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# How should we assess the Paris meeting?

## What are goals?

### Are these realistic?

## What are metrics of effectiveness?

## What are constraints, especially after Friday’s terrorist attacks?

# How should we assess Paris? Use Kyoto for practice

## What are goals? How are goals in tension with each other?

### Are these realistic?

### Are they sufficiently ambitious

## What are metrics of effectiveness? Compliance, Counterfactals, or Goal Achievement

## What evidence of influence should we collect? How should we analyze it?

### Correlational evidence

### Process tracing evidence

# Climate Change Treaties and Protocols and Amendments

## 1992 UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (no targets)

## 1997 Kyoto Protocol (agreed-upon targets from 1990 for developed countries for 2008 to 2012)

## 2012 Doha Amendment (agreed-upon targets from 1990 for developed countries for 2013 to 2020)

## 2015 Paris Agreement (voluntary targets for 165 countries for 2030 but different base years)

#  Was it effective? And why?

## Did it work or NOT? Evidence you would look for for each side of argument?

## WHY did it work or not?

# Using Kyoto as a model: Can we evaluate success in terms of Compliance?

## Kyoto Success and Failure -- BADLY presented!

## Kyoto Success and Failure - Put in ascending order of DV

## Kyoto Success and Failure - Group by some IV to see “causes”

### Using Kyoto as a model: Can we evaluate success in terms of Counterfactuals?

### Step 1: Note: China grew a lot due to production “on behalf of” other countries

## Kyoto Success and Failure Group by some IV to see “causes”

### Step 2: Compare Before Trend to After

### Step 2: Compare Members/Non-Members

## Kumazawa and Callaghan

### Environmental Kuznets Curve model

### ***RQ***: does relationship of income to emissions change dependent on Kyoto rqmts

### Finding: “industrialized countries … subject to emission reduction targets [under] Kyoto Protocol, have different patterns of carbon dioxide emissions from other countries that do not have any targets.”

### “For Annex B countries, since the signing of the agreement, there were significant reductions in carbon dioxide emissions, a desirable outcome of the protocol. The reduction was larger for the second period when the protocol entered into force. However, non-Annex B countries did not experience any changes in emissions in both periods.”

## Using Kyoto as a model: Can we evaluate success in terms of *Goal Achievement*?

# What goal should we use?

## Political goal that states set for selves (4.7% decrease)

## Political goal of what might have been possible (??)

## Environmental goal of protecting the planet (drastic and rapid decrease)

## “There are presently no binding obligations for countries with 85 per cent of total emissions.” (Andresen, 2014) == about “Kyoto 2” but still true today

# Analysis of evidence

## But question is ***not*** what HAPPENED but what CAUSED it!

### Switch question

### From: Was Kyoto the cause of the decrease?

### To: What were emission changes and what caused them?

### When were changes?

### How much were changes?

### Take out Russia/Ukraine change that was due to collapse of Soviet Union

## But Earth doesn’t care about Kyoto Parties, it cares about ALL countries

## And what was the PROCESS of Kyoto influence

# Process-tracing and looking for fingerprints

## “Through careful process tracing, we need to establish that key target groups reduce emissions ***as a result of rules and regulations*** laid down by the climate regime” (Andresen 2014)

## Flexibility mechanisms (Andresen 2014)

### Pledge-and-review process (look at reviews conducted)

### Copenhagen climate fund but money never came

### Joint implementation but little used

### CDM ***increased*** emissions

### Emissions trading system of Protocol never applied

### Need to compare actual emissions to a “business-as-usual scenario” (i.e., counterfactual): “Emissions would in all likelihood have been somewhat higher in their absence” (Andresen 2014)

## Alternative Explanations (Andresen 2014)

### “Economic ups and downs of the world economy as well as switches in the energy base, both unrelated to climate policies, have been far more important for emission trajectories.”

## Andresen

### Looking much more at process and details

### Looking at “problem structure” – maybe no progress because it’s a hard (‘malign’) problem

### “UNFCCC regime is weak and the main reason is the malign problem-structure” – true but doesn’t preclude it from having been effective