

## Understanding the Global Climate Change Regimes

Khushboo Fatima \*

Noor Fatima †

### Abstract

*Climate change is considered as one of the most hazardous security threats, which contains challenges for carbon-emitting countries as well as non-emitting countries. International regimes have been engaged in mitigating climate-related effects as these threats are more lethal than terrorism and any other traditional security threats. International regimes for climate change are being developed through an evolutionary process and currently working on different levels to combat the perils of climate change. Their efficiency is always under consideration by non-emitting states that are victims of climate change, consequently through developed or carbon-emitting states. The study identifies efficient and valuable work of climate regimes and provides a critical approach to so far work done on climate change to diminish its effects worldwide. The research includes the responsibility of various factors to mitigate the consequences of climate change i.e. role of carbon-emitting and non-emitting states and the role of inter-governmental organizations.*

### Heading

- [Introduction](#)
- [Historical Background](#)
- [The Yearly Progress](#)
- [Role of Creating](#)
- [Role of International Climate](#)
- [The Efficiency of the Kyoto Protocol](#)
- [Conclusion](#)
- [References](#)

**Key Words:** Climate Change Regimes, UNFCCC, Paris Agreement, Kyoto Protocol, Copenhagen Accord, Global Security

### Introduction

Climate has changed and rose on universal scales since Earth's creation. It is not altered in a specific domain; however, the earth's entire natural environment has acquired high on different scales. The concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> (Carbon Dioxide) on the planet has accomplished a record high concerning more than the past half-million years and has done all things considered at an uncommonly fast rate. Current inclusive temperatures are more boiling than ever been in any duration in past centuries since the earth's beginning. The recorded environmental change reveals that the issue is not a sudden phenomenon with limited natural climate change; however, continuous change.

Climate change is also connected with the growing population globally and participating in

the overall increase in temperature. Individuals are the essential drivers behind creating a risk of climate change. In 1712, Thomas Newcomen envisioned the first commonly used steam engine, which became a milestone for the Industrial Revolution. In 1800, the population increased to one billion, thus caused in the growth of more industrial revolutions. French physicist Joseph Fourier outlined the Earth's expected temperature impact in 1824. The intercession of the air can extend the temperature of the Earth since hotness in the state of light finds a minor impediment in entering the air than in re-going into the air when changed over into non-sparkling heat. In 1861, Irish physicist John Tyndall revealed that water vapor and certain various gases produce the nursery influence. He

\* MS Scholar, Department of Politics & IR, International Islamic University Islamabad, Pakistan.  
Email: [Fatimabaloch862@gmail.com](mailto:Fatimabaloch862@gmail.com)

† Assistant Professor, Department of Politics & IR, International Islamic University Islamabad, Pakistan.

intended that: 'this liquid-vapor is a general continuously overbearing to the vegetable presence of England. He was regarded for establishing the UK's first prominent air inspect affiliation, the Tyndall Centre, named after him. In 1886, Karl Benz revealed the Motor wagon, similarly acknowledged as the leading vehicle, contributing to climate change by carbon emission (Shaikh, 2018).

### **Historical Background of Climate Change**

Since 17<sup>th</sup>-century climate change can be observed, however disappointingly, there has not been any compelling association to manage this hazard. Institutional work to counter this issue began in the later 1980s after the foundation of the organization to manage the issue of the ozone layer. The upgrading of the climate change regimes in the late 1980s and mid-1990s provoked an overflow of environmental activities. This started in 1987 with the Brundtland Commission report's disclosure, Our Common Future (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987). It was moreover emaciated at the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED). The advancement of the environmental change system until the advent of the Kyoto Protocol in 1997 can helpfully be separated into a different period. The primary time frame, during which coherent concern about a worldwide temperature alteration, developed the plan setting stage, from 1985 to 1988. When the environmental change was transformed from a rational into strategy issues, a pre-negotiation period from 1988 to 1990 when governments turned out to be vigorously engaged with the procedure, the formal intergovernmental exchanges stage promoted the reception of the UNFCCC in May 1992. (Bodansky, 2001).

Advisory Group on Greenhouse Gases was established in 1985 to distinguish important climate change issues. It initiated a formalized Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in 1988 by the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) and the World Meteorological Organization. In 1989, the Netherlands initially facilitated a meeting of Heads of State to observe environmental change and subsequently a meeting of ecological

ministers in Noordwijk. In 1990, the World Meteorological Organization held the Second World Climate Conference, and key logical concerns and political developments were recognized at the meeting. The Climate Action Network was built up in March 1989 (an alliance of a wide range of ecological NGOs) and the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives in 1990. Industry, then again, was barely occupied with the issue around then (Gupta, 2010).

### **The Yearly Progress for Climate Change Instructions are as follows**

- 1992: The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) was embraced and opened for marks in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, at the UN Conference on Environment and Development, otherwise called the Earth Summit (IISD, n.d).
- 1994: The UNFCCC Treaty went into power in the wake of receiving 50 sanctions.
- 1995: The Central Conference of the Parties (COP 1) to the UNFCCC was held in Berlin, Germany. Non-Annex one nations were excluded from extra commitments.
- 1996: COP 2 was held in Geneva, Switzerland. Participants encompassed the consequences of IPCC's subsequent evaluation report.
- 1997: COP 3 was held in Kyoto, Japan. On December 11, the Kyoto Protocol was embraced by accord with more than 150 signatories. The Protocol included lawfully restricting discharges focuses for created nation Parties for the six noteworthy GHGs: carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons sulfur hexafluoride.
- 1998: COP 4 was held in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Gatherings comprised the Buenos Aires Plan of Action.
- 1999: COP 5 was held in Bonn, Germany, as indicated by the UNFCCC; parties proceeded with arrangement endeavors to emphasize the reception of the rules for the readiness of national correspondences to climate hazards by developed nations.

- 2000: COP 6 was held in The Hague, Netherlands. Arrangements wavered, and meetings consented to meet once more to incorporate climate disasters.
- 2001: COP 7 was held in Morocco. The point-by-point rules for the execution of the Kyoto Protocol were included and called the Marrakesh Accords.
- 2002: COP 8 was held in Delhi, India. Congregations incorporated the Delhi Ministerial Declaration that, in addition to other things, called for created nations to move innovation to aware nations.
- 2003: COP 9 was held in Milan, Italy. New emanations detailing rules dependent on IPCC proposals were received. The Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) and the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) were additionally created.
- 2004: COP 10 was held in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Meetings of members started examining the modification of alternatives. The meeting received various choices and ended on issues identifying with advancement and advances; land use, land-use change, and developed states service.
- 2005: COP 11 was held in Montreal, Canada. This gathering was the first to happen after the Kyoto Protocol took power. The Parties' primary yearly Meeting enhanced the yearly congregation between the parties (COP) to the Kyoto Protocol.
- 2006: COP 12 was held in Nairobi, Kenya. Budgetary components were looked into, and different choices were made about the Special Climate Change Fund.
- 2007: COP 13 was held in Bali. COP meetings consented to a Bali Action Plan to arrange GHG relief activities after the Kyoto Protocol terminated in 2012. The Bali Action Plan did not require restricting GHG to focus on creating nations.
- 2008: COP 14 was held in Poznan, Poland. Nations started dealings on the financing component to enable developing nations to adjust to the impacts of environmental change. Exchanges proceeded about what might succeed in the Kyoto Protocol.
- 2009: As a significant aspect of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) process, governments met in Bonn, Germany, to start dialogues on draft exchanges that would shape the premise of an understanding at Copenhagen.
- 2010: The United States and more than 130 countries consented to the Copenhagen Accord reported in December 2009.
- 2011: COP 17 was held in Durban, South Africa. Meetings consented to the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action, which established another universal emanation decrease convention.
- 2012: COP 18 was held in Doha, Qatar. Gatherings consented to expand the terminating Kyoto Protocol, making a subsequent duty stage that would start on January 1, 2013, and end December 31, 2020.
- 2013: COP 19 was held in Warsaw, Poland. Gatherings were relied upon to make a guide for the 2015 COP in Paris, where a lawfully restricting settlement to diminish ozone-depleting substance (GHG) outflows is required to be finished to happen in 2020.
- 2014: COP 20 relied upon to happen in Lima, Peru, to discuss the efficiencies of present regimes.
- 2015: The Paris Agreement expands upon the Convention and – just because – brings all countries into a typical reason to embrace take aspiring endeavors to battle environmental change and adjust to its belongings, with upgraded backing to create nations such. [\\_\(United Nations, 2018\).](#)

### **Role of Creating and Non-Creating States in Climate Change Mitigation**

States that emit more carbon in the air due to industrial activities are known as carbon-emitting or creating states, and states with low less carbon emission are called non-carbon emitting states or non-creating states. For instance, the climate has dispersive effects; it affects both creating and non-creating states equally. An ethical race has been started between climate change producing and affected states, causing a strange environmental dilemma. The

question of 'Who will act?' is still unanswered by the international community and international global climate change regimes. Maximum emitting states are even not ready to consider this security threat as a threat, especially those who can act like the USA. In 2002, the US was emitting 20 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> per capita annually, according to the World Bank report. When developing states are asked to cut survival emissions, developed states are not ready to cut their luxury emissions. With its dangerous nature, climate change is a challenge to the environment. It brings a blame game between states, concluding that finger-pointing is not an appropriate solution, only evading the problem (Ivanova & Figueres, 2002).

Climate change risks are well recognized and experienced by communities and the ecosystem. Despite the global acknowledgment and commitment of most states in 1992 to maintain anthropogenic GHG at a secure grade, emissions are not in control but increasing day by day, risking the globe's future. This miserable attitude of states calls for courage for decision and determined actions, which can be possible by practical actions of the plan established in climate negotiations in past years that determine the efforts of some volunteer states. (Moncel, Joffe, McCall, & Levin, 2011).

As per the obligation of the Kyoto Protocol, even if it would have been done from 1990, the targeted 5.2 reductions could not be possible with the US. If the USA and other industrialized states start reducing emissions and developing states continue to emit, this cannot be reached to any solution. Hence it is understood that the climate change challenge seeks the attention of the entire world. Nonetheless, some other states are voluntarily participating in climate change protection by reducing carbon emissions. China, Brazil, Mexico, India, South Korea, and Thailand are states to cut carbon emissions substantially by adopting efficiency standards and imposing energy incentive taxes. These states' efforts are needed to be praised and followed by other states as well by accepting a global responsibility (Ivanova & Figueres, 2002).

During the last decade, global climate

change regimes, including norms, rules, and decision-making procedures, have undergone various modifications with a focused agenda of protecting the climate. In 1992, after its commencement, UNFCCC worked with a top-down mechanism, and reduction targets were made on states economy-wise. Thus, this was legally bound later in the Kyoto protocol with the consent of participating states in 1997. Two groups were made as annex-1 states (have to act according to recorded emissions) and non-annex states (with no such responsibility and referred to as developing states). Concerning the plan of CBDR-RC (Common however Differentiated Responsibility and Respective Capabilities), a distinction was made between both groups of underprivileged and prosperous states. According to that, developed or annex-1 states have more work to mitigate greenhouse gas than developing or non-annex states. The present multilateral struggle to acclimate climate change under UNFCCC revolves around the Kyoto Protocol & Paris Agreement, which formulates the global climate change regime's basics. (Widerberg & Pattberg, 2017).

## **Role of International Climate Change Regimes**

### **United Nations Framework of Climate Change Convention**

In 1992, several countries unified for the global treaty in Rio, the UNFCCC, as a plan for global cooperation to fight against climate change by restraining usual global temperature rises, causing climate change, calculating the expected results to make a productive solution. (United Nations Climate Change, 2019).

Between the periods of February 1991 to May 1992, the agenda of this convention was established with mutual negotiations of states. In June 1992, this was provided to all participants for signature in the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), also called Rio Earth Summit.

The detailed document consists of 26 articles that define entire terms of climate-related activities and phenomena, including all historical events covering the struggle on climate change control. It welcomes future efforts to mitigate the

consequences of climate change with legally binding agreements of states on international and intergovernmental levels. The document further enlists states as annex-I and annex-II based on their contribution and responsibilities. UNFCCC is not absolute regime that will open doors for further agreements and negotiations related to climate change policies. UNFCCC provides a platform for states to perform their role in climate change mitigation on a different level, however, with equal participation. All states must have to perform; nevertheless, their part is different according to their participation in climate change (Craig, 2016).

The UNFCCC introduced a mechanism for states to produce and share data about local GHG emissions. UNFCCC implies more responsibilities towards developed states. Therefore these states have to submit their emission record and policies to control emissions. These reports and records have so far facilitated developing states to understand climate challenges scientifically. Moreover, a record produced through UNFCCC provides material for the agenda-setting of further agreements and negotiations (Kuh, 2018). UNFCCC has so far been a successful body in the context of awareness related to environmental challenges. Climate change and other environmental challenges are now the nation's agenda and are considered a worldwide non-traditional security threat. Environmental actions have gained the attention of many countries that fluctuate country-wise with local and international efforts to cope with. (Green Clean Guide , 2017).

The establishment of UNFCCC is for extreme political implication, as it ensures one side that the latest market-based mechanisms subsidize in mitigation of climate change and attainment of goals. On the other side, it exposes that multiple market-based methods can be united in the worldwide carbon market. Therefore, there is little intelligibility in the parts and projects of this framework. Ocean acidification, such as climate change, is on a panel of UNFCCC which is being considered forward to the best possible standard solution by UNFCCC. Nonetheless, this framework is not as effective for reducing the acidification of oceans

for climate change mitigation (Harrould-Kolieb & Herr, 2011).

### **The Efficiency of the Kyoto Protocol**

The Kyoto Protocol is a universal understanding of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which submits its Parties by setting globally, restricting outflow decrease targets. Perceiving that created nations are mainly in charge of the present elevated amounts of GHG outflows in the environment because of over 150 years of mechanical action, the Protocol puts a heavier weight on created countries under the rule of "common but differentiated responsibilities." The Kyoto Protocol was received in Kyoto, Japan, on 11 December 1997 and went into power on 16 February 2005. The comprehensive guidelines for the execution of the Protocol were embraced at COP 7 in Marrakesh, Morocco, in 2001 and are referred to as the "Marrakesh Accords". The Kyoto Protocol shares a definitive goal of the Convention to balance out environmental centralizations of GHGs at a level that will avoid hazardous impedance with the atmosphere framework. In the quest for this objective, the Kyoto Protocol expands upon and improves many of the duties set up under the Convention. These emanation remittances are considered Kyoto units and are liable to explicit principles contingent upon the specific unit type (UNFCCC, 2008).

Non-Annex I countries contribute by putting resources into ventures intended to bring down emanations in their nations. For these tasks, they earned carbon credits, which could be exchanged or offered to Annex I nations, permitting them a more elevated amount of most powerful carbon emanations for that period. Under the convention industrialized countries were to diminish ozone-harming substances by 5.2%, all things considered by 2012; however, every country had its objective. For instance, when the understanding was concluded, European Union individuals had an objective of decreasing emanations by 8% by 2012. The U.S. had a decreased focus of 7%, while Canada's objective was 6% (Murphy, 2019).

Under Kyoto, industrialized countries vowed to cut their yearly emanations of carbon,



as estimated in six ozone-depleting substances, by changing sums, averaging 5.2% by 2012 when contrasted with 1990. That likens to a 29% cut in the qualities that would have generally happened. Be that as it may, the convention didn't wind up universal law until more than partially through the 1990–2012 periods. By that point, worldwide outflows had risen considerably. A few nations and locales, including the European Union, were on track by 2011 to meet or surpass their Kyoto objectives; however, other enormous countries missed the mark. What's more, the two most significant producers of all – the United States and China – produced all that could be needed additional ozone-depleting substances to delete every one of the decreases made by different nations during the Kyoto time frame. [\(The Guardian, 2011\)](#).

Even though the Kyoto Protocol spoke to a milestone discretionary achievement, its prosperity was a long way from guaranteed. Reports issued in the initial two years after the arrangement produced results showed that most members would neglect to meet their outflow targets. Regardless of whether the objectives were met, a definitive advantage to nature would not be noteworthy, as per a few commentators. Since China, the world's driving producer of ozone-depleting substances, and the United States, the world's second-biggest producer, were not bound by the convention. [\(The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2019\)](#).

### **The Efficiency of Copenhagen Accord**

In Copenhagen, December 2009, 193 delegates of governments approached a forum at the fifteenth session of the Conference of the Parties (COP15) of the UNFCCC. The fifth session of the Conference of the Parties filled in as the Parties' Meeting to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP5); around 120 were spoken to by Heads of State. Work started in Bali in 2007, intending to critically improve the usage of the Convention to counteract risky human-made obstruction with the climate change framework [\(UNFCCC 2007\)](#), which was to be finished at COP15. In the Accord, Parties concur that intense cuts in worldwide releases are required by science to lessen worldwide emanations to hold the expansion in a worldwide temperature

underneath 2°C' and thus anticipating perilous human-centric impedance with the climate framework. 1.5°C referenced in the Accord concerning conceivably vital the long haul temperature objective depends on different issues introduced by the science. [\(Rogelj, 2010\)](#).

The actual purpose of the conference in Copenhagen (COP 15) had been to complete negotiations on a new international agreement on climate change to come into force when the Kyoto Protocol's first commitment period came to an end in 2012. Judging from the high talk heard before the Copenhagen meeting, asking gatherings to finish dealings on another universal concession to environmental change to pursue the Kyoto Protocol, the results must be viewed as a disappointment. The Copenhagen Accord – the excellent result of the dealings – does not force real and evident commitments or restrict outflows that focus on specific or account commitments. This reality, be that as it may, ought not to be permitted to put down the considerable advances that have been made in at any rate three territories: "financing, deforestation and adaptation". [\(Georgiev, 2009\)](#).

The Copenhagen Accord is unmistakably a task in advancement. For example, with critical restraints, the outflows decrease focuses on industrialized nations and emanations moderation activities of creating nations to be filled in later. Likewise, it is a deliberate system, with exchanges to proceed in 2010 towards a legitimately restricting instrument that would either go with or override the Kyoto Protocol [\(Meyer, n.d.\)](#).

The Copenhagen Accord came about because of the elements of worldwide atmosphere discretion, many of which have remained unaltered since the dealings that delivered the Kyoto Protocol. The hugest dynamic is that between the United States and the enormous creating nations, mainly China. During the drafting of Kyoto, China would not acknowledge any coupling points of confinement on its emanations or arrange any procedure that endeavored to present such new responsibilities [\(Spak, 2010\)](#).

The essential disappointment is that the Copenhagen Accord is undoubtedly not a

legitimately restricting report; it is simply a political understanding. By the final form of the accord, all objectives had vanished. The other primary exclusion was a reference to a cresting year. Copenhagen did not deliver the last cake; however, it left nations with all the correct fixings to make another one in Mexico (Wit, 2010).

### **The Efficiency of the Paris Agreement**

The Paris Agreement (signed on 15 Dec 2015) requires all nations, created and creating noteworthy to-do duties to address environmental change. Nations in charge of 97% of worldwide emanations have officially sworn their Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) for how they will address environmental change. Nations will return to their present promises by 2020 and, in a perfect world, fortify their discharges decrease focuses for 2030. It requires an account of ozone-depleting substance inventories and projections liable to a specialized master audit and a multilateral examination. Nations will keep on giving atmosphere account to help the most helpless adjust to climate change and assemble low-carbon economies. While the Paris Understanding does not "unravel" environmental change, it enables us to begin the subsequent flood of worldwide atmosphere activities, making a virtuous cycle for increasingly forceful activity in the decades to come (NRDC, 2017).

The Paris Agreement enters into force on 4 November 2016. While thirty days after the date on which in any event, 55 Parties to the Convention completely for in any event an expected 55 % of the total worldwide ozone harming substance outflows have saved their instruments of sanction, acknowledgment, endorsement, or increase with the Depository. (United Nations , 2015).

Paris Agreement ultimately to be operational, a work program was propelled in Paris to create modalities, methods, and rules on an expansive exhibit of issues. The Conference of the Parties filling in as the gathering of the Parties to the Paris Agreement met without precedent for combination with COP 22 in Marrakesh (in November 2016) and received its

initial two choices (United Nations Climate Change , 2018).

To achieve the cores of agreement, nations have submitted Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) illustrating their post-2020 climate activity. Here it is evaluated the impact of current INDCs on lessening total ozone harming substance discharges, its suggestions for accomplishing the temperature goal of the Paris atmosphere understanding, and potential choices for overachievement. INDCs all things considered, lower ozone-depleting substance emanations contrasted with where current strategies stand, yet at the same time infer middle warming of 2.6 to 3.1 degrees Celsius by 2020 (Joeri Rogelj, 2016).

Fundamentally, the Paris agreement is about finding the balance between what is conceivable and what is essential. It is anything but difficult to request what appears to be meaningful without respect to whether it's politically unthinkable and straightforward to do the politically practical absent much respect for what's vital. Finding that sweet spot is difficult. If Paris turns into the compelling routine it was intended to be and encourages lead the world to do what is required; it will procure its place ever (Stern, 2018).

The Paris Agreement requires that all countries—rich, poor, developed, and developing, do their part and slash greenhouse gas emissions. To that end, greater flexibility is built into the Paris Agreement: No language is included on the commitments countries should make, nations can voluntarily set their emissions targets (NDCs), and countries incur no penalties for falling short of their proposed targets. However, what the Paris Agreement does require is the monitoring, reporting, and reassessing of individual and collective country targets overtime to move the world closer to the broader objectives of the deal. And the agreement sets forth a requirement for countries to announce their next round of targets every five years, unlike the Kyoto Protocol, which aimed for that objective but didn't include a specific requirement to achieve it (Denchak, 2018).

Budgetary guide for third world nations could highly affect the result. For 2030, and likely for future deadlines, the promises of many

creating countries expect help will be given to support the run. The more extravagant nations have consented to give it. However, the progression of assets up to this point has been little in connection to the need. The inability to accomplish considerable increments in aspiration in these 2020 affirmations, and the money related help to help them, would be terrible news for the temperature. As their fixation develops, the way of decrease prompting a two °C result will end up more extreme and along these lines all the more unreasonable, conceivably putting temperature objectives distant. There is extraordinary time weight between now and 2020, given all that should be finished hence posing another challenge for executing the Paris agreement (Henry D. Jacoby, 2018).

## **Conclusion**

Since the declaration of climate change and environmental regimes, various efforts and agreements have been made to bring the world on a single and binding forum to save the planet from climate penalties. Regardless of international duty by the more significant part of the world's legislatures to balance out heat-producing substances and gradient vows of future activity, lack of implementation is considerable regarding what science proposes, is essential. All accords have somehow been successful to some degree; however, there is no such treaty to wholly bound states on remarkable agenda. Expectations of states are not thoroughly entertained as every state wants a free ride; however, climate consequences need volunteer work. Yet, there is a hope these regimes have

persuaded states to distinguish climate threats worldwide.

For the past few years, international governments have attempted to complete an administrative framework for climate change administration. Instead, their actions have created a complex, much firmly associated administrative system that incorporates international regimes and institutions. Legitimate systems and understandings (for example, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change — UNFCCC), principal appraisals (for example, those created by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change), and different two-sided and one-sided activities. Various variables represent this result, where universal endeavors are neither completely coordinated nor divided. From a valuable point of view, the particular administrative difficulties included fluctuating to the point that a solitary institutional reaction is uncommonly hard to sort out. From a dynamic outlook, the advantages of an extensive system may not appear to be adequate to legitimize the dealing endeavors and concessions that would be expected of individual states with frequently unique interests.

Managing climate change will require unusual state political initiatives to create and non-creating states and create a hard-to accomplish through formal dealings with the 194 gatherings to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change by devoted atmosphere representatives alone. Slighter social affairs that incorporate heads of state and ground-breaking government department ministers can potentially open less inflexible participation and discover chances to exchange crossway over climate change issue.



## References

- Bodansky, D. (2001). The History of the Global Climate Change. In U. Luteracher, D. F. Sprinz, & S. Luterbacher (Ed.), *International Regimes and Global Climate Change* (pp. 23-40). London, Cambridge, England: *The MIT press*.
- Craig, J. (2016, June). International Climate Change Law. 03 24, 2019, Researchgate: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312320726\\_International\\_Climate\\_Change\\_Law](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312320726_International_Climate_Change_Law)
- Denchak, M. (2018, December 18). Paris Climate Agreement: Everything You Need to Know. 7 4, 2019, NRDC: <https://www.nrdc.org/stories/paris-climate-agreement-everything-you-need-know>
- Georgiev, C. E. (2009, December 25). The Copenhagen Accord, A first stab at deciphering the implications for the EU. CEPS Commentry.
- Green Clean Guide. (2017, July 17). The weaknesses and strengths of working with INDCs. Green Clean Guide: <http://greencleanguide.com/the-weaknesses-and-strengths-of-working-with-indcs/>
- Gupta, J. (2010). A history of international climate change policy. pp. 636-653.
- Harrould-Kolieb, E. R., & Herr, D. (2011, 10 10). Ocean acidification and climate change: synergies and challenges of addressing both under the UNFCCC. *Climate Policy*, 12(3), 378-389.
- Henry, D., Jacoby, J. M. (2018, December 4). Why the next two years are critical for the Paris climate deal's survival. 7 4, 2019, The Conversation: <http://theconversation.com/why-the-next-two-years-are-critical-for-the-paris-climate-deals-survival-107931>
- IISD. (n.d). Brief Overview. August 23, 2019, IISD: [https://enb.iisd.org/process/climate\\_atm-fcccintro.html](https://enb.iisd.org/process/climate_atm-fcccintro.html)
- Ivanova, M., & Figueres, C. (2002). Climate Change: National Interests or a Global Regime? In M. Ivanova, & C. Figueres, *Global Environmental Governance: Options & Opportunities*. (pp. 1-21). Boston: Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies.
- Joeri Rogelj, M. d. (2016). Paris Agreement climate proposals need a boost to keep warming well below 2 °C. *nature*, pages 631–639.
- Kuh, K. F. (2018). The Law of Climate Change Mitigation: An Overview. *ScienceDirect*, 2, 505-510.
- Meyer, A. (n.d.). The Copenhagen Accord: Not Everything We Wanted, But Something to Build On. 7 4, 2019, UCSUSA: <https://www.ucsusa.org/global-warming/solutions/reduce-emissions/the-copenhagen-accord.html>
- Moncel, R., Joffe, P., McCall, K., & Levin, K. (2011). BUILDING THE CLIMATE CHANGE REGIME. *World Resources Institute* (WRI).
- Murphy, C. B. (2019, May 24). Kyoto Protocol. *Commodities*.
- NRDC. (2017, November). The Paris agreement on climate change. 7 3, 2019, NRDC: <https://assets.nrdc.org/sites/default/files/paris-agreement-climate-change-2017-ib.pdf>
- Rogelj, J. (2010). Analysis of the Copenhagen Accord pledges and its global climatic impacts—A snapshot of dissonant ambitions. *Researchgate*.
- Sepibus, J. d., Sterk, W., & Tuerk, A. (2013, 08 09). Top-down, bottom-up or in-between: how can a UNFCCC framework for market-based approaches ensure environmental integrity and market coherence? *Green house gas managment and measurment*, 3(1-02), 6-20.
- Shaikh, F. H. (2018, Febuary 25). History of climate change. *Perspectives*.
- Spak, B. (2010, April 22). The Success of the Copenhagen Accord and the failure of Copenhegan Accord. *SRP*.
- Stern, T. (2018, April 11). The future of the Paris climate regime. *Brookings*.
- The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (2019, feb 13). Kyoto Protocol. July 1, 2019, Encyclopædia Britannica: <https://www.britannica.com/event/Kyoto-Protocol>

- The Guardian. (2011, March 11). What is the Kyoto protocol and has it made any difference? July 1, 2019, The Guardian: <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2011/mar/11/kyoto-protocol>
- UNFCCC. (2008, November 6). Kyoto Protocol reference manual. July 1, 2019, United Nations framework convention on climate change: [https://unfccc.int/resource/docs/publications/08\\_unfccc\\_kp\\_ref\\_manual.pdf](https://unfccc.int/resource/docs/publications/08_unfccc_kp_ref_manual.pdf)
- United Nations. (2015). Adoption of the Paris agreement. 7 3, 2019, United Nations: [https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/english\\_paris\\_agreement.pdf](https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/english_paris_agreement.pdf)
- United Nations Climate Change. (2018, October 22). What is the Paris Agreement? 7 3, 2019, UNFCCC: <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/what-is-the-paris-agreement>
- United Nations Climate Change. (2019). History of convention. United Nations Climate Change: <https://unfccc.int/process/the-convention/history-of-the-convention#eq-1>
- United Nations Climate Change. (n.d, n.d n.d). What is the Kyoto Protocol? July 1, 2019, United Nations climate change: [https://unfccc.int/kyoto\\_protocol](https://unfccc.int/kyoto_protocol)
- United Nations. (2018, October). What is the Paris Agreement? 12 6, 2018, UNFCCC: <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/what-is-the-paris-agreement>
- Widerberg, O., & Pattberg, P. (2017, January). The Climate Change Regime. Researchgate, 2-35.
- Wit, E. d. (2010, January 27). Copenhagen: success and failure? 7 5, 2019, Lawyers weekly: <https://www.lawyersweekly.com.au/news/13503-copenhagen-success-or-failure>