



Civil Society and Multilevel Climate Governance

Dovev Levine

University of New Hampshire, Department of
Natural Resources and Environmental Studies

Aims

- Demonstrate why civil society influences national/international climate policy
- Potential methods towards proving this influence exists, and the specific ways it exists
- In other words, examine where policy change emanates from

Multilevel Climate Governance

- Actors operating across horizontal and vertical levels of social organization and jurisdictional authority around a particular issue
- In other words, policy change no longer emanates strictly from top-down

Shortcomings of Literature

- Literature fails to conclusively demonstrate civil society exerts significant influence
- In other words, does the popular bottom-up model of policy change really exist, and if so, in what specific ways does it operate?

Why is This Important?

- Even if US national policy is adopted, multilevel governance is expected to characterize the overall US response to climate change
 - Thus, the question of how to consider the role played by multilevel actors

Multilevel Governance: Theoretical Perspectives

- Again, why is this important?
- US National Policy is prerequisite for international Re-Engagement?
 - Desombre: US only engages with existing policy; US does not want legally-binding reduction targets, and instead wants int'l agreement with compliance only at domestic level.
 - Bang & Tjemshaugen: U.S. has yet to determine own national policy needs; UN spokesperson asserts US must come to Copenhagen with “concrete” proposals.

Multilevel Governance: Theoretical Perspectives

- International coordination is ultimately necessary
- US national policy is ultimately necessary
- Civil Society actors shape and push eventual national policy

Institutions of Higher Education

- Why use institutions of higher education as a study site?
 - Need way to examine civil society actions
 - Function similarly to municipalities and firms in size and buying power
 - 4000 US institutions of higher education
 - 20 million individuals

Pathways of Policy Change

- Subnational action shapes eventual national policy.
- Policies with most subnational support most likely for national adoption.
 - Precedented in health care & education.
- Influence described by Pathways of Change.

Demonstration Effects

- Speth & Haas: Critical factor accounting for policy change is subnational pressure.
- Campuses play key role: Harvard, St. Mary's, Neutrality commitment gain media/political attention
- Modeling cost- and politically-feasible mitigation policies (UCSB--\$36 million saved)

Market Expansion & Pricing

- Rappaport & Creighton: Subnational action effects market dynamics.
- Campuses similar to municipalities and firms (\$2 billion/year on energy, Largest NGO wind purchase)
 - Help establish consistent and reliable revenue streams (Pennsylvania wind firm)

Policy Diffusion

- Subnational policies model for national policy (e.g. Toxics, Air, Water)
- Campuses lead in setting/achieving reduction goals
 - UNH
 - Yale
- Cost-effective (less than 1% operating budget costs)

Norm Promulgation

- Cass: Norms shape policies and behaviors deemed appropriate.
 - Expected renewable energy structures = less resistance
- Campuses play significant role through curricula & informal education.
 - Oberlin real-time monitors
 - Numerous wind/solar structures

Need for Further Research

- The pathways provide vague description of influence...but what do they actually do beyond their own borders?
 - In other words, what is the real impact of Yale's GHG commitments/reductions?

Potential Methods

- Comparative analysis of three cap & trade programs:
 - NO_x
 - SO_x
 - RGGI
- Examine relationship between relevant policymakers' voting records and comments on each program:
 - Focused interviews
 - Public hearings/testimony
 - Media documents
 - Congressional Quarterly