

Fritz Reusswig , Lutz Meyer-Ohlendorf, Ulrike Anders

Partners for a Low-Carbon Hyderabad

A stakeholder analysis with respect to “Lifestyle Dynamics and Climate Change”

Fritz Reusswig, Lutz Meyer-Ohlendorf, Ulrike Anders

Partners for a Low-Carbon Hyderabad

A stakeholder analysis with respect to "Lifestyle Dynamics and Climate Change"

Europäischer Hochschulverlag GmbH & Co. KG

Table of Contents

[1 Purpose of the Current Report](#)

[2 Methodology](#)

[2.1 A Brief Review on Methods for Stakeholder Analyses](#)

[2.2 Operational Guideline for the Project](#)

[2.2.1 Definition of Rationale, Policy Issues, and Subsystems](#)

[2.2.2 Identification and Description of Stakeholders](#)

[2.2.3 Categorisation and Differentiation](#)

[2.2.4 Project Integration](#)

[3 Climate Change from an Indian Perspective](#)

[4 Indian Political Parties and Climate Change](#)

[5 The Business Sector](#)

[6 Social Classes and Lifestyles](#)

[7 Stakeholders relevant to Lifestyle and Consumption](#)

[8 Outlook for the Stakeholder Participation Process](#)

[References](#)

Partners for a Low-Carbon Hyderabad

A stakeholder analysis with respect to "Lifestyle Dynamics and Climate Change"

Fritz Reusswig^{†}, Lutz Meyer-Ohlendorf[†], Ulrike Anders[†]* May
2009

Abstract

This paper analyses the structure of local, regional and national stakeholders that might be relevant for a transition of Hyderabad into a low-carbon megacity. The main angle of the stakeholder selection in this report is defined by the leading question of our research: How do (local) lifestyle dynamics contribute to climate change, and how can lifestyle changes help to reduce local emissions and the vulnerability to global climate change? Our analysis reveals that climate change actually is a medium to low attention issue for the majority of stakeholders in Hyderabad (as in India in general). At the same time, the identified minority of individual or collective actors that actually do rate climate change higher on their agendas have the potential to form a critical mass for socio-ecological change in the city if (1) they improve their cooperation, if (2) institutional reforms in the urban space increase their impact, and if (3) they manage to align with a still 'silent majority' of stakeholders that by now rate climate change to be of minor relevance. The latter point is based on another key finding of our

analyses: Actors with high structural power (based either on political, economic or network power) might be turned into potential ‘allies’ of a low-carbon strategy, if (1) they can interpret adaptation and mitigation options as new opportunities in their option space, (2) climate issues are more closely linked to sustainability issues, and (3) they perceive institutional reforms and stakeholder involvement as being beneficial for their daily operations. From these insights we derive some consequences for future pilot projects and policy advice.

Key words: *climate change mitigation, stakeholder analysis, stakeholder participation, Hyderabad, India*

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +49 331 288 2576. Email: fritz@pik-potsdam.de

† Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK), Research Domain Transdisciplinary Concepts and Methods, P.O. Box 60 12 03, 14412 Potsdam

1 Purpose of the Current Report

The current Hyderabad Megacity Project is—both from its funding and from its participant structure—a German undertaking. Nevertheless it tries to achieve progress in climate change related perceptions and actions in an Indian megacity. It is clear from the outset that this ambitious goal cannot be accomplished unless major actors in Hyderabad and elsewhere in India get involved and do actively support the project goals. In fact, we do assume that chances to adopt ‘our’ goals do only increase from near-zero if these actors do identify ‘our’ goals as their own ones—at least partially.

This requires a more or less ‘clear picture’ of the stakeholders one wishes to co-operate with. Who could be the ‘partners for a low-carbon Hyderabad’, and how could a cooperation look like? The current report tries to answer these questions from the particular perspective of the work package WP 2.1 (“Lifestyle Dynamics and Climate Change”). Other work packages will surely have other stakeholders in mind, and they will use other stakeholder analysis formats. With good reasons, given the basic intuition of the project as a whole that stakeholder co-operation in general and stakeholder analysis as a supporting tool must not be limited to one particular work package, but has to be detailed out and organised by each individual research team.

In our case, the stakeholder analysis does have a very special meaning. Lifestyle and consumption issues do not have a particular ‘address’ in a society. Neither is there a more or less clear cut (economic) sector called ‘consumption’, nor can we find a limited set of social actors shaping it. Even if one might think of ‘the private

households' as an economic sector or aggregated actor, one would still have to be aware of two caveats: (1) Private households differ significantly in their internal structure, e.g. with respect to size, income, educational level, economic assets, class and caste characteristics, spatial location etc. Most of these aspects clearly affect their actual (consumption) behaviour as well as their option space with regard to climate change mitigation and adaptation. A successful strategy to engage upper class households from, say, Jubilee Hills with respect to energy saving will most probably fail if applied to a poor household in one of Hyderabad's slum areas. As there is no single typical 'Hyderabad private household', any strategy to approach the aggregate 'household sector' in Hyderabad is either forced to develop differential strategies that take social differences into account—or almost surely doomed to fail. (2) Even a differentiated way to approach private households would not be able to grasp lifestyle and consumption issues in a society. Consumption as a social process and lifestyle as its structural driver and social location are both not confined to private household activities, but part of a wider set of actors and institutional practices. Who ever wants to analyse lifestyle and consumption issues in a structurally meaningful way does in fact have to talk about production and consumption systems; and it is only these systems that will become sustainable—or fail to achieve sustainability (Reusswig 2009).

For these two reasons the current report goes far beyond a decomposition of the urban household 'sector'. We have tried to embed the private households in a bigger picture including institutional aspects as well as influential other actors with the power to directly or indirectly shape the urban consumption process with respect to the overall project goals in a meaningful way.

It should be stressed that this report is not intended to be a final statement about how we perceive the stakeholders relevant to our WP. Stakeholder analysis is an ongoing process if one wishes to involve stakeholders in a research project, as we do. This implies that stakeholder analysis will be a continuing management task for the rest duration of the project.

The rest of this paper is organised as follows. We start with a short outline of methodological assumptions that had major influence on the choice of applied methods. ([Chapter 2](#)) We then give a scene-setting glimpse on the issue at stake: climate change from an Indian perspective (as far as we were able to reconstruct it) ([Chapter 3](#)). We then move to a brief overview of climate change as an issue for important political parties in India, as no pilot project and, particularly, no policy advice can ignore the political landscape of which actors are part ([Chapter 4](#)). A short look at how the Indian business community is prepared for climate change follows ([Chapter 5](#)). We then significantly broaden the scope of our analysis by looking at issues of social class and lifestyles more general in India. Besides addressing the particular profile of the actual work package, this move also serves as a complementary to the location of climate change in the political landscape ([Chapter 6](#)). We then present the major results of our empirical research work on major national and local stakeholders in India and Hyderabad and provide a participation planning diagram as a visualisation of the proposed project integration of our key stakeholders ([Chapter 7](#)).