

GSAPS THE SUMMARY OF DOCTORAL THESIS

Genesis of Institutional Fragmentation in Global Governance Architecture on Climate Change: Constructivist Approach to Asian Climate Change Institutions

4011S301-6

Chaewoon Oh

Chief Advisor: Prof. Matsuoka Shunji

Keywords: Climate change governance, Institutional fragmentation, Genesis, Asian climate institutions, Constructivism

The 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), formally signaling the birth of global regime on climate change, took regulatory ascendance ladder by the adoption of the Kyoto Protocol (KP) in 1997. About two decades later, climate change issue area is now co-governed by multiple climate change institutions besides the once dominantly governing UN-based institutions of the UNFCCC/KP. This phenomenon, called institutional fragmentation in a given issue area, has recently aroused scholarly interests in the degree, the consequence, and the management of institutional fragmentation. In the midst of these concerns arose a new question: *the genesis of institutional fragmentation*. Saliently, Asian region has been a breeding ground of numerous overlapping climate change institutions. This research will venture to unveil the genesis of institutional fragmentation with Asian regional climate change institutions.

The genesis of institutional fragmentation questions why a competing or overlapping institution is created besides or outside a dominantly existent institution in the given issue area of climate change. Previous studies have explored the appearance of the Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate (APP) on the grounds of international relation theories. The rational approaches of neo-realism and neo-liberal institutionalism have explanatory strength in the creation of the APP besides the UNFCCC/KP by bringing forward strategic and interest-oriented actors in dissatisfaction with the rules and functions of the UNFCCC/KP. Yet, limitations reside in the explanation on the creation of conflictual institution in cognitive dimension. Meanwhile, constructivism explicates well the normatively and discursively conflictive aspect of the APP in relation with the UNFCCC/KP, but causal relation between the normative contestation and the establishment of a normatively contestant institution remains as a black box. Cognizant of theoretical promises and limitations, this research takes the theoretical side of constructivism and explicates the genesis of institutional fragmentation with the logic of normative contestation for strategic social construction on two norms of common-but-differentiated responsibility (CBDR) and precautionary approach that undergird the UNFCCC. Along this line, three posing questions with the Asian climate change institutions are as follows;

1) *Normative contestation in spectrum as the logic of institutional fragmentation*: In what degree does a competing institution form normative contestation against a dominantly existent institution? The fragmenting institutions as an embodiment of normative contestation will be analyzed to reveal the level and the range of current normative contestation.

2) *Genesis of institutional fragmentation with normative contestation in action*: Why does a normatively competing institution emerge besides (outside) a dominantly pre-existing institution? The genesis of institutional fragmentation will be analyzed on the ground of norm entrepreneur's normative contestation for strategic social construction.

3) *Evolution of institutional fragmentation in the face of normative contestation*: Which normative positions do agents take and reveal through the institutional establishment in the face of normative contestation? The direction of institutional fragmentation will be analyzed by the relevant agents' normative position-setting and position-propelling practices in the

face of normative contestation on two global norms on climate change.

The first empirical study hypothesizes that the Asian climate change institution is an embodiment of regional interpretation on the transnational norms of the UNFCCC/KP. In this study, a comprehensive normative contestation map is drawn with the KP and the APP, as two extremes that normatively go against each other. Each normative dimension has spectrum of contestation by the existing and the competing normative interpretations. Then, the normative position of the Asian regional institution is tested with the Japan-led institution, the East Asia Low Carbon Growth Partnership (LCGP). The normative position of the LCGP is skewed toward the APP, which ascertains the normative contestation against the UNFCCC/KP.

The second empirical study analyzes why a series of nation state-led overlapping institutions of the APP, the LCGP, and the East Asia Climate Partnership (EACP) are created in Asian region besides the UNFCCC/KP. From this study, the APP is explicated as an organizational platform to diffuse competing normative interpretations by the US which played the role of a strategic norm entrepreneur. Then, the EACP and the LCGP are the emulative behaviors of Japan and South Korea who became norm leaders that followed the footsteps of the norm entrepreneur. Thus, the genesis of institutional fragmentation is explained to be derived from normative contestation by the nation states working as strategic agents in Asian region.

The third study analyzes the climate change institutions created by Asian regional cooperative organizations for normative position-setting and -propelling in the face of normative contestation in the climate change issue area in 2007. The cases to be studied are formal declarations made by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the East Asia Summit (EAS), and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC). The normative position-setting and position-propelling practices of three organizations are found to be divergent but directional in overall toward the contestant position against those of the UNFCCC/KP. The Asian region as a site of normative resistance fragments the UN-based climate change regime.

In conclusion, this research explores the genesis of institutional fragmentation on the basis of normative contestation with Asian climate change institutions and engendered some implications: i) climate change norms has experienced normative contestation with the newly defined range of policy options, ii) Asian climate change institutions have emerged as organizational platforms to embody and diffuse the Asian agents' contestant normative position, iii) institutional fragmentation can work as a challenge to the UN-based logic of appropriateness, and iv) the evolution of institutional fragmentation is still open-ended. Clearly, *the genesis of institutional fragmentation in the issue area of climate change is what strategic states make of it.*

References

- Biermann, F., Pattberg, P., van Asselt, H., Zelli, F. (2009), 'The Fragmentation of Global Governance Architectures: A Framework for Analysis', *Global Environmental Politics*, 9(4), 14-40.
- Zelli, F. and van Asselt, H. (2013), 'The Institutional Fragmentation of Global Environmental Governance: Causes, Consequences, and Responses', *Global Environmental politics*, 13(3), 1-13.