

a range of opportunities and shortcomings of the Oslo-Potsdam Solution.

Empirically, the early regulations under the **transboundary air pollution regime** have received the strongest attention in terms of effectiveness assessments. Depending on the method chosen, the early sulfur and nitrogen protocols have generated only mild to medium effects on environmental quality, thus leaving substantial scope for improved policy design (e.g. Helm and Sprinz 2000). Recent research showed benign effects of (1) the EU on member countries during the first compliance period under the Kyoto Protocol on climate change as well as (2) legally binding (compared with legally nonbinding) international agreements on European water quality (Avrami and Sprinz 2019; Köppel and Sprinz 2019).

Perhaps the most heralded global environmental agreement is the **ozone regime** (Montreal Protocol and amendments) on substances that deplete the stratospheric ozone layer. Since 1980, ozone-depleting substances have been reduced very substantially, yet recovery to 1980s levels is not foreseen before the 2060s.

The **climate change regime** on greenhouse gas mitigation and especially its 2015 Paris Agreement will hopefully witness a similar trajectory.

References

- Avrami, Lydia and Detlef F. Sprinz. 2019. "Measuring and Explaining the EU's Effect on National Climate Performance." *Environmental Politics* 28(5): 822–846.
- Grundig, Frank. 2006. "Patterns of International Cooperation and the Explanatory Power of Relative Gains: An Analysis of Cooperation on Global Climate Change, Ozone Depletion, and International Trade." *International Studies Quarterly* 50(4): 781–801.
- Helm, Carsten and Detlef F. Sprinz. 2000. "Measuring the Effectiveness of International Environmental Regimes." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 44(5): 630–652.
- Hovi, Jon, Detlef F. Sprinz, and Arild Underdal. 2003a. "The Oslo-Potsdam Solution to Measuring Regime Effectiveness: Critique, Response, And Extensions." *Global Environmental Politics* 3(3): 74–96.
- Hovi, Jon, Detlef F. Sprinz, and Arild Underdal. 2003b. "Regime Effectiveness and the Oslo-Potsdam Solution: A Rejoinder to Oran Young." *Global Environmental Politics* 3(3): 105–107.
- Köppel, Martin and Detlef F. Sprinz. 2019. "Do Binding Beat Nonbinding Agreements? Regulating International Water Quality." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 63(8): 1860–1888.

- Sprinz, Detlef F. and Carsten Helm. 1999. "The Effect of Global Environmental Regimes: A Measurement Concept." *International Political Science Review* 20(4): 359–369.
- Underdal, Arild. 1992. "The Concept of Regime 'Effectiveness'." *Cooperation and Conflict* 27(3): 227–240.
- Young, Oran R. 2001. "Inferences and Indices: Evaluating the Effectiveness of International Environmental Regimes." *Global Environmental Politics* 1(1): 99–121.
- Young, Oran R. 2003. "Determining Regime Effectiveness: A Commentary on the Oslo-Potsdam Solution." *Global Environmental Politics* 3(3): 97–104.

EMERGING COUNTRIES

Ana Flávia Barros-Platiau

University of Brasília, Brazil

Amandine Orsini

Université Saint-Louis – Bruxelles, Belgium

In 1981, Antoine van Agtmael coined the term "emerging markets," in contrast to the "third world" concept. His idea was to point at the fact that several developing countries were in a period of transition, performing better economically than the rest of the South. According to the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the top ten emerging markets in 2018, therefore before the Coronavirus crisis which is likely to change the game were China, India, Brazil, Russia, Mexico, Indonesia, Turkey, Thailand, South Africa, and Malaysia. Some of these countries perform very well economically, but they also face social priorities (with low human development indexes) and are laggards with regards to environmental performance. Emerging countries therefore have mixed characteristics and challenge traditional concepts such as the North–South divide.

Emerging countries are considered rich in terms of biodiversity resources (Orsini and Nakanabo Diallo 2015), or megadiverse—as they host most of the world's biodiversity—and have traditional populations that own important knowledge that biotechnology companies can turn into commercial applications (pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, etc.). But they are also large polluters, the fastest growing greenhouse gas emitters and are vulnerable to natural **disasters** due to serious social problems and lack of **adaptation** policies. One should keep in mind that more

Indians and Chinese live under the poverty line than the population of all least developed countries put together.

From a global environmental perspective, emerging countries are interesting for two reasons. First, their respective fast-growing middle classes tend to have an increasing environmental footprint. Second, their economic performance led them to struggle for more assertiveness in major multilateral institutions, notably those concerning trade, financing, and development, particularly China.

Although there is no clear definition of the category of emerging countries, two broad emerging countries' **negotiating coalitions** active in economic governance have embraced environmental issues, namely the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) and the IBSA (India, Brazil, and South Africa). These loose coalitions actively support multilateral arenas linking development and environment, such as the 2015 Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the **Sustainable Development Goals** (SDGs).

Emerging countries can also organize in specific groups within particular negotiations. It was only in 2009, at the Copenhagen summit of the **climate change regime**, that emerging countries expressed themselves in a coalition specifically dedicated to climate change known as the BASIC group (Brazil, South Africa, India, and China) that has been prominent within climate negotiations (Hochstetler and Milkoreit 2015). In October 2019, in a collective declaration, BASIC members confirmed "their commitments to multilateralism in order to address the issue and to foster climate resilience and promote greenhouse gas emissions reduction, low-carbon and sustainable development." Yet, their specific plans for action are unclear.

Emerging countries share principles and values that enable them to work together, such as the right to development, and the **common but differentiated responsibilities** principle. Overall, they agree that high-income countries must take first responsibility for financing global environmental solutions. Still, they are inconsistent on a number of other issues. For instance, disparities between the members can be found in the biosafety regime and the genetic resources regime (Cullet and Raja 2004; Gupta and Falkner 2006), as well as in the ongoing biodiversity beyond national jurisdiction negotiations (see **Ocean protection**) and in the **Antarctic Treaty System** negotiations. It may also be argued that emerging countries have in common a frequently stark dissonance between their national policies and their foreign policy discourses. As a result, their international agenda is often limited by their poor environmental regulations at home (Economy 2006).

Finally, in global environmental politics, emerging countries are often inclined to maintain a status quo that plays in their favor (with principles such as **sovereignty** or common but differentiated responsibilities), rather than promoting major reforms (Hurrell and Sengupta 2012). A few aspects are changing—there are some indications that emerging countries are trying to embrace donor roles (see also **Aid**). While the balance between the environmental benefits and harms of the individual projects their development banks finance is not evident (Hochstetler 2019), they are recently actively engaging in multilateral funding schemes such as the International Development Finance Club for climate action (see also **Sustainable finance**).

References

- Cullet, Philippe and Jawahar Raja. 2004. "Intellectual Property Rights and Biodiversity Management: The Case of India." *Global Environmental Politics* 4(1): 97–114.
- Economy, Elizabeth. 2006. "Environmental Governance: The Emerging Economic Dimension." *Environmental Politics* 15(2): 171–189.
- Gupta, Aarti and Robert Falkner. 2006. "The Influence of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety: Comparing Mexico, China and South Africa." *Global Environmental Politics* 6(4): 23–55.
- Hochstetler, Kathryn. 2019. "South-South Relations and Global Environmental Governance: Brazilian International Development Cooperation." *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional* 62(2): 1–22.
- Hochstetler, Kathryn and Manjana Milkoreit. 2015. "Responsibilities in Transition: Emerging Powers in the Climate Change Negotiations." *Global Governance* 21(2): 205–226.
- Hurrell, Andrew and Sandeep Sengupta. 2012. "Emerging Powers, North–South Relations and Global Climate Politics." *International Affairs* 88(3): 463–484.
- Orsini, Amandine and Rozenn Nakanabo Ndiello. 2015. "Emerging Countries and the Convention on Biological Diversity." In *Rising Powers and Multilateral Institutions*, Eds. Dries Lesage and Thijs Van de Graaf, 258–276. Basingstoke and New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Papa, Mihaela and Nancy W. Gleason. 2012. "Major Emerging Powers in Sustainable Development Diplomacy: Assessing their Leadership Potential." *Global Environmental Change* 22(4): 915–924.