected people and not follow the line of the developed countries. A matter of concern for this reaction is also the fact that India's Aggressive role in international negotiations has not been accompanied by adequate and appropriate domestic actions.

Apart from all the action and reaction, there are serious doubts about India's International stand. One of the chief reservations is that it can be observed that the ability to take on political stand often does not translate into the ability to cope up with the ecological concern. Whether the voluntary targets adopted are too big or small, no estimate has yet been made of India's mitigation potential. Legal form for the AWGCL has been India's stand, but there is no legal obligation for mitigation. For the whole legal framework of the mitigation process to be implemented a proper technical framework is required, but the developed countries seem not to be interested in any such move. Further, there is a gap in the financial process as well. There are 40 members in the Transitional Committee for the Green Climate Fund but there is no concrete design on the framework of the fund as yet. India must push to set up such a framework. The legal architecture in the international level is another matter to be addressed. Since the Kyoto Protocol has no such measure, an alternate policy should be created with a proper legal architecture.

## **CHAPTER 7: CALL**

We the members of Beyond Copenhagen Coalition, an umbrella organization of more than 40 organizations and networks, civil society organizations, women's groups, agriculture workers unions, and individuals, having met at Delhi on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> November, 2011 in Roundtable on climate crisis and state response, and having discussed the current state of play at climate change negotiations, position of government of India in climate negotiations, priorities of developing countries and national priorities in climate stabilization, also having discussed National Action Plan on climate change (NAPCC) of government of India and State Action Plans of various states in India, and other policies aimed at combating climate change in the country; express serious concern on the lack of ambition and development in the climate change negotiations, and trend of shifting burden of both mitigation and adaptation on developing and poor countries who have least or no contribution in bringing climate crisis.

We also express serious concern on impacts of climate crisis and climate change response policies on poor communities, farmers and agricultural workers, indigenous populations, dalits, women, climate refugees and migrants in developing countries and South Asia in general and India in particular.

Noting significant climate change impact on agriculture and food security in the form of extreme variability and unpredictability in monsoon and weather pattern, increasing temperature and reduced precipitation, reduced number of rainy days and due formation, increasing costs of agriculture and livestock rearing, and reduced farm incomes, which have resulted in increased migration, distress sale of land and livestock, and increased agrarian distress and increased burden on women, recognizing that climate change policies must be based on the needs of rural poor communities and farmers in developing countries in South Asia, Africa and Latin America, and must meet the needs of small farmers, indigenous population, women, and climate refugees and victims.

Also recognizing that national climate change policies must not be influenced by the trajectory of imperfect rules and proposals advanced by developed countries, neo-liberal policies and corporate interests in climate change, emphasizing that agriculture, rural development, livelihood and food security must be the pivot of global response to climate change and national policies, as must recognize the multidimensional role that agriculture provides in developing countries in providing sustainable solutions to the multiple crises of economies, food, climate change and sustainable development that world is facing today.

Recalling that food security has a central role in the UNFCCC, which is to avoid dangerous climate change within a time frame sufficient...to ensure that food security is not threatened (Art.4), recalling that UNFCCC and Kyoto Protocol confirms the role of developed countries in bringing about the climate crisis by having "largest share of historical and current global emissions" and the duty that they owe to the developing and countries, LDCs and small island nations in collective task of climate stabilization, Also recalling that sustainable development will be achieved only to the extent of our having enabled the mother earth and nature to regain their regenerative capacity.

Recalling that IPCC and various other studies have identified India as one of the most vulnerable country, and South Asia to be severely affected by climate change impacts besides Sub Saharan Africa, and has projected a severe decline in agricultural and food production even to the extent of 40%, expressing serious concern that various scientific studies have projected an increase in temperature in the range of 3.5DC to 5DC unless the developed countries efforts are lifted to ambitious levels, and further that emission reduction pledges of Annex 1 countries are thoroughly inadequate to keep the rise in temperature below 2DC, Emphasizing that

annex 1 countries are trying to replace the science based, rules based and commitment based system of the Kyoto Protocol to pledge and review, which is completely not accountable and will result in further rise in emissions and global warming.

Also emphasizing the urgent need to inform climate change negotiations of the impacts taking place in developing countries, LDCs and small island nations, need for more participatory, transparent and accountable, just and fair process to address the crisis and need for a farmer, affected community and civil society based approach to climate negotiations, demand

## **1. On agriculture and climate change**

- 1.1 We demand that climate change negotiations, must pay due attention to the importance and multidimensional role of agriculture and must respect its linkages with livelihoods, food security, rural development, and equity, and treat agriculture as one of the central concerns in climate change negotiations.
- 1.2 The response policies should be designed in consultation with farmers, farmers organizations and affected farmers and must be responsive to the needs of small farmers in developing countries.
- 1.3 We strongly oppose the mitigation focus in agriculture and demand that negotiations must make a distinction between highly industrialized, mechanized, input intensive, and export oriented agriculture in developed countries and low input, low energy sustainable agriculture in developing countries
- 1.4 We also strongly oppose to use agriculture as a sink and undue emphasis on including soil carbon sequestration in approved mitigation technologies. We completely reject the technological fixes in agriculture those are being promoted by developed countries on the behest of agribusiness companies, which takes away the focus from source of greater emission in developed countries and puts undue burden of mitigation on developing countries and farmers. These methodologies will not only harm agriculture and farmers but also exacerbate the climate change.

## **2. On mitigation and emission reduction**

- 2.1 We demand that developed countries must adhere to their legally binding reduction commitments under the Kyoto Protocol and reduce their emission at source as per the demands of the science, acknowledge their historical role and undertake common but differentiated responsibility in mitigating climate change.
- 2.2 We also demand that Annex 1 countries as per the decision in Cancun must undertake second commitment period, and should not put any precondition to their going into second commitment period of the protocol.
- 2.3 We also reject the efforts of some developed countries to merge the two tracks of AWG LCA and WAG KP in the second commitment period in order to repudiate their binding commitments.
- 2.4 We also strongly demand that countries who decide not to go into second commitment period must have comparable reduction commitments.
- 2.5 We call upon the Annex 1 countries to address emission at source and at domestic level without having recourse to increased use of market based mechanisms. The market based mechanism should not be used to offset more than one-quarter of Annex 1 countries emissions.
- 2.6 We also call upon the developed countries to reform their highly industrialized and mechanized and high carbon footprint agriculture and agricultural subsidies. And we also demand an

immediate closure of loopholes in the LULUCF which they have been using to hide their agricultural emissions.

- 2.7 We demand that developed countries not to resort to unilateral trade measures such as Border adjustment tax, subsidies, carbon labeling requirements, environmental payments and subsidies, which have the potential of making exports and agricultural exports from developing countries less competitive.

### **3. On climate change adaptation**

- 3.1 We demand that developed countries to compensate developing countries for encroachment of their atmospheric space and current climate change impacts according to the principles of the CBDR laid down in the Protocol.
- 3.2 We emphasize that agricultural adaptation is the most important component in the adaptation and must be addressed forthwith through a variety of efforts including finance, technology, capacity building and research.
- 3.3 We call upon the Annex 1 countries to allocate at least 2.5% of their GNP for support to the costs of adaptation in developing countries and especially agricultural adaptation, which should be also supported through variety of other resources mainly through public sources.

### **4. On climate finance**

- 4.1 We demand that climate finance architecture should be transparent, accountable, and easily accessible. We also support the G-77 demand that it should not be administered by World Bank.
- 4.2 We also demand that climate finance should be provided by public sources rather than through market based mechanisms and finance should be in addition to overseas development assistance, and should be provided as a grant rather than as loan. We also regret that finance being made available through 2010-2012 has been largely repackaged ODA rather than new and additional funding.
- 4.3 We also reiterate that climate finance administration mechanisms must co opt representatives from farmers and affected communities, besides having equitable representation from all country groups.
- 4.4 The climate finance must be human rights based, country led and democratically owned.
- 4.5 We call on the GCF to support adaptation, mitigation and technology transfer and ask for a new fund in the agriculture sector to support adaptation.

### **5. On technology transfer**

- 5.1 We reiterate the urgent need to scale up existing technologies and facilitate expedited transfer and knowledge to help small farmers adapt to climate change. The knowledge created must make due appreciation of the knowledge of farming community and create a synergy between scientific and technical knowledge.
- 5.2 We also call upon for immediate and full assessment of technology by civil society and farmer led approaches to ensure that technologies developed and transferred are appropriate, based on the needs of small farmers, environmentally sound and financially viable.
- 5.3 We also demand that UNFCCC prevent all agribusiness companies from acquiring patent o f

climate resilient plant and seed varieties invented, demonstrated and used by farming and traditional communities for years. We also strongly demand that IPR regimes should be reformed to facilitate easy access of technology at reasonable costs for countries and communities in need.

**6. On compliance, enforcement and climate justice**

- 6.1 We reiterate that costs of inaction on climate stabilization is being borne by poor communities in developing countries, who have no contribution in climate crisis, the rising number of climate refugees and migrants and increasing extreme climatic events along with subtle and chronic impacts of climate change is leading to social conflicts, inequity and poverty.
- 6.2 We express serious concern at repudiation of legal commitments by developed countries, and lack of legal framework for enforcing compliance and institutional mechanism for addressing climate change impacts
- 6.3 We underline the need for judicial mechanism, besides finance and technology, accessible to communities and countries and having expertise and powers to appraise and take action against state and non-state parties for climate crimes
- 6.4 We also express serious concern that existing legal, judicial and quasi-judicial institutions including PCA, ICJ, DSB of the WTO, or the UNCLOS are either restricted by jurisdiction or by expertise to deal with issues related to environment and climate justice.
- 6.5 We demand an International Tribunal on Climate and Environmental Justice to strengthen environmental and climate justice laws, identify the countries and communities at risk, state and non-state parties in violation of climate justice principles, lay down rules of state and non-accountability and liability for climate change impacts, award compensation and sanctions to state and non-state actors.
- 6.6 We also take note of the express appreciation for the demand of International Environmental Courts raised by civil society organizations, judicial bodies , countries and demand for International climate justice Tribunal (by Peoples Conference on Climate Change and rights of the Mother earth, Bolivia), and call upon the UNFCCC to take immediate steps for prompt realization of this.

We express solidarity with farmers and civil society groups in South Asia, Sub Saharan Africa and Latin America and completely identify with their concerns with rise in temperature and its concomitant effects on agriculture. We call upon the developed countries to raise their level of ambitions at COP 17, to keep the rise in temperature below 2DC with the incremental goal of capping it 1.5DC. We also express our solidarity with the concerns raised by Peoples World Conference on Climate Change and Rights of the Mother Earth and express our confidence in the justice of nature and Mother earth.

## Partners in the Beyond Copenhagen Collective

Accion Fraterna, Andhra Pradesh  
Arthik Anusandhan Kendra, Uttar Pradesh  
ASHA, Madhya Pradesh  
Bej Bachao Andolan, Uttarakhand  
Bharat Jan Vigyana Jatta, Delhi  
CECOEDECON, Rajasthan  
Centre for Sustainable Agriculture, Andhra Pradesh  
Chhattisgarh Citizens' Initiative, Chhattisgarh  
Development Support Team, Maharashtra  
Forum for Biotechnology and Food Security, Delhi  
Gene Campaign, Delhi  
Gram Vikas Navyuvak Mandal Laporiya, Rajasthan  
Gramin Swabhiman Sansthan, Rajasthan  
Institute of Development Studies, Rajasthan  
Jagriti Seva Sanstha, Chhattisgarh  
Jamin Adhikar Aandolan, Maharashtra  
Jandesh, Uttarakhand  
Javahar Jyoti Bal Vikas Kendra, Bihar  
Kalptaru Vikas Samiti, Madhya Pradesh  
Kisan Sewa Samiti Chaksu and Phagi, Rajasthan  
Kisan Sewa Samiti Malpura, Rajasthan  
Kisan Sewa Samiti Newai, Rajasthan  
Kisan Sewa Samiti Shahbad, Rajasthan  
Mahila Sanchetna, Madhya  
Pradeshaldhari Research Action Group, Gujarat  
MANAVI, Jharkhand  
ODAF, Odisha  
OXFAM India, Delhi  
PAIRVI, Delhi  
Parhit Sansthan, Madhya Pradesh  
Parmarth Samaj Seva Sansthan, Uttar Pradesh  
Peoples Action for National Intergration, Uttar Pradesh  
Samarpan Jan Kalyan Samiti, Uttar Pradesh  
Rural Development Centre, Maharashtra  
Samarthan, Uttar Pradesh  
SANSAD, Delhi  
Satya Path, Bihar  
Seva Mandir, Rajasthan  
SADED, Delhi  
Social Koraput, Odisha  
SNEHA, Tamil Nadu  
Uttaranchal Development Institute, Uttarakhand  
Van Panchayat, Delhi  
Vasudev Kutumbhakam, Delhi  
Vidhyasagar Samajik Suraksha Seva Evam Shodh Sansthan, Bihar  
Vikas Anusandhan Avam Shekshanik Pragati Sansthan, Madhya Pradesh  
Wada Na Todo Abhiyan, Delhi  
YUVA- Rural, Maharashtra



## BEYOND COPENHEGEN

**Beyond Copenhagen Collective (BCPH)** is a coalition of more than 40 organizations and networks working on the issues of sustainable development, environment, sustainable agriculture etc. We have been extensively engaged with India's response to Climate Crisis, Domestic Action and its position in International negotiation process under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. We have tried to attract global attention on due consideration of agriculture and food security in climate change negotiations, state responsibility and accountability for climate justice.

Organizations and networks part of the BCPH collective bring with them varying experiences and expertise, ranging from grassroots works with farmers and peasant communities to engaging with policy makers and the polity through policy analysis, advocacy and lobbying, engaging with the media through their sensitization and orientation; and undertaking documentation and scientific exploration in climate change, sustainable agriculture and food security. The focus of our work emanates from the understanding that there is an urgency to work in collaborative action on climate change and climate justice issues. The collective proposes to address these issues through a variety of actions at local, state/provincial, national and global level.

Secretariat: CECOEDECON

SWARAJ, F 159-160, Industrial & Institutional Area,

Sitapura, Jaipur-302022 (Raj.), India

Ph: +91-141-2771488/2770812/3094828 | Fax: +91-140-2770330

E-mail: [cecoededon@gmail.com](mailto:cecoededon@gmail.com) | Website: [www.cecoedecon.org](http://www.cecoedecon.org)