

The Consultation Process & Outcome by Walter Mendoza (INECC Consultation 13th-15th November, 2011)

There are two things that we need to take forward very seriously. First: we have been working on bringing the Voices of the Vulnerable to the fore for some time. The eco-region based vulnerability studies, though uneven, are part of that effort. They are not uneven in the sense of inadequate. They were pilot studies, and not very academic, complete or well rounded. While the mountain study gave us a macro perspective, we had micro studies of three hamlets in forests, and three in slums in urban areas.

Each of the studies gave pointers to understand the overall situation and understanding of vulnerability. So while we generally paid a lot of attention to livelihoods, the Western Himalayan study brought in the aspect of disaster.

As a result of these studies, we can follow up with the final study to include indicators highlighted in other studies like health, disaster, living conditions.

The other important effort in INECC has been to reclaim development in the climate change debate. This is not just at the COPs or international level, but also internally within the country and in our own eco-regions.

At the International level, we find that organizations like CAN (Willy has included WWF in this category), seem to adopt unacceptable view/top-down view of emissions reduction. Our attempt is to bring peoples voices, and the voice of the vulnerable – which entails bringing issues of equity into the centre stage of negotiations. In this Dr Raghunandan's approach of the right to a minimum development threshold coupled with the distribution of carbon space, is what we can pursue. It is not just a question of per capita emissions, or equity in a purely notional sense, but the right to actual development – dignity, well being and livelihood, that has to be brought into the debate of carbon emissions and climate crisis. Any centralized system that looks mainly at technology and science, will not solve the crisis, unless it is well directed to attaining the minimum development threshold for all. Thus the focus of the low carbon path must be on equity in a very practical and living sense.

The Plans for these should not be done in haste, as has been the case of the National Action Plan and now even the state action plans. We must slow down the process to include a bottom up to ensure that we bring in the concerns voices and choices of the vulnerable.

On REDD+, INECC would take in Prof Lele's view that in any case the emissions saved is only marginal to the process, and therefore one must be wary of the industrial models of reforestation being pushed using Climate Change, and develop such programmes under previous objectives of sustainability, forest people's rights, ecological balance etc.

Thus the effort of INECC would be to reclaim equitable and sustainable development in climate change debate, and these have been incorporated in INECC's programme plans for the next three years.