

North / South Divide in Climate Change

–

Indian Insights

Antto Vihma

Finland Futures Research Centre

“We do not wish to impoverish the environment any further and yet we cannot for a moment forget the grim poverty of large numbers of people. Are not poverty and need the greatest polluters?”

- PM Indira Gandhi, Stockholm 1972

*“Mitigation commitments?
- Not now, not ever!”*

Prodipto Ghosh, delegate, member of PM's
council on climate change, 2008

”India has acquired an ugly reputation on the global front against climate change [...] among big economies perhaps only America and Russia are considered more obdurate.”

The Economist, 5/6/2008

“Indian climate policy is a salutary case study in the failure to build North/South trust”

Navroz Dubash, associate professor, 2009

Indian development agenda

- 2009-2032 projected economic growth 8% (TERI, Planning Commission) or 6,3% (IEA)
- 8% GDP growth requires 3 – 4 times the energy production of 2003 in 2032
- Human Development Index ranking: 128
 - 27,5% below US\$1/day
 - 76% below US\$2/day
- 44% without electricity access
- Considerable differences to e.g. China and South Africa on all indicators

The Indian Position

- Framing: development vs. the environment
 - Indira Gandhi 1972 in Stockholm
 - Development is the first and overriding priority of developing country parties (Article 4.7 of the UNFCCC)
- Developed countries must take the lead and recognise their responsibility
 - Reduce more than 20-40% of 1990 emissions before 2020
- New and additional financing
 - CDM, public funds, technology transfer
- Defensive and legalistic interpretations of mandates, slowing down of changes in status quo
 - MoEF and MEA independency in policy making
 - Chandrashekar Dasgupta ja Prodipto Ghosh

Key argumentation

- **Historic responsibility of the North**
 - 1992 UNFCCC: historic emissions in the preamble
 - Case India: 5,5 % of global GHG emissions, ~2% historically
- **Per Capita emissions**
 - US 22,5; OECD 14,1; China 5,5; India 1,7 (tCO₂e)
- **“Common but Differentiated Responsibilities”**
 - 1990-1992: “Common responsibility” vs “Major responsibility”
 - 1992 UNFCCC: semantic compromise

Indian Perspective on Current Debate

- Major developing countries annoyed over being labelled "Major Emitters"
 - Cumulative emissions
 - Per Capita emissions
- Developed countries have not "taken the lead"
 - US emissions are far from 1990, returning maybe by 2016?
 - Transition economies excluded, developed world has increased its emissions 11% between 1990-2005
 - Technology transfer?
- The unfinished development agenda is not sufficiently understood
 - "China and India", "Chindia", "Emerging economies"...

Indian (elite) perspectives

- **Hard liners – it is our turn now!**
 - Climate governance is a geopolitical threat from the North
 - We must slow down and stonewall all Southern action
- **Realists – developing countries should act nationally**
 - Developing countries face no international requirements, but national interest is to favor development with climate co-benefits
- **Internationalists – cease the moment!**
 - Not only CBDR, but CBDR + effectiveness
 - Domestic actions and international process are connected
 - South should show leadership (South Africa)

Indian (elite) perspectives

- Increased public deliberation – a healthy debate since 2007
- CDM has influenced the views of business actors – language of opportunities is also present
- Governance of international funds is important
 - Deep mistrust towards GEF and WB
- Sectoral cooperation? Linking unilateral action to international process?
 - BAP 1 (b) ii; the MRV of the NAMAs

Thank you

`antto.vihma@tse.fi`