

# THE STRATEGY OF COLLABORATION: THE SINO-INDIAN PERSPECTIVE

Sukruthi Gaddam17060222132

Research Supervisor: Mr. Kalyan Shankar

A Dissertation Submitted in the Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Bachelor of Science in  
Economics  
(Batch 2017-20)  
Symbiosis School of Economics Symbiosis International (Deemed  
University)

Re-accredited by NAAC with 'A' grade | Awarded Category – I by UGC 3rd Floor, SCHC Building, Senapati  
Bapat Road, Pune – 411004

## ABSTRACT

The issue of Climate Change can be very characteristically viewed as a ticking time bomb as imminent action to negate the negative externalities that arise from it, is crucial to solving it. Mankind has set itself on a path to achieve ineffable accomplishments that progressively drives the world's economy forward but, in its wake, has permitted for the environment to deteriorate. Principles of sustainable development are therefore, necessary to be implemented at a global scale in an equitable manner and are the grounds of deliberations under the UNFCCC. This paper follows the negotiating strategy portrayed by India in such international climate talks, as well as that of China in order to identify points of convergence and interpret its significance. The international forum can be daunting for developing countries but finding an ally and thereby, gaining negotiating power has proven successful for India to wade tough waters. The importance of domestic interests being protected during climate talks is essential for economic development. In course of identifying the points of convergence, the paper also identifies if there persists any divergence in India and China's negotiating strategies. Furthermore, the paper interprets what the implications of such points of convergence are on the developing nations of the world as well as the superpowers in the West.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research paper has been a collaborative effort right from the beginning. Mr Kalyan Shankar sir has been a source of utmost support and help throughout the research process. His academic experience made his feedback invaluable, and this project so far, would not have been possible without his guidance. I'd like to extend my gratitude to him for contributing his time and expertise to the research. I heartily thank Mrs. Sushma Nayak for her insights on economic journalism and research work which have helped immensely in beginning with academic writing. Finally, I would like to thank Symbiosis School of Economics and our director Dr Jyoti Chandiramani, for providing the opportunity and means to conduct this research project.

## INTRODUCTION

In what seems like an apocalyptic world, the issue of Climate Change still holds prevalence to be one of the thorniest political, legal and economic issues of our time. Mankind has set itself on a path to achieve ineffable accomplishments that progressively drives the world's economy forward. However, the world today is a product of such innovations and developments that has been of occurrence with no realization of or accounting done for nature's tipping point. Continuous depletion of the Earth's resources and the consequent degradation of the environment by its utilization have resulted in the irreversible phenomenon that threatens the sustainability of our planet. The human race, which can arguably be considered as the sole perpetuator for what is now observed as Climate Change, finds itself in a race against time and to curb the negative externalities associated with global industrial revolution. All countries, irrespective of their contribution to the world's aggregate Gross Domestic Product holds climacteric stake in negating Climate Change. Much like the Earth's atmospheric temperature, tensions in international conventions have also been on an inevitable rise as the current amalgamation of generations endeavor to prevent any further instigation of the existing state of the problem.

The fight against Climate Change is no small feat making it an uphill battle even if efficient international cooperation is present. However, for the greater good, measures to attain international cooperation have been implemented, resulting in the foundation of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in 1988 which further motivated the installation of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 1992. These organizations supply a platform for its

member countries to collaborate their efforts against Climate Change. The member profile ranges from superpowers to third world countries. This platform is suitable for the countries to address the pressing issues and advice on taking the necessary actions. The policies are set to target the reduction and eventual elimination of actions contributing to the amplification of Climate Change; and are adapted to member specifications. Initiatives like the Kyoto Protocol, Paris Agreement and Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) are the by-products of conventions organized by these prominent institutions. (NCCS, 2019)

### India's Position

Over the years, international climate negotiations have gravitated towards implementing an inductive regime thereby, prompting India to overcome any and all hurdles to optimize its negotiating strategy. India is one of the world's most vulnerable countries to Climate Change and is increasingly becoming an influential actor in global climate negotiations. India being very susceptible to the perils of Climate Change must not poke the bear and yet, India ranks third in the world in terms of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions. The country has managed to triple its incomplete-fuel-combustion related carbon dioxide emissions between 1990 and 2011 while its emissions are predicted to only increase further by almost times between 2008 and 2035. The absolute magnitude of population, economic size, rapid energy consumption and brisk growth of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) are factors that contribute to India's figures of polluting emissions. However, factors like the masses of population and the GDP are also put at risk through the combat against Climate Change, thus justifying India's vulnerable position on its own versus the changing climate. (International Energy Agency, 2013) Having an impuissant position as a singular force while holding a very real stake in climate change mitigation negotiations, India's strategy must entail devising a favourable climate agreement that apportions responsibility for taking action appropriately. As a growing economic power with affiliations among powerful economies, India must be encouraged to recognize its potential in driving these conferences to enforce domestic priorities simultaneously, particularly to attain a higher level of social and economic development throughout the country and the eradication of poverty. (Leiserowitz & Thaker, 2014; Rong, 2010) India's perspective on mitigation measures reversing Climate Change has displayed a dramatic flair through the years. In international deliberations, India has procured the stature of a 'deal maker' while on the domestic front, it has championed the comprehensive development and implementation of Climate Change policies. What has been considered as an uncharacteristic shift of negotiating ideology can be perceived as a stance adopted due to India's socio-economic development ambitions and the changing global geopolitical landscape. Climate Change, due to its multifarious nature, cuts across an orbit of issues and India can benefit both domestically and internationally by confronting them. India's desire to play a strategically important role as well as tackle pivotal issues like energy security and energy access, all integrate with the climate issue. By proactively participating on climate change, India may be able to achieve all of these objectives at once. To succeed, it must demonstrate that action on climate change does not come at the expense of economic growth or development goals, and that these can, in reality, go hand in hand.

### A friend in China

India does not have to look far for a country aiming to overcome similar hurdles as her, be it in the domestic front or in terms of international climate action. China, a neighbour to India mirrors essential internal resolutions of alleviating poverty and achieving economic growth in all sectors. Developed nations of the world would also agree on the importance of achieving these resolutions in order to boost the overall status and the standard of living of a country. The primary emphasis of national policies and actions taken by the central governments must work towards fulfilling such commitments before taking on international issues on the lines of climate action. These goals require immediate action as stagnation in its resolution will only result in the magnification of the problem. However, so is the case regarding climate change mitigation measures? China may boast spectacular economic growth rates as the country continues its strive to eliminate destitution and achieve further growth by utilising conventional techniques that aren't adapted to the environment protective stipulations imposed by the international community. China, however is still reckoned as a low-income country which encourages other developing nations to take cue from its inspiring tactics in dodging the abiding the emission targets and the subsequent disciplinary actions. Not to suggest that the country is not environment conscious as China does support environmental arrangements that do not restrict or retard the country's economic growth and social development. China, as a developing nation has already reported to be releasing more emissions on a yearly basis than the former top emitter from the West, the United States of America. Nonetheless, the country is resolute in its stance of not hampering its independent economic growth which is a characteristic that drives other developing nations to take heed of China's strategies. Although in today's environmental climate, the prevalence of such stubbornness can bear no fruit causing Chinese resistance to Western views and execution of individual mitigation measures to increasingly be lessened. As the rising realization in China of the prospective environmental deterioration that is inflicted from climate change as well as the increasing awareness about the multitude ways in which developments in improving the current state of affairs can be made. For example, regulation for China's large manufacturing and export sector is constantly being strengthened in terms of greater energy efficiency and stricter emissions standards. Addressing which, plans are currently underway to decommission a significant portion of small coal power generation plants and replace them with more efficient larger ones. Such projects broadcast China's willingness to participate in green initiatives, which may aid in facilitating a broader bilateral or international climate change deal. (Walsh, Tian, Whalley, & Agarwal, 2011)

### Research Questions

This paper targets to answer the following questions:

- i. How can India benefit from any existing and/or potential collaboration with China in climate change negotiations?

- ii. Have there been points of disjuncture between India and China's negotiating strategies during subsequent climate talks?
- iii. What does this convergence and divergence mean for the west and like-minded developing countries?

This paper aims to explore the various influences on India's engagement with international negotiations on Climate Change and seeks to offer an analytical approach to the observed negotiating strategy. The analytical approach would regard the influence contributed by material as well as ideational factors gathered by the researcher. The analysis would offer the differentiating viewpoints within coalitions formed by virtue of these climate change deliberations as well as shed light upon the constraints to an efficient round of arbitration. The paper further provides an examination of the continuities and points of disjuncture between subsequent climate talks and cross examines the variations in strategy employed by Indian delegates while representing a coalition and promoting domestic priorities.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Indian diplomats have played integral and key roles in the international climate negotiations since their very initiation. The United Nations Conference on Human Environment conducted at Stockholm in 1972 witnessed the birth of India's traditionalist outlook to climate policy; wherein socio-economic development is pit against environmental protection consequently, regarding the North liable for the impending global environment crisis, characterised by shift in planetary boundaries. Its traditionalist perspective shines through the delegation presented by India at Nordwijk in 1989 as India promoted mechanisms to involve developing countries in the international process. India advocated against emission targets for developing countries while argued for industrialized economies to not only reduce emissions but additionally, cover the costs for emission reduction implementation in developing countries. India exhibits the enthusiasm to participate in the global negotiating process while, the same is lacking at burden-sharing; with its traditionalistic ideology conforming developed countries to bear the bulk of the responsibility given their historical emissions and requiring per capita allocation of emissions to be the metric for distributing the burden of climate mitigation. (Agarwal & Narain, 2003; Mohan, 2017)

### India's Negotiating Handbook

As this traditionalist ideology began implanting itself as the foundation of India's position in climate policy, India ventured on to integrate itself with the Group of 77 (G77). The G77 is a group of developing countries, advocating for developed countries to take action on climate change while arguing that developing nations might only take on voluntary commitments conditional on acquiring monetary compensation and technological transfers from these developed countries. As a member of G77, India has made possible for the interests of the industrialized countries to be acknowledged. During the UNFCCC at Rio in 1992, principles of equity such as the Common But Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities (CBDR-RC) were introduced and championed by the Indian strategists representing India and G77. The CBDR-RC is a principle within the UNFCCC that acknowledges the different capabilities and varying degrees of responsibilities of individual countries in addressing climate change. The ratification of CBDR-RC were essential triumphs for the developing nations of the world at the time as it was a revolutionary move that will set precedent for the future of international negotiations on climate change mitigation measures. (Hurrell & Sengupta, 2012; Mohan, 2017) India's intellectual strategy carried traditional values through the securement of the Berlin mandate in 1995 to the eventual formulation of the Kyoto Protocol in 1997. The Indian diplomats continued to play a crucial role in guiding the mitigation action negotiating process that culminated in the Kyoto Protocol. The by-product of the two yearlong negotiations exhibited the success of the Indian traditional strategies as the Kyoto Protocol required the developed countries of the world that were categorized as Annex I parties of the UNFCCC to commit themselves to "quantifies emission limitation and reduction objectives" while developing nations such as India were exempted from legally binding commitments. The Kyoto Protocol championed the Indian delegation's efforts in showcasing the interest of other G77 nations as it shed importance on the continued relevance of the firewall differentiation between developed and developing nations with respect to the burden of responsibility of climate action. India was prosperously able to compel developing nations to take on more of the responsibilities in climate change mitigation as well as protect its space for socio-economic development to elevate poverty. This negotiating strategy eluding a traditionalist ideology could be identified as the principal reason why India has acquired a reputation of being a difficult partner in climate negotiations. (UNFCCC, 1998; Hurrell & Sengupta, 2012; Mohan, 2017; Vihma, 2011) During the negotiations between 2007-2009 on climate governance post the Kyoto Protocol which was on its first commitment period (2008-2012), heavy economic growth was witnessed in key developing countries such as China, India, Brazil and South Africa (together referred to as BASIC) resulted in increasing expectation on these countries to hold influential strategy moves that would indubitably have snowballing effects on global climate governance. These nations differentiated their economies from the G77 with regards to their comparably significant economic size and carbon footprint. These emerging countries further composed and bargained with strategies independent from the G77, much suited to their individualistic characteristics. The thriving economies coalition engage in dialogues with developed countries presenting an united front and coordinating climate policies with each other. The early years of the new millennium also witnessed negotiations pertaining to climate change occur outside of the realm of the UNFCCC process such as the G8+5 Dialogue on Climate and Energy in 2008 and the Major Economies Forum on Energy and Climate in 2009; where India continued to advocate for a more orthodox and BASIC approved stance on climate policy against the argument that advanced developing countries shouldn't benefit from the Kyoto exemptions. (Vihma, Mulugetta, & Karlsson-Vinkhuyzen, 2012; Hallding, Jurisoo, Carson, & Atteridge, 2013; Antholis, 2008)

### Leaving Traditions

The Conference of the Parties 13 summit at Bali in 2007, however propelled Indian diplomats to shift its stance in climate

policy, striking a contrast with their previous BASIC accommodating stance. India very astonishingly complied with the action suggesting developing countries should as well participate in the global mitigation effort towards Climate Change, at least on a voluntary basis in line with their capabilities. This was however, not the first instance where India displayed a contradiction in its stance as while negotiating the Kyoto Protocol, India was adamant against any notion of voluntary commitments, only to announce along with the other BASIC countries voluntary targets in late 2009, to reduce the emissions intensity of its GDP by 20-25 percent against 2005 levels by 2020 and never exceed the per capita emissions of Annex I developed economies. (Michaelowa & Michaelowa, 2012; Hurrell & Sengupta, 2012)

At the 2010 conducted Conference of the Parties Summit 16 conducted at Cancún, the Indian delegation denounced their precedented established traditional strategy and argued for all nations to take on legally binding commitments under an appropriate legal form in favour of climate change mitigation. Moreover, India played an integral role in consolidating the negotiating compromises on the issue of transparency within the community and gained widespread recognition for it, even receiving personal thanks from the Conference President during the closing plenary. This was yet an additional indicator of the newly discovered flexibility in India's engagement as in previous years issues of transparency were a red line with Indian strategists, who were resistant to discuss any course of action that could potentially impinge on the country's sovereignty. (Mohan, 2017; Vihma, Mulugetta, & Karlsson-Vinkhuyzen, 2012) In the following year, at the Conference of the Parties 17 at Durban in 2011, the Indian delegation reinstated its stance by attempting to reverse the shift from India's core climate policy by behaving as a 'deal breaker' for refusing to sign a new legally binding framework including both developed and developing countries. Nevertheless, these actions bore little fruit for the negotiators to impact the change in course of comprehensive developments in the negotiations. The Durban Conference resulted in the termination of the Bali Action Plan and the induction of the Durban Platform for Enhance Action which demonstrated a complete reversal of former initiatives by disintegrating the firewall between North and South for climate change control; the Durban Platform made no such reference to the founding principles of CBDR-RC and also recommended a new round of negotiations for a global initiative to be agreed upon by and applicable to all before 2015. The negotiating strategies unveiled at this conference indicated a shift towards a more inductive structure of climate governance which garnered no room for negotiating strategies. (Hurrell & Sengupta, 2012; Leiserowitz & Thaker, 2014)

### It's a New Era

During COP 19 at Warsaw in 2013, the concept of Nationally Determined Commitments was first introduced, which on undergoing further rounds of debating led to the formulation of the Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs). These are pledges that are to be made by all nations under a system of peer review. These pledges were finalised upon and adopted by the countries at COP 20 in 2014 conducted in Lima. The architecture within the realm of climate governance balances on the newly structured peer review system which is confirmed by the requirement for all countries to submit INDCs outlining the implementation of climate change mitigation measures for all years leading up to 2030.

On October 2015, India put across its pledge to reduce the carbon intensity of its economy by 33-35% by 2030 compared to its levels in 2005; India further committed to install clean energy capacity equivalent to around 40% of the total installed electrical capacity in the country by 2030 and announced a goal to install carbon sinks worth an additional 2.5 to 3 billion tonnes of carbon dioxide through additional forest and tree cover by 2030. After the successful ratification of the Paris Agreement where, India presented its self-proclaimed 'fair and ambitious' pledge for the now Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and pushed for the quick sanctioning of the Paris Agreement; India's contribution to action against climate change could be considered as 'limited' with no necessity for negotiating strategies as such. However, on the domestic front, in 2014 Prime Minister Narendra Modi announced a goal of 175 GW renewable energy by 2022 which on achievement would establish India as a leader in global climate action. (Mohan, 2017; Government of India, 2015)

### Why China?

At the international forum for governing mitigation against climate change, there exists an empty podium directing the programme as no country or union of countries has shown a globally fair and accepted initiative in doing so. The demand for leadership in the field of global climate change politics has been momentarily satisfied with the likes of superpowers in the West as well as rising developing countries in the Orient. China's internal ramification from its prescription to "never take the lead" was recognised by its contention in the Copenhagen Accord negotiations. China's negotiating preferences supported by similar thinking developing nations were focal in determining the concluding result in COP-15. By the sheer virtue of its economic size and international influence which are perpetually increasing with the passage of time such that development persists, China's role in climate change negotiations cannot possibly be belittled. Moreover, China's candour in these negotiations places the country as a frontrunner to be identified as a leader, for elaborating on the interests of most developing countries. China has been identified to assume a leadership role in the 14th Conference of Parties by the participating countries, after the European Union, followed by the Group of 77 and the United States of America. Considering that there exists no clear leader in such conferences, aggregating the perceptions of the participating countries sheds clarity on which nation assumes the leadership role, which in turn determines which direction the negotiations may stray towards. The prevalent idea that has been observed to be followed in these conferences is the idea that "leadership is shared" among a number of actors. (Karlsson, Parker, Hjerpe, & Linnér, 2011) On studying the apprehensions of the negotiators in these conferences, it was analysed that China has been accorded with the leadership title by countries all across three continents, Asia, Africa and South America. China has been regarded as more fitting for the

leadership role by the individuals involved in the actual business of negotiating a new climate agreement. Having these individuals who are trained to be the best informed actors in the negotiating process, observe China as the primary leader is an indication of China's critical and deterministic role in the negotiating process. The abundance of the common opinion that recognises China as a leader speaks volumes indicating that the majority of the countries, which are in fact developing nations share the same ideologies with China's climate policy. China's intensive and extensive investment in clean energy technology can be elucidated as directional leadership, for which the country has been on the receiving end of positive recognition. Thereby, pointing towards the conclusion that relations with China are increasingly becoming more crucial for determining the outcomes of climate change mitigation negotiations. (Karlsson, Parker, Hjerpe, & Linnér, 2011)

## **METHODOLOGY**

This paper aims to analyse India's stance in climate change negotiations by conducting a study of the existing literature regarding the nature of these mediations and determining the value of any and all collaborations with another rising economy, China. A deep comprehension of the negotiations is made possible by a review of papers presented and contributed by countries to the conferences over the years, internal documents with reference to changes in implementation strategies and if at all, other records that are at liberty to be disclosed. The paper also reviews China's role as a deterministic actor as well in abetting Indian negotiations at climate talks. The paper further aims to find any understanding gaps that may surface and provide an authentic analysis to resolve them. The continuities as well as the contrasting strategies with China will be highlighted as part of the analysis on the intelligence gathered from the extensive review of pre-existing literature and papers collected. Following which, the implications of such points of convergence and divergence on the developing nations of the world as well as the superpowers in the West are identified and elaborated upon as part of the inference derived from the review of the pre-existing literature accumulated and its subsequent analysis.

## **ANALYSIS & DISCUSSION**

As pioneering members, India and China have forged essential alliances amongst like-minded countries in order to obtain a higher leverage at the negotiating table for Climate Change mitigation. The two countries have strived to preserve and promote their interests which align with those of the developing countries block, the G77 and other groups of similar likes such as BASIC and BRIC.

### **Points of Convergence**

India and China have exhibited signs of a budding partnership ever since the United Nations Conference on Human Environment conducted at Stockholm in June 1972. The two countries have incorporated the views of several countries whose interests align with each other. Such coalitions primarily consist of the amalgamation of the interests of developing countries which necessitate the recognizes and incorporates social development concerns and other inhibiting responsibilities. China and India have remained adamant over the facilitation of the requirement of not abiding to the restrictions and regulations instituted by Annex-1 countries which emphasize the environment over development, which developing countries of Annex-2 can't survive. The countries held their ground for establishing the chief factors that have led to the present emergent nature of Climate Change mitigation to be the actions of certain imperialistic, radical, colonialist and neo-colonialist nations regarded as Annex-1 countries. Developing nations around the world are burdened with issues of poverty and overall economic and social development that are too crucial to take the backseat as general parity in their country remains inaccessible. (Mizo, 2016)

The Non-Aligned Movement which propagated the preferences of developing world states whose interests didn't orient in line with those of the powerful developed states of the world, was further augmented by China's addition to G77. The Group of 77 served as the operating caucus and highlighted the combined view of establishing historical culpability regarding environmental degradation to the developed nations. The negotiating process revealed auxiliary stipulations to guarantee cooperation by the developing bloc. India and China have been consistent in their advocacy for the requirement of additional resources in terms of monetary benefaction as well as transfer of technology to achieve targets.

Such collaboration between the nations, China and India have been a regular element of the United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change Conference of Parties under the Intergovernmental Negotiation Committee, throughout the years. The promotion of interests of several other developing countries lie with the robustness of this crucial alliance between India and China which accentuates each country's individual economic development needs and establishes responsibility with the industrialized nations of the west. China and India have cooperatively championed the principles of Common but Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities. (Jayaram, 2018)

The subsequent UNFCCC Conference of Parties which were conducted at Bali, 2007 and Copenhagen, 2009 also continued to exhibit the congruence in the negotiating strategies of India and China. Their joint opposition demanded for developed nations to take notice of historical emissions and consequently practice stricter emission checks before endorsing the same on the poverty-stricken states in the Orient. Their bourgeoisie argument for resisting any exorbitant emission cap, arises due to the comparatively inexpensive energy extraction and consumption that is made possible from the environment-polluting fossil fuels. The two nations rallied successfully in the prevention of a Climate deal that stipulated significant emission reduction by the developing nations such as China and India; the likes of which would prove to be economically detrimental. However, the countries worked in their commitments registered in the Bali Action Plan within their respective agendas which included issues of mitigation, adaptation, technology transfer and finance. A common interest was discovered to be the allowing of the continuation of the non-legally binding approved emission reduction plans agreed for each country at earlier COPs under the

Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee. The non-legally binding nature of which is essential for nations to elude compliance with the stipulated targets, is exploited by the likes of China, India and other developing as well as developed states of the world. Nonetheless, in an era where it is absolutely crucial for measures to be taken to offset the damaging effects of Climate Change, countries all across the globe inclusive of the developing as well as the advanced nations have agreed to begin new negotiations to manifest what is now known as the Paris Agreement, 2015. India and China are undoubtedly amongst the abiding countries as the new accord is to resonate with principles of differentiation and parity. China and India have shown initiative of furthering their coalition by combing forces under BASIC, which is a forum for the emerging economies of Brazil, South Africa, India and China. (Hallding, Jurisoo, Carson, & Atteridge, 2013) Through which the countries are able to distinguish themselves from the industrialized and poorer developing countries while also pledging adherence to the G77 collective. China and India exhibited paramount initiative to integrate strategies in order to gain added leverage at international climate deliberations and fend off the concerted efforts by the industrial economies to inflict legally binding commitments concerning GHG emission reductions that would particularly obstruct their economic growth. As a unit, the BASIC countries championed the interests of China and India by preparing a successful defense at the Copenhagen summit which highlighted the desideratum of a second commitment period for the Kyoto Protocol and a funding mechanism to aid the poorest developing nations. The BASIC forum offers a platform China and India to engage with each other and not only coordinate their negotiation strategies but also collaborate on mitigating actions and encourages climate-related transfer of technology. Working together as BASIC and tackling various issues of common interest shows the extent of international level cooperation China and India have augmented regarding the matters of climate change. Another multilateral platform enabling the collaboration of China and India on the issue of climate change is that of the association of the BRIC group, comprising of Brazil, Russia, India and China. The group collectively shares the ideology that the liability of climate change mitigation measures should be enforced by the developed countries of the West on the grounds that these nations are not only better equipped to do so, in terms of technology but also hold the moral obligation for doing so. Realizing the humungous potential residing with the collaboration of these major emerging economies, the countries are strengthened to affect change in the international climate change dialogue and propagate the values of equity promoted individually as well. (Mizo, 2016)

Cooperation between China and India, however, did not rest here as the two nations collaborated with other developing countries and led the delegation representing the group of Like-Minded Developing Countries on Climate Change. The group was birthed in Beijing in 2013 honoring the principles of Common but Differentiated Responsibility and Respective Capabilities and endorses the practicing of which at any and all new climate change mitigation programmes. Such cooperation between China and India at the international perspective can further be traced on several multilateral platforms on which both countries find common grounds on climate change related matters.

### **Divergence**

India and China have been the poster children for prosperous partnership in international climate deliberations as they have proven victorious in their unity. In the negotiations concerning mercury emissions, China and India portrayed a joint front stressing for a voluntary and flexible approach. The countries emphasized on the differing circumstances in developing and developed countries restricting them to take stringent action. However, this bilateral confederation became moot at the fifth and final deliberation under the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee. This conference witnessed China's divergence from its previous joint narrative of requiring a voluntary and flexible approach. Chinese negotiators, in an unforeseen manner were willing to comply with the rigorous mitigation measures on emissions. The new Chinese narrative was to allow countries to decide upon reduction measures based on their individual restraints on compliance with the Accord. China, by complying with the international community and compromising its voluntary approach philosophy was appreciated and credited with a more active role in penning the legalities of the Accord. Nevertheless, China held its ground when it came to deciding the sources of emission that were under scrutiny. This clearly put in perspective, the effectiveness of the Chinese negotiating strategy as it compromised to achieve a widely accepted consensus. (Wu, 2012; Stokes, Giang, & Selin, 2016)

However, the same could not be said for the Indian delegation as they continued to be obstructive in the negotiating process by barricading contact group attempts to operationalize broad concepts like source thresholds. The Indian negotiators maintained their reluctance to commit towards implementing any emission control technologies above the pre-existing standards. Moreover, India protested in the formation of a consensus on final negotiating packages considering the mercury phase-out dates, without China's support. The protesting nature of the Indian delegation as a nonparticipation attracted criticism on the domestic front and proved as a hindrance in the international perspective, especially after China's compliance.

### **INFERENCE**

Sino-Indian cooperation on climate change has been a driving force in international deliberations for the same. The combined delegation is a force to be reckoned with as they have time and again continued to alter these proceedings to cater to the needs of their individual economies. The tactical approach implemented by the countries is one that is admired and closely observed in the international community on the grounds of climate change mitigation measures. The Sino-Indian collaboration that has been observed during the COP-15, in the formulation of the Copenhagen Accord is one successful example of such an alliance. The countries pushed their agenda of administering voluntary emission reduction pledges that are subject to national as well as international validation on the account of setting emission mitigation targets. Furthermore, the Accord stresses the Sino- Indian narrative that implementation, measurement and verification of these targets would fall upon each country's jurisdiction while international involvement will be restricted to consultations and analysis; unless international involvement is warranted for under the grounds of accepting support from the international community. However, any and all greenhouse gas emission

reduction measures executed under this Accord would not be legally binding differing from the precedent set by the Kyoto Protocol. (Jayaram, 2018)(Wu, 2012) An additional implication of the Sino-Indian collaboration on the climate front is the emphasis of principles of equity in the international deliberations. This discerning alliance between the two countries came into existence initially on the premise of propagating the idea behind Common but Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities. The establishment of which is regarded as a significant benchmark by the United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change. China and India have emerged victorious in consistently denying legally binding arrangements to tackle the issue of emission mitigation. Their rejection and protesting attitude in the international forum is supported with the argument that in tackling this human-induced climate change issue, the international community must Endeavour to practice justice and fairness; implying that those responsible for apparent environment degradation must take responsibility in implementing corrective measures as well. India and China acknowledge the issues of poverty and economic development that persist in their respective countries and realize their inability to abide with stringent mitigation measures on such grounds. The Common but Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities principle recognizes that the issue of climate action must be prioritized by countries who can afford to do so and moreover, morally obligated to do so. Furthermore, India and China colluding their negotiating strategies in the international deliberations for climate change mitigation has proven problematic to the European Union's traditional leadership role in the forum. This seemingly alliance between the countries has been advantageous for them to defer from being lowball at these negotiations by superpowers in the West. However, for the developed nations the Sino- Indian alliance is one that poses as a threat to attain nationalistic and domestic resolutions in the international forum. The cooperation between the Chinese and Indian delegation not only weakened the European Union's traditional leadership role in the regime but also frustrated the leadership aspirations of the United States of America in future regime building. This bilateral alliance champions the interests of several developing countries implying that the taming of its tantrums is no simple feat. The magnitude of countries whose interests are represented by this bilateral as well as by virtue of other multilateral confederacies itself is a strong opposition to the unreasonable stipulations introduced by the industrialised countries in climate talks. Chinese and Indian negotiators have been strengthened by the backing of several like-minded developing countries further implying that this alliance is supported by the developing countries of the world and rightfully so. With the strengthened Sino-Indian solidarity in the international climate change deliberations, not only has the European Union's conventional authoritative role been marginalized but the United States of America's leadership aspirations have been substantially staggered which can be exemplified by the negotiating processes carried out in the Conferences of Parties conducted under the United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change by the Intergovernmental Negotiation Committee.

## CONCLUSION

In order to address climate change, a common challenge for the world as a whole, all countries, developed as well as developing, have already been acting collectively, which is reflected in the creation of an international climate change regime, consisting of the United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change. In the post-Kyoto round of global climate change negotiations, the requirement of broadening scope of action to a truly global scale becomes a necessity with the rampant pursuit of emissions and the corresponding environmental degradation. Linkages, particularly in terms of finance, technological transfer, trade and development policy are integral subjects up for discussion in these negotiations. Given the emissions emanating currently and all the potential definite futuristic emissions from the developing world, particularly in China and India, these countries do play a central role. As the lynchpin countries of the Orient, much depends on the stances of China and India for a successful negotiations to be realised, particularly one that paves the way to branch out to include future linkage for any and all environmental issues that may and will ensue.

The regime assigns some binding greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets to developed countries due to their historical responsibilities for climate change; at the same time, it respects developing countries' development rights by exempting them from any binding targets. Even so, China and India, two of the largest developing countries, have been increasingly pressured by the international community, especially developed countries, to undertake some mandatory emissions reduction targets given their continued growth in greenhouse gas emissions. However, the two countries maintain the stance of unwillingness to implement any emissions reduction commitments unless and until the major developed countries of the West have demonstrated both the willingness and capacity to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions first. In order to enhance their bargaining power against developed countries in the international climate change negotiations, China and India have been cooperating with each other since the 1990s, which has been strengthened by their bilateral agreement on cooperation on climate change in 2009. This has significant implications for the international climate change regime. On the one hand, both countries' cooperation has not only brought forth a different approach to addressing climate change at the international level but also strengthened the ethical benchmark in the international climate change regime. On the other hand, their cooperation has challenged the European Union's traditional leadership status and the leadership ambitions of the United States of America in the international regime for climate action. Considering the rise of India and China in the international forum with respect to their greenhouse gas emissions as well as their negotiating capabilities, the Sino-Indian cooperation will enable both countries to enforce a more important and significant role in constructing the future of the international climate change regime. As rightfully iterated by the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme, Erik Solheim, "On climate action, India, China are main driving forces". China and India's positions emerging economic giants of the world will play a significant and dominant role in shaping the environmental outcomes for our planet in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. (Chengappa, 2018)

## REFERENCES

1. Haubrich, J. G. (2006). *Does the Yield Curve Signal Recession?* Cleveland: Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland. Retrieved from <http://turningnegative.free.fr/doc/Does%20the%20Yield%20Curve%20Signal%20Recession.pdf>
2. Bauer, M. D., & Mertens, T. M. (2018). *Economic Forecasts with the Yield Curve*. San Francisco: FRBSF Economic Letter. Retrieved from <https://www.frbsf.org/economic-research/files/el2018-07.pdf>
3. Rudebusch, G. D., & Williams, J. C. (2008, July). Forecasting Recessions: The Puzzle of the Enduring Power of the Yield Curve. *Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco*. Retrieved from <https://www.frbsf.org/economic-research/files/wp07-16bk.pdf>
4. *International Energy Agency*. (2013). Retrieved from CO2 emissions: <https://www.iea.org/co2highlights/co2highlights.pdf>
5. NCCS. (2019). Retrieved from International Efforts: <https://www.nccs.gov.sg/climate-change-and-singapore/international-efforts>
6. Vihma, A., Mulugetta, Y., & Karlsson-Vinkhuyzen, S. (2012). *Global Change, Peace & Security*.
7. UNFCCC. (1998). *KYOTO PROTOCOL TO THE UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE*. United Nations.
8. India, G. o. (2015). *INDIA'S INTENDED NATIONALLY DETERMINED CONTRIBUTION: Working towards Climate Justice*. Government of India.
9. Michaelowa, A., & Michaelowa, K. (2012). India as an emerging power in international climate negotiations. *Climate Policy*.
10. Antholis, T. S. (2008). A Changing Climate: The Road Ahead for the United States. *The Washington Quarterly*.
11. Hallding, K., Jurisoo, M., Carson, M., & Atteridge, A. (2013). Rising powers: the evolving role of BASIC countries. *Climate Policy*.
12. Agarwal, A., & Narain, S. (2003). *GLOBAL WARMING IN AN UNEQUAL WORLD a case of environmental colonialism*. New Delhi: CENTRE FOR SCIENCE AND ENVIRONMENT.
13. Vihma, A. (2011). India and the Global Climate Governance: Between Principles and Pragmatism. *The Journal of Environment & Development*.
14. Hurrell, A., & Sengupta, S. (2012). Emerging powers, North—South relations and global climate politics. *International Affairs*.
15. Mohan, A. (2017). From Rio to Paris: India in Global Climate Politics. *Wuppertal Institute for Climate, Environment & Energy*.
16. Rong, F. (2010). Understanding developing country stances on post-2012 climate change negotiations: Comparative analysis of Brazil, China, India, Mexico, and South Africa. *Energy Policy*.
17. Leiserowitz, A., & Thaker, J. (2014). Shifting discourses of climate change in India. *Climate Change*.
18. Walsh, S., Tian, H., Whalley, J., & Agarwal, M. (2011, July). China and India's participation in global climate negotiations. *Int Environ Agreements*.
19. Karlsson, C., Parker, C., Hjerpe, M., & Linnér, B.-O. (2011). *Looking for Leaders: Perceptions of Climate Change Leadership among Climate Change Negotiation Participants*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
20. Mizo, R. (2016). India, China and Climate Cooperation. *Indian Council of World Affairs (ICWA)*.
21. Stokes, L. C., Giang, A., & Selin, N. E. (2016). Splitting the South: China and India's Divergence in International Environmental Negotiations. *Global Environmental Politics*.
22. Wu, F. (2012). Sino-Indian Climate Cooperation: implications for the international climate change regime. *Journal of Contemporary China*.
23. Jayaram, D. (2018). Sino-Indian Cooperation at the Climate Change Negotiations: The Past, the Present and the Future. *World Scientific Reference on Asia and the World Economy*
24. Chengappa, R. (2018). *Business Today*. Retrieved from <https://www.businesstoday.in/magazine/features/climate-action-india-china-un-environment-programme/story/272896.html>