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The phenomenon of climate change and global warming now are mainstream issues of international political agenda and programs. It has become clear that the phenomenon is not merely a technical or natural phenomenon, but politico-economic issue with socio-political implications at all levels of global to local governance. Indeed some may argue that few long term problems among international affairs are more important than this one. However, erratic climatic patterns as are being realized through out the world have started impacting to myriad aspects of socio-economic to politico-environmental dimensions of common man. As a consequence apart from the Govts. of world nations common people too, are feeling deep involvement towards causes and remedial measures to check the current trends of global warming. Some questions arising to resolve the issue are: How has the discussion on climate change affected common man? How does this problem and other environmental issues more generally, challenge the international relation theory? How does the international climate politics influence domestic politics and development planning's and vice versa? What are the legal, ethical and political implications of the uneven distribution of the impacts of climate change? Negotiations to date including the most recent one held at Copenhagen accord have revealed serious divisions on interests among the stake holders of which those dividing North & South and developed, developing and underdeveloped countries are quite conspicuous. One reason to delay follow up of hard decisions, is because no country head has a will power to impose restrictions to curb inflated energy consumption of its people during their stewardship, for political reason. It is suggested that the best prospects for building an effective long term regime can arise from seeking to develop a non-traditional alliances across the north-south divide, so as to form a central coalition that more reluctant states will have to accept, ultimately. This brief review presents just a glimpse of the existing international projections towards the phenomenon of global warming, more than the text one has to read between the lines, understand and interpret.

The problem of global warming is quite imminent now. The summers of 2010 have further taken us to believe that the phenomenon of climate change is hand in gloves with global warming. To begin with it will be interesting to quote few lines from the article entitled, "Listening to the voice of Humanity" authored by Steven Kull1, (Director of the Program on International Policy Attitudes and World Public Opinion.org), “When we look at world conditions and project current trends into the future we see much that is disturbing--environmental degradation, the proliferation of nuclear weapons, persisting poverty and injustice, violent conflict, the fiscal collapse of democratic governments. The institutions that have the greatest power--nation states, corporations, and organized interest groups--seem locked in patterns of self-interested behavior such that the necessary changes are hard to imagine1.

These lines remind us of our ancient Indian philosophy as preached in our Vedas (the most ancient literature of human race over this earth planet) of living in harmony with every biotic and abiotic constituent of our nature, following the principle of take as much minimum from the nature, as much is essential for living and do not go for hoarding. But on account of ever growing human population and its multiplying multidimensional requirements to make his life unnaturally comfortable, we have over exploited earth resources. Our global climate is far greater disrupted and erratic, than it ever happened in past ten thousand years of earth history. No doubt there occur Ice ages, but never so sooner have such rapid rise in earth atmosphere have taken place, which ultimately leads to an ice age. Believing our scientist the rate of rise in global earth temperature and concentration of carbon-di-oxide are critically higher than ever before. The main cause of global warming are attributed to the over use of non renewable energy resources on one hand and fast fall in vegetative cover of myriad forms from the earth surface. The rise in atmospheric temperature has found a great supporter in equally faster pace of global industrialization.
We must not forget that a tiny item like our mobile phone to a giant object like an airplane are heat producing from their formation to use level. In this article a random review has been made of some political interceptions of importance in combating the global warming, as spread in a number of news media and other publications, in print and data in electronic form of data\textsuperscript{1-15}.

**Political Background of Global Warming and Climate Change:**

The politics of global warming have involved policy decisions, legislation, and political debate over the science and response to global warming. The political struggle over global warming has involved various governmental bodies, special-interest groups, and scientific organizations \textsuperscript{-2}. As a matter of fact every country desires to follow with commitments to save world from the process of global warming or the climate change. But another truth is that every country also wants to protect its own interest. Specially the rich developed countries like USA does not desire to put any sort of check or control on reducing the carbon emission and utilizing petro-fuels, in excess. Most the rich and developed countries have become so used to their life styles that they shiver on the name of control's over the use of extra energy/fuels utilities. They feel it suffocating to lessen their fuel budget and more than that it appears that reduction in carbon emission is like curbing their self esteem.

I quote here what Anushka Sharma\textsuperscript{3}, (policy editor of The Observer) has said in a recent publication, that how the Tories of Britain have reacted about policies on global warming:

"Most Conservative MPs, including at least six members of the shadow cabinet, are sceptical about their party's continued focus on climate change policies, it has been claimed. The recent furor around "Climate gate" has hardened the views of Tory MPs, many of whom were already unconvinced by the scientific consensus, and has led to increasing calls for the issue to be pushed down the priority list. Tim Montgomerie, founder and editor of the Conservative Home website, said climate change had the potential to be as divisive for the party as Europe once was. "You have got 80% or 90% of the party just not signed up to this. No one minded at the beginning, but people are starting to realize this could be quite expensive, so opinion is hardening."

Montgomerie said that while some MPs simply did not believe the science, others felt it would harm the economy too much to focus on policies to reduce emissions. "Some think, 'What is the point in taking all these decisions if India and China and others row ahead?' Nigel Lawson makes the point that 30% of Indian people have no electricity and the Indian government has to give that to them. The cheapest way to do that is fossil fuels."

Lord Lawson chairs the Global Warming Policy Foundation, a think tank that claims the climate debate has been distorted by exaggeration. Benny Peiser, director of the foundation, debates the issue with the Observer's science editor, Robin McKie. A recent BBC poll found that 25% of people did not think global warming was happening compared with 15% in November - and a similar trend is taking place among Conservative MPs. "You scratch almost any backbencher and you find they are sceptical and I know of six shadow cabinet ministers who are sceptical about the economic consequences of a low-carbon policy," said Montgomerie. He said the leadership was "recalibrating" its message.

"Nick Herbert and Greg Clark - the shadow environment and energy secretaries - argued that green policies could save money and improve Britain's energy security. Clark rejected the notion that it was a change in direction. "There is a real threat to our energy security and there is a risk of a black-out," he said. Green policies that developed alternatives to fossil fuels and persuaded people to reduce energy consumption were "win-win" because they saved money, provided energy security and reduced carbon emissions. One MP said the party was much
more likely to respond to economic arguments: "There is a large group in the party - probably the majority - who are sceptical. That ranges from those who don't believe any of it to those that think the climate is changing but are not sure how much it is down to human beings, to those who accept the science but think we could act, but then in one year China and India could wipe out that effort. "There are fears that the issue could flare up after the election if the Conservatives win power - particularly around plans for a third runway at Heathrow, which the party has said it will scrap. Tim Yeo, the Tory MP who chairs the environmental audit select committee, said the shift had come about because of scientific mistakes, and a "backwash" from Copenhagen. "That has created a context in which it is easy for sceptics to build momentum and that is influencing a good number of politicians. "What people have lost sight of is that serious climate-change scientists have always argued that the climate is changing gradually, that temperatures are rising and that one factor - and probably the main one - is the increase in greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. But they have never argued that it is easy to know how quickly that is happening."

In the 1980s, Margaret Thatcher was instrumental in increasing the United Kingdom's electricity generation from North Sea gas and reducing generation from coal. The UK government-commissioned Stern Review into the economic effects of climate change was published in October 2006. Tony Blair's assessment was that it showed that scientific evidence of global warming was "overwhelming" and its consequences "disastrous". He added, "We can't wait the five years it took to negotiate Kyoto - we simply don't have the time. We accept we have to go further [than Kyoto]." Britain's government launched an official calculator in June, 2007 that enables every person in the country to work out how much carbon dioxide they produce and how to cut it.. Tory group sets out plans for Green Revolution.

On the other hand though today, USA is blaming a lot to India and China for contributing to global warming, as majors, ignoring views expressed in a column in Wikipedia, about American view of the problem, "The politics of global warming is played out at a state and federal level in the United States (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Politics of global warming (United States)."

However, the first politician putting Global Warming on the political agenda was perhaps Richard Nixon in 1969. Nixon wanted environmental topics (as acid rain and greenhouse effect) to be treated by a third and civil pillar of NATO. The reaction of the NATO allies was lukewarm but the initiative gained impact in the civil field. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Pioneer of the political treatment of the Greenhouse Effect 1969, on Initiative of US President and NATO tried to establish a third civil column and planned to establish itself as a hub of research and initiatives in the civil region, especially on environmental topics. The initiative was seen as an American attempt to regain international terrain after the lost Vietnam War. Now see, weither Nixon, really has such a deep rooted prospectus or not or is merely a political conjecture, remains an analytical aspects, by political pandits. The topics and the internal coordination and preparation effort however gained momentum in civil conferences and institutions in Germany and beyond during the Brandt government. It can be said an irony of events that the politics of global warming was raised to a considerably higher profile when former Vice President Al Gore was given an Academy Award for his documentary film, an inconvenient truth. Gore has made a considerable number of public appearances to promote the film and the subject-matter within it.

Now see here that what a small country like Bolevia has to demonstrate about the issue, when it held a sort of international event on the Global warming:

The World People's Conference on Climate Change and the Rights of Mother Earth kicked off Tuesday 20th April,
2010, with an opening ceremony in Tiquipaya, Bolivia, as reported by Reuters on 21st April, 2010. Over 10,000 people from about 130 countries attended the actual conference in Cochabamba, Bolivia. Indigenous leaders, activists and scientists were present for the opening ceremony, where Bolivian President Evo Morales made opening remarks that condemned the failed UN climate talks. "The climate crisis is not about which civilization is right and which civilization is wrong," said Angelica Navarro, Bolivia's chief climate negotiator, after Copenhagen meet, "It's about who has real solutions."

"We are gathered here because the so-called developed countries didn't meet their obligation of establishing substantial commitments to cutting greenhouse gas emissions in Copenhagen," Morales said. "If those countries had respected the Kyoto Protocol and had agreed to substantially reduce the emissions inside their borders, this conference wouldn't be necessary." [ Ref.: Face book: stumble reddit del.ico.us ]

The Kyoto Protocol: The farmers Kyoto Protocol (KP) was resolved in Feb. 2005. In most English-speaking countries, support for action to mitigate global warming, such as ratification and implementation of the Kyoto Protocol has been strong on the political left. In Germany Angela Merkel, then secretary of the environment during the conservative Helmut Kohl government, lead the German Kyoto Delegation and had a substantial role in making the Kyoto agreement possible. In December 2007, Kevin Rudd's first act as prime minister of Australia was to ratify the Kyoto Protocol in time for the Kyoto Protocol talks in Bali. In Canada, the Liberal Party government ratified Kyoto. In New Zealand, the Labour government of Helen Clark ratified Kyoto.

In the United Kingdom, the Labour Party ratified Kyoto In the United States, Bill Clinton's Administration signed Kyoto and Democrats have proposed and supported a number of bills to mitigate emissions. Although Kyoto is signed, the Democratic Congress refuses to take a vote on it and thus the United States is not bound to the treaty. Barack Obama supports passage of the American Clean Energy and Security Act to establish a United States Carbon Cap and Trade Program. "We are not going to ratify the Kyoto Protocol. That is out," said US climate negotiator Jonathan Pershing at the 2009 Bangkok Climate Change Talks. Russia signed the Kyoto Protocol in November 2004, after a deal with the European Union over WTO membership. Russia's ratification completed the requirements of the treaty to come into force, based on nations totaling 55% of world greenhouse gas emissions.

In some countries the political right are fighting on a platform of taking tough action against global warming, while in others the political right either dispute the scientific consensus on global warming or oppose action to mitigate global warming, instead favoring adaption. All European countries have ratified the Kyoto Protocol, and all have supported strong reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. In the United States, a February 2007 survey found that 95% of the 41 Congressional Democrats surveyed agreed "it's been proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the Earth is warming because of man-made problems" while only 13% of the 31 Republicans surveyed agreed.

Global warming skepticism has been promoted by newspapers associated with the right such as The Australian, the Daily Telegraph in the United Kingdom and the National Post in Canada. Asia and Oceania. Australia officially ratified the Kyoto Protocol, after the new Labor government came into power on December 3, 2007. The previous Coalition government had long objected to ratifying the treaty, arguing it would unduly impact on Australian jobs, especially when countries such as China, India and the U.S. were not party to it. Japan is preparing to force industry to make big cuts in greenhouse gases, taking the lead in a country struggling to meet its Kyoto Protocol obligations.
Canada’s Liberal Government during the 1990s had agreed to Kyoto but oversaw the increase of greenhouse gas emissions during their terms in office and did little to meet Kyoto’s targets. Canada’s current Conservative Government has claimed that, due to increased emissions since 1990, it is realistically impossible to meet their Kyoto targets and attempting to do so would be disastrous for the Canadian economy. Prime Minister Stephen Harper came under fire for being adamant in leaving Kyoto and working on a different climate plan. Consequently, this issue has become something of an Achilles Heel for the Government in recent months. The current Liberal Party has been quick in their condemnation of the Government but has also been accused of using Global Warming for political purposes as seen in the naming of leader Stéphane Dion’s dog ‘Kyoto’.

However, the fact remains that Since the phenomenon of global warming was recognized about three decades back, most of the developed countries have changed their opinion many times. As we get through the news papers or other news media, countries like USA, Britain, Russia, Germany, Canada, Australia and Japan have never been consistent in their stand in favour of the policy drafts at various international summits or conferences held to combat the global warming. We have seen what happened to Kyoto protocol or in the most recent Copenhagen summit of world leaders, despite best efforts of most of the world leaders, to look idealist and eco-environment friendly.

The Religious Groups: It will be interesting to cite that Christian environmental groups are also increasingly active on climate change, such as The Evangelical Climate Initiative. A core group of influential evangelical leaders has put its considerable political power behind the cause that has barely registered on the evangelical agenda, fighting global warming. They say, “These church leaders, scientists, writers and heads of international aid agencies argue that global warming is an urgent threat, a cause of poverty and a Christian issue because the Bible mandates stewardship of God’s creation.”13 “People on all sides of the debate say that if evangelical leaders take a stand, they could change the political dynamics on global warming. The Rev. Ted Haggard, president of the National Association of Evangelicals, an umbrella group of 51 church denominations, said he had become passionate about global warming because of his experience scuba diving and observing the effects of rising ocean temperatures and pollution on coral reefs. “The question is, Will evangelicals make a difference, and the answer is, The Senate thinks so,” Mr. Haggard said. “We do represent 30 million people, and we can mobilize them if we have to, because clean air, pure water and adequate resources are crucial to public health and civic order,” the statement said, “government has an obligation to protect its citizens from the effects of environmental degradation.” It would be informative to mention that what Vatican has to say on the issue, “ Pope Benedict XVI told up to half a million people, over a hillside near the Adriatic city of Loreto on the day Catholic Church marks its annual Save Creation Day, that world leaders must make courageous decisions to save the planet “before it is too late”. US Catholic Bishops also have recognized the urgency of addressing global warming in a 2001 statement from the US Congress of Catholic Bishops Global Climate Change: A Plea for Dialogue, Prudence, and the Common Good.

The Corporates: The fact is well known reality that the politics of global warming have involved corporate lobbying, funding of special interest groups and public relations campaigns by the oil and coal industries which have affected policy decisions and legislation worldwide. In turn this has caused political debate over the science of and response to global warming. Similarly it will be interesting to know what certain forum of Energy Industries have to say about the problem: “One of the biggest opponents of action on global warming has been the fossil fuels energy industry, and particularly the oil industry, such as Exxon Mobil, which regularly publishes papers
minimizing the threat of global warming. In 1998, the company started providing financial support to organizations and individuals who disagreed with the scientific consensus that human activities were contributing to climate change. One of the groups that received funds from the company was the Competitive Enterprise Institute. Exxon Mobil also helped create the "Global Climate Science Team" whose members were active climate contrarians. According to a study by the Union of Concerned Scientists, between 1998 and 2005, Exxon Mobil dispersed roughly $16 million to organizations that were challenging the scientific consensus view. After heavy criticism from the press and environmental groups in late 2006 and early 2007, Exxon Mobil began distancing itself from these organizations.

In 2005, the oil giant opposed a shareholders' resolution to explain the science behind its denial of global warming. In recent years, other companies have increasingly come to accept the existence and consequences of global warming; for example, the Chairman of BP, John Browne, declared a need for action in 2002. Lord Oxburgh, non-executive chairman of Shell, said in a speech at the 2005 Hay-on-Wye Festival: "We have 45 years, and if we start now, not in 10 or 15 years' time, we have a chance of hitting those targets. But we've got to start now. We have no time to lose."

One sector of the energy industry that has no problem with the greenhouse gas arguments is the nuclear industry. Margaret Thatcher was one of the first major political figures to suggest that the nuclear power was a "green" solution. This was largely regarded with derision at the time but it is the ultimate goal of Tony Blair's solution to tomorrow's energy needs and probably explains his enthusiasm for CO2 emission controls.

Indeed as many countries move towards legally binding engagements to Kyoto targets, including fines for failing to achieve them, many governments may find this a convenient excuse for otherwise unpopular expansions of their nuclear programs.

As pointed out on Counter Punch the nuclear power industry is not slow to present itself as the "green" solution: only realistic way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels in the next ten years is to bring online at least an additional 50 reactors. "Nuclear energy has been the largest single contributor to reduced air pollution in the world over the past 20 years", the NEI's Kyoto global warming book boasts.

Nuclear power produces fewer CO2 emissions than fossil fuel plants; the exact level remains somewhat controversial; Greenpeace assert that nuclear power produces about one third of the CO2 emissions as equivalent fossil fuels energy over the lifetime of an installation.

Environmental groups, Media & Academia: The fact that the credit to bring the cause of the mitigation of global warming has been brought to central platform of international political wisdom goes to NGOs and media, all over the world. For reference, it will be worth recalling that millions of of protesters all over the world marched on the international day of action on December 3, 2005, which coincided with the first meeting of the Parties in Montreal. The planned demonstrations were endorsed by the Assembly of Movements of the World Social Forum. In New Zealand, the Climaction Coalition has blockaded the main thoroughfares of Auckland City on two occasions, calling for Free and Frequent Public Transport to reduce the city's dependency on cars. They argue that such a measure would also help reduce global warming if repeated in other cities throughout the world.

There are a large number of academic contributions specifically to the politics of global warming. For example G8 science academies' statements, Monograph by Dessler and Parson entitled "The Science and
Politics of Global Climate Change: a Guide to the Debate, emphasizing the complexity of the issue. Nobel Prize winner Elinor Ostrom cautions against using single governmental units at the global level to coordinate work against global warming. Partly, this is due to the complexity of such top-level negotiations, and partly it is due to the diversity of actors that would have to be involved. Her proposal is that of a polycentric approach, where key management decisions should be made as close to the scene of events and the actors involved as possible.

Important events on the International horizon of Global Warming, since 1972’s UN conference of Human Environment:

1972 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment: leading role of Nobel Prize winner Willy Brandt and Olof Palme, Germany saw enhanced international research cooperation on the Greenhouse topic as necessary
1978 Brandt Report, the greenhouse effect dealt with in the energy section
1979: First World Climate Conference
1987: Brundtland Report
1987: Montreal Protocol on restricting ozone layer-damaging CFCs demonstrates the possibility of coordinated international action on global environmental issues
1988: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change set up to coordinate scientific research, by two United Nations organizations, the World Meteorological Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to assess the “risk of human-induced climate change”.
1996: European Union adopts target of a maximum 2°C rise in average global temperature
25 June 1997: U.S. Senate passes Byrd-Hagel Resolution rejecting Kyoto without more commitments from developing countries
1997: Kyoto Protocol agreed
2001: George W. Bush withdraws from the Kyoto negotiations
16 February 2005: Kyoto Protocol comes into force (not including the US or Australia)
2005: first carbon emissions trading scheme (EU) implemented
July 2005: 31st G8 summit has climate change on the agenda, but makes relatively little concrete progress
November/December 2005: United Nations Climate Change Conference; the first meeting of the Parties of the Kyoto Protocol, alongside the 11th Conference of the Parties (COP11), to plan further measures for 2008-2012 and beyond.

July 19, 2006: In California, Gov. Schwarzenegger proposed forming the Climate Action Board, a new, centralized authority under his direct control that would be responsible for implementing one of the nation’s most far-reaching initiatives to curb global warming. California ranks 12th in the world in terms of carbon dioxide emissions, however its regulatory actions tend to have far-reaching effects throughout the U.S.

October 30, 2006: The Stern Review is published. It is the first comprehensive contribution to the global warming debate by an economist and its conclusions lead to the promise of urgent action by the UK government to further curb Europe’s CO2 emissions and engage other countries to do so. It discusses the consequences of climate change, mitigation measures to prevent it, possible adaptation measures to deal with its consequences, and
prospects for international cooperation.

June 26, 2009: U.S. House of Representatives passes the American Clean Energy and Security Act, the "first time either house of Congress had approved a bill meant to curb the heat-trapping gases scientists have linked to climate change.".

Govt. of India's Policy Paper on Climate Change:

The foregoing account briefly outlines the opinions and views of some important nations, nation heads and persons of eminence of various international organizations. Now let us have a brief account of our Govt.'s policy on global warming / climate change in the back drop of International scenario, on the subject. To have an exposure of what our Govt. envisages on the problem it will be useful to have first the plan as presented by the Hon'ble Prime Minister of India, in brief:

On June 30, 2008, Prime Minister Manmohan Singh released India's first National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC) outlining existing and future policies and programs addressing climate mitigation and adaptation. The plan identifies eight core "national missions" running through 2017 and directs ministries to submit detailed implementation plans to the Prime Minister's Council on Climate Change by December 2008.

Emphasizing the overriding priority of maintaining high economic growth rates to raise living standards, the plan "identifies measures that promote our development objectives while also yielding co-benefits for addressing climate change effectively." It says these national measures would be more successful with assistance from developed countries, and pledges that India's per capita greenhouse gas emissions "will at no point exceed that of developed countries even as we pursue our development objectives."

National Missions: Following are the eight National Missions envisaged in the policy paper of the subject under discussion:

National Solar Mission: The NAPCC aims to promote the development and use of solar energy for power generation and other uses with the ultimate objective of making solar competitive with fossil-based energy options. The plan includes:
- Specific goals for increasing use of solar thermal technologies in urban areas, industry, and commercial establishments;
- A goal of increasing production of photovoltaics to 1000 MW/year; and
- A goal of deploying at least 1000 MW of solar thermal power generation. Other objectives include the establishment of a solar research center, increased international collaboration on technology development, strengthening of domestic manufacturing capacity, and increased government funding and international support.

National Mission for Enhanced Energy Efficiency: Current initiatives are expected to yield savings of 10,000 MW by 2012. Building on the Energy Conservation Act 2001, the plan recommends:
- Mandating specific energy consumption decreases in large energy-consuming industries, with a system for companies to trade energy-savings certificates;
- Energy incentives, including reduced taxes on energy-efficient appliances; and
- Financing for public-private partnerships to reduce energy consumption through demand-side management programs in the municipal, buildings and agricultural sectors.
National Mission on Sustainable Habitat: To promote energy efficiency as a core component of urban planning, the plan calls for:

- Extending the existing Energy Conservation Building Code;
- A greater emphasis on urban waste management and recycling, including power production from waste;
- Strengthening the enforcement of automotive fuel economy standards and using pricing measures to encourage the purchase of efficient vehicles; and
- Incentives for the use of public transportation.

National Water Mission: With water scarcity projected to worsen as a result of climate change, the plan sets a goal of a 20% improvement in water use efficiency through pricing and other measures.

National Mission for Sustaining the Himalayan Ecosystem: The plan aims to conserve biodiversity, forest cover, and other ecological values in the Himalayan region, where glaciers that are a major source of India's water supply are projected to recede as a result of global warming.

National Mission for a "Green India": Goals include the afforestation of 6 million hectares of degraded forest lands and expanding forest cover from 23% to 33% of India's territory.

National Mission for Sustainable Agriculture: The plan aims to support climate adaptation in agriculture through the development of climate-resilient crops, expansion of weather insurance mechanisms, and agricultural practices.

National Mission on Strategic Knowledge for Climate Change: To gain a better understanding of climate science, impacts and challenges, the plan envisions a new Climate Science Research Fund, improved climate modeling, and increased international collaboration. It also encourages private sector initiatives to develop adaptation and mitigation technologies through venture capital funds.

Other Programs: The NAPCC also describes other ongoing initiatives, including:

- **Power Generation**: The government is mandating the retirement of inefficient coal-fired power plants and supporting the research and development of IGCC and supercritical technologies.
- **Renewable Energy**: Under the Electricity Act 2003 and the National Tariff Policy 2006, the central and the state electricity regulatory commissions must purchase a certain percentage of grid-based power from renewable sources.
- **Energy Efficiency**: Under the Energy Conservation Act 2001, large energy-consuming industries are required to undertake energy audits and an energy labeling program for appliances has been introduced.

Implementation:

Ministries with lead responsibility for each of the missions are directed to develop objectives, implementation strategies, timelines, and monitoring and evaluation criteria, to be submitted to the Prime Minister's Council on Climate Change. The Council will also be responsible for periodically reviewing and reporting on each mission's progress. To be able to quantify progress, appropriate indicators and methodologies will be developed to assess both avoided emissions and adaptation benefits.

Outcome:

It must be pointed out here that, it was after the release / declaration of Govt. India's first NAPCC, that
perhaps for the first time in India’s election history, both Congress and the BJP—the two leading contenders—gave fairly significant mention to climate change and the environment in their manifestos, during the last Parliamentary elections of 2009.

Followed by the Prime Minister's Plan, as above, now let us go through selected excerpts of the speech of our Minister of State (independent charge) for Environment & Forests, Government Of India, at the high-level segment of the UN Climate Conference, Copenhagen, as he spoke on 16 December 2009:

"India is already and will be even more profoundly impacted by climate change. In many ways, we have the highest vulnerability on multiple dimensions. We have a tremendous obligation to our own people by way of both adaptation and mitigation policies and programmes. That is why we have already announced a number of ambitious measures proactively. " Certainly these lines exhibit our concern & commitment for global warming.

"We have established our own version of an IPCC comprising more than 120 of our leading scientific and technological institutions to continuously measure, monitor and model the impacts of climate change on different sectors and in different regions of our country. In addition to establishing a nation-wide climate observatory network, we are going to launch our own satellite in 2011 to monitor GHG and aerosol emissions globally. " These lines show that India is technically embarking to share her role in the mitigation of GHG. "Derived from our detailed National Action Plan on Climate Change, (NAPCC) we are now considering nationally accountable mitigation outcomes in different sectors like industry, energy, transport, building and forests. Over the last decade we have added over 3 million hectares to our forest cover and today our forest cover is sequestering close to 10% of our annual greenhouse gas emissions. We will endeavour to maintain that level.

India has been a major participant in the clean development mechanism (CDM). If all our projects are approved and implemented as scheduled by 2012, carbon credits amounting to a further 10% of our annual GHG emissions will be available to developed countries to enable them to meet their KP (Kyoto Protocol) commitments. We are convinced that a low-carbon strategy is an essential aspect of sustainable development. While we already have one of the lowest emissions intensity of the economy, we will do more. We are targeting a further emissions intensity decline of 20-25% by 2020 on 2005 levels. This is significant given our huge developmental imperatives.

We are transforming environmental governance systems. A judicial National Green Tribunal and an executive National Environmental Protection Agency is on the anvil. We have just announced a new generation of national ambient air quality standards that is on par with the strictest in the world. Our entire approach to this Conference is anchored in the sanctity of the troika—the UNFCCC, the Kyoto Protocol and the Bali Action Plan. We believe that the well-known and widely accepted principles of (i) common but differentiated responsibility; and (ii) historical responsibilities are sacrosanct.

As a global goal, India subscribes to the view that the temperature increase ought not to exceed 2 degrees Celsius by 2050 from mid-19th century levels. But this objective must be firmly embedded in a demonstrably equitable access to atmospheric space, with adequate finance and technology available to all developing countries. " These paragraphs out of Ministers speech show the sincere efforts Govt. of India would pursue to the global warming.

The world leaders expected much from the Copenhagen conference, though there were ample apprehensions too, specially from countries like USA, Canada, Australia and few European countries. It is said that a time came almost at the close of the conference, when every body was hopeless about the final out come.
of such a grand show of world leaders, but then to save the situation some ironing out draft was prepared, so that process of future conferences remains open. Immediately after this Copenhagen conference Business Standard (BS, New Delhi), interviewed to Honble Mr. Jairam Ramesh Minister of State, Environment and Forests on January 15, 2010,. Few important questions were put to him by BS about his future agenda. And the meaning of the Copenhagen Accord. The same are quoted here:

Q: In Copenhagen, did you let the rich countries off the hook? What did you gain by allowing Annex I countries to dilute the Kyoto protocol?
A: They have not diluted Kyoto. The two largest emitters are not part of Kyoto. Let’s understand that 45 per cent of the world’s emissions are accounted for by two countries (China and the US), who are not part of Kyoto. One outcome of Copenhagen was that negotiations under Kyoto will continue for the second commitment period. But the fact is, Kyoto is in intensive care. Most countries want to get out of Kyoto. The desire of the international community is to bring China into an international agreement on controlling greenhouse gas emissions. What the Europeans are saying is, we will not take commitments under Kyoto because the Americans are not doing it; and the Americans are saying we will not take commitments because the Chinese are doing it. To that extent, we are in a bit of a quandary. We have not killed Kyoto. We have bought time.

Q: Let’s assume it is dead…
A: It’s facing a grave crisis. No question about it. The second commitment period is under question because of structural reasons, because of questions being raised on the US, and in the US questions being raised on China. What we got in Copenhagen was the mandate to continue the negotiations on that. Then we got the Copenhagen accord. Twenty-nine countries negotiated this accord.

Q: What did India gain by aligning with China?
A: Our alignment was strategic. It goes beyond climate change. Within the climate change issue, it was India that helped bring transparency on to the agenda; and by bringing transparency on to the agenda, actually the pressure is on China to do a much better job on what it is doing - making it transparent. Frankly, it (China’s) is a very opaque system. For example, day before yesterday, the chief negotiator was shifted.

Q: The criticism is that, after Copenhagen, the 2 degree limit on global warming is impossible to achieve. It will go well beyond that limit. And since India is among the world’s most vulnerable countries when it comes to climate change, basically, you’ve killed yourself.
A: It’s a no-win situation. There was pressure on us to agree to a 1.5 degree limit - Bangladesh, Maldives, Nepal, Bhutan - all wanted that. We cannot agree to that. That will further constrict our development space. Even the 2 degrees - today we are 380 parts per million, it goes to 450. How much is going to be attributable to growth from India? We don't know. There is no international framework for sharing.

Q: What you are saying is that the 2 degree cap will not work?
A: No, what we are saying is we’ve agreed to a 2 degree cap by 2050. That was not at Copenhagen.

Q: By killing Kyoto, you knocked out the 2 degree limit. If you are going to be one of the early victims of global warming, it will be a disservice to India to have let Annex I countries off the hook.
A: The best service to India is to agree to a 1.5 degree limit. But India has multiple objectives. India has its objective of ensuring its vulnerability gets minimised. Its objective is to preserve its development space for 9 per...
cent growth. If I had gone with purely environmental objectives, I would have perhaps taken a different stance. I did not go with a pure environmental objective.

Q: How will we keep development space if we come under international scrutiny?

A. This is a bogus argument. India has been under international scrutiny for the last 55 to 60 years. We are quite adept at handling ourselves internationally. We do Article IV consultations with the IMF. We do trade policy discussions with the WTO. In fact, our trade liberalisation autonomously has been far more aggressive than what we have committed to under WTO. The IMF comes and produces a fiscal and monetary policy assessment. Has our sovereignty been eroded? Just because we have consultation and analysis (that’s the word, not scrutiny)? I have said from day one that we have nothing to hide. We are quite willing to have consultations, I’m quite willing to put up every year a climate policy statement of the Government of India. I’ll discuss it with whoever you want. How will sovereignty get eroded because of that?

Q: What did we get in return for shifting our negotiating position?

A. First, we did not shift, we negotiated our position. On the global goal, we got what we wanted. We went to Copenhagen with the express objective of having a global goal in terms of an increase limited to 2 degrees Celsius. Nothing more.

We didn’t want a 50 per cent cut in global emissions. We didn’t want a PPM (parts per million) goal. We wanted a temperature goal. We got that. We didn’t want the Copenhagen accord to be a legally binding treaty. We got that.

Q: It is an operational document, so it is binding, de facto.

A. It is not a legally binding document. The Americans themselves don’t want a legally binding document. It is an operational document.

Q: You set out to change the agenda before you went to Copenhagen. The picture the government presented in the run-up to the meeting was of speaking in different languages, then the negotiators were on strike.

A. We are an argumentative society. We allow a multiplicity of opinions. We are a democracy at work. We have diversity at work. Ultimately, what is it that the PM wants.

Q: Since you are leading the effort, did you not discuss and get a consensus before you took a formal position?

A. If Dr Manmohan Singh had gone for consensus in 1991, would we have got economic reforms?

Q: So, you did not get a consensus?

A. But I did not do anything by stealth. I said whatever I had to say in Parliament. I said, when I was asked, ‘Have you shifted from the position,’ I said yes. I had said we would have our domestic obligations subject to international information. I said it had changed to international consultation and analysis. Yes, it’s changed. There is no big loss to national sovereignty.

Q: You also took the position that we don’t need the money, whereas under Kyoto the money was supposed to come?

A. Who will give us public money? Nobody will. We are the world’s fourth largest economy, the second fastest growing economy, and the world will give us money? Let us be realistic.
Q: There was supposed to be a transfer of technology, too.

A: Who is going to transfer technology? Why would they transfer technology? That was under UNFCCC (the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change) in 1992, when China was nowhere on the horizon as a greenhouse gas emitter, and India's 8 per cent growth was a dream. Things have changed. We are not junking UNFCCC. In Copenhagen, after a long time, India was seen to be pro-solution in the debate.

To conclude this brief review, it can be inferred that the intentions of developed countries are to delay a solid follow up protocol on the burning issue of climate change or global warming. One reason to delay follow up of hard decisions, because no country head has a will power to impose restrictions to curb inflated energy consumptions of its people during their stewardship, for political reasons. These countries are trying to find out sort of escape goat to wriggle out of the rigorous conditions to bring down the rate of global warming and carbon dioxide concentration of our atmosphere to the earlier agreed levels during Kyoto Protocol. On the other hand developing countries like India and China have to look forward to promised basic amenities to its people like that of electricity, transportation, health & hygiene, potable and irrigational water, besides rapid pace of industrialization to create and provide employment opportunities to their ever growing population of highly complex socio-economic background and educational status, hence certainly require increase in energy consumption. On the other hand developed countries have just to control and put small checks on their excessive use of all sorts of energy utilities, with minimum moderation in their growing mechanized life styles at various levels. A strong political will power is most urgently required to curb the growing tendencies of over use of energy and a life sans lesser and lesser physical labour including the over exploitation of world's natural/earth resources where ever they can buy on account of their high purchasing power. On the other hand developing and under developed countries would have to go more for traditional and simpler mode of energy conservation and renewable non pollutional, lesser global warming energy production technologies on one hand and earlier adaptations of energy conservation latest technologies available even at higher cost, to save the world from rapid rate of global warming and climate change.
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