Climate change cooperation across the North-South divide – the case of the EU and India

Dissertation

Paper submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Science in Contemporary India at the University of Oxford

By

364700

School of Interdisciplinary Area Studies

University of Oxford

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

CDR	Principle of Common but Differentiated Responsibilities
COM	European Commission (in reference)
EC	European Commission (in text)
EEAS	European External Action Service
EU	European Union
GHG	Green House Gas
GoI	Government of India
IEA	International Energy Agency
IPCC	International Panel for Climate Change
IPEEC	International Partnership for Energy Efficiency Cooperation
IR	International Relations
NAPCC	National Action Plan on Climate Change
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCC	United Nations Framework on Climate Change

Introduction

While the specificities of the impacts of global climate change are uncertain, policy makers generally agree that efforts need to be made to limit its negative consequences (Dubash 2009: 8; Panagariya 2010: 74-94). Yet, no global agreement has been reached until date. One of the principal narratives regarding the underlying causes of this ongoing deadlock is the "North-South divide" (Cao 2010: 4; Parks and Roberts 2008). This divide is most visible when it comes to the interpretation of the "Principle of Common but Differentiated Responsibilities" (CDR) (Dubash 2009: 9). The principle was agreed upon at the 1972 UN Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm, when leaders agreed that responsibilities should be divided equitably rather than equally (Scott 2008: 7-8). It was formalised in Principle 7 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development in 1992 (UN 1992). According to CDR, developed countries are required to change their patterns of production and consumption and support developing countries to pursue paths of more sustainable development because of their greater historical responsibility and capabilities (Scott 2008: 8). However, the particulars of this support and the resulting necessary commitments by both developed and developing countries are issues of fierce debate (Dubash 2009: 9-10). The "North", i.e. the industrialised countries, demand more "pragmatic approaches" regarding future emissions, which would involve more substantial engagement from the "South", i.e. the industrialising countries. These however demand that the "polluters pay" for the damage already done (ibid.).[1] It could therefore be expected that cooperation across the North-South divide is limited. However, increasingly cooperation does exist, such as between the European Union (EU) and India. This provokes questions regarding the underlying causes of this cooperation. In particular, it is interesting to enquire if the case is exceptional or an example of a broader pattern of

[1] This argument is based on the polluter-pays principle (Rajamani 2000: 122), which stipulates "the requirement that the costs of pollution should be borne by the person responsible for causing the pollution and consequential costs" (Sands 1995: 213).

change. Therefore, the main research question of this paper is: To what extent is the intensified cooperation between the EU and India on climate change mitigation a useful model for cooperation between developing and developed countries?[2]

"Second best alternatives", such as bilateral cooperation, are important to analyse as they are pursued as interim solutions and to build strong foundations for a post-2012 agreement (Barrett and Stavins 2003; EEAS 2010a: 3). Therefore, they are significant not only as cases in themselves but also to learn from them for future agreements. The relation between the EU and India is particularly interesting to analyse as both are attempting to assume leadership in their respective groups, i.e. the North and the South, and are also aiming to establish themselves as global players, not least through their role in climate negotiations (Dubash 2009: 8, 10-11; Mitra 2010; Narlikar 2006: 63, 72; Oberthür 2007: 8). The evolution of their bilateral climate change cooperation has not been analysed in depth. To trace this process will also shed light on the challenges and potentials of climate negotiations between the North and the South more generally. Thereby it will fill a gap in the literature on climate change negotiations.

The theoretical framework employed synthesises aspects of structuralist, constructivist and liberal International Relations (IR) theory while being informed by the body of literature on climate change negotiations. As these aspects are tested on the empirical case, the study will also contribute to the large body of literature on IR theory and climate change cooperation. Within the literature concerned with climate change cooperation, it is generally assumed that issue linkage and positive incentives are more efficient in climate change negotiations than negative incentives (e.g. Barrett and Stavins 2003: 366,

[2] The focus of this dissertation is on negotiations at the state level. It is however acknowledged that there are "important interactions and relations at many other levels, including local governments, corporations, civil society organisations, and other levels of interaction that deserve analysis" (Parks and Roberts 2010:155). The taken focus is due to the key importance of state regulatory power in energy and climate policies and the limitation of space.

370-371; Schroeder 2008: 509; Kemfert 2004: 455). This has informed the study and provided a lens through which the cooperation has been analysed. In IR theory concerned with cooperation, authors disagree on the dynamics at stake and the consequential effective strategies to apply. While realists and structuralists are pessimistic regarding efficient cooperation, constructivists and liberalists are more optimistic. As inequality is a key issue in climate change negotiations across the North-South divide, aspects of structuralist theory which highlight the importance of perceptions of fairness in negotiations will be drawn upon (Barrett and Stavins 2003: 358). It is also acknowledged that non-material gains are motivational factors in international cooperation, which is highlighted by constructivists (Keohane, 2010: 16, 18; Wendt in Hurd 2008: 303). Gaining esteem through moral leadership is pursued by both India and the EU, not least through initiatives in the field of climate change policy (Freres 2000: 63; Lauren and Le Cacheux 2010; Narlikar 2006: 63, 72; Saran 2010). Liberal theories highlight that "state-society relations"[3] shape state preferences (Moravcsik 1997: 513). In this light, the negotiations between the EU and India are perceived as embedded in changing global conditions, in particular the renewed global focus on energy security (Helm 2007). Furthermore, liberalists argue that transnational policy interdependence positively influences cooperation, if gains are presumably mutual (Moravcsik 2008: 236, 239). The win-win strategies pursued in the EU-India cooperation stand in congruence with this theory, as will be shown below.

Methodologically, the study will aim to trace the process of official climate change cooperation between the EU and India over the past decade. Content analysis and discourse analysis will be employed for this single case-study designed project.

I will argue that energy security has been intrinsically linked with climate change in the case of EU-India negotiations. This has been influenced by the prioritisation of energy at a

[3] State-society relations are understood as "the relationship of states to the domestic and transnational social context in which they are embedded" (Moravcsik 1997: 513).

global and domestic level and has served as a vehicle for cooperation. However, other issues, such as biodiversity loss, have been neglected and rhetorical commitments often lack tangible results. Nevertheless, this development indicates that issue linkage and positive incentives are motivating collaborative activities in areas of mutual interest and that serious engagement with the demands of Southern countries can lead to trust-building and thereby cooperation. Furthermore it supports the liberal claim that state-society relations shape state preferences. How incentives are valued is influenced by a number of factors including international norms, the position of the actor, and policy interdependence, which interact with one another. As an emerging power, India assumes more responsibility and is also increasingly factored into the considerations of the international community. This shows that identity is key in climate politics, which supports constructivist claims. It will be argued that policies and negotiation strategies that take aspects of state identity into consideration are more efficient for successful cooperation. The intensified cooperation between the EU and India does not necessarily suggest that the North-South divide is less rigid, but may indicate that India has moved out from the “South”. Therefore, lessons can be drawn for comparable cases, such as other emerging economies.

The first chapter (I) provides a short literature review, outlines the theoretical framework and defines the methodology of the study. This situates the research theoretically, states the researcher’s ontological and epistemological position, and justifies the methods employed for the empirical case study. In the second chapter (II), the study analyses the underlying conditions of the North-South divide in order to draw out the dynamics and causes of the divide. Additionally, global shifts in international norms and policy priorities related to climate change are analysed, with particular reference to the new energy paradigm, and their influences on state preferences explored. The third chapter (III) analyses the climate change-related positions and policies of the EU and India in order to explore how these have developed over the past decade and how they relate to global

paradigm shifts. In the fourth chapter (IV), the official negotiations between the EU and India are taken up in order to trace this process of bilateral climate change cooperation. These are then interpreted against the background of global and domestic shifts in preferences and policies. This will allow for an empirical analysis of the case of climate change cooperation between the two countries.

Chapter I - Literature review, theoretical framework and methodology

In what follows, literature relating to international cooperation and in particular climate change cooperation will be reviewed; from this the theoretical framework will be defined. Then, the methodological approach and the research design will be discussed.

Literature review and theoretical framework

According to Kratochwill (in della Porta and Keating 2008: 24), theories are "partial ways of understanding the world". Therefore, the theoretical framework employed in this dissertation draws on several International Relations theories, namely structuralism, constructivism and liberalism, as well as the climate change cooperation literature. This theoretical framework has emerged through the research process.

IR theorists disagree on the underlying dynamics of cooperation between states. Realists tend to highlight the role of power in international relations. According to this view, cooperation is limited by the "relative gains approach", which means that "winning" rather than "doing well" is the overriding priority for actors in negotiations (Snidal 1991: 701). Structuralists (who may also be realists) view actors' options as limited by meta-conditions. In this view, global inequality is a central impediment for climate change cooperation because it incentivises "zero-sum" and "negative-sum" behaviour (Parks and Roberts 2008). State-actors might refuse offers they do not perceive as fair even at significant costs (Barrett and Stavins 2003: 358).

Constructivists point out that "cultural and social influences" inform the motivations of actors (della Porta and Keating 2008: 25).[4] Notions such as "gains" and "fairness" are

[4] While "constructivism" is generally understood as a theory (see for instance Hurd 2008: 300), Moravcsik (2008: 251) argues that "constructivist...describes an ontology not a theory".

socially constructed (Wendt in Hurd 2008: 300). Non-material gains, such as a rise in social status and esteem, are significant incentives in cooperation (Keohane 2010: 16, 18; Wendt in Hurd 2008: 303). It has been widely observed that both the EU and India are aiming to establish themselves as moral leaders, not least through initiatives in environmental policies (Atteridge 2010: 3; Freres 2000: 63; Lauren and Le Cacheux 2010; Narlikar 2006: 63, 72; Saran 2010). States' perceptions, interests and behaviours are strongly influenced by their identities, a prime example being the international climate negotiations along the lines of the North-South divide (Reus-Smit 2005: 188; Wendt in Reus-Smit 2005: 197). In sum, constructivism highlights many of the dynamics at work in climate change mitigation cooperation between the EU and India and therefore provides a useful lens for the analysis.

Liberal IR theory highlights that "state-society relations" shape "state preferences"[5] (Moravcsik 1997: 513). Therefore, the importance that climate change is given in bilateral negotiations also depends on the global priority level of the issue. State-society relations are dynamic; the various societal demands are constantly shifting (Moravcsik 2008: 236-237). Additionally, policy interdependence, domestic and transnational, shapes state behaviour and the prospect of mutual gains positively influences cooperation (Moravcsik 2008: 236, 239). As climate change is a transboundary issue, policies are inherently transnationally interdependent. Furthermore, climate change encompasses the political, economic, security and social spheres with particularly strong links to the fields of energy, health and food (see for example Barroso, 2009). In consequence, actors would arguably aim for win-win strategies in climate change cooperation. It will be shown that cooperation strategies between the EU and India are framed in this way. In sum, liberalism also

[5] State preferences are defined as "the fundamental social purposes underlying the strategic calculations of governments" (Moravcsik 1997: 513).

provides a useful lens for the analysis as several aspects of the case are highlighted by this theory.

There are several ways of achieving effective climate change cooperation strategies. While some authors argue for international agreements, such as a global tax on greenhouse gas emission (e.g. Cooper 2008), others argue for differentiated approaches because countries react differently to incentives (Buchner and Carraro 2004: 14). Authors generally agree that positive incentives are crucial to motivate actors to cooperate in climate change cooperation (e.g. Schroeder 2008). Some authors (e.g. Barrett and Stavins 2003; Kemfert 2004) argue for issue linkage, that is, the linking of negative incentives to positive ones, as the most effective strategy. The case of the EU-India cooperation is an example of negotiation techniques that highlight positive incentives and issue linkage, as will be shown below.

As state behaviour is “rarely shaped by a single factor” (Moravcsik 2008: 249), several theories will be drawn upon to constitute the theoretical framework for this dissertation. Insights from three theoretical approaches are synthesised into the theoretical approach employed in this dissertation. From structuralist theory the importance of structural inequalities; from constructivism the importance of social contexts at different levels, non-material gains, and identity; and from liberalism the importance of state-society relations in shaping state preferences and the influence of policy interdependence on cooperation. Furthermore, the framework is informed by the suggestions of the climate change cooperation literature, which highlights the importance of positive incentives and issue linkage.

The various aspects of the empirical data will thereby be assessed with a “framework of hypotheses” (Vennesson 2008: 230). Thereby, the case can be apprehended more holistically (della Porta and Keating 2008: 34). This framework has evolved in congruence with the research project, after an initial analysis of the portrayed preferences of the EU and India had been concluded. This analytical priority setting has enabled the determination of “which systemic theory is appropriate and how it should be specified” (Moravcsik 2008: 249). Thereby, a “pragmatic theory synthesis” has been attempted (ibid.: 250).

Epistemology, ontology and methodology

It is assumed that “objective and subjective meanings” are “deeply intertwined” and that interpretations depend on the “values and concerns” of the researcher herself (della Porta and Keating 2008: 23-25). Therefore, the knowledge acquired is “socially conditioned and subject to challenge and reinterpretation” (ibid.). In this paper, both “positivist and post-positivist methodological lenses” are employed in order to “capture [the] dynamic interactions” of agents and structure (Klotz and Prakash 2008: 114). While the study is mainly focused on understanding the preferences of the actors, it also serves as a test case for certain hypotheses, namely the alleged North-South divide as one of the root causes of the absence of significant and effective cooperation, and the claim that positive incentives and issue linkage are efficient strategies to encourage cooperation between actors (George and Bennett 2005: 5; della Porta and Keating 2008: 26, 29). Furthermore, the study tests aspects of structuralist, constructivist and liberal theory. The importance of context is stressed (della Porta and Keating 2008: 30). How incentives are valued is influenced by a number of factors including international norms, the position of actors, and policy interdependence, which interact with one another. As this dynamic set of “causal variables” (George and Bennett 2004: 212) is unique, it is impossible to draw out general

rules of cause and effect and thereby predict future events (della Porta and Keating 2008: 28, 30). However, tracing the process of the cooperation will allow to "uncover the relations between *possible* causes and observed outcomes" [emphasis added] (Vennesson 2008: 231). An in-depth analysis of the EU-India climate cooperation process has not been done before. Therefore the research will contribute to a deeper understanding of the preferences and interests of the EU and India in climate politics and of cooperation strategies in bilateral climate change negotiations between developed and developing countries. The case study will thereby provide potential insights for the interpretation of similar cases.

The research process includes the quantitative and qualitative analysis of secondary and primary sources, in particular academic literature and policy documents. All of the material is accessible either in the Oxford libraries or on the internet. The methodological approach taken for the research project is pluralist, combining several methods while focusing on meanings and context through the analysis of text and discourse (della Porta and Keating 2008: 32-33). In congruence with constructivist theory, the study seeks "conceptual and theoretical illumination through the systematical analysis of [the] empirical puzzle" (Reus-Smit 2005: 195). The empirical case is analysed employing the theoretical framework laid out above and drawing on insights gained by reviewing the literature on cooperation generally and climate change cooperation in particular. Discourse analysis, content analysis and process tracing complement each other in this single-case study designed project for reasons I state below (della Porta and Keating 2008: 34). The empirical investigation is designed to explore the configuration of the case and "to elucidate [its] features...by developing and evaluating theoretical explanations" (George and Bennett 2005: 5, 32; Ragin in Vennesson 2008: 226). The case is understood as "an instance" (George and Bennett 2005: 17) of the "broader class of events" (Vennesson

2008: 226) of bilateral climate change mitigation cooperation across the North-South divide. Where feasible, the findings of the study will be compared to broadly similar cases, such as the the US-India cooperation. However, this representation is constructed and the phenomenon could also be seen as a case of other classes of events (Davis in Vennesson 2008: 230).

Academic literature and policy documents on climate change cooperation are analysed in order to gain an understanding of the conditions, dynamics and shifts in the field. This enables a more informed analysis of the preferences and strategies of the actors. State preferences are analysed before state strategies, as this aids in apprehending the negotiation process, as suggested by Moravcsik (2008: 249-250). This research design allows for an examination of the incentives employed in the cooperation process and also for their contextualisation. The study will apply process tracing to uncover the central mechanisms[6] at work. Process tracing is here defined as the "analytical explanation couched in [the] theoretical variables" identified above, which allows for a combination of positivist and interpretivist outlooks (George and Bennett 2004: 225; Klotz and Prakash 2008: 114; Vennesson 2008: 224). The research also uses content analysis, a "research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use" (Krippendorf 2008: 18). While some forms of content analysis assume that the meaning of words is highly stable, more qualitative forms of the method do not assume this "consistency of meaning" (Hardy et al. 2004: 20). This form of content analysis is compatible with a broader discourse analytical methodology, as employed in this dissertation. Within this perspective, "all textual analysis is an exercise in interpretation" (Hardy et al. 2004: 20). Discourse analysis is understood as the detailed

[6] A "mechanism" is defined as "a set of hypotheses that could be the explanation for some social phenomenon" and "operate at an analytical level below that of a more encompassing theory" (Klotz and Prakash 2008: 155).

examination of “groups of related statements which cohere in some way to produce both meanings and effects in the real world” (Wetherell et al. 2001: 268). The choices made regarding the presentation of information “reflect the disposition of the person responsible for devising it” (Gill in Bryman 2008: 501). The “same set of facts” can be “interpreted differently and presented differently to evoke different reactions” and this process is rarely coincidental (della Porta and Keating 2008: 35). Therefore, “uncovering the reasons that actors give for their actions” provides insights regarding their identities, preferences and interests (Amenta, Davis in Vennesson 2008: 234).

By employing these methods, a deeper understanding of the motivations of the actors can be gained. Furthermore, it becomes evident which issues have been highlighted, linked or sidelined. These processes are interpreted with reference to the insights gained from the literature review, which critically surveys the literature related to the North-South divide, the role of energy in contemporary foreign policy, and policy documents of the EU and India related to climate change and energy. In order to analyse the negotiation process, official joint documents published after the yearly EU-India Summits and documents relating to the various working groups initiated by the Summits are examined (George and Bennett 2004: 211). While the period observed stretches over twelve years (2000-2011), the research focuses predominantly on the period from 2005 onwards when cooperation intensified. As the content of the documentation on high-level meetings is selective and influenced by political considerations, triangulation with project documentation and media reports has been attempted where feasible.

In sum, a theoretical framework which synthesises aspects of structuralism, constructivism and liberalism and is informed by insights of climate change cooperation literature is employed in order to gain a deeper understanding of the preferences and strategies of the EU and India regarding climate change cooperation. To arrive at this deeper understanding, the process of cooperation is traced via content and discourse analysis. By acknowledging the global and domestic context, the negotiating process is interpreted in a more holistic manner.

Chapter II - Climate change and energy at the global level

The state of the international climate change debate influences state preferences and bilateral cooperation (Moravcsik 1997: 513). These conditions are not static but change over time (Moravcsik 2008: 236-237). In the following, a historically embedded analysis of the current state of these conditions will be presented. This provides the context of the bilateral EU-India cooperation. The continuing impasse in climate change negotiations finds its root cause in the North-South divide, which is mainly caused by diverging interests and a historically embedded mistrust between the two sides. However, through the re-politicisation of energy and its coupling with climate change policies, this mistrust can be circumvented to an extent as cooperation is mutually beneficial.

The North-South divide

International climate change negotiations have attracted unprecedented attention by policy makers and civil society alike (Barrett 2007: 422) but despite ongoing efforts, no substantial results have been produced (Parks and Roberts 2010). Emissions can be reduced by either "constraining economic activity or by developing and diffusing technologies that decouple economic activity and emission" (Barrett 2007: 434-435). Developing countries' per capita energy consumption and CO_2 intensity to GDP are still comparably low and in India, 44 per cent of the population are still without access to electricity (Joshi and Patel 2009: 182). Furthermore, developing countries fear that constraining emissions could "constrain development" (Atteridge 2010: 1). Therefore, it is "hardly tenable" to demand India and other developing countries to "contribute towards emission reduction" (Joshi and Patel 2009: 182). In its National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC) (GoI 2008: 4), India clearly states that any climate change actions will be "co-beneficial" to development rather than vice versa. Consequently, in order to

stimulate “climate friendly” development, technologies, particularly energy efficient ones[7], need to be transferred to developing countries (Barrett 2007: 435, 438). Technology transfer is facilitated in a number of ways and might not always have climate change mitigation as its core objective. This is also the case with other strategies that foster sustainable development. Furthermore, climate change mitigation strategies need to be mainstreamed across policy areas in order to achieve substantial change. Therefore, developed countries argue that development aid should incorporate “climate considerations” (Dubash 2009: 10). However, to be recognised as climate change mitigation assistance by developing countries, funds need to be “additional to aid” (ibid.).

One of the underlying causes of the insistence on this “additionality” is the “deep mistrust” of developing countries vis-à-vis developed countries, which at the same time also lies at the heart of the North-South divide (ibid.: 8). The reasons for this can be traced back to colonial times, but even after countries gained independence, treaties continued to be unequal, favouring the interests of the powerful (Scott 2008: 4,10). Furthermore, industrialised countries have repeatedly “reneged” on international agreements as implicit political compacts were not fulfilled (ibid.). The resulting mistrust has made negotiations more difficult (Harris in Scott 2008: 13). Consequently, developing countries, India in particular, have been strong defenders of the principle of sovereignty and have insisted on fair treaties which clearly state the responsibilities of developed countries as well as mechanisms to trace commitments (Cooper and Fues 2008: 298, 301; GoI 2008: 4; Narlikar 2006: 72). This is also reflected in the bilateral cooperation between the EU and India, as discussed below.

[7] “Energy efficiency means producing the same final energy services...but using less energy to do so....usually at less cost” (Meadows et al. 2004: 96).

With regards to climate change agreements, India has continuously reminded the international community that the pledges made at the Earth Summit in 1992 by regarding technology transfer and additional finances for mitigation and adaptation measures have not been implemented (Korppoo et al. 2009: 50). In 2001 at the sixth Session of the UNFCC Conference of the Parties, the EU-15, together with Canada, Iceland, New Zealand, Norway and Switzerland, pledged to contribute $ 410 million per year by 2005 to the cause of climate change adaptation and mitigation (Pallemaerts and Armstrong 2009: 5). Importantly, these payments should be “new and additional” (Müller 2009: 3). However, only an estimated $ 260 million has been received (BBC 2009). Also Pallemaerts and Armstrong (2009: 16) find that “it is very surprising that there is not a single official document issued by the EU with reliable and verifiable information on the total level of finances purposed to developing countries for climate change mitigation and adaptation...This lack of transparency is clearly inconsistent with the EU’s claim to global leadership in the climate change process”. Ban Ki-moon was in this context quoted as stating “[t]here have been promises which have not been fully materialised. This is an issue of trust” (in BBC 2009). Also the Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen in 2009 resulted in an impasse (Dubash 2009: 9). While industrialised countries demanded more “pragmatic politics”, developing countries portrayed “deep mistrust” (ibid.: 8-9). The issues that led to this impasse, “mitigation commitments, financing, and measurement, reporting and verification”, reflect the divide between the North and the South and in particular the disagreement over CDR (ibid.: 9).

The new energy paradigm

Bilateral climate change cooperation is influenced by broader discourses around climate change. In the past decade, climate change has increasingly become associated with an ever larger number of issues, so that Hulme (2009: 333) argues that it has become a "meta-narrative". In particular, climate change has become directly linked with energy. While the examination of the linkage between climate change and issues such as "food security [and] hyper consumption" (ibid.) presents a fascinating topic for further research, this paper is focused on the association between energy and climate change, as it is the single largest factor contributing to global anthropogenic Green House Gas (GHG) emissions (IPCC 2007: Fig. 2.1.). Additionally, energy has again become a priority issue in foreign and domestic policy as pressure on resources has intensified (Gupta 2010: 294; Helm 2007). These factors and the consequential demands by various actors influence the preferences of the EU and India and thereby the bilateral cooperation. Therefore, they will be examined in the following.

Increasing pressure on resources caused by global consumption patterns and the industrialisation of the emerging economies, coupled with the growing urgency to act on climate change, have put energy on the top of domestic and foreign policy agendas (Helm 2007). While energy was treated economically in the 1980s and 1990s, from 2000 onwards the issue has become re-politicised (ibid.: 1). This has several causes, among them the "oil shock in 2000" (ibid.: 3-4). Pressure on fossil fuels will probably increase as they will continue to account for 80-90 per cent of the global energy supplies unless there are unforeseen revolutions in the renewable energy sector and the implementation of energy efficient technologies while global primary energy demands are predicted to rise by 40 per cent until 2030 (Exxon Mobil in Dadwal 2009: 841; Gupta 2010: 793, 798; IEA in Gupta 2010: 294). This increase is mainly due to the accelerating energy needs of

emerging economies like China and India (Helm 2007: 4). Coupled with the moral imperative to avoid fossil fuel use[8], this has led to a "paradigm shift" in energy politics (ibid.: 2, 5, 9). Central to this new paradigm is the question of "how to design a new energy policy with security of supply and climate change at the core" (ibid.: 34). Precisely this question is a key issue in the negotiations between the EU and India, as will be shown in Chapter IV.

As two-thirds of the overall increase will be generated by the energy requirements of China and India, their development paths need to be "engineered" in order to limit the damage that "their conventional coal-burning technologies will bring" (Helm 2007: 6, 14) and to restrain the pressure on finite resources (IEA 2007). Replacing the existing technologies with "non- and low-carbon" ones and "investing in energy-efficiency technologies" (Helm 2007: 28) "is one of the quickest, greenest, and most cost-effective way to address energy security, climate change, and ensuring economic growth" (IPEEC 2008: Art. 1). Therefore, the diffusion of these technologies is in the interest of both developing and developed countries. This policy interdependence encourages cooperation and it will be shown below that energy security and efficiency have been issues over which EU-India cooperation has intensified (Moravcsik 2008: 236, 239).

Climate change and energy are also connected to various other fields, such as health and innovation; therefore, climate-friendly development has a range of important co-benefits (IPCC in Boldt and Das 2008: 42). An integrated approach is necessary to efficiently tap these synergies (ibid.). The integration of other benefits into the climate change negotiations is also conducive to the removal of cooperation barriers such as perceived inequality (Parks and Roberts 2010: 134). Mutual benefit-agreements lead to trust building and thereby to a better negotiation climate in the future.

---

[8] Despite this "moral imperative", it is predicted that the role of fossil fuels is unlikely to diminish substantially in the next 20 years (Gupta 2010: 793, 798).

In the above it has been shown that the ongoing deadlock in international climate negotiations is rooted in a deep mistrust between the North and the South. However, in the past decade, energy has been re-politicised and it has been widely acknowledged that cooperation with the emerging economies is crucial to safeguard security of supply and mitigate climate change. Furthermore, climate-friendly development has a range of other co-benefits which can act as motivators for climate policies. Through the integration of climate change with other issues, and in particular energy security and efficiency, issue blockages, which find their causes in the deeply-embedded mistrust, can be circumvented to an extent. In particular the demand of additionality becomes potentially less relevant.

Chapter III - Climate change policies of the EU and India

State identities are prior to state preferences, which are prior to state strategies, which is why these will be examined in the following. To uncover the "reasons that actors give for their actions" (Amenta, Davis in Vennesson 2008: 234) will give insights into the areas of mutual interest and therefore potential areas of cooperation (Moravcsik 2008: 236, 239). To change consumption and production patterns is not only crucial for energy security but also to avoid harmful climate change consequences that negatively affect the economy, human well-being and ecosystems. Taking action on climate change is domestically important and also brings international prestige. Taking leadership in this area means for the EU to adopt credible targets and cooperate effectively with third parties, such as India (Helm 2007: 6). For India, the co-beneficial approach outlined above is an effective way to engage with the issue. Both countries have undertaken substantial policy changes over the past decade and integrated climate change into domestic and foreign policy. India's climate diplomacy has undergone a substantial shift towards more pragmatism (Atteridge 2010: 1-2; Grant 2006: 1; Raja Mohan 2005). This has resulted from new key actors in Indian government and their motivation to raise India's international status. This supports the constructivist claim that identity predisposes interests (Wendt in Reus-Smit 2005: 197).

India

For developing countries like India, climate change is a conundrum. While Indian policy-makers fear that climate action could constrain development objectives, Indian economy and society are highly vulnerable to negative consequences of climate change (Atteridge 2010: 1, 3; EEAS 2010b: 2). India has historically been a strong advocate of "international equality and justice" and repeatedly assumed leadership of developing countries, such as through its engagement in the Non-Alignment-Movement (Narlikar 2006: 63, 72).

Regarding global climate governance, India has, since the 1970s, been a strong defender of the “traditional developing country position” and able to ensure the climate regime’s consistency with its strict interpretation of CDR (Dubash 2009: 9-11; Korppoo et al. 2009: 48, 65). However, more recently, India’s growing status and power, and the responsibilities these entail, have prompted India to “shake off the anti-western attitudes” (Grant 2006: 1) and after “two decades” of stasis “India’s approach to international climate diplomacy has been shifting towards more constructive engagement with international partners and the UNFCC negotiations” (Atteridge 2010: 1-2). This shift has mainly resulted from “new actors taking responsibility for India’s international stance” and in particular been initiated by Jairam Ramesh, India’s Minister for Environment and Forests since 2009 (ibid.: 1, 3). While climate diplomacy was treated “in virtual isolation from other foreign policy issues”, it is now being “woven into wider foreign policy objectives” (ibid.: 1). Acting on climate issues is also a strategy to raise India’s international status, which is a “particularly strong desire” (ibid.: 3). This shows that non-material gains act as motivating factors to take climate action and constructively engage in international climate negotiations (Keohane 2010: 16, 18; Wendt in Hurd 2008: 303). Furthermore, it supports the constructivist claim that identities shape preferences and thereby strategies: India’s new identity as a global player has motivated it to act more pragmatically on climate change (Wendt in Reus-Smit 2005: 197).

However, structural conditions of the Indian economy and in particular the energy sector continue to constrain policy options regarding the reduction of GHG emissions (Atteridge 2010: 2). Coal is the most accessible source of energy production in India and will continue to play a significant role in India’s energy mix in the foreseeable future (ibid.; GoI 2006: xiv). Furthermore, small and medium enterprises whose financial and technological capabilities are limited and are difficult to regulate, dominate the Indian industrial sector (Atteridge 2010: 2). However, the Indian Government increasingly acts on pressure from

international norms and indigenous demands to develop more climate-conscious (Guha and Martinez-Alier 2000: 17-18; Peet and Watts, 1993: 227) and India already "has an extensive environmental management system" (World Bank in Boldt and Das 2008: 14, 16). The Indian Government set up a climate change council (The Hindu 2007) and is aiming to "afforest more than 6 million hectares" (Sethi 2007). This project is a primary example of the co-beneficial approach outlined in Chapter II. India has emphasised that the "carbon service from forest and plantations is one of the co-benefits and not the main or the sole benefit" of the project (UNFCC 2011: 2).

Nonetheless, India's energy needs are rising and will do so for the foreseeable future. Achieving energy security is a key priority of the Indian government (Indian Express 2005; GoI 2007). While energy conservation and energy efficiency are policy strategies (ASEM 2009: 1), they have as their goals human and economic development, rather than climate change mitigation (Atteridge 2010: 1). Climate co-benefits might be incidental but are not prioritised. Yet, energy efficiency measures could lead to important climate co-benefits (Garg et al. in Boldt and Das 2008: 25). If the ambitious goals regarding energy efficiency, renewable energies, etc. stated in the NAPCC were successfully implemented, the result would be a "far greater reduction in GHG emissions than pledged by India" (Atteridge 2010: 1).

EU

In the EU, climate change has become a high priority issue in domestic and foreign policy (e.g. Barrosso 2009; Reinfeld in Traynor 2009). In 2008, the Climate and Energy Package was adopted by the European Parliament, which set binding targets of 20 percent reduction of GHG emissions, an increase of the share of renewables to 20 per cent and the improvement of energy efficiency by 20 percent by 2020 (Delind 2008: 4). The European Commission (EC) states that "the EU has sought to 'mainstream' climate change across the board of domestic and external policy areas" (COM, DG CLIMA 2010).[9] The need for stronger cooperation with developing countries, in particular with emerging economies like India, in the fields of climate change and energy has been repeatedly emphasised (COM 2002; COM 2007: 17; COM, DG CLIMA 2010; COM, DG Energy 2010; EEAS 2007b: 13). A maximisation of "energy efficiency...and increasing the use of renewable energy" is recommended (COM 2007: 17). In sum, the EC's analyses and recommendations accord with the global propositions regarding climate change and energy cooperation outlined in Chapter II. In line with the argument made by Buchner and Carraro (2004: 14) regarding the importance of differentiated approaches in climate cooperation strategies, the Commission also acknowledges that the "diversity in national circumstances and development levels will require different types of actions" (COM, DG CLIMA 2010). The EU "stepped up its cooperation with both China and India" by establishing the EU-India Clean Development and Climate Change Initiative and the EU-China Partnership on Climate Change (COM 2007: 11). This engagement is unmatched in other bilateral relations and emphasises the distinct role of China and India (e.g. COM 2007: 12). This shows that policy interdependence in the field of energy shapes the

[9] Dadwal (2009: 839) argues that the EU raised the issue of climate change to being "the most crucial national security issues" because it could thereby pursue energy security focused policies, which would resonate "with audiences both at home and abroad". However, it is difficult to divide these two issues in practical policies. Furthermore, co-beneficial policy strategies are an efficient way to integrate various interests and motivate actors to cooperate.

preferences of the EU and serves as a motivation to cooperate on climate change with emerging economies like India. This supports the liberal claim that mutual interests and policy interdependence are conducive conditions for cooperation (Moravcsik 2008: 236, 239).

The EU has acknowledged the particular identity of India as a former colony, a defender of the traditional developing countries' position, and an emerging power in its policies (Grant 2006: 1; Narlikar 2006: 63, 72). Rhetoric that is reminiscent of colonial discourse or foreign policy strategies that could be termed "imperialist" is generally avoided. The European Commission highlights that "strategies are owned and driven by developing countries themselves" (COM 2007: 6). The necessary "low carbon development strategies" should therefore be developed within the industrialising countries and supported (financially and technically) by the EU (COM, DG CLIMA 2010). Furthermore, the centrality of energy in the Indian context is acknowledged as "this scale of development cannot happen without significant growth in power generation" (Boldt and Das 2008: 8). The co-benefits approach is adopted, which internalises India's priorities of economic development, improved air quality, and energy security (ibid.: 42).[10] This includes aiming at co-benefits from climate change policies as well as at climate change benefits from "policies in other areas" (COM in Boldt and Das 2008: 4). The more efficient use of resources reduces pressure on sources and sinks and also increases profitability (ibid.: 42). The differentiated approach advocated by Buchner and Carraro (2004: 14) also applies to different audiences and a publication of the EC argues that the co-benefits approach for India should not be climate-centric, but rather "energy-security centric (for Government), energy-efficiency centric (for industries) and air-quality centric (for the general public)", as these are the respective key

[10] This approach has also been adopted by the United States in its development cooperation with India (Boldt and Das 2008: 50).

priorities (Boldt and Das 2008: 4). This reflects the liberal claim of state preferences stemming from a compromise of various societal demands (Moravcsik 2008: 236-237).

In sum, both India and the EU have undergone policy shifts regarding climate change and energy over the last decade. Both have raised the priority level of climate change in domestic and foreign policy. India's climate policy has become more pragmatic, which has also resulted from its objective to increase its international status. This supports the constructivist claim that identity shapes interests (Wendt in Reus-Smit 2005: 197). The co-beneficial approach, which integrates several strategies into policies has been pursued by both countries. The EU has emphasised the need for stronger climate and energy cooperation with emerging economies like India, particularly because of policy interdependence in these two fields. This also shows the recognition of India as an increasingly important player in the international realm. This approach is different from the one towards less powerful developing countries. The differentiated approach is replicated when it comes to diverse actors within India. Overall, there is a strong emphasis on pursuing energy security and energy efficiency conducive policies (Boldt and Das 2008: 42, 71).

Chapter IV - Bilateral climate change cooperation between India and the EU

In this chapter it will be shown that despite the North-South divide, there is substantial climate cooperation between the EU and India for a number of interrelated reasons. Firstly, the EU and India have a general interest in a positive partnership for political and economic reasons. Secondly, climate change is an inherently transboundary issue. Therefore, policies are interdependent, which encourages cooperation (Moravcsik 2008: 236, 239). Thirdly, climate change is linked to energy and both are priority areas for the two countries. Fourthly, the cooperation has emphasised positive incentives and a co-beneficial and integrative approach. However, the cooperation has only selectively addressed issues related to climate change. Discussions have focused on strategies that enhance energy security and neglected other areas, such as biodiversity loss and renewable energies. Furthermore, the discussions have not sufficiently resulted in tangible outcomes, even in the priority areas. Nevertheless, the cooperation in areas of mutual benefit and policy interdependence is a positive development. Besides the value this cooperation holds in itself, win-win outcomes are also conducive to the building of trust between the two parties. Thereby, a root cause of the North-South divide is implicitly addressed.

The integration of climate change and energy

The EU and India have reasons to cooperate. India is an emerging power and good relations are politically and economically desirable for the EU. The EU is India's largest trading partner (Delind 2010) and invests in the sustainability of its development, which is also domestically a concern (Delind 2009: 11). While India is investing in its relation to the US, it also aims to balance this relationship with "closer ties to the EU" (Grant 2006: 2). The cooperation between the EU and India "benefits from a longstanding relationship going back to the early 1960s" (EEAS 2011). Since 2000, high level annual Summits are

held. When tracing the process of the bilateral state level negotiations by content and discourse analysis of the official high level post-Summit publications from 2000 to 2011 (EEAS 2000; EEAS 2001; EEAS 2002; EEAS 2003; EEAS 2004; EEAS 2005a; EEAS 2005b; EEAS 2006; EEAS 2007a; EEAS 2008a; EEAS 2008b; EEAS 2008c; EEAS 2009; EEAS 2010a), it can be observed that considerable emphasis has been put on climate change and energy. In 2005, these issues take up approximately 11 % of the analysed document (EEAS 2005b: 12-14). In 2007, the issues account for approximately 21% and in 2009 for approximately 18 % (EEAS 2009: 1: 7, 8). Besides, an *Initiative on Clean Development and Climate Change* is launched to be "taken forward at successive...Summits" (EEAS 2005b: 13), which indicates the high priority level of the issue.

Furthermore, a clear shift in the treatment of climate change and energy is evident. While these two issue areas are addressed separately in the earlier years, this changes around 2005, when the EU and India became strategic partners [11], which resulted in a general intensification of cooperation across policy areas. From then onwards, climate change and energy are linked and increasingly approached integrally. From 2000-2004, climate change is described as a "global environmental issue of mutual concern" (EEAS 2000: 4) a "twin challenge of...sustainable development" (EEAS 2000: 4; EEAS 2001: 3) or mentioned in context of the Kyoto Protocol (EEAS 2002: 3; EEAS 2003: 2; EEAS 2004: 5). From 2005 onwards, climate change and energy are addressed together (EEAS 2006: 7; EEAS 2007a: 1-2, 6-7; EEAS 2008a: 2; EEAS 2008b; EEAS 2009: 1-2, 7; EEAS 2010a:

[11] The EU has currently "nine strategic partnerships with individual countries, three with the EU's traditional partners (US, Canada, Japan), four with the BRICs (Brazil, Russia, India and China), South Africa and Mexico, plus the...'strategic partnerships' with groups of countries or regional organisations" (Balfour 2010: 1). These partnerships are "with countries which 'share norms and values" with the EU and with the aim of strengthening "effective multilateralism" (ibid.). However, this "strongly normative definition" was neither reflected in the choice of countries nor in the negotiations at Copenhagen, where the BRICs "seemed far from being partners" (ibid.).

2). It is explicitly acknowledged that “an integrated approach to climate change and energy is crucial” (EEAS 2007a: 7). The dissemination of “cleaner technologies” is a key strategy (EEAS 2005a: 2; EEAS 2005b: 13). In particular, a commitment is made to develop, transfer, deploy and disseminate “more efficient, cleaner and alternative energy chains” (EEAS 2005b: 14; EEAS 2006: 7).

It is difficult to determine the relative importance of climate change mitigation vis-à-vis energy concerns, but it is evident that energy security is emphasised. In the official documentation, “energy security” is described as “key to stable and sustainable development” (EEAS 2006: 6; EEAS 2007a: 6; EEAS 2008a: 2; EEAS 2008b: 1) and “improving access to energy and increasing energy efficiency” is acknowledged as “an important contribution to fulfilling sustainable development needs as well as achieving greater energy security” (EEAS 2009: 2). A “financing instrument supporting projects in the fields of energy sustainability and climate change mitigation” is established by the European Investment Bank (EEAS 2007a: 7). Thus, energy acts as a vehicle of climate change cooperation between the EU and India. This is related to the inherent connectedness of the two issue areas and also to the global shifts regarding energy politics discussed in the previous chapters. The *Joint Action Plan* in 2008 explicitly states that “new challenges have arisen. The unprecedented pressure on energy and natural resources...poses new difficulties and call for immediate action, as well as long-term structural measures” (EEAS 2008c: 1).

Benefits and Costs

While cooperation on energy-related issues has intensified, other climate change-related issues, such as biodiversity loss, are neglected. A probable cause for this is the absence of sufficiently strong mutual interest in this area (Oye in Moravcsik 2008: 250). Cooperation on traditional sources of energy has intensified in contrast to cooperation in the field of new and renewable energy technologies. Moravscik (2008: 236) argues that existing opportunities are preferred at the detriment of new gains, as actors tend to be "risk averse", which is a possible explanation for the phenomenon. Activities on traditional energy resources, i.e. fossil fuels, were regularly expanded (e.g. EEAS 2007a: 6; COM 2009) and the DG Energy lists "the development of clean coal technologies [and] increasing energy efficiency and saving" among its priorities for cooperation with India (COM, DG Energy 2010).[12] In contrast, the only mention of cooperation in the fields of renewable energy is "the launch of call for proposals focusing on solar power technologies amounting to €10 million" (EEAS 2009: 7).[13] However, the EU states its commitment to "cooperate with India in implementing its National Action Plan on Climate Change" (EEAS 2009: 3), which lists as one of its missions, the development of solar energy (GoI 2008: 3). This is in congruence with the Union's policy to support "low carbon development strategies" (COM, DG CLIMA 2010) which are "owned and driven by developing countries themselves" (COM 2007: 6).

This emphasis, and particularly the cooperation in the field of traditional power generation, is evidence of an approach which aims for co-beneficial strategies that enhance economic and security objectives as well as climate change mitigation (EEAS 2007a: 7; EEAS

[12] This policy was similar for China: in 2005, the then DG TREN (Energy and Transport) agreed with China to focus on the "development of clean coal technologies...and promoting energy efficiency" (Freeman and Holslag, 2009: 25).

[13] The presumed lack of mutual interest in solar energy cooperation might also be a result of the substantial cooperation in this area between the US (the Clinton Foundation) and India (the state government of Gujarat): In August 2006, officials signed a Memorandum of Understanding to build the world's largest solar power station (Nelson 2009).

2008b: 1). This approach is emphasised in the cooperation documentation: The “need to exploit...the synergies between the promotion of energy security, sustainable energy supply, innovation...[,] reduction of greenhouse gas emissions” (EEAS 2006: 7) and “improved air quality” (EEAS 2007a: 6) is emphasised. Furthermore, attempts are increasingly made to aggregate a variety of interests and associate a variety of “stakeholders involving business, academia and civil society” (EEAS 2005b: 12; Gibbins 2008; Schuster 2006). Private and public partnerships are promoting, for instance by launching the European Business and Technology Centre (EEAS 2007a: 2).

In the above it has been shown that considerable emphasis has been put on climate change and energy in the bilateral state-level negotiations between the EU and India. These two areas have been linked, with energy acting as a vehicle for climate cooperation. An effort has been made to develop co-beneficial strategies and involve various stakeholders in the cooperation process, which enables an aggregation of interests. Thereby, the theoretical propositions in the climate change literature and from liberal IR theory are reflected in the cooperation. However, this has not culminated in the desired results. According to an Indian member of the Energy Panel: “The Energy Panel meetings have been useless. They are only addressing well-known issues and pleasantries. A radically new mechanism for technology transfer is needed” (quoted in Boldt and Das 2008: 72). Also the *Joint Action Plan* in 2008 states that “[c]lean development and climate change needs more concrete activities” (EEAS 2008c: 2). An Indian Government Official states that the EC has “no comparative advantage” vis-à-vis individual countries and “cannot deliver operational activities” (cited in Boldt and Das 2008: 70). Therefore, it is “very difficult to cooperate with EC on activities yielding tangible results” (ibid.).

It can be concluded that the climate cooperation between the EU and India has intensified over the past decade and is today a priority issue. Climate change and energy have been

linked and addressed integrally. Positive incentives, such as finance mechanisms, have been employed. This supports the hypotheses advanced in the climate change literature that issue linkage and positive incentives are efficient tools to encourage cooperation. Discussions have particularly focused on areas in which policies are interdependent and which aggregate a high number of interests, such as energy efficient technologies that implicitly enhance energy security. This supports liberal claims that mutual interest and policy interdependence encourage cooperation. Furthermore, this reflects and substantiates EU- and India-internal policy recommendations, which advocate co-beneficial approaches. However, while cooperation in areas of mutual interest is pursued, other issues, such as biodiversity loss and the development of renewable and decentralised energy, have been neglected. Intensifying cooperation in the coal sector might be of mutual benefit but lacks the innovative vision one would hope for from global moral leaders. Furthermore, it seems that there is room for improvements regarding tangible results. Climate change cooperation, it appears, remains largely a rhetorical priority. Yet, the cooperation between the EU and India has direct benefits, such as knowledge transfer through exchange and also results in indirect positive outcomes, in particular the building of trust.

Conclusion

International climate change negotiations have so far not resulted in a comprehensive global agreement. The main underlying cause for this ongoing deadlock is frequently cited as the North-South divide (Cao 2010: 4; Parks and Roberts 2008). The main root cause for the divide is the "deep mistrust" between the two groups (Dubash 2009: 8). However, cooperation does exists across the divide and increasingly so, for instance between the EU and India. This outlier-case has been the focus of the above described research project. In particular, it begs the question of whether the instances of cooperation are exceptional or part of a broader shift. For this a detailed analysis of the case is necessary, as has been pursued in this dissertation. As such an in-depth study has not been done before, this dissertation fills a gap in the literature by contextualising and analysing the preferences and strategies of the EU and India in bilateral climate change cooperation across the North-South divide.

The research has been designed has a single case study project, which employed process-tracing, discourse analysis and content analysis in order to understand the empirical puzzle. The theoretical framework employed has drawn on aspects of structuralist, constructivist and liberal theories. The levels analysed comprise the global and domestic arenas, and the focus on the official bilateral cooperation. Thereby, various factors shaping state behaviour have been taken into account (Moravcsik 2008: 249).

First, the global conditions have been analysed, as they deliver insights into the structures that actors are embedded within. Then the domestic situation has been examined in order to provide an understanding of the identities and preferences of actors. Thirdly, the negotiations have been analysed in order to examine the strategies employed by actors.

The dissertation has been structured in this way, as structural conditions and state identities shape state preferences, which in turn determine state strategies. Understanding the conditions, identities and preferences of actors enhances the potential to understand their strategies. It has been shown that globally, domestically, and in the bilateral cooperation between the EU and India, energy has moved to the top of the policy agenda. Furthermore, at all levels, climate change and energy have been intrinsically linked and are increasingly addressed integrally. This supports the liberal claim that state-society relations shape state preferences, which in turn shape state strategies. It has been shown that both the EU and India have integrated climate and energy concerns into their domestic policies and pursued bilateral cooperation in this area. Contributing causes of this are the rise of India and the importance of the EU for India, for instance in terms of trade. The growing pressure on resources and the environment have made cooperation increasingly important for reasons of both climate change mitigation and energy security. This is reflected in the intensified cooperation in this area, which supports the liberal argument that policy interdependence and the potential of mutual benefits encourages cooperation (Moravcsik 2008: 236, 239). In contrast, other issues, such as biodiversity loss, have been silenced in the bilateral state-level cooperation. This suggests that mutual interests are not only conducive to cooperation in the case of the EU and India, but a necessary precondition.

Both actors aim for acknowledgement in the international realm as moral leaders (Freres, 2000: 63; Lauren and Le Cacheux, 2010; Narlikar, 2006: 63, 72; Saran, 2010). The importance the EU bestows on the cooperation with India is an indication of its recognition. This shows the importance of identity and of non-material gains in shaping state behaviour, as argued for by constructivists (Keohane, 2010: 16, 18; Wendt in Hurd 2008: 303). It has been shown that discourses and strategies that acknowledge the specific

identity of India as a leader of developing countries and an emerging power help to overcome structural barriers of cooperation, such as global inequality (Barrett and Stavins 2003: 358).

The case of the EU-India cooperation is specific and does not suggest that the North-South divide has narrowed. However, lessons can be drawn for cases with broadly similar conditions, such as the EU and China or India and the US. Furthermore, the case study indicates that positions along the North-South divide are not static but that actors' identities constantly shift. It has been shown that in this case issue linkage and positive incentives have been successful strategies to encourage cooperation, as has been suggested by the literature on climate change cooperation (Barrett and Stavins 2003: 366, 370-371; Schroeder 2008: 509; Kemfert 2004: 455). In particular, the linking of energy and climate change circumvents the demand of additionality to an extent. This could also be an efficient strategy for other cases of climate change cooperation across the North-South divide. Successful cooperation in areas of mutual benefit also has more far-reaching positive impacts, such as trust-building between partners which produces a more conducive climate for cooperation in multiple domains. Thereby, one of the key issues in North-South cooperation is implicitly addressed and the improved relations between the EU and India could potentially act as a building block for more constructive cooperation across the divide. However, while it is important to pursue cooperation in areas of mutual interest and reach for "low-hanging fruit", other issues, such as biodiversity loss and renewable energy should not be neglected. Furthermore, climate change cooperation needs to lead to more concrete projects. It presents an interesting topic for further research to draw out the causes of this lack and develop mechanisms which can enhance the likelihood of more tangible action. If and when the EU-India cooperation shows more innovative activities, this partnership has the potential to create results which can benefit

its populations, environments and economies. In particular, taking the lead in the shift of energy politics towards more sustainable production and consumption, would raise their international profile considerably and potentially lead to a significant competitive edge over future markets.

9998 words

References Cited

Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) (2009) 'India'. ASEM Ministerial Conference on Energy Security, Brussels, 18th June 1009, http://eeas.europa.eu/energy/events/asem_energy_2009/docs/india_en.pdf (accessed 20 May 2011)

Atteridge, A. (2010) 'Shifting Sands: India's New Approach to the Politics of Climate Change'. Policy Brief, Stockholm: Stockholm Environment Institute, http://sei-international.org/mediamanager/documents/Publications/Climate-mitigation-adaptation/Atteridge%20-%20India%20PB%20101122c%20web.pdf (accessed 21 May 2011)

Balfour, R. (2010) 'EU Strategic Partnership: are they worth the name?'. Commentary, European Policy Centres, http://www.epc.eu/documents/uploads/pub_1145_eu_strategic_partnerships_-_are_they_worth_the_name.pdf (accessed 3 June 2011)

Barrett, S. (2007) 'Climate Change Negotiations: Past and Future'. In *The New Energy Paradigm*, edited by Dieter Helm, pp. 422-439, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Barrett, S. and Stavins, R. (2003) 'Increasing Participation and Compliance in International Climate Change Agreements'. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics,* 3, pp. 349-376

Barrosso, J.M.D. (2009) 'José Manuel Durão Barroso President of the European Commission Achieving a deal on climate change: an EU view on Copenhagen Council of Foreign Relations New York, 21 September 2009'. Speech/09/401, http://europa.eu/rapid/

pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/09/401&type=HTML (accessed 20 May 2011)

BBC (2009) 'Action on 2001 climate change financial pledges falling way short, reveals BBC World Service investigation'. Press Office, World Service, 25.11.2009, http://www.bbc.co.uk/pressoffice/pressreleases/stories/2009/11_november/25/ws_climate.shtml (accessed 14 May 2011)

Boldt, J. and Das, A. (2008) 'EU-India Cooperation on Climate Change- Study on Environment and Energy in India'. European Commission, DG Clima, http://ec.europa.eu/clima/studies/international/docs/consolidated_report_0608.pdf (accessed 21 May 2011)

Bryman, A. (2008) *Social research methods.* 3rd Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Buchner and Carraro (2004) 'Emission Trading Regimes and Incentives to Participate in International Climate Agreements'. *European Environment,* 14, pp. 276-289

Cao, J. 'Beyond Copenhagen: Reconciling International Fairness, Economic Development and Climate Protection'. *The Harvard Project on International Climate Change Agreements,* Discussion Paper 10-44, http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/CaoHPICADP44.pdf (accessed 8 March 2011)

Cooper, A.F. and Fues, T. (2008) 'Do the Asian Drivers Pull their Diplomatic Weight China, India and the United Nations'. *World Development,* 36 (2), pp. 293-307

Dadwal, S.R. (2009) 'Is Energy Security the Main Driver for the West's Debate on Climate Change?'. *Strategic Analysis,* 33 (6), pp. 836-848

Delegation of the European Commission to India (Delind) (2008) 'EU creates History- Adopts a Unique Climate and Energy Package'. EU-India Update- Newsletter of the Delegation of the European Commission to India, 8 (6), http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/india/documents/press_corner/newsletter/2008_06.pdf (accessed 20 May 2011)

Delegation of the European Commission to India (Delind) (2009) 'Working with India to tackle Climate Change'. European External Action Service, European Union, http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/india/documents/publications/eu_brochure_final_press_low.pdf (accessed 21 May 2011)

Delegation of the European Commission to India (Delind) (2010) 'India-Trade'. available at http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/india/eu_india/trade_relation/index_en.htm (accessed 4 June 2011)

della Porta, D. and Keating, M. (2008) *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences - A Pluralist Perspective.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Dubash, N.K. (2009) 'Copenhagen: Climate of Mistrust'. E*conomic and Political Weekly,* 44 (52), pp. 8 - 11

European Commission (COM) (2002) 'Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament - Energy cooperation with the developing countries'. COM/

2002/0408 final, available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!DocNumber&lg=en&type_doc=COMfinal&an_doc=2002&nu_doc=408

European Commission (COM) (2007) 'EU action against climate change - Working with developing countries to tackle climate change'. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, http://ec.europa.eu/clima/publications/docs/asia_en.pdf (accessed 14 May 2011)

European Commission (COM) (2009) 'The EU-India Summit to focus on climate change, energy and trade'. Press Release RAPID, IP/09/1678, 5 November 2009, http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/09/1678&language=EN (accessed 18 May 2011)

European Commission (COM) DG CLIMA (2010) 'Climate change cooperation with non-EU countries'. Policies, International Partners, Bilateral Cooperation, http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/international/cooperation_en.htm (accessed 21 May 2011)

European Commission (COM), DG Energy (2010) 'External dimension-Bilateral cooperation-India', http://ec.europa.eu/energy/international/bilateral_cooperation/india_en.htm (accessed 20 May 2011)

European Council (1994) 'Co-operation Agreement between the European Community and the Republic of India on partnership and development- Declaration of the Community concerning tariff adjustments - Declarations of the Community and India'. 21994A0827(01), http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:21994A0827(01):EN:NOT (accessed 1 Mai 2011)

European Union External Action Service (EEAS) (2000) ‘EU-India Joint Declaration’, First EU-India Summit, Lisbon, 2000, http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/india/documents/eu_india/021_eu_india_reso_1st_page2_en.pdf (accessed 14 May 2011)

European Union External Action Service (EEAS) (2001) ‘Joint Communiqué: Second India-EU Summit’. Second EU-India Summit, New Delhi, 2001, http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/india/documents/eu_india/021_eu_india_reso_2nd_page2_en.pdf (accessed 14 May 2011)

European Union External Action Service (EEAS) (2002) ‘Third EU India Summit : Joint Press Statement’. Third EU-India Summit, Copenhagen, 2002, http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/india/documents/eu_india/021_eu_india_reso_3rd_page1_en.pdf (accessed 14 May 2011)

European Union External Action Service (EEAS) (2003) ‘4th EU-India Summit - Joint Press Statement’. Fourth EU-India Summit, New Delhi, 2003, http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/india/documents/eu_india/021_eu_india_reso_4th_page2_en.pdf (accessed 14 May 2011)

European Union External Action Service (EEAS) (2004) ‘Joint Press Statement for 5th India-EU Summit’. Fifth EU-India Summit, The Hague, 2004, http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/india/documents/eu_india/021_eu_india_res_5th_summit1_en.pdf (accessed 14 May)

European Union External Action Service (EEAS) (2005a) ‘Political Declaration on the India-EU Strategic Partnership’. Sixth EU-India Summit, New Delhi, 2005, http://

eeas.europa.eu/delegations/india/documents/eu_india/021_eu_india_res_6th_summit2_en.pdf (accessed 14 May 2011)

European Union External Action Service (EEAS) (2005b) 'The India-EU Strategic Partnership - Joint Action Plan'. Sixth EU-India Summit, New Delhi, 2005, http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/india/documents/eu_india/021_eu_india_res_6th_summit1_en.pdf (accessed 14 May 2011)

European Union External Action Service (EEAS) (2006) 'EU-India Summit - Joint Statement'. Seventh EU-India Summit, Helsinki, 2006, http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/india/documents/eu_india/021_eu_india_res_7th_summit1_en.pdf (accessed 14 May 2011)

European Union External Action Service (EEAS) (2007a) 'India-EU Joint Statement'. Eighth EU-India Summit, New Delhi, 2007, http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/india/documents/eu_india/021_eu_india_res_8th_summit1_en.pdf (accessed 14 May 2011)

European External Action Service (EEAS) (2007b) 'Multiannual Indicative Programme (2007-2010) - India'. DG RELEX.H3, http://eeas.europa.eu/india/csp/mip_07_10.pdf (accessed 20 May 2011)

European Union External Action Service (EEAS) (2008a) 'EU-India Joint Press communiqué'. Ninth EU-India Summit, Marseille, 2008, http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/india/documents/eu_india/021_eu_india_res_9th_summit1_en.pdf (accessed 14 May 2011)

European Union External Action Service (EEAS) (2008b) 'Joint Work Programme, EU-India Co-operation on Energy, Clean Development and Climate Change', Ninth EU-India Summit, Marseille, 2008, http://eeas.europa.eu/india/sum09_08/climatechange_workprog_2008_en.pdf (accessed 15 May 2011)

European Union External Action Service (EEAS) (2008c) 'EU-India Joint Action Plan', Ninth EU-India Summit, Marseille, 2008, http://www.eeas.europa.eu/india/sum09_08/joint_action_plan_2008_en.pdf (accessed 18 May 2011)

European Union External Action Service (EEAS) (2009) 'India-EU Joint Statement November 2009'. Tenth EU-India Summit, New Delhi, 2009, http://eeas.europa.eu/india/sum11_09/joint_statement_en.pdf (accessed 14 May 2011)

European Union External Action Service (EEAS) (2010a) 'EU-India Summit - Joint Statement'. Eleventh EU-India Summit, Brussels, 2010, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/118404.pdf (accessed 14 May 2011)

European Union External Action Service (EEAS) (2010b) 'India'. Country Strategy Paper 2007-2013, Mid-Term Review, April 2010, available at http://www.eeas.europa.eu/india/csp/11_13_mtr_en.pdf (accessed 4 June 2011)

European Union External Action Service (EEAS) (2011) 'India'. available at http://eeas.europa.eu/india/index_en.htm (accessed 30 April 2011)

Freeman, D. and Holslag, J. (2009) 'Climate for Cooperation - The EU, China and Climate Change'. Brussels Institute for Contemporary Chinese Studies (BICCS) at the Vrije

Universitiet Brussel (VUB), http://www.vub.ac.be/biccs/site/assets/files/apapers/Policy%20papers/Freeman_Holslag_EU_China_Climate.pdf (accessed 18 May 2011)

Freres, C. (2000) 'The European union as a Global 'Civilian Power': Development Cooperation in EU-Latin American Relations'. *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs,* 42 (2), pp. 63-85

George, A.L. and Bennett, A. (2005) *Case studies and theory development in the social sciences.* London: MIT Press

Gibbins, J. (2008) 'Possible Links with the UK Academic CCS Community'. Imperial College London, Power Point Presentation at the EU-India Working Group Coal and Clean Coal Technologies, New Delhi, 21-22 January, 2008, European Commission, Energy, External dimension, India, Related Documents, EU-India Working Groups on energy, Coal/ Clean coal technology, part 2, available at http://ec.europa.eu/energy/international/bilateral_cooperation/india_en.htm (accessed 18 May 2011)

Government of India (GOI) (2006) 'Integrated Energy Policy- Report of the Expert Committee'. Planning Commission, August 2006, http://planningcommission.nic.in/reports/genrep/rep_intengy.pdf (accessed 20 May 2011)

Government of India (GOI) (2007) 'New Division of Energy Security'. Press Information Bureau, Ministry of External Affairs, Rajya Sabha, 6 September, http://pib.nic.in/newsite/PrintRelease.aspx (accessed 15 May 2011)

Government of India (GOI) (2008) 'National Action Plan on Climate Change'. Prime Minister's Council on Climate Change, http://pmindia.nic.in/climate_change.htm (accessed 10 November 2010)

Grant, C. (2006) 'India and the EU: Strategic Partners?'. *Centre for European Reform Bulletin,* 46, February/March 2006, http://www.cer.org.uk/articles/46_grant.html (accessed 20 May 2011)

Guha, R. and Martinez-Alier, J. (2000) *Varieties of Environmentalism - Essay North and South.* London: Earthscan Publications Limited

Gupta, A. (2010) 'Turbulent Future Lies Ahead for Global Energy Markets'. *Strategic Analysis,* 34 (6), pp. 793-298

Hardy et al. (2004) 'Discourse Analysis and Content Analysis: Two Solitudes?'. *Qualitative Methods: Newsletter of the American Political Science Association Organized Section on Qualitative Methods,* 2 (1), pp. 19-22

Helm, D. (2007) *The New Energy Paradigm.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

The Hindu (2007) 'Govt. acts on UN reports on climate change, sets up panel'. December 27, 2007, http://www.hindu.com/thehindu/holnus/000200712271041.htm (accessed 20 May 2011)

Hulme, M. (200) *Why we disagree about climate change: understanding controversy, inaction and opportunity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Hurd, I. (2008) 'Constructivism'. In *Political Science: The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* edited by Reus-Smit, C. and Snidal, D., Oxford Handbook. Online resource, http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2593/oso/private/content/oho_politics/9780199219322/p034.html?q=constructivism#oxfordhb-9780199219322-chapter-17 (accessed 8 March 2011)

Indian Express (2005) 'Energy independence has to be priority No.1: Kalam'. August 15, http://www.indianexpress.com/oldStory/76324/ (accessed 20 May 2011)

International Council on Climate Change (IPCC) (2007) 'Global Anthropogenic GHG emissions'. In *Climate Change 2007: Synthesis Report,* Fig. 2.1., http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/syr/en/figure-spm-3.html (accessed 5 June 2011)

International Energy Agency (IEA) (2007) 'World Energy Outlook 2007- China and India Insights'. http://www.worldenergyoutlook.org/2007.asp (accessed 21 May 2011)

International Partnership on Energy Efficiency (IPEEC) (2008) 'Declaration'. available at http://www.energy.gov/media/IPEEC_declarationfinal_June082008.pdf (accessed 20 May 2011)

Joshi, V. and Patel, U.R. (2009) 'India and Climate-change Mitigation'. In *The Economics and Politics of Climate Change,* edited by Dieter Helm and Cameron Hebpurn, pp. 167-196, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Kemfert, C. (2004) 'Climate coalitions and international trade: assessment of cooperation incentives by issue linkage'. *Energy Policy,* 32, pp. 455-465

Keohane, R. (2010) 'The Economy of Esteem and Climate Change'. *St. Antony's International Review,* 5 (2), pp. 16-28

Klotz, A. and Prakash, D. (2008) *Qualitative methods in international relations: a pluralist guide.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Korppoo et al. (2009) 'India' In *Towards a new climate change regime? View of China, India, Japan, Russia and the United States on the road to Copenhagen*. FIIA Report, No. 19, pp. 47 - 65 http://www.upi-fiia.fi/en/publication/72/towards_a_new_climate_regime/ (accesses 29 April 2011)

Krippendorff, K. (2004) *Content Analysis - An Introduction to Its Methodology.* London: Sage.

Laurent, E. and Le Cacheux, J. (2010) 'The EU as a global ecological power: The logics of market integration'. Document de travail, 2010-08, *Observatoire Francais des Conjonctures Économiques,* http://ideas.repec.org/p/fce/doctra/1008.html (accessed 9 March 2011)

Meadows, D. et al. (2004) *Limits to Growth - The 30-year update.* White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing Company

Mitra, A. (2010) 'It's true, India has emerged'. *The Economic Times,* 11 November, http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/opinion/Its-true-India-has-emerged/articleshow/6904295.cms (accessed 21 November, 2010)

Mohan, C.R. 2005. *Crossing the Rubicon: the shaping of India's new foreign policy*. London: Penguin.

Moravcsik, A. (1997) 'Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics'. *International Organization*, Vol. 51 (4), pp. 513-553.

Moravcsik, A. (2008) 'The New Liberalism'. In *Political Science: The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* edited by Reus-Smit, C. and Snidal, D., Oxford Handbook. Online resource, http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2593/oso/private/content/oho_politics/9780199219322/p030.html?q=liberalism#oxfordhb-9780199219322-chapter-13 (accessed 9 March 2011)

Müller, B. (2009) 'On the Need to Certify - Oversight of compliance with financial commitments under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change'. *Oxford Energy and Environment Comment,* Oxford Institute for Energy Studies, http://www.oxfordclimatepolicy.org/publications/documents/comment_01_12_09.pdf (accessed 14 May 2011)

Narlikar, A. (2006) 'Peculiar chauvinism or strategic calculation? Explaining the negotiating strategy of a rising India'. *International Affairs*, 82 (1), pp. 59-76

Nelson, D. (2009) 'Clinton Foundation to build solar power station near Pakistan border'. *The Telegraph,* 6 August 2009, online version, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/energy/solarpower/5980826/Clinton-Foundation-to-build-solar-power-station-near-Pakistan-border.html (accessed 4 June 2011)

Oberthür, S. (2007) 'EU leadership on Climate Change: Living up to the Challenge'. *Institute for European Studies,* http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/llp/jm/more/forum07/oberthur.pdf (accessed 9 March 2011)

Pallemaerts, M. and Armstrong, J. (2009) 'Financial Support to Developing Countries for Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation: Is the EU Meeting its Commitments?'. Institute for European Environmental Policy, http://www.ieeplondon.org.uk/publications/pdfs/2009/sds_paper_funding.pdf (accessed 14 May 2011)

Panagariya, A. (2010) 'Climate Change and India: Implications and Policy Options' in *India Policy Forum,* 6, edited by Bery et al., **pp.????** India: Sage

Parks, B.C. and Roberts, J.T. (2008) 'Inequality and the global climate regime: breaking the North-South impasse'. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 21(4), pp. 621-648

Parks, B.C. and Roberts, J.T. (2010) 'Climate Change, Social Theory and Justice'. *Theory, Culture and Society,* 27 (2-3), pp. 134-166

Peet, R. and Watts, M. (1993) 'Introduction: Development Theory and Environment in an Age of Market Triumphalism'. *Economic Geography,* 69 (3), pp. 227-253

Rajamani, L. (2000) 'The Principle of Common but Differentiated Responsibilities and the Balance of Commitments under the Climate Regime'. *Reciel*, 9 (2), pp. 120-131

Reus-Smit, Ch. (2005) 'Constructivism'. In *Theories of International Relations,* 3rd Edition, edited by Burchill et al., pp. 188-212, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Sands, P. (1995) *Principles of International Environmental Law - Volume I: Frameworks, Standards and Implementation.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Saran, S. (2010) 'Shyam Saran: India and the new Energy Revolution'. *Business Standard,* 8 June 2010, http://www.business-standard.com/india/news/shyam-saran-indiathe-new-energy-revolution/397366/ (accessed 9 March 2011)

Schroeder, M. (2008) 'The construction of China's climate politics: transnational NGOs and the spiral model of international relations'. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs,* 21 (4), pp. 505 - 525

Schuster, R. (2006) 'Development of Mining Methods for Steep and Thick Seam Mining-Challenges and Chances'. DBT Mining Engineers GmbH, power point presentation at the EU-India Energy Panel Talks in Brussels, 29 November, 2006, European Commission, Energy, External dimension, India, Related Documents, EU-India Working Groups on energy, Coal/Clean coal technology, part 3, available at http://ec.europa.eu/energy/international/bilateral_cooperation/india_en.htm (accessed 18 May 2011)

Scott, S.V. (2008) 'The problem of unequal treaties in contemporary international law: how the powerful have reneged on the political compacts within five cornerstone treaties of

global governance are situated'. *Journal of International Law & International Relations*, June 2, 2008, http://www.thefreelibrary.com/_/print/PrintArticle.aspx?id=189290290 (accessed 9 November 2010)

Sethi, N. (2007) 'Govt plans mega forest project'. *Times of India,* 10 September, http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2007-09-10/india/27973222_1_afforestation-ambitious-plan-project (accessed 16 May 2011)

Snidal, D. (1991) 'Relative Gains and the Patterns of International Cooperation'. *The American Political Science Review,* 85 (3) , pp. 701-726

Traynor, I. (2009) 'Sweden kicks off EU presidency with focus on climate change'. *The Guardian,* 1 July 2009, http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/jul/01/sweden-eu-presidency-climate-change (accessed 21 May 2011)

United Nations (UN) (1992) 'Rio Declaration on Environment and Development', General Assembly, Report of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, Rio de Janeiro, 3-14 June, A/CONF.151/26 (Vol.I), http://www.un.org/documents/ga/conf151/aconf15126-1annex1.htm (accessed 29 April 2011)

United Nations Framework for Climate Change (UNFCC) (2011) 'India - Views on implementing COP decisions on 'Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries; and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries' (REDD-plus)'. http://unfccc.int/files/documentation/

submissions_from_parties_in_2011/application/pdf/india_submission_reddplus-strategy.pdf (accessed 25 May 2011)

Vennesson, P (2008) 'Case studies and process tracing: theories and practice'. In della Porta, D. and Keating, M., *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences - A Pluralist Perspective,* pp. 223-239, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Wetherell et al. (2001) 'A Geneological Analysis'. In *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*, edited by Wetherell et al., pp. 267- 310, London: Sage