



# **High-Level India-EU Dialogue London, 7-8 July 2009**

## **Final report**

Organised by  
Action for a Global Climate Community

Kindly supported by  
the UK Department for Energy and Climate Change  
and the Oak Foundation

*Co-Chairs of the High-Level India-EU Dialogue: Mr Nitin Desai & Sir Crispin Tickell*

*Patrons of Action for a Global Climate Community include: Sir Crispin Tickell, Sir John Houghton, Suresh Prabhu (former Indian Environment and Energy Minister), Fabio Feldman (Executive Secretary of Brazilian Climate Change Forum), Grace Akumu (Director of Climate Network Africa), Professor John Schellnhuber (Director of the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research), Ambassador Raul Estrada-Oyuela, Ambassador Chandrashekhar Dasgupta, Professor Margaret Kamar (Vice Chancellor, University of Nairobi).*



## Executive Summary

The High-Level India-EU Dialogue is an independent initiative to promote joint action by India and the European Union on climate and clean development, as a step towards an equitable and effective global framework. This is the third high-level event organised by AGCC.

The dialogue concluded that, to be a success, the India-EU Summit (in Delhi from 6 November 2009) needs to do something which cannot be achieved by the global Conference in Copenhagen one month later, but which contributes to global action. A programme of **enhanced cooperation** between India and the EU would show the world how the strategic partnership between India and EU can bring real progress on clean energy and sustainable development through **flagship projects** for solar energy, black carbon, biochar, adaptation and a major private – public clean infrastructure investment fund (CIIF).

The lack of tangible progress since the 2008 India-EU Summit highlights the need for more effective mechanisms to drive its ambitious agenda forward between summits.

The meeting proposed that existing mechanisms, such as the EU-India Energy Panel or the EU-India Science and Technology Steering Committee, should be strengthened with a small permanent secretariat of civil servants from India and the EU, based in Delhi, and overseen by an Action Group or Task Force of six senior people – representing the Commission, the Presidency (on behalf of the Council of Ministers) and Parliament from EU, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Prime Minister's Climate Panel and Lok Sabah from India – to give the strategic partnership political weight between Summits.

The meeting concluded by agreeing that

1. AGCC will produce a revised report, incorporating the additional points raised at the London meeting on finance and private sector involvement;
2. AGCC will produce a very short proposal on the flagship projects and enhanced mechanisms for the EU-India Summit (maximum two pages);
3. participants will work together with their respective governments and the EU to propose that AGCC presents this proposal to the next Summit in person.

### Contact details

---

Peter Luff  
Action for a Global Climate Community  
Room 203, Southbank House  
Black Prince Road  
London SE1 7SJ  
United Kingdom

*Tel* +44 203 176 0538  
*Mob* +44 777 093 0942  
*Email* peterluff@hotmail.com  
*Website* www.climatecommunity.org

Mark Runacres  
Honorary Senior Fellow, TERI  
Darbari Seth Block  
IHC Complex  
Lodhi Road  
New Delhi 110 003  
India

*Tel* +91 11 2468 2100  
*Mob* +91 98 1129 9622  
*Email* markr@teri.res.in or  
markrunacres@hotmail.com



## **General Discussion on the Report**

The High-Level India-EU Dialogue is a forum aiming to create a bridge between India and the European Union for joint action. It is not a negotiation.

The meeting recognised the central importance of climate justice, equal per capita emissions rights, development as an issue integrally connected to climate change, and the responsibility of industrialised countries to take a lead in cutting emissions, converging to equity, and to mobilise funds for sustainable development by developing countries.

India is committed to tackling climate change on the basis of the Bali Action Plan and its recently published *Road to Copenhagen* makes it clear that India will not accept binding caps on its emissions of greenhouse gases. It suggests that what is needed is the implementation of the existing international climate treaty, rather than negotiations for a new one.

### ***Proposals for discussion***

Action for a Global Climate Community presented its report (latest version available online at [www.climatecommunity.org/documents/IndiaEUDialoguereport.pdf](http://www.climatecommunity.org/documents/IndiaEUDialoguereport.pdf)), which was prepared in line with the Delhi seminar conclusions. It makes two key proposals:

1. four flagship projects to accelerate action on climate and development;
2. institutional mechanisms to drive forward the outcomes of the EU-India Summits.

It argues that the Summits produce powerful statements of intention, but very little happens in between meetings. Existing mechanisms, like the EU-India Energy Panel or the Science and Technology Steering Committee, could be strengthened to fill this vacuum.

### ***Discussion***

Climate change is the biggest issue faced by humanity but progress in multilateral negotiations is slow. Parallel dialogues like this can seek consensus and promote practical initiatives which governments can take up faster. Any agreement from Copenhagen will be implemented in 3 – 4 years at the earliest. India and the EU can start collaborating without waiting or compromising their negotiating positions. The report was therefore welcomed by the participants and it was recognised it created a building block for action on the ground.

A bilateral framework needs to be created to encourage participation by the private sector, particularly SME's, and to mobilise finance for large scale infrastructure investment in clean development and the low carbon economy. It needs a mechanism for action between Summits, just as the UK-India initiative has a home in the British Council. This does not need to be a new institution, but it has to be effective.

The Science and Technology Cooperation Agreement, which is built around the EU Framework Programmes, needs to be strengthened to increase research and funding for both sides. The Strategic Energy Technology Plan, which has identified between 5 and 8 technologies for development including carbon capture and storage (CCS) and solar, also

needs to be improved. A follow-up communication on financing low carbon technology, including a chapter on international negotiations, is due to be issued in September 2009.

Many initiatives are not captured by government negotiations. For example, the Indian Ministry of Environment and Forests has commissioned work on the Himalayas and there has been work on issues of black carbon and biochar from the point of view of impacts on women and their health. However, there is a need for finer grain forecasts of climate impacts on smaller areas. All of this needs better ways of working round the deadlocks in the international negotiations.

There is also a need to ensure that all countries participate and that there are no free riders. Cumulative emissions since 1990 should be allocated on a basis converging to per capita equality to provide a mechanism for redistributing resources between countries. This would provide a clear, transparent and equitable mechanism. Per capita agreement is the only basis for a long term solution.

The EU has taken on commitments and is therefore in a good position to work with India. However, to make things happen quickly, India needs money and technology. This could come from companies and financiers but it needs a framework and support mechanisms from government. For example, Germany and Spain have developed solar technologies which could be applied in India. Perhaps the EU needs an annual review of innovation, like the OECD, to identify emerging technologies, which can be made available in India, on a purely commercial basis.

The EU is the largest source of private capital on the planet and India needs investment. The dialogue needs to include a round table with on one side 1) institutional fund managers 2) insurance and pension funds 3) credit providers and 4) government sovereign funds, and on the other side, the major Indian ministries (energy and power), to discuss how to invest the estimated \$ 100 billion needed in infrastructure for sustainable development.

One of the biggest environmental security issues for the planet is the consequence of the melting of the Himalayan glaciers. Black carbon contributes to glacial melt and is something about which immediate action would bring rapid results. India could make a huge impact by tackling black carbon and, by doing so, could change the whole debate.

### ***Response from government representatives***

Representatives of the India and UK governments welcomed the dialogue and agreed to take the points up with their respective governments.

The UK representative offered to see if there could be an appetite for a private sector round table and to find ways of pulling together the work of different EU countries with India. For example, the UK Department for International Development is funding research in impacts of ice melt from the Himalaya. A private sector group led by Lord Stern is looking at the potential of government guarantees for private sector funding. The UK takes guidance from Indian Government's National Action Plan on Climate Change about what it funds in India. The idea of tracking progress between summits was seen as very helpful.

## **Flagship Projects**

### ***Solar***

Solar is the only form of clean energy which is abundant in India and will need substantial subsidies before it is competitive with coal. India will need 4 trillion units of electricity by 2030. Replacing 25% by solar at a cost of Rs 15-20 compared with Rs 4 or 5 for coal, so 1 trillion units of solar would require \$ 100 billion subsidy. This is not an option so new technologies need to be developed to make solar cost competitive with coal by 2020, through the Indian Solar Technology Initiative.

The initial development of plants needs subsidies to get economies of scale, but it has to be done in a way that creates competitive pressures on the private sector. Other routes do not work so well. For example, just distributing solar lanterns in villages meant that people stopped using them after one or two years when the batteries ran out, because they were not supported by a commercial infrastructure, so their use fell off rapidly. Villagers often don't want short term solutions if strings are attached or they won't get grid power as a result, which they want.

Two areas with most potential are:

1. concentrated solar power with heat storage – it can be connected to the grid, but costs need to be brought down;
2. photovoltaic costs per peak watt need to be brought down.

Work on solar in India should be linked with the EU's work in the Sahara. Stirling engines could be useful in bringing down the cost of solar power.

More detailed study is needed to understand the kind of grid needed for greater use of solar or micro power.

A study of use of renewables in six States showed that roof top solar panels are more effective than lanterns, so there is a need to look at integrated solutions.

### ***Black carbon***

Black carbon is key to rapid reduction of greenhouse gases. It is fast to remove and has a radiative forcing of 0.9W per square meter out of a total 3.77W. Black carbon has a big impact, affecting critical areas of the Himalaya and the Arctic (it causes 50% of warming in both areas) and with security implications.

Policy on black carbon is evolving. A soot-free Europe campaign was recently launched. Similarly in the United States, two bills relating to black carbon are being introduced and there is a legal challenge to get the US Environmental Protection Agency to act on black carbon. There are various proposals in the UNFCCC Climate Negotiations for a fast action work programme including black carbon, biochar and HFCs. If there is no deal in Copenhagen, it is still possible to act on black carbon, such as the cook stove programme and the project Surya with The Energy and Resources Institute.

However, scepticism is arising about improved cooking stoves because of the loss of convenience compared to what people use in cities. LPG stoves are consequently likely to be more successful.

The Montreal Protocol has had great success in removing chemicals, in which India had a leading role. Cooling aerosols such as sulfates are being reduced to protect health and prevent acid rain, with the side effect of raising temperatures. The Montreal Protocol could take 10Gt out following one decision. 69 gases have been removed by setting targets and timescales.

Leadership from India and the EU on black carbon could be key for both climate and health issues. India is very unlikely to act on grounds of climate but is much more likely to address black carbon as a health and development issue, unless there are considerable Clean Development Mechanism benefits. It may be better to bring this issue forward in the context of the Millennium Development Goals. What is needed is a work plan for fast action, within the EU – India Summit.

### ***Biochar***

Biochar has benefits for CO<sub>2</sub> reduction, health and soil improvement, and its production via pyrolysis provides energy which can be used in stoves. The process is analogous to the production of charcoal, slow heating of any biomass without oxygen. The benefit for climate change is that it sequesters CO<sub>2</sub> into the land, but it also improves productivity of the soil and therefore benefits farming. Biochar and CCS are the two main solutions for removing CO<sub>2</sub> from the atmosphere. Biochar (biosequestration) has the potential to be used on a local scale but cumulatively with a major impact. It can also be used on an industrial scale, for example, burning biomass for cement production.

There is a limit to how much biochar can be used as a soil enhancer, but it can simply be buried below 6 ft. Because it is inert, it could be placed anywhere. It can enhance desert and degraded soils when used with seawater farming. The Convention on Desertification is also interested in its potential.

Biochar is being actively pursued in Australia, Africa and America, using agricultural waste rather than dedicated plantations.

NGOs have challenged the potential of biochar and the risk of using this method to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

The Major Economies Forum has been discussing carbon reduction and the win-win solutions available, and has stressed the importance of good practice that aids agriculture and takes carbon from the atmosphere. A study on how much carbon is stored on a life-cycle basis would be useful. Not enough attention has been paid to the issue of soils in the climate negotiations, as it has been done recently on forests. A large scale study is therefore proposed.



## **Adaptation**

Adaptation is receiving a lot of attention in India, particularly in agriculture, water and human habitation. However, more research needs to be done particularly on agriculture and its dependence on climate variability, on the effect of climate destabilisation on cities, on water efficiency, coastal zone protection, disaster preparedness, infrastructure and building planning, and on Himalayan ecosystem and Himalaya-Hindu Kush. A focused assessment of likely impacts of climate change on different areas of India would be useful as well as the creation of a predictive tool.

A few key points were raised during the discussions:

- adaptation needs to be integrated into all other planning processes; it cannot be added on;
- in which extent should particular areas be abandoned or saved?
- lessons can be learnt from research and progress already made in some European countries such as in The Netherlands and in Austria and also from military authorities' experience on disaster.

## **EU-India Institutional Mechanisms**

The High-Level India-EU Dialogue is about facilitating actions and decisions-making from those involved in the India EU summit in order to upgrade the existing EU-India institutional mechanisms or to set up new and stronger mechanisms to carry out flagship projects. These upgraded mechanisms would

- coordinate existing initiatives and create enhanced cooperation between the European Union and India;
- take forward research and development;
- bring in the private sector;
- set clear targets and drive the agenda forward;
- oversee the execution of projects and evaluate the implementation;
- encourage dialogue with civil society, bringing in the intelligence and initiatives from the bottom up;
- draw together different departments of the EU and India.

The EU-India relationship has been very cautious and has been evolving and incrementing slowly. India praised the efforts by the European Union to put climate on the agenda of the Summit. By 2004, there was an opportunity to bring climate change in through the EU-India Energy Panel, which has produced some interesting conceptual drivers for India's participation, for example on nuclear energy. In 2005, the EU-India Initiative on Energy and Climate Change was created which initiated an EC-India Joint Working Group on Environment. Since then, there have been critical developments in India, notably the setting up of the Indian Prime Minister's Climate Advisory Committee, the adoption of the National Action Plan on Climate Change in June 2008, and the nomination of the Indian Prime Minister's Special Envoy on Climate Change.

It was recognised that there is a lack of preparation before EU-India Summit in terms of climate change when compared with the preparation pre-EU-China Summit. Troika Ministerial meetings are held ahead of the Summits but no meetings specifically on climate change are organised. The action concerning India is acknowledged to be more ad hoc.

A high level climate action group, composed of six officials and outside experts equally from India and the EU, and assisted with a permanent secretariat based in Delhi, is proposed to be set up in order to create an institutional driver.

Existing institutional mechanisms, such as the EU-India Energy Panel or the Science and Technology Steering Committee, could be mandated as an agency responsible for acting between the annual EU-India Summits.

The evolution of the structure of the European Union and notably the potential ratification of the Lisbon treaty will be essential to distinguish who the best interlocutor is on the European side for the climate and development dialogue between the EU and India. If the Lisbon treaty is ratified, there is no doubt that a longer term EU presidency will make a difference in the EU relationship with India, in terms of continuity and clarity. The permanent secretariat could be based in Delhi within the Ministry of External Affairs. The European Commission most importantly, through potentially a new DG Energy and Climate Change, but also the President of the European Council and the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy could be the right place for this Secretariat to report directly to. On the Indian side, it would report directly to the Prime Minister, his/her Special Envoy on Climate Change being the obvious person to lead on this. A parliamentary role is also absolutely critical.

Whatever is created or upgraded must be made and run jointly, both by the European Union and India.

The financial community has not been involved sufficiently in climate and development issues. The EU-India Summit could mandate a round table of about 15 institutional investors, fund managers, debt providers and public sector guarantors, to look at policy environments in both source and destination countries. at the roundtable should address issues such as reducing transaction costs of cooperation for SME's and at how to raise the \$ 100 billion needed for clean energy infrastructure investment in India. Success has been shown in bringing together financiers in Silicon Valley, and innovators in Bangalore in the area of information technologies. An innovation network between the EU and India could be built to drive forward innovation in renewable energy technologies.

## **Conclusions**

The India-EU Summit will take place in Delhi from 6 November 2009, in the shadow of Copenhagen. To be a success, the Summit needs to do something which cannot be achieved by the global Conference but which contributes to global action. A programme of enhanced cooperation between India and the EU would show the world how our strategic partnership could bring about real progress on clean energy and sustainable development through flagship projects for solar energy, black carbon, biochar, adaptation and a major private – public clean infrastructure investment fund (CIIF).

The 2008 Summit agreed that “climate change is one of the great challenges of our time and decided that clean and sustainable development should be a joint priority area of EU-India cooperation.” The Leaders “agreed to work towards a long term cooperative action including a long term global goal.” The lack of tangible progress so far highlights the need for more effective mechanisms to drive the agenda forward between summits.

The meeting proposed that existing mechanisms, such as the EU-India Energy Panel or the EU-India Science and Technology Steering Committee, could be strengthened with a small permanent secretariat of civil servants from India and the EU, based in Delhi, and overseen by an Action Group or Task Force of six senior people – representing the Commission, the Presidency (on behalf of the Council of Ministers) and Parliament from EU, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Prime Minister’s Climate Panel and Lok Sabha from India – to give the strategic partnership political weight between Summits.

The meeting concluded by agreeing that

1. AGCC will produce a revised report, incorporating the additional points raised at the London meeting on finance and private sector involvement;
2. AGCC will produce a very short proposal on the flagship projects and enhanced mechanisms for the EU-India Summit (maximum two pages);
3. participants will work together with their respective governments and the EU to propose that AGCC presents this proposal to the next Summit in person.

## **Appendix I:**

### **Suggested amendments from respondents to the report “Enhancing cooperation: Report of the High-Level India-EU Dialogue”**

The following papers were received for discussion at the London meeting. Where there was consensus, the points have been included in the report; others were referred for future meetings.

#### ***Executive Summary***

**Win-win approach between India-EU process and UNFCCC process to be emphasised:** “Probably the “win-win” approach between the Indian-EU process and the UNFCCC process could be expressed with a more strong tone. The rationale of the Indian-EU process is driven by the state of necessity of the climate change global situation. It’s not competitive regarding the global UN process, but stimulating and synergetic, a kind of “concurrent planning”, to use a strategic and business language.”

#### ***Flagship Projects***

**Black carbon and biochar:** The report “could, among other studies/research, propose more forcefully joint Programmes on development and deployment of improved, more efficient biomass cookstoves/pyrolysis stoves to replace traditional stoves, and greater penetration of biomass gasifiers/pyrolysis units for agri-processing and cottage/rural industry to replace highly inefficient boilers in the rural/small scale industry sectors.”

**Sustainable Water Treatment as a further flagship project:** “The quality of WATER supply is closely related to the energy consumed to treat it. There are some estimates of emissions from water disinfection and decontamination processes. Unless the Indian delegation expresses some objections, I would include this among the Flagship Projects.”

**Further need of research:** “While in some Projects demos are appropriate with some small room for research, in some cases, such as PV, research should play an important role with accompanying small demo Projects.”

#### ***Engagement of the private sector and public-private partnership***

**International financing:** “In relation to international financing options for CSP Projects in India that may emerge as a result of the EU-India Joint Initiative, we could mention about the proposal for support by the Clean Technology Fund to the extent of 10% of the cost of a major CSP intervention in the MENA Region. Similar support could be considered for an Indian Project. Another option could be grant support by Global Environment Facility (GEF) of up to 10% which could leverage concessional financing from European Investment Bank (EIB), Asian Development Bank (ADB) and other bilateral lenders such as KfW of Germany. Equipment financing could be considered under export credit schemes in operation in several EU countries.”

## **Conclusion**

The conclusion of the report “falls short of proposing the creation of a Non-governmental (Track 2) institutional mechanism, duly recognized and supported by EC and GOI, with the Charter to follow up, to co-ordinate with the multiplicity of agencies on both sides, and to oversee the implementation of the Flagship Projects set out in this Report, as well as other recommendations/Action Plans/directives of the Leaderships at the Annual Summits pertaining to clean energy joint initiatives within the context of climate change and sustainable development.”

### ***Further proposed additions to the report***

**Intellectual property rights and technology transfer:** “IPR and technology transfer issues might be stumbling blocks to progress and should be carefully analyzed. In some fields India might be in a position to transfer technology to the EU.”

**Greater collaboration with European and Indian industries:** “Politicians are important to setup the stage for cooperation and provide seed money to launch initiatives. However, Industry is vital to make collaboration happen and to generate successful results. Therefore, I would propose the following:

1. identify enterprises both in India and the EU which might contribute to specific Flagship Projects.
2. contact them and inquire about their interest in being a partner of one of these Projects.
3. organise a two day meeting of potential industrial partners. Separate Groups would meet for specific Projects.
4. groups would be asked to draft preliminary Conclusions and possible Strategies by the end of the meeting.
5. groups should be responsible for drafting a Roadmap, with Activities, Deliverables and Budgets, for specific Projects, within one month after the meeting.
6. an EU-India ad hoc Committee would analyse the previous documents and propose action to the EC and to the Indian Government.
7. project funding would be split among EC, Indian Government, Industries, Development Banks, etc.”

## Appendix II: Meeting Programme

**7<sup>th</sup> July**

Conference dinner at the Crowne Plaza St James

**8<sup>th</sup> July**

Registration, Royal Overseas League

Welcome address

**Melanie Speight**, Head Policy, International climate change and Energy, UK  
Department for Energy and Climate Change

**Asoke Mukerji**, Indian Deputy High Commissioner in London

Introductory remarks by **Christopher Layton**, Honorary Director General, European  
Commission

**Session I** - “**Enhancing cooperation: Report of the High-Level India-EU Dialogue**” –  
**General Discussion**

*Chair: Sir Crispin Tickell*

**Session II** - **Flagship Projects: solar and black carbon**

*Chair: Nitin Desai*

**Session III** - **Flagship Projects: biochar and adaptation**

*Chair: Sir Crispin Tickell*

**Session IV** - **EU-India institutional mechanisms: The Next Steps**

*Chair: Nitin Desai*

Conclusions - Reflections of the Co-Chairs

## Appendix III: List of Participants

Titus Alexander	Director, AGCC
Bernadette Bord	Deputy Head, Legal Department, German Embassy in London
Anna da Costa	Co-Director, Indian Climate Solutions; Worldwatch India Fellow
Dr Pierre Dechamps	Advisor, Energy and Climate change, Bureau of European Policy Advisors
Nitin Desai	Co-Chairman, India-UK Round Table; former UN Under-Secretary General for Economic and Social Affairs
Dr Nitya Khemka	Director, The Nand and Jeet Khemka Foundation
Uday Khemka	Managing Trustee, The Nand and Jeet Khemka Foundation
Christopher Layton	Honorary Director General, European Commission
Sue Lee	Sir Crispin Tickell's assistant
Becky Luff	Programme Assistant, AGCC
Peter Luff	CEO, AGCC; Chair, the European Movement UK
Asoke Mukerji	Indian Deputy High Commissioner, London
Prof Jyoti Parikh	Executive Director, Integrated Research and Action for Development
Dr Kirit Parikh	Former member, Planning Commission, India
Hon'ble Suresh Prabhu	Former Indian Member of Parliament; former Industry Minister, Environment Minister and Energy Minister, Government of India
Estelle Rouhaud	Research and Programme Assistant, AGCC
Mark Runacres	Consultant, AGCC; former UK Deputy High Commissioner, Delhi
Ashutosh Shastri	Founding Director, EnerStrat Consulting
Melanie Speight	Head Policy, International climate change and Energy, UK Department for Energy and Climate Change
Tom Spencer	Director, AGCC; Vice-Chairman, Institute for Environmental Security
David Stephen	Director and Chairman, AGCC
Sir Crispin Tickell	Director of the Policy Foresight Programme in the James Martin Institute, Oxford University, UK

Paul Watkinson	Coordinator of International Questions, Interministerial Mission of the Greenhouse Effect, French Ministry of Ecology (MEEDDM)
Robert Whitfield	Director, AGCC
Durwood J. Zaelke	Director, INECE Secretariat; President and founder, Institute for Governance and Sustainable Development

### **Wider reference group**

Peter Betts	Director General, International Climate Change, UK Department for Energy and Climate Change
Raj Chengappa	Managing Editor, India Today
Amit Chugh	Co-founder and Managing Director, Cosmos Ignite Innovations
Chandrashekhar Dasgupta	Former Ambassador to China and the EU; Distinguished Fellow, TERI, Delhi
Robert Donkers	Environment Counsellor, European Commission Delegation to India
Prof Cesar Dopazo	Professor, Departamento de Ciencia y Tecnologia de Materiales y Fluidos, Universidad de Zaragoza, Spain
Ottmar Edenhofer	Deputy Director and Chief Economist, Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, Germany
Olof Ehrenkrona	Political adviser/Chief of Staff, Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs
Prodipto Ghosh	Former Secretary, Indian Ministry of Environment and Forests; Distinguished Fellow, The Energy and Resources Institute
Ajit K. Gupta	Former Adviser, Indian Ministry of New and Renewable Energy
Dr Jamshed J Irani	Director, Tata Sons
Prof Dr Claudia Kemfert	Head, Department for Energy, Transportation, Environment, Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung, Berlin
Dr Michael Koberlein	Director, Heinrich Böll Foundation, India
Martin Kremer	Former Counsellor/Head Science, technology and Environment, German Embassy, London
Ritu Kumar	Director, TERI-Europe
Brice Lalonde	Ambassador for Climate Change, France
Prof Allan Larsson	Former Swedish Minister; former Director-General of the European Commission



Jo Leinen	Member of the European Parliament
Claude Mandil	Former Executive Director, International Energy Agency
Ajay Mathur	Director General, Indian Bureau of Energy Efficiency
Vikram Mehta	Chairman, Shell Group of Companies in India
Don Mohanlal	President and Chief Executive Officer, The Nand and Jeet Khemka Foundation
Dr. Rajendra Pachauri	Chair, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change; Director, The Energy and Resources Institute, Delhi
Baijayant Panda	Indian Member of Parliament
Prof Margolzata Pilawska	Professor, Cracow University of Technology, Poland
V. Raghuraman	Former principal adviser, Confederation of Indian Industry
Prof John Schellnhuber	Director, Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, Potsdam; Chief Scientific Advisor on Climate Change to the German Chancellor
Prof Viriato Soromenho Marques	Professor catedrático na Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal
Lord Nicholas Stern	London School of Economics; Former Chief Economist, World Bank
Pavan Sukhdev	Green Indian States Trust
Klaus Toepfer	Former Executive Director, United Nations Environment Programme
George Varughese	President, Development Alternatives
Anders Wijkman	Former Member of the European Parliament
Michael Zammit Cutajar	Chair, Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term on Cooperative Action, UNFCCC; Ambassador for Climate Change, Malta