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1 Introduction

Carola Klöck, Paula Castro, Florian Weiler, and Lau Øfjord Blaxekjær

Introduction

Climate change is undoubtedly one of the great challenges of the 21st century. For about 30 years, global and local communities have sought to tackle this challenge. In 1988, the United General Assembly (UNGA), at the initiative of Malta, recognised climate change as “a common concern of mankind” (United Nations, 1988), and the United Nations Environment Programme and the World Meteorological Organisation were tasked with establishing the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Climate change entered the international agenda, and has only increased in importance since.

Multilateral negotiations on a global climate agreement started in 1990 – also the year in which the IPCC published its first assessment report. Only two years later, negotiations culminated in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Since 1995 – one year after the Convention’s entry into force – the international community has met annually at the Conference of the Parties (COP) to further negotiate and implement the Convention’s ultimate objective of “prevent[ing] dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system” (UNFCCC, 1992). These climate summits have become “environmental mega-conferences” (Gaventa, 2010) with thousands of participants, and receive considerable academic, political, media, and public attention (Bäckstrand, Kuyper, Linnér, & Lövbrand, 2017; Lövbrand, Hjerpe, & Linnér, 2017; Schmidt, Ivanova, & Schäfer, 2013; Schroeder & Lovell, 2012).

A core feature of the climate change negotiations, and in fact of any multilateral negotiation, is that many states do not negotiate individually, but through groups or coalitions; Dupont (1996) even defines “negotiations as coalition building”. At the same time, some states, particularly larger ones, may also engage in negotiations individually, although they typically are also members of a coalition. In the context of multilateral negotiations, coalitions can be defined as cooperative efforts between at least two parties to obtain common goals (e.g. Elgström, Bjurulf, Johansson, & Sannerstedt, 2001; Narlikar, 2003; Starkey, Boyer, & Wilkenfeld, 2005). For some, this refers only to short-range, issue-specific objectives (Dupont, 1994, p. 148; Gamson, 1961). For us, coalitions are more long-term, and refer to repeated coordination to obtain shared objectives.
The terminology used in research and practice differs widely, ranging from alliances, negotiating groups, climate clubs, dialogues, or blocs. Some scholars use these terms to refer to specific types of coalitions. Narlikar (2003), for example, distinguishes issue-specific strategic “alliance coalitions” from broader, ideology-based “bloc coalitions”. In line with this divergent terminology, coalitions in the climate negotiations have divergent names such as “Alliance of Small States”, “Coalition of Rainforest Nations”, “Environmental Integrity Group”, “The Cartagena Dialogue for Progressive Action”, or “Association of Independent Latin American and Caribbean Countries” (our emphasis). For simplicity, in this volume we refer to coalitions throughout, regardless of the specific form of that coordination. Coalitions can thus be broad or issue-specific, strategic or ideology-based, ad-hoc or long-term, etc. Indeed, one of the objectives of the present volume is to develop some way of differentiating between coalition types. Before we proceed to outline the individual contributions of this volume, let us briefly review coalition research, in particular work on coalitions in multilateral climate negotiations.

**Coalition research in and beyond climate change negotiations**

Coalitions exist in multiple contexts beyond multilateral negotiations, and research has paid far more attention to coalitions outside of multilateral negotiations. A large part of coalition research is interested in coalition building from a game theory perspective (Bandyopadhyay & Chatterjee, 2012; Gamson, 1961). Much of this research remains conceptual. Applications to climate change are rare and remain rather theoretical (e.g. Buchner & Carraro, 2006; Wu & Thill, 2018). More common are applications to multi-party coalitions in parliamentary democracies and bargaining in business and organisational studies (e.g. Agndal, 2007; Stevenson, 1985), as well as individual behaviour in psychology (e.g. Bazerman, Curhan, Moore, & Valley, 2000). Many of these studies are also theoretical, or based on experiments, often with student subjects, and focus on small-scale negotiation settings with just two or three actors (e.g. Sagi & Diermeier, 2017). In international relations, coalition-building in the European Union has been studied in some depth (Bailer, 2004; Elgström et al., 2001; Finke, 2012), yet because of their majority voting system, these negotiations resemble government coalition-building at the national level, rather than multilateral UN negotiations.

Multilateral UN negotiations, such as those on climate change, are very different and much more complex: they involve almost 200 parties; they cover a large agenda with multiple, highly technical, and partly overlapping items; they are long-term with regular, repeated interactions; and they work through consensus, rather than majority voting. The intricacies of multilateral negotiations are less studied and less well-understood than bilateral settings, and thus require additional work (Crump & Zartman, 2003; Gray, 2011).

In theory, coalitions fulfil two essential functions (Dupont, 1994, 1996): they reduce the complexity of multilateral negotiations, and they increase members’ negotiation capacity and bargaining power.
To come together in a coalition, states must share some objectives and positions (Atela, Quinn, Arhin, Duguma, & Mbeva, 2017; Bhandary, 2017; Ciplet, Khan, & Roberts, 2015; Costantini, Crescenzi, Filippis, & Salvatici, 2007). By highlighting commonalities in state positions, and by reducing the number of actors and positions, coalitions reduce complexity and make the process more manageable (Dupont, 1996). Additionally, coalitions improve members’ negotiation capacity by allowing them to pool resources and information, and they are thus able to engage more effectively in negotiations. Finally, coalitions increase members’ bargaining power, as positions shared by several states carry more weight than those of individual states (Dupont, 1996; Rubin & Zartman, 2000). These functions make coalitions particularly relevant for smaller and less powerful countries (Chasek, 2005; Narlikar, 2003; Penetrante, 2013; Williams, 2005).

On the other hand, coalitions also add a layer to the negotiations, and therefore represent “negotiation within negotiation” (Starkey et al., 2005, p. 40). This additional layer does not come without costs. Coalition formation and maintenance require significant coordination efforts, which represents a challenge in particular for smaller and poorer countries who mostly can send only small delegations to negotiations (Borrevik, 2019; Calliari, Surminski, & Mysiak, 2019; Mrema & Ramakrishna, 2010). Further, coalition positions are necessarily compromise positions that need to be negotiated. Since power asymmetries also exist within coalitions, this compromise position may not equally reflect every coalition member’s preferences (Jones, Deere-Birkbeck, & Woods, 2010; Narlikar, 2003). Even if the group position carries more weight, it may be rather far from an individual member’s national position (Costantini, Sforina, & Zoli, 2016; DeSombre, 2000; Tobin, Schmidt, Tosun, & Burns, 2018).

Under which conditions do the benefits of coalition formation outweigh its costs? When do states create, or join, coalitions? Which coalitions are more successful, and why? Although coalitions are so central to the functioning of multilateral negotiations, they have received surprisingly little academic attention. Coalition formation, maintenance, and effectiveness are not well-understood in multilateral (climate) negotiations (Blaxekjær & Nielsen, 2015; Drahos, 2003; Gray, 2011), partly because negotiation research and scholarship on climate negotiations are disparate fields (Crump & Downie, 2015). As Carter (2015, p. 217) writes, “[d]espite the importance of coalitions in climate change negotiations, there remains a lacuna in the literature on coalition-building and coalition diplomacy in the regime more broadly”.

What do we know about coalitions in multilateral negotiations so far? There is some research on the negotiation strategies of small states, for which coalitions are of particular relevance, for example at the United Nations (Albaret & Placidi-Frot, 2016; Panke, 2012, 2013; Thorhallsson, 2012) or within the European Union (Panke, 2011; Thorhallsson, 2016; Thorhallsson & Wivel, 2006). Several studies focus on (developing country) coalitions in world trade negotiations (Cepaluni, Lopes Fernandes, Trecenti, & Damiani, 2014; Costantini et al., 2007; Drahos, 2003; Jones et al., 2010; Lee, 2009; Narlikar, 2003; Narlikar & Odell, 2006; Odell, 2006; Oduwole, 2012; Singh, 2006), or – more rarely – other UN negotiations.
A number of studies also focus explicitly on environmental negotiations (Allan & Dauvergne, 2013; Mrema & Ramakrishna, 2010; Williams, 2005), including those on climate change.

Research on the climate change negotiations has in particular examined the strategies, challenges, and achievements of individual coalitions, notably the Group of 77 and China (G77) (Chan, 2013; Kasa, Gullberg, & Heggelund, 2008; Vihma, Mulugetta, & Karlsson-Vinkhuyzen, 2011); the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) (Betzold, 2010; Chasek, 2005; de Águeda Corneloup & Mol, 2014; Deitelhoff & Walbott, 2012; Ronneberg, 2016); the emerging economies, Brazil, South Africa, India, and China (BASIC) (Brütsch & Papa, 2013; Downie & Williams, 2018; Hallding, Jürisoo, Carson, & Atteridge, 2013; Hallding et al., 2011; Happaerts, 2015; Hochstetler & Milkoreit, 2014; Hurrell & Sengupta, 2012); and the European Union (Afionis, 2011, 2017; Bäckstrand & Elgström, 2013; Groen & Niemann, 2013). The EU, however, is a special case, since the EU, as a supranational organisation, is itself a party to the Convention. There are also case studies of other coalitions (Atela et al., 2017; Bhandary, 2017; Kameri-Mbote, 2016; Watts & Depledge, 2018). Further, a number of studies use discourse analysis to identify common positions or narratives across countries, to identify potential coalitions, and/or match positions and existing coalitions (Costantini et al., 2016; Jernnäs & Linnér, 2019; Stephenson, Oculi, Bauer, & Carhuayano, 2019; Tobin et al., 2018).

The present volume builds on this body of work, and in particular seeks to widen the focus by examining a plurality of coalitions, and by exploring developments over time. This seems particularly relevant because the climate change negotiations have changed substantially since the first summit in 1995. While coalitions have existed in the climate change negotiations since their inception, this landscape of climate coalitions has fundamentally changed over time, and the number of groups active in climate negotiations has multiplied. Already in 2004, Yamin and Depledge (2004, p. 34) noted that

> The post-Kyoto negotiations have seen a proliferation of new negotiating coalitions, with several groups having emerged over the past few years. This reflects the growing maturity of the regime, accompanied by an increasing awareness among countries of their specific and group interests relative to climate change, along with their desire to participate more actively in the regime. The demand by countries to form new coalitions also responds to the growing tendency of structuring negotiations based on coalitions.

Between 2004 and today, the number of climate coalitions has increased even further, from a handful of negotiating groups at the first COP in 1995 to around 20 at the Paris COP in 2015 (Carter, 2018). Today, there are a wide range of different, partly overlapping coalitions (see Figure 1.1).

How can we make sense of these changing coalition dynamics? Why did these coalitions emerge? Who joins which coalitions, and why? How do coalitions work? How successful are they? And how do they impact the negotiation
Introduction

Figure 1.1 Coalitions in the climate change negotiations. Updated from Haller (2018).

process and outcomes? The present volume addresses these questions. It seeks to explore the landscape of climate coalitions and to understand more comprehensively the origins, roles, and effects of coalitions, and coalition proliferation, in the UNFCCC process. In Part I, the book takes a comprehensive approach to coalitions. The contributions in this Part serve as the conceptual and theoretical framework of this book, and do not examine individual coalitions, but rather are interested in general patterns in coalition formation and dynamics. In Part II, the book then turns to individual coalitions. The contributions here try to understand how and why individual coalitions were formed, how they work and with what results. Below, we outline the individual chapters of this volume in more detail.

Outline of contributions

Part I: Coalition formation and behaviour

Part I provides the point of departure and the overall framework for the subsequent chapters by mapping out and taking stock of patterns of cooperation in the climate change negotiations since their inception in 1995. This Part defines coalitions as a specific form of cooperation or diplomacy, different from other negotiation strategies and behaviours. Yet coalitions come in many forms and
shapes, and the first part of the edited volume explores this diversity of cooperation patterns across all countries and over time.

In Chapter 2, Paula Castro and Carola Klöck seek to systematically map and characterise 25 coalitions active in the climate negotiations to understand the growing number and diversity of coalitions. The authors develop a typology of (climate) coalitions, based on three dimensions: a coalition’s geographic and thematic scope; its membership size; and its level of formality. These dimensions in part correlate, such that three distinct clusters or categories of coalitions can be identified: (i) regional coalitions, which are typically pre-existing regional organisations that at some point started to engage in the climate negotiations; (ii) global generic coalitions, which also pre-date the climate negotiations but unite members from across the globe; and (iii) global climate-specific coalitions, which have been formed specifically for the purpose of defending common climate-related objectives. The latter could thus also be termed instrumental coalitions. The authors then discuss the proliferation of coalitions, particularly global climate-specific coalitions, and, to a lesser extent, regional ones. Finally, the chapter finds that coalitions persist, leading to additional and overlapping coalition memberships. These multiple coalition memberships could have positive and negative implications. On the one hand, coalitions can mutually support each other, and common members can forge new alliances and build bridges across coalitions. On the other hand, there are also logistical challenges of multiple coalition memberships, as well as potential tensions between coalitions that advance divergent positions. Which of these effects plays out is an open empirical question.

Chapter 3 directly builds on the typology developed in Chapter 2. Florian Weiler and Paula Castro argue that coalition characteristics make a coalition more or less central to the overall negotiations. In particular, the authors hypothesise that closer coordination within a coalition leads to higher centrality, as does size. In other words, more cohesive and larger coalitions should be more influential. The authors systematically test for differences in coalition behaviour by conceptualising the negotiations as a network of negotiation exchanges. Their dataset covers negotiations until 2013, and for this period, the authors find that coalition type does have an impact on coalition behaviour. Notably, regional, climate-focused, larger, and older coalitions tend to play a more central role in the negotiations, in terms of both their levels of activity and popularity, and the way in which they build bridges between their members and all other parties (“betweenness”). In addition, regional, climate-focused, and larger coalitions seem to adopt a position that is closer to more players in the negotiations (“closeness”).

Finally, Nicholas Chan takes a more historic and descriptive approach to understanding coalition building and maintenance in Chapter 4. His analysis draws on historical institutionalism and focuses on the timing and sequencing of coalition formation of subgroups within the larger Group of 77 and China (G77). Since the UNFCCC process was created by the United Nations General Assembly, the G77 became the “default” coalition for the countries of the Global South. However, as the negotiations developed and were increasingly structured by coalitions, many countries felt the need to create new coalitions. Yet, the G77 dominated the “political
space” available for subsequent coalition formation; rather than new, cross-cutting coalitions, this meant that new coalitions were understood to be subgroups of G77, and membership could only be “layered” on top of G77 membership. This means that (developing country) coalitions will seek to associate themselves with the G77 position, but also that they seek to influence this G77 position during G77 coordination meetings. By tracing these dynamics over time, the chapter shows how important historical legacies and institutional context are to understanding current coalition patterns: temporal sequencing has causal significance for the patterns of coalition formation and development that follow. A historical approach to the UNFCCC process thus also provides a more nuanced understanding of the nature of North–South differences in international climate politics.

**Part II: Case studies of individual coalitions**

Part II of the book zooms in on individual coalitions. In particular, it focuses on some “new” political groups that have emerged in the last rounds of negotiations around the 2009 Copenhagen Accord and the 2015 Paris Agreement. While there are too many coalitions for all of them to be covered, we have selected coalitions that represent the variety of groups active in the climate change regime, including: regional groups and global “meta-coalitions”; formal negotiation groups and informal ad-hoc groups; and coalitions of small and less influential states and cooperation between large and influential ones.

In Chapter 5, George Carter traces the involvement of Pacific small island developing states (SIDS) over 30 years of climate change negotiations. Despite being some of the smallest countries in the world, Pacific SIDS have managed to actively engage in and shape the global climate negotiations. The chapter examines the role of these “pivotal players” in three negotiation periods: the early years from 1989 to the signing of the Convention in 1992; an implementation period from the first COP to 2013; and the negotiations leading to the 2015 Paris Agreement and beyond. Pacific SIDS, notably Vanuatu and Tuvalu, co-founded the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) as the core coalition of SIDS and helped to spread awareness of the plight of these “frontline states”. Pacific SIDS also influenced AOSIS’ negotiating positions and strategies, notably when they held the rotating AOSIS chair. Yet over time, Pacific SIDS also turned to alternative venues to spread their message, and joined or became active in other coalitions. Finally, they increasingly also worked as Pacific SIDS in the negotiations, as a subgroup of AOSIS. In the negotiations around the Paris Agreement, three Pacific island states stand out: Tuvalu opposed the USA on the issue of loss and damage; the Marshall Islands initiated the High Ambition Coalition to pave the way for the Paris Agreement; and Fiji was the first island state to preside over a COP. Clearly, after 30 years of leadership and partnerships, Pacific island states have been, and will continue to be, pivotal players in global climate change negotiations.

Chapter 6 turns to a special type of coalition or group, the Cartagena Dialogue on Progressive Action. Lau Øfjord Blaxekjær examines how this platform for
dialogue and open exchange re-created trust in the multilateral UNFCCC process and made it possible for the climate negotiations to resume after the failure of the Copenhagen Summit (COP15). The Cartagena Dialogue is not a “normal” coalition: it does not intervene in the negotiations as a group, and it does not make joint statements or media appearances. Instead, it is a dialogue, an informal space for member states from both the Global North and the Global South to come together, exchange viewpoints, learn about others’ positions, and share information. As such, the Cartagena Dialogue is best understood as a community of practice whose members share an understanding of what is at stake in the UNFCCC process and a common desire for progressive climate policies. The Cartagena Dialogue spans the classical North–South boundary. Members meet regularly face-to-face, but do not agree on consensus positions; rather, members can use notes as they see fit and often refer to, and mutually support, other members’ interventions in the negotiations. Through such practices, the Cartagena Dialogue was crucial to taking the negotiations forward and finding compromise at a decisive and difficult moment in the history of the UNFCCC, helping to pave the way for the 2015 Paris Agreement.

Chapter 7 analyses the group of Like-Minded Developing Countries (LMDCs), which emerged in 2012 in the run-up to the 2015 Paris Summit. Lau Øfjord Blaxekjær, Bård Lahn, Tobias Dan Nielsen, Lucia Green-Weiskel, and Fang Fang focus on this period, in which the LMDCs were very vocal. Starting from a constructivist, narrative approach to international relations, they use interviews and other sources to understand how the LMDCs see themselves and how they are seen by others. Their analysis identifies four core characteristics of the LMDCs’ narrative position: first, the LMDCs are firmly anchored in the G77 and consider themselves as the “true” representatives of the Global South as a whole. Second, LMDCs see themselves as guardians of the Convention. They insist on maintaining a differentiation between developed Annex I countries, and developing non-Annex I countries, and object to binding emission reductions commitments for all countries. The developed countries’ historical responsibility, equity, and the principle of “common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities” (CBDR-RC) – all enshrined in the Convention – imply differential treatment of developed versus developing countries. This relates to the third element of the LMDC position, namely that developing countries are the victims, not the culprits, of anthropogenic climate change. Fourth, and finally, even if LMDCs resist binding emission reduction commitments, they are by no means “blockers”, but actively engage in climate action at home. Eventually, the Paris Agreement largely left behind the rigid differentiation of countries into developed and developing countries. Although LMDCs’ key demands were not met, the coalition continues to meet and coordinate in the climate change negotiations.

Chapter 8 explores the African Group of Negotiators (AGN), the only UN regional group that is active in substantive negotiations. Simon Chin-Yee, Tobias Dan Nielsen, and Lau Øfjord Blaxekjær argue that the AGN has come a long way from being marginalised in the negotiations, and now plays a significant role. African countries are strongly affected by climate change, but contribute
minimally to global greenhouse gas emissions. Based on this vulnerability and lack of (historical) responsibility, the AGN seeks to achieve better representation for Africa’s priorities by portraying itself as a coherent and unified coalition – although this does not deny the huge diversity found on the African continent. As the authors show, it has not always been easy to bring together the 54 countries of Africa and speak with one voice in the negotiations. Overlapping coalition memberships, split loyalties, and tensions among African countries exist. Yet, African countries recognise the importance of speaking as one continent; additionally, individual negotiators have become key figures and driven the African agenda in the negotiations. These factors all contributed to the growing role of Africa, through the AGN, in the climate negotiations.

In Chapter 9, Joshua Watts examines the role of Latin American and Caribbean countries in the negotiations, by comparing and contrasting the structure, positions, and impact of ALBA, the Bolivarian Alliance of the Peoples of Our America, and AILAC, the Independent Association of Latin American and Caribbean Countries. ALBA and AILAC emerged in 2009 and 2012, respectively, and represent two contrasting voices from the region. ALBA has taken a more controversial approach and sees capitalism and neoliberalism as the root cause of climate change. Accordingly, the coalition has adopted strong and uncompromising positions on equity and climate justice, emphasising the historical responsibility – or historical “debt” – of developed countries for climate change, and objecting market mechanisms. In contrast, AILAC has taken a conciliatory and pragmatic approach (more in line with the Cartagena Dialogue, in which AILAC members participated). AILAC seeks to build bridges, increase trust, and enable compromise and consensus for ambitious and progressive climate policies. The coalition thus encourages mitigation from developing countries alongside emission cuts from developed countries, including through market mechanisms. The overall negotiations have rather leaned toward AILAC’s positions. This development, as well as the more formalised structure of AILAC as compared to ALBA, may explain why AILAC is overall more active and engaged in the negotiations, while ALBA’s participation and engagement has declined.

The concluding Chapter 10 returns to the point of departure of this volume, mentioned earlier: the central, but understudied, role of coalitions in multilateral negotiations. Florian Weiler, Paula Castro, and Carola Klöck focus on recurring themes of the volume’s diverse contributions. In particular, the authors note four results: first, coalitions are context-specific and need to be studied and understood against the backdrop of overall negotiation dynamics. Coalitions shape negotiations, but negotiations in turn shape coalitions. Second, coalitions tend to be “sticky” and persist. Once created, they tend to remain – even if their level of activity and influence may change over time. Third, coalitions operate at different levels. We note the creation of both sub-groups that are anchored in core coalitions such as the G77 or AOSIS, but also “meta-coalitions” that specifically seek to unite negotiators from across the different coalitions. Fourth, the proliferation of coalitions inevitably leads to multiple and partially overlapping coalition memberships: most countries belong to more than just one coalition. These multiple
memberships have both negative and positive effects, creating tensions on the one hand, but also synergies and partnerships on the other. Overall, while the book hopes to contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of coalitions in multilateral (climate) negotiations, many open questions remain, and the concluding chapter also outlines ways forward for coalition research.

Finally, the Appendix contains two additional documents: Appendix I lists all countries and the coalitions in which they participate, while Appendix II provides a brief description of all major coalitions that are, or were, active in the climate change coalitions.
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