



## **“Climate governance innovation trends in the run-up to Paris 2015: analysing mitigation and adaptation policies”**

15<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> May 2017 at the [International Academic Forum Heidelberg \(IWH\)](#)

### **Call for Papers**

The 2009 Conference of the Parties (COP) in Copenhagen was widely seen as a failure. Six years later, the Paris COP led to a diplomatic success, even if, by itself, the outcome is not necessarily sufficient to ensure effective climate change mitigation and adaptation. Crucially, the Paris COP was more bottom-up in structure, with each state submitting a Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC). This transition – from a top-down governance model in 2009, to a more bottom-up approach in 2015 – and the new possibilities it opens up, represents a fascinating and underexplored topic of climate governance research.

In order to explore the topic in more detail, INOGOV will host a fully-funded international workshop for Early Career Scholars, supported by leading figures in the field, in Heidelberg, Germany, from 15<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> May, 2017. An Early Career Scholar is any researcher who is within eight years of completing their Ph.D. (with very strong MA students and Ph.D. researchers especially welcome).

### *Topical themes:*

- i) How have key actors – and coalitions – influenced the transition, both as leaders and as laggards?
  - a. The European Union as a climate leader, or falling star;
  - b. States as facilitators of, and obstacles to, ambition;
  - c. The role of the local level and Non-State Actors.
- ii) What empirical examples of new governance innovations can be identified, and how do these fit into broader trends?
  - a. Climate Change Acts as burgeoning legislation;
  - b. The dual challenges of mitigation and adaptation;
  - c. The role of Nationally Determined Contributions.
- iii) What theoretical tools can we use to explain these new trends in climate change mitigation and adaptation?

- a. Distinctions between leaders, pioneers, and laggards;
- b. The role of polycentricity, both normatively and analytically;
- c. Pathway models for individual action.

*The following keynote speakers will give talks at the workshop and provide feedback:*

- [Prof. Dr. Jale Tosun](#) (Heidelberg University)
- [Prof. Andy Jordan](#) (University of East Anglia)
- [Dr. Claire Dupont](#) (Vrije Universiteit Brussel)

Moreover, experts from the [Heidelberg Centre for the Environment](#) (HCE) and the [Institute for Political Science](#) at Heidelberg University will attend the workshop.

*Practicalities:*

The workshop will be hosted in the beautiful medieval city of Heidelberg, which is home to Germany's oldest university. All workshop participants will receive full funding (including travel, accommodation and subsistence) by INOGO in line with the [COST reimbursement rules](#). This workshop is open to any Early Career Researcher (from Masters Level up to eight years after the completion of a viva), particularly from INOGO ['inclusiveness' countries](#). Please send a letter of motivation (maximum 400 words) and an abstract of a paper (maximum 300 words) to the workshop organiser Nicole Schmidt ([nicole.schmidt@ipw.uni-heidelberg.de](mailto:nicole.schmidt@ipw.uni-heidelberg.de)), by Wednesday February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2017. Authors will be notified of acceptance/rejection by Friday February 24<sup>th</sup>, 2017. The letter of motivation should explain how attending the workshop could benefit the attendees' own research and next career steps, and fit with INOGO's core aims and objectives. The abstract should describe the objective, background, theory and methods, expected insights, and fit with INOGO. Please list the title, the name and e-mail address of the participant. Papers should be 4,000-6,000 words. Papers must be submitted to [nicole.schmidt@ipw.uni-heidelberg.de](mailto:nicole.schmidt@ipw.uni-heidelberg.de) by Monday May 1<sup>st</sup>, 2017.

Participants are expected to give a 10 minute presentation of their paper using at most 3-4 PPT slides (or no slides), and they will then receive feedback from the other participants and senior scholars. Following the workshop, we aim to create at least one joint journal publication, a blog post for the INOGO website, and an INOGO Policy Brief.

## Full Conference details

### Organisers

Nicole M. Schmidt (ECIN)	Dr. Paul Tobin (ECIN)
Department of Political Science	Politics Department
Heidelberg University	University of Manchester
D – 69115 Heidelberg	Manchester – M13 9PL
nicole.schmidt@ipw.uni-heidelberg.de	Paul.tobin@manchester.ac.uk

Resident expert: Prof. Dr. Jale Tosun

This workshop seeks to critically analyse the climate governance trends that occurred between the Copenhagen Conference of the Parties (COP) in 2009 and the Paris COP in December 2015. The Paris conference represented a pivotal event in the history of global climate change negotiations. How did states, international organisations and non-state actors engage with the conference and each other, and can we identify leaders or pioneers amongst them? What new policy innovations were introduced during the period, and how can we measure their success? Finally, what theoretical approaches can be employed most effectively to explain this period?

### Context of the planned workshop

When the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) was established in 1992, it was agreed that states held ‘common but differentiated responsibilities’ (CBDR) towards climate change. The Kyoto Protocol, first negotiated in 1997, provided a means for developed states to commit to making reductions to the greenhouse gas emissions. Here, the overwhelming focus was on climate change mitigation, not adaptation. However, the Protocol was hindered by the USA’s refusal to accede, and by increasing reluctance from key signatories, culminating in Canada’s withdrawal in 2011. Moreover, since 1992, the significant emissions produced by rapidly-industrializing states, such as Brazil, China, India and South Africa (the ‘BASIC states’), have challenged the assumptions of CBDR. New coalitions have begun to emerge between ‘major economies’ and ‘major emitters’ (Bäckstrand & Lövbrand, 2015). The 2009 Copenhagen Conference of the Parties (COP), which had been expected to provide a replacement for the Kyoto Protocol, was widely seen as a failure (*see* Bodansky, 2010). The Copenhagen COP was structured in an ostensibly top-down manner, whereby key states presented other nations with their proposed Accord in the final hours of the negotiations. In December 2015, the Paris COP provided a belated opportunity to create a long-term mitigation and adaptation solution. To do so, Paris sought to draw together developing states as well as developed states, by requiring all actors to submit Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs). This

shift towards a more bottom-up approach had started to emerge at the Durban COP in 2011. During this pivotal time in climate governance, from 2009 until 2015, what trends can we identify in the fields of adaptation and mitigation governance?

### **Themes of the planned workshop**

It appears that the Paris COP was a diplomatic success, if not necessarily a climatic success. The new Paris Agreement was labelled ‘historic’, particularly by those who had been involved in its creation (*see* Buxton, 2016). Due to the recent nature of this conference, many facets of the run-up to the negotiations have yet to be analysed, although the Paris Agreement has drawn rapid and widespread attention (for example, *see* the Special Issues in *Climate Law* (2016), *Globalizations* (2016) and *Politics and Governance* (2016); and Christoff, 2016; Cléménçon, 2016; Geden, 2016; Oberthür, 2016). We seek to identify and analyse the climate governance trends during the period up to and including the Paris COP. How have key actors – and coalitions – across all levels influenced negotiations, both as leaders and as laggards? What empirical examples of new governance innovations can be identified, and how do these fit into broader trends? And thirdly, what theoretical tools can we use to explain these new trends in climate change mitigation and adaptation?

#### *Key actors*

Liefferink and Wurzel (2016) have recently differentiated between environmental leaders and pioneers, arguing that while leaders seek to attract followers, pioneers do not often seek to do so. The EU, a traditional climate leader (Kilian & Elgström, 2010; Parker & Karlsson, 2010; Wurzel & Connelly, 2011) was on home turf in Paris- did the EU reclaim its lost dwindling leadership status? Beyond Europe, in what ways did other developed states, such as Australia, Canada, Japan and the USA, assume the leadership responsibilities? In recent years, the rapid development of ‘emerging economies’ has repositioned the locus of power towards encouraging greater commitments from states with low per capita emissions but large and growing absolute emissions. As such, did these emerging economies demonstrate leadership, or, at least, pioneering policy in the run-up to Paris? How can we measure their performance?

In addition to actions taken at the national level, recent academic literature has highlighted the importance of non-state actors to climate action, such as individuals’ contributions (Tosun & Schoenefeld, 2016). It appears that non-state actors engaged in agenda-setting activities before the Paris conference, and also sought to influence negotiations once there (van Asselt, 2016; Jordan and van Asselt, 2015). In what ways did these actors – individuals and communities, NGOs and

businesses, and local and regional governments – influence mitigation and adaptation discourses? By acting in advisory capacities, how did Western NGOs shape the policy ambitions of developing states’ climate targets, and does such actions reflect continuing Western dominance within the global climate regime, or a shifting locus away from developed states?

### *Governance innovations*

At the national level, the creation of Climate Change Acts (CCAs) has been a particularly evident trend since the Copenhagen COP in 2009 (Nachmany *et al.*, 2015). Have we seen a rise in the number of actors developing their own CCAs in line with the Paris conference, and how ambitious are the contents of these new pieces of legislation? Moreover, the dichotomist view of mitigation and adaptation approaches has been increasingly blurred. Several states included adaptation components alongside mitigation efforts within their INDCs. The mitigation components of INDCs represented negotiating positions as much as fixed targets, but adaptation components may provide a clearer insight into the needs of developing states, as well as the governance innovations that are underway. Scholarship has focused heavily on examining adaptation at the national or local level (Heidrich *et al.*, 2013; Lesnikowski *et al.*, 2011, 2013; Panic & Ford, 2013; Reckien *et al.*, 2014), but few studies exist that highlight the importance of multiple scales (Glaas *et al.*, 2010; Howlett, 2009; Measham *et al.*, 2011; Urwin & Jordan, 2008). Are certain mechanisms more suited to the local, rather than national, level, particularly in a context of resource constraints? And, crucially, how effectively are mitigation and adaptation efforts being interwoven?

### *Theoretical developments*

How can we theorise recent climate governance efforts, both analytically and normatively? During the 1990s and 2000s, efforts had primarily revolved around climate change mitigation, rather than adaptation. It has been increasingly argued that the concept of ‘polycentricity’ can help us to both understand climate governance practices, and provide a normative framework for future endeavours (Cole, 2015; Jordan *et al.*, 2015; Ostrom, 2010; Rayner & Jordan, 2013; Sovacool, 2011). How can we measure the existence, and effectiveness, of polycentricity? Alternatively, can other theoretical paradigms further enhance our understandings of the negotiations? What roles can path dependence, orchestration of international relations, or the pathway model for individual action (see Tosun & Schoenefeld, 2016) offer to analysing this period?

## **Workshop details**

This workshop offers an opportunity to bring together the very best research currently being developed by early career researchers on the subject of climate mitigation and adaptation trends. The workshop seeks to improve our understandings of the latest theoretical efforts that attempt to explain global climate governance, the governance innovations that are being introduced, and the key actors that are influencing governance across a variety of levels. The workshop is aimed at early career researchers from across the COST Action member states, particularly those from ['inclusiveness' countries](#). We will bring together around 12 researchers, whose travel and accommodation/food costs will be fully funded, to provide peer review and expert feedback, as well as to facilitate future collaborations. Moreover, we seek to encourage participants to develop new projects with one another around shared interests, as result of the workshop.

### **Publication strategy**

An expectation of the attendees at the workshop is that they will engage in the publication strategy following the workshop. We will seek to co-author a Research Note/Forum piece that dissects the current state of the art regarding climate governance innovation in the years preceding the Paris climate conference. This publication will build upon the contributions from many of the attendees' submitted work, whilst also being an original and independent contribution. The article will be of similar style and format to Jordan et al. (2015) ('Emergence of polycentric climate governance and its future prospects'), in that it will seek to problematize and lay the foundations for future research, but in this case, regarding the governance innovations in the run up to the Paris COP. This Forum piece will be drafted during the six weeks after the workshop concludes, with a view to submitting the piece at the start of July 2017. Target journals would be determined by the attendees' and their research specialisms. We imagine that the piece could be a Forum article for *Global Environmental Politics*, or a Profile article for *Environmental Politics*.

From here, we would also seek to create an INOGO Working Paper Series resulting from the individual papers that were submitted. We imagine that four-to-six attendees would be interested and willing to submit work to this series, with a view to garnering feedback on their wider research projects. For those who are not interested in submitting a version of their draft for the INOGO Working Paper series, we encourage three-to-four attendees to co-author an INOGO Policy Brief, which would build upon the arguments made in the papers presented at the Workshop.

Finally, we intend to co-author two INOGO Blogs. The first would be a summary of the events of the workshop and highlight the range of topics covered and the key arguments that were made. The

second INOGOv blog would be written once the above Research Note/Forum piece was accepted, to raise awareness of the article and to summarise its findings.

### **Date and location**

The organisation and scientific support for the workshop will be provided by the Institute for Political Science at Heidelberg University, in close collaboration with the Heidelberg Center for the Environment (HCE). Both departments hold particular expertise in the fields of environmental and climate governance. The workshop will take place from 15 May (afternoon) until 17 May 2017 (lunch), at the [International Academic Forum Heidelberg \(IWH\)](#). The IWH is affiliated with Heidelberg University and focuses on scholarly exchange in all areas of science and academic research. It particularly encourages participation of early-career researchers at their workshops and symposia, and has hosted more than 1,600 conferences in its 30 year history. The IWH offers rooms for the holding the workshop, accommodation for the participants, and separate rooms for serving the meals all on one site. The venue is therefore an ideal location for ensuring that workshop participants are able to continue their discussions throughout the duration of the workshop. As such, participants are kindly asked to provide their addresses upon notification of acceptance.

### **Practicalities and submission deadlines**

The workshop will be funded under the 4 year COST Action INOGOv (IS1309 Innovations in Climate Governance: Sources, Patterns and Effects). For the COST guidelines regarding reimbursement for travel costs and rules, please visit: <http://www.ingov.eu/resources/expenses-reimbursement/>. Participants will receive an invitation to reclaim their expenses after the workshop, and will need to pay for their accommodation in Heidelberg in cash.

### **Sustainability**

INOGOv is committed to maximising the sustainability of its events. As such, we encourage attendees to:-

- travel via train rather than flying, or even by carpooling . If you are interested in attending via carpool, please contact the organisers;
- estimate travel emissions using the Tyndall tool (similar to the Zurich workshop)
- visit the [INOGOv sustainability page here](#) for more ideas.

In addition, the workshop organisers will ensure that the workshop is as sustainably organised as possible, for example, by avoiding the use of disposable cups, crockery and cutlery, etc.

**Draft structure of the workshop**

The workshop will take place from the 2pm of Monday 15<sup>th</sup> and conclude at 12.30pm on Wednesday 17<sup>th</sup> May. As such, many attendees will be able to travel to the workshop on the morning of the first day and return during the afternoon of the third day. Draft articles will be discussed in pairs, as determined by the themes of their papers’ contents. Each author will present their paper for 10 minutes, followed by 50 minutes of discussion on the two papers, and the common themes between them. We hope that such pairing will facilitate future collaboration.

<i>Monday 15<sup>th</sup> May</i>	<i>Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> May</i>	<i>Wednesday 17<sup>th</sup> May</i>
<p><b>2pm-</b> Welcoming address by Prof. Jale Tosun, who will also highlight some key trends from her current work that engage with the workshop theme on contemporary climate governance trends, followed by questions.</p> <p><b>2.45-3.15pm-</b> Welcome to INOGOVCN from Jonas Schoenefeld, ECN Chair.</p> <p><b>3.15-3.45pm-</b> Coffee and networking break.</p> <p><b>3.45-5.15pm-</b> First pair of papers.</p> <p><b>5.15-6.00pm-</b> Keynote address by Prof. Andy Jordan, followed by questions.</p> <p><b>6.30pm-</b> Dinner, held at the</p>	<p><b>9am-10.30am-</b> Second pair of papers.</p> <p><b>10.30-11am-</b> Coffee and networking break.</p> <p><b>11.00am-12.30pm-</b> Third pair of papers.</p> <p><b>12.30-1.30pm-</b> Lunch, held at the workshop venue and provided for participants.</p> <p><b>1.30pm-3.00pm-</b> Fourth pair of papers.</p> <p><b>3.00-3.30pm-</b> Coffee and networking break.</p> <p><b>3.30-5.00pm-</b> Fifth pair of papers.</p> <p><b>5.00-5.45pm-</b> Identification of key themes and possible joint publication options.</p>	<p><b>9am-10.30am-</b> Sixth pair of papers.</p> <p><b>10.30-11am-</b> Coffee and networking break.</p> <p><b>11am-12.30pm-</b> Discussion of research strategy. Allocation of responsibilities for drafting of joint article, blog and Policy Brief.</p> <p><b>12.30pm-</b> CLOSE.</p>

workshop venue and provided for participants.	<b>6.00pm-</b> Dinner, held at the workshop venue and provided for participants.	
---	--	--

## References

- Bäckstrand, K. & Lövbrand, E. (2016). 'The Road to Paris: Contending Climate Governance Discourses in the Post-Copenhagen Era'. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1523908X.2016.1150777>
- Bodansky, D. (2010). 'The Copenhagen Climate Conference: A Postmortem'. *American Journal of International Law*. **104** (1), pp.230-240.
- Christoff, P. (2016). The promissory note: COP 21 and the Paris Climate Agreement. *Environmental Politics*, 1-23.
- Clémengon, R. (2016). 'The Two Sides of the Paris Climate Agreement: Dismal Failure or Historic Breakthrough'. *Journal of Environment and Development*. 25 (1), pp.3-24.
- Cole, D. H. (2015). 'Advantages of a polycentric approach to climate change policy'. *Nature Climate Change*. DOI: 10.1038/NCLIMATE2490
- Geden, O. (2016). The Paris Agreement and the inherent inconsistency of climate policymaking. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 7(6), 790-797.
- Glaas, E., Jonsson, A., Hjerpe, M., & Andersson-Sköld, Y. (2010). Managing climate change vulnerabilities: formal institutions and knowledge use as determinants of adaptive capacity at the local level in Sweden. *Local Environment*, 15(6), 525-539. doi: 10.1080/13549839.2010.487525
- Heidrich, O., Dawson, R. J., Reckien, D., & Walsh, C. L. (2013). Assessment of the climate preparedness of 30 urban areas in the UK. *Climatic Change*, 120(4), 771-784.
- Howlett, M. (2009). Governance modes, policy regimes and operational plans: A multi-level nested model of policy instrument choice and policy design. *Policy Sciences*, 42(1), 73-89.
- Jordan, A. J., Huitema, D., Hildén, M., van Asselt, H., Rayner, T. J., Schoenefeld, J. J., ... & Boasson, E. L. (2015). Emergence of polycentric climate governance and its future prospects. *Nature Climate Change*.
- Kilian, B., and Elgström, O. 2010. Still a Green Leader: The European Union's Role in International Climate Negotiations. *Cooperation and Conflict*. 45 (3), 255-273.
- Lesnikowski, A., Ford, J., Berrang-Ford, L., Paterson, J., Barrera, M., & Heymann, S. (2011). Adapting to health impacts of climate change: a study of UNFCCC Annex I parties. *Environmental Research Letters*, 6(4).

- Lesnikowski, A., Ford, J. D., Berrang-Ford, L., Barrera, M., & Heymann, J. (2013). How are we adapting to climate change? A global assessment. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, 1-17.
- Measham, T., Preston, B., Smith, T., Brooke, C., Gorddard, R., Withycombe, G., & Morrison, C. (2011). Adapting to climate change through local municipal planning: barriers and challenges. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, 16(8), 889-909. doi: 10.1007/s11027-011-9301-2
- Nachmany et al., 2015. *The 2015 Global Climate Legislation Study: A Review of Climate Change Legislation in 99 Countries. Summary for Policy-makers* [online]. Available from: [http://www.lse.ac.uk/GranthamInstitute/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/Global\\_climate\\_legislation\\_study\\_20151.pdf](http://www.lse.ac.uk/GranthamInstitute/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/Global_climate_legislation_study_20151.pdf)
- Oberthür, S. (2016). Where to go from Paris? The European Union in climate geopolitics. *Global Affairs*, 1-12.
- Ostrom, E. (2010). 'Polycentric systems for coping with collective action and global environmental change'. *Global Environmental Change*. 20, pp.550-557.
- Panic, M., & Ford, J. (2013). A Review of National-Level Adaptation Planning with Regards to the Risks Posed by Climate Change on Infectious Diseases in 14 OECD Nations. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 10(12), 7083-7109.
- Parker, C. F. and Karlsson, C., 2010. Climate Change and the European Union's Leadership Moment: An Inconvenient Truth? *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 48 (4), 923-943.
- Rayner, T. & Jordan, A. (2013). 'The European Union: the Polycentric Climate Policy Leader?' *WIREs Climate Change*. 4, pp.75-90.
- Reckien, D., Flacke, J., Dawson, R., Heidrich, O., Olazabal, M., Foley, A., . . . Hurtado, S. D. G. (2014). Climate change response in Europe: what's the reality? Analysis of adaptation and mitigation plans from 200 urban areas in 11 countries. *Climatic Change*, 122(1-2), 331-340.
- Sovacool, B. K. (2011). 'An international comparison of four polycentric approaches to climate and energy governance'. *Energy Policy*. 39, pp.3832-3844.
- Tosun, Jale und Jonas Schoenefeld (2016). Collective climate action and networked climate governance. *WIREs Climate Change*, DOI: 10.1002/wcc.440, 1-17.
- Urwin, K., & Jordan, A. (2008). Does public policy support or undermine climate change adaptation? Exploring policy interplay across different scales of governance. *Global Environmental Change*, 18(1), 180-191. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2007.08.002>
- Wurzel, R. K. W. and Connelly, J., eds., 2011. *The European Union as a Leader in International Climate Change Politics*. Abingdon: Routledge.