Volume and Issues Obtainable at Centeriir.org
Pakistan Journal of Criminal Justice
ISSN: 2958-9363 ISSN (E): 2958-9371
Volume 2, No.1, 2022
Journal Homepage: https://journals.centeriir.org/index.php/pjcl

The Discourse of Limitations and Strengths of the Paris Climate Agreement

Muhammad Ahmad
University Gillani Law College
Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan
ahmadkambohctn@gmail.com
ORICID: 0001-7153-0875

ABSTRACT

This article critically analyses the limitations and strengths of the Paris Climate Accords. With this purpose, the article first highlights the legal character of this agreement. The article then discourses the assessment of the fundamental components of the statute of the Paris accords with the purpose to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses in the preamble, long-term goals, mitigation, adaptation, cooperative approaches, finance, loss and damage, capacity-building, global Stocktake, and Compliance by using the qualitative research techniques. Further, this article describes the agreement's basic theme and future assessments. In the end, this article culminates into a reasonable conclusion.

Article History: Received: April 31, 2022: Accepted: May 28, 2022
Keywords: Paris Agreement, Climate Accord, Climate Change, Stakeholders, Nations

1 Introduction

Efficient international cooperation on climate change surely entails inspiring and empowering the stakeholders to act in a way that might be beneficial not typically to what they regard to be in their own country's interest but to the whole world community. The Kyoto Protocol was one strategy for reaching this objective. It was founded, at least in part, on the premise that sovereign nations are more willing to take actions for the good of the global community if they are certain that other nations will do the same and if they believe the effort is being distributed fairly. Aligning one's interest with the interest of the whole community is the aim. Therefore, emission reduction targets under the Kyoto Protocol were decided upon jointly by nations with the ultimate goal of encouraging those nations to adopt aspiring aims taking into consideration and subject to similar promises made by other parties. Making the marks legally binding and providing appropriate repercussions as a result of non-compliance were priorities (Meinhard, 2005).

While the Kyoto strategy was widely regarded as effective and efficient in Europe, it failed to conclusively advance most other affluent nations apart from "no regrets actions." For instance, Kyoto Protocol never received American ratification. Canada quit rather than put out the necessary effort to reach its emission reduction target. Australia set a fairly low priority to Kyoto negotiations. Most recently, instead of accepting a second commitment period target under the 2012 Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol, industrialized nations outside of Europe decided to achieve their goals within the Convention (UN, 2016). Despite participating in the Kyoto negotiations, targets were unilaterally proposed. While substantial initiatives have been taken by countries to reduce emissions, several growing economies without Kyoto objectives, such as China, Brazil, India, and South Africa, have seen their

emissions keep increasing drastically (Climate, 2016).

The Paris Outcome presents an alternative strategy. Based on the notions that displayed domestic development, complete pellucidity, a shared adherence to advancement, aspiration, and continuous monitoring of the combined endeavours are essential for progressing stakeholders beyond 'no regrets actions', it is more probable that self-imposed, willful commitments will be upheld more so than agreements achieved through international cooperation in discussions. A long-running debate has focused on the relative benefits of these competing strategies in international relations and law literature (Richard, 2009)

The Kyoto approach is centred on the premise that national governments always behave in their own best interests, necessitating a global accord that harmonizes those interests through legally enforceable pledges and strict adherence. The Paris Climate Agreement (hereinafter the Climate Accord) is predicated based on the idea that various states may be persuaded to act for the sake of the world community through management strategies that produce new standards of state behaviour. This managerial strategy is founded on open communication, a well-defined shared objective, consideration of the state of the science, frequent reviews of collaborative progress, opportunities for engagement and information sharing, as well as the adaptability to change as conditions and science do.

Extensive conservations over the efficacy of multiple regulatory strategies have taken place in other national and worldwide contexts, with some supporting administration, market-based, or volunteer techniques while others support leading centralized management strategies. A significant number of scholars and practitioners are now supporting a combination of techniques that are specifically customized to the situation as a result of recent local debates. In a domestic setting, there are effective ways to implement a control and command approach; nevertheless, this has proven difficult on a global scale (Neil, 2009). This is a major distinction between the national and global contexts. This indicates furthermore grounds why command and control strategies shouldn't be the only ones used from an international perspective.

The Paris Agreement is an attempt to use a more management strategy to persuade nations to take climate change action that goes beyond no regrets. It constitutes a fundamental divergence since it seeks to promote aspiration by strict oversight and the establishment of norms, even while it keeps many key components of the Kyoto method. Although it is an experiment with strong ties to "managerial theories of international relations", it is also partly driven by real-world circumstances, like the internal political climate in the United States and enduring contrasts between the advanced and developing world (Chayes, n 6).

2 Critical Analysis of Substantial Components of the Paris Agreement

An aerial perspective of the main components of the Climate Accord is provided in this section. The emphasis is on the crucial elements that set the stage for the objective assessment of the Paris Declaration.

2.1 Preamble

The Paris Accord's preamble functioned as a crucial tool for enumerating ideas and clauses in a region that, in a sense, lies between the Paris Decision and the Agreement's operative legal provisions. It served as the foundation for some cutting-edge clauses and ideas that only lately surfaced in the negotiations.

Some Parties insisted that the Paris Agreement contain these clauses, while other Parties objected to their inclusion. Some of the significant challenges mentioned in the preamble are acknowledged for the first time in a contract under the control of the UN climate regime. Among them are:

• Importance of a fair workforce transition;

• Importance of a fair workforce transition;

• The necessity of upholding, promoting, and considering human rights;

• The necessity to consider the right to development, promoting gender equality, women's rights, and respect for human rights when implementing global environmental action;

• The need to take into account everyone's rights, including the right to health, those of local populations, migrants, minors, individuals with impairments, and those in vulnerable circumstances.

2.2 Long-term goal (Article 2)

Perhaps the surprising part and a major success of the Paris negotiations was the consensus to strive to decrease this increase to 1.5 °C and maintain the increase in the average world temperature at "far below" 2 °C.

It may be argued that 1.5 °C has now evolved into the basic standard by which all future mitigation measures will be evaluated. This optimistic long-term aim is a crucial starting point for every nation's futurity nationally determined contributions (NDCs), their equity-based reasoning, and the Global Stocktake and NDC communication's five-year cycles. The 1.5 °C targets are anticipated to have an impact over time on discussions on other facets of the deep-rooted aim, like more definite timetables for the declared demand for a rapid high in total emissions worldwide and for reaching an equilibrium between emissions and removals.

The temperature in the long-term aim also offers an adequate framework for other significant Paris Agreement components, including finance and adaptation. An essential prerequisite for adaptation activities is achieving the future goal, and financing is crucial for accomplishing Paris Agreement's mitigation and adaptation targets. Sustainable growth, development, and the alleviation of poverty are connected in significant ways. Based on the Global Stocktake, it is anticipated that the protracted goal outlined in Article 2 will serve as the comprehensive guideline for the adoption and execution of the Paris Agreement.

2.3 Mitigation and cooperative strategies (Articles 4-6)

As measured against the protracted temperature target, the combined mitigating action embodied by the NDCs forms the basis for mitigation under the Climate Accord. Commencing in 2025, subsequent NDCs will be enhanced every five years as a result of a global stocktaking effort that finished two years before the deadline for each revised NDC (Agreement, arts 4.9). The Climate Accord provides crucial instructions on how Countries will be to evaluate whether the proposed NDCs are sufficient in terms of mitigation.

Article 4.1 states that Parties must work to reach a global peak in emissions as quickly as practicable and shall then implement rapid reductions by science and equality. As a result of parties' recognition that underdeveloped countries' emissions will take longer to peak, wealthier nations are under pressure to quicken their emission cuts to quickly reach a worldwide peaking. Parties strive to enhance an equilibrium between greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and discharge from the environment in the second decade of this century, which suggests that GHG quantities should be balanced and after 2050 start to decline.

These clauses establish several procedural requirements and give some clarification regarding the scope and distribution of preventive actions; however, they do not establish a methodology for determining which NDCs are appropriate for various stakeholders or a legally binding commitment to adopt NDCs. Significantly, the long-term mitigating strategies are stated in terms that are not dependent on technology, leaving open the question of how much individual technologies, Improved sinks, carbon capture, storage technologies, and sources of clean energy should all help the endeavour. Given that the Paris Outcome expressly acknowledges that the current pledges made by the participants and the protracted objective have different levels of ambition, additional guidance provided to Parties regarding their obligations has greater significance. According to Decision 1/CP.21, the target gap will be greater than 15 gigatons by 2030.

The Paris Agreement particularly includes forests in this sense and stresses the significance of improving and conserving sinks (Agreement art 5). In addition, the Paris Agreement affirms that Stakeholders may use international carbon trading and other market mechanisms to achieve the reduction target in carbon emissions provided that they change their intent with an optimistic approach (Agreement, art 6). The

Climate Accord sets forward broad guidelines for utilizing trade processes, including avoiding dual counting, maintaining ecological quality, adopting trustworthy budgeting, and being transparent. The Accord further contains provisions for non-market strategies to aid stakeholders in putting their NDCs into practice.

Before a thorough assessment of their ecological sustainability and capacity to support the Paris Accord's ultimate goal can be achieved, specific guidelines for these diverse mechanisms must be created. Among the core framework's observations to be made are the importance of inspiring domestic effort and the importance of developed country leadership in closing the ambition gap and achieving long-term objectives. The Paris Agreement's ambitious mitigation goals will be realized in part through pellucidity, the Global Stocktake, and ever-lasting mitigation plans. Effective collaboration on mitigation ought to facilitate by providing the essential aspiration if parties are aware that doing so will decrease their vulnerability to damage and loss, their need for adaptation, and its cost.

2.4 Adaptation (Article 7)

Regarding adaptation, there aren't many surprises in the Paris Agreement. It does acknowledge a worldwide objective of improving adaptability, increasing tenacity, and decreasing susceptibility to change in climate for the first time. It also explains the connection between the demands of developing nations for adaptation and the effectiveness of mitigating as measured by the protracted temperature target. In a broader sense, it makes the notion that being ambitious in terms of mitigation will lower adaptation costs. The Paris Agreement (Agreement, 11.1) must strike a balance between money for adaptation and mitigation, as well as between the two more generally.

On the whole, the Agreement builds on prior initiatives to encourage adaptability at the municipal, domestic, and governmental levels in underdeveloped nations. Interestingly, Climate Accord acknowledges the desire for adapting initiatives to be open to participation, gender-responsive, and transparent. Adaptation is a component of the Global Stocktake under Article 14 of the Climate Accord, although it is not added to the stocktaking process in 2018 as specified in Decision 1/CP.21. Increasing transparency regarding adaptability is a significant advancement.

2.5 Loss and damage (Article 8)

The topic of damage and loss kept negotiators busy right up until the very end, as it had guaranteed. An unaided damage and loss provision in the Climate Accord with a slightly broader purpose but an obvious absence of redress and responsibility was the result of the compromise. The Climate Accord does not contain this exemption; it is specified in Outcome 1/CP.21, allowing for subsequent modification by the Conference of the Parties (Decision, para 51). In the later phases of the discussions, a demand for integrated strategies to address climate change-related displacement was also added to the Declaration (Decision, paras 49-50).

The expansion of the Paris Agreement's loss and damage mandate must include references to early alert systems, rigorous analysis, planning processes, prevention, benefit plans, and capacity building.

The largely reactive structure put in place in Warsaw would seem to become a more proactive one under the new mandate. While strengthening assistance for loss and damage is mentioned in Article 8, funding is not specifically mentioned as a form of support. Damage and loss are not among the matters listed in Article 3 that signatories are asked to take into consideration as core elements of their contribution to the international effort to combat environmental issues.

2.6 Finance (Article 9)

The discussions' planned to be financed issue was one of the possible stumbling blocks. A major question was whether the previous commitment to create $100 billion in yearly climate funding by 2020 was still sufficient. Additional contentious issues were financial streams, the distinction between public and private funding, and how much funds should be allocated for damage, loss, and climate change adaptation and mitigation. The requirement for dependable scaled-up funding before 2020 was another area of contention.

In the end, the biggest financial surprise was how little work was required to allow for a global Climate accord. A

minimum of $100 billion and the plan to raise this mobilization target before 2025, (Decision, paras 53 and 114) were both confirmed, but only in the Decision. By their current obligations under the UN Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), developed nations are required by the Paris Agreement to contribute financial resources to help underdeveloped nations with mitigation and adaptation. Developing economies are additionally encouraged to make voluntary contributions. It is anticipated that developed nations would continue to dominate in the mobilization of financial resources. There hasn't been much significant progress in terms of funding sources. The communal pledge of USD 100 billion exclusively pertains to wealthier nations; benefactions from underdeveloped nations are not covered by this shared approach (Decision, paras 53) Parties mainly concurred to continue using current financial methods, such as the Green Climate Fund, for money distribution (Agreement, 9.8).

A consensus was reached about the openness, evaluation, and application of monetary assistance via biannual reporting and the Global Stocktake, which will be conducted every five years commencing in 2023 (Agreement, art 9.5). REDD-plus (lowering emissions resulting from deforestation and degradation) has widespread support, but no specific aims or guarantees have been made (Agreement, art 5.2). The final round of discussions resulted in the deletion of references to the elimination of indigenous fossil fuel subsidies that had been included in earlier draughts. This is in line with the broader strategy of refraining from prescribing particular domestic measures to realize the objectives of the Climate Accord.

In terms of financing before 2020, decision 1/CP.21 emphasizes the importance of additional financial support from developed nations for raising the ambition of pre-2020 commitments. Putting particular emphasis on public spending value and financing for adaptation (Agreement arts 9.4) makes the case for more financial assistance. It calls on industrialized nations to produce a clear plan for meeting the USD 100 billion targets for 2020 and opts to convene a facilitative meeting in 2016 to monitor the advancement (Decision, paras 114-115). The direction and dynamic the accord generate for a rise in ambition over time may be the most effective tool it provides in terms of financing. It does it primarily using three components, namely:

(1) establishing the target of aligning all financial flows with a growth route (Agreement, art 2.1(c)) that is low in emissions and climate-resilient,

(2) utilizing climate finance (Agreement, art 3). and the development principle, and

(3) incorporating the global stocktake's financial component (Agreement, art 14.1).

2.7 Technology (Article 10)

Since COP 15 in Copenhagen, the United Nations climate regime has made significant efforts to advance technology development, transfer, and use in emerging economies, in particular through the development and implementation of the Technology Mechanism (TM), which is made up of “the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN)”. The climate accord provides an advanced technological framework, but there is a high chance that it will overlap with the current TM, and there has been little advancement on the important substantive concerns.

To effectively promote the creation, transfer, and application of technology in developing nations, significant effort still has to be done. The Paris Agreement makes no financing pledges specifically for technology. In addition, there are no evident connections between the TM and the financial framework of the Accord, despite the fact that the global stocktake would consider financing for implementation tools. The COP agreed to evaluate the effectiveness and sufficiency of the TM's support regularly. Moving forward, Parties will need to pay close attention to the crucial role that capacity building will play in properly implementing relevant technology.

2.8 Capacity-building (Article 11)

The Climate Accord's inclusion of a separate article on capacity building as a result of persistent efforts to raise awareness of this issue since COP 13 in Bali is arguably the most significant development for this field. A recent organization, the “Paris Committee on Capacity Building”, was also created to supplement PCCB (Decision, paras 71-81). It won't be feasible to evaluate its role fully until it is entirely functionalized, develops, and puts its plan

into action. The more sophisticated differentiation strategy, notably about transparency and review under Article 13, is related to the increasing role of capacity-building in part because it was the dedication to enhancing capability that made it feasible to reach a transparency accord. The relationship between building capacity and leniency in the integrity criteria for poor countries, especially through 'the Capacity-Building Initiative for Transparency' will determine how well Article 13 of the Climate Accord is implemented (Decision 1/CP.21 paras 84-88).

2.9 Transparency, Global Stocktake & Compliance (Articles 13, 14, 15)

The transparency regulations represented a compromise, but they essentially follow the strategy favoured by developed nations. Apart from a few small exclusions made primarily because of a determination to versatility and help poor nations, all members are subject to the accountability criteria. All Parties' information will be reviewed by technical experts, and progress will be taken into account on a multilateral, facilitative basis. A specific focus is placed on the world's poorest nations and small islands with low economies (Agreement art 13.7). The Paris Agreement's capacity-building initiatives are focused on fairness, a sign that the stakeholders in advanced nations are driven to help underdeveloped nations build their capacity to reduce discrepancies in authenticity (Agreement, arts 11, 13.15)

The Climate Accord reflects a desire to strengthen and expand the UNFCCC's existing transparency provisions, such as domestic communications, biannual reports, update reports, global evaluation and review, and worldwide dialogue and discussion (Agreement, art 13.4). It explicitly demands more consistent reporting that is thorough, a more streamlined verification process (Agreement art 13.11), and standard modalities, processes, and regulations (Agreement, art 13.13).

The fifteen clauses of Article 13 of the Climate Accord provide a startling amount of information on financial reporting and accounting, and transparency is also highlighted in several significant sections on mitigating adaptability, and capacity-building (Agreement, arts 4.8).

Another essential component of the overall endeavour to guarantee that the Climate Accord's objective is achieved by the joint endeavours of stakeholders is the development of a stocktaking process. The Worldwide Stocktake described in Article 14 includes assistance, implementation strategies, mitigation as well as adaptation. The first Worldwide Stocktake is planned for 2023, right before the Parties' 2025 NDCs are modified. Enhancing national action and global collaboration is the mission of the global stocktake. 2018 will see the beginning of the Parties' "facilitative discussion," a process for taking an inaugural stock (Decision, para 20).

The collaborative, non-competitive, and non-punitive compliance method applies to all stakeholders (Agreement, art 15). The membership of the compliance committee, which will be selected like that of the Kyoto Protocol's facilitative branch, shall comprise twelve members with the necessary technical competence (Decision, para 102). In carrying out its task, the committee must be mindful of the national capacities and circumstances of the Stakeholders (Agreement art 15.2).

The visibility measures about the participants' application of their NDCs, along with 'the Global Stocktake' and 'the compliance system', form the basis of the framework developed under the Climate Accord to ensure the development of independent and mutual efforts toward future targets. The fundamental components, which take the shape of Articles 13 to 15, are present and seem sound. The specific guidelines must still be agreed upon. Determining whether the accountability, evaluation, reassessments, and compliance method in the Climate Accord is effective in raising aspiration adequately to encounter the greater milestone will likely depend on several factors that fall outside the purview of the future climatic system, particularly the financial, governmental circumstances in significant member countries.

3 Was the Paris Climate Accords a game-changer?

The Paris Accord's heterogeneous strategy is the core concern around its effectiveness, which combines shared long-term ambitions with credibility and norm-building, fairness, and assessment can generate enough effort above and beyond "no-regrets action" to accomplish its future aim. There are certain potential drawbacks to the Accord decisions that are needed to be addressed, even in the context of the management method. These are as follows:

a) Because they are essentially contained in the Climate Accord's preamble, basic fundamental rights, social equity, no gender discrimination, and protection of the environment's full incorporation into the regime's execution is less assured.

b) If the stakeholders won't negotiate on a high point of the year and on a carbon reduction per year that is persistent either with the 1.5 or the "well below" 2 °C heat targets, it might be more challenging to minimize the ambition slot. Additionally, it appears that in the second half of the century, a significant amount of reliance will be placed on speculative negative emissions.

c) Even though the GHG neutrality goal and the temperature goal precisely indicate the elimination of fossil fuels, failure to expressly signal their phase-out or remove incentives for fossil energy increases the danger of striving to drag out the discussion over their future in certain states and trying to distract from comprehensive climate change measures.

d) Parties made little progress in the area of financing, raising serious concerns about their capacity to enhance the money required for the full application and complete execution of the Climate Accord and reach the main goal.

e) The Paris Decision on the elimination of accountability and alternative remedy for any damage caused might make inevitable discussions about who is to blame for loss and damage more challenging.

f) Although expected given the speed of the discussions leading up to Paris, little information was supplied regarding the roles played by carbon trading, counterbalance, descend, and non-market techniques. Although the fundamental components exist, there is a plan to discuss the particulars of these crucial areas shortly.

g) Despite considerable emphasis being placed on their significant contribution to channelizing stakeholders' ambitions for mitigation, non-state entities and sub-national governments received surprisingly little attention in the final talks.

The result of the Climate Accord represents a substantial advancement in the United Nations' project on climate change, despite these limits. The Agreement establishes a firm foundation for organizing nations to move away from using fossil fuels and toward low-emission, and switch towards alternative means of using energy i.e., solar energy, wind energy, tidal energy, and other renewable sources of energy, and transfer the world powered entirely by renewable and sustainable energy, even though there is still plenty to be done and the method chosen is an attempt at higher international cooperation. The Paris Agreement ensures sufficient nation-state control over mitigation measures and monetary commitments to ensure international participation. It offers developing nations important, if yet insufficient, aid and serves as a solid foundation for complete transparency, regular stocktaking, and assessment.

4 Conclusion

The NDCs, massive monetary support for developing nations, five-year stocktaking and evaluation cycles, greater accountability, and a facilitative method of alignment are the significant elements of the Climate Accord. According to their capacities, obligations, and other national circumstances, each of these particular components is anticipated to work together to help achieve the ambitious long-term objective. The Paris Agreement's preambular text makes frequent mentions of intergenerational fairness, human rights, and gender parity.

The main point is obvious. If the international world wants to achieve these lofty objectives set in Paris Climate Accord, all nations will need to use all of their efforts. Developed economies must swiftly reach net zero GHG emissions if they are to fairly contribute to these climate-related goals. Further, these high emitters should now be the subject of more scrutiny and will come under greater pressure to demonstrate that they are contributing to the universal mitigation endeavour and they have to accept these essential objectives in the coming future, even though the Paris Accord contains no legally binding quantified emission reduction obligations. Provided this long-term aim, it appears evident that anything less than the best efforts to reach net zero GHG emissions as soon as possible will not pass any logical equity test given the large overall and per capita emissions in developed economies historically

and today, as well as their high capacity.

The Paris Agreement is essentially a test of a hybrid style of international collaboration. Along with top-down aspects like the Global Stocktake and the long-term aim, it also incorporates bottom-up features like managerial, transparency, and norm-building. The strategy is a reasonable bet given the failed attempts over the past 20 years to put the more top-down Kyoto Protocol approach into practice as well as the obvious and ongoing domestic political constraints in important nations like the United States and other large emitters.

To improve the chances that this technique will be successful, stakeholders must resist the temptation to incorporate more top-down features too fast, without giving the Paris Accord's balance of top-down and bottom-up aspects time to mature. An upfront evaluation of the sufficiency and fairness of individual NDCs is one example of a new factor that might be taken into account if the Paris strategy fails. Such initiatives might raise ambition, but they run the risk of bringing back the equitable deadlock that has long plagued negotiations between the Parties.

The Climate Accord, which is, in a nutshell, a historic breakthrough, finally resolves a decade-long standoff over the full inclusion of the United States and growing economies in the system and the commitment of all participants in a worldwide endeavour to successfully confront the climate change crisis. Paris represents a uniting moment in the history of United Nations climate policy that spurs fresh dynamics of coordination and serves as motivation for broad-based international action.

Success is now heavily reliant on what happens at the municipal, governmental, and microstate levels, as well as how those activities connect with national initiatives and the five-year review cycles of the new system. Both state and non-state entities will need to take an active part in this. The nationwide execution of pre-2020 commitments and their strengthening is the first and most important step. It will be essential to this process that non-state organizations and regional governments work together. It remains to be seen whether the Parisian discovery will also lead to a global answer to the challenge of maintaining temperatures at relatively safe levels and mitigating the effects of climate change.

For the time being, we can take solace in the fact that the Paris summit has provided the international community with an opportunity to meet the issue and that we are now in a better position than before the Climate Accord. But it is now clearer than ever that the UN's climate policy is just one—though a crucial—part of the worldwide fight to prevent global warming. The international, regional, national, and subnational levels must be coordinated, and significant and effective efforts must be mobilized. There will be a need to strengthen some of the current links, including those related to sustainable development objectives, depletion of the ozone layer, maritime, and transportation. The drive to guarantee that actions taken to combat climate change are coordinated with one another has not yet started in earnest in other areas, such as international trade.

Success will mostly depend on considerable advancements in three crucial areas. The participants of the Climate Accord must first negotiate a thorough set of rules for putting the agreement into practice. Second, participants will require the helpful assistance of non-state entities to successfully execute and achieve their NDCs. Third, all efforts at the international and national levels need to be much better integrated and coherent as a whole.

References

A, P. (2015). Paris agreement. In Report of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (21st Session, 2015: Paris). Retrieved December (Vol. 4, p. 2017). HeinOnline.

Aakre, S. (2014). The political feasibility of potent enforcement in a post-Kyoto Climate Agreement. International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics, 1–15. doi:10.1007/s10784-014-9238-5

Bang, G. (2010). Energy security and climate change concerns: Triggers for energy policy change in the United States? Energy Policy, 38(4), 1645–1653. doi: 10.1016/j.enpol.2009.01.045

Bang, G., Froyn, C. B., Hovi, J., & Menz, F. C. (2007). The United States and international climate cooperation: International "pull" versus domestic "push". Energy Policy, 35(2), 1282–1291. doi: 10.1016/j.enpol.2006.03.015

Bang, G., Hovi, J., & Sprinz, D. F. (2012). US presidents and the failure to ratify multilateral environmental agreements. Climate Policy, 12(6), 755–763. doi: 10.1080/14693062.2012.699788

Barker, T., Bashmakov, I., Bernstein, L., Bogner, J. E., Bosch, P. R., Dave, R., & Davidson, O. R. (2007). 11.7.2 Carbon leakage: Mitigation from a cross-sectoral perspective. In B.

Betsill, M., Dubash, N. K., Paterson, M., van Asselt, H., Vihma, A., & Winkler, H. (2015). Building productive links between the UNFCCC and the broader global climate governance landscape1. Global Environmental Politics. doi:10.1162/GLEP_a_00294

Bodansky, D. (2015). Legal options for US acceptance of a new climate change agreement. Arlington, Virginia: Center for Climate and Energy Solutions.

Branger, F., & Quirion, P. (2014). Climate policy and the 'carbon haven' effect. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 5(1), 53–71.

Brunnee, J. (2008). Europe, the United States, and the global climate regime: All together now. Journal of Land Use & Environmental Law, 24, 1–44.

Burtraw, D., & Woerman, M. (2012). US status on climate change mitigation (Resources for the Future Discussion Paper No. 12–48).

Chan, S., & Pauw, P. (2014). A global framework for climate action: Orchestrating non-state and subnational initiatives for more effective global climate governance. Bonn: Deutsches Institut für Entwickslungpolitik.

Horowitz, C. A. (2016). Paris agreement. International Legal Materials, 55(4), 740-755.

Meinhard Doelle (2005) From Hot Air to Action? The Future of International Environmental Law, Climate Change, and Compliance (Carswell).

Metz, O. R. Davidson, P. R. Bosch, R. Dave, & L. A. Meyer (Eds.), Climate change 2007: Mitigation. Contribution of working group III to the fourth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change (pp. 76–81). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Neil Gunningham (2009), 'Environmental Law, Regulation and Governance: Shifting Architectures' 21 Journal of Environmental Law 179

P. A (2016), Arts 4.8, 4.13, 6.2, 7.5, 9.7, 11.1. Transparency is referenced throughout Decision 1/CP.21.

P. A arts 6.1, 9.1, 9.4, 10.1, 10.2, and 11.1. Adaptation can now formally be part of an individual Party's contribution to the objective of the Party so chooses.

P.A (2016) art 5.2 and Decision 1/CP.21 para 54. The reference in Article 2 to the long-term goal of net zero GHG emissions by the second half of the century is perhaps the clearest signal of the important role of sinks, as it suggests that at some point, any emissions will have to be offset by removals.

Richard Stewart and others (2009), *Climate Finance: Regulatory and Funding Strategies for Climate Change and Global Development* (NYU Press) forecasted this shift to a bottom-up approach.

Savaresi, A. (2016). The Paris Agreement: a new beginning?. Journal of Energy & Natural Resources Law,

34(1), 16-26.

Schleussner, C. F., Rogelj, J., Schaeffer, M., Lissner, T., Licker, R., Fischer, E. M., ... & Hare, W. (2016). Science and policy characteristics of the Paris Agreement temperature goal. Nature Climate Change, 6(9), 827-835.

Tracker (2016); Climate Action Tracker Partners, 'Climate Action Tracker' <http://climateactiontracker.org/>, accessed 4 April 2022.

UN Treaty Collection (2016), '7 c Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol', available online at: <https://treaties.un.org/pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=XXVII-7-c&chapter=27&lang=en>, accessed March, 2022 ("Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol").

van Asselt, H., & Brewer, T. (2010). Addressing competitiveness and leakage concerns in climate policy: An analysis of border adjustment measures in the US and the EU. Energy Policy, 38, 42–51. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2009.08.061