Austral: Brazilian Journal of Strategy & International Relations
e-ISSN 2238-6912 | v.13, n.26, Jul./Dec. 2024 | p.32-51

HYBRID MULTILATERALISM: GREENPEACE IN THE GLOBAL CLIMATE GOVERNANCE

Ninda Soraya[1]
Ali Muhammad[2]
Sitti Zarina Alimuddin[3]

Introduction

Ecosystem function and biodiversity are currently being threatened by climate change. Future projections indicate that these risks will only increase. The repercussions that are anticipated include habitat destruction, a reduction in the distribution of native species that are poorly suited to heat and drought, and a shortage of water. The most significant dangers are, for instance, the consequences of heat waves and other severe occurrences like floods and droughts, changes in the patterns of infectious illnesses, and effects on food production and freshwater supply. Urban populations also face diminishing water supplies in cities and rising forest fire danger in peri-urban regions (Hjerpe and Nasiritousi 2015). Despite the dangers of climate change's irreversible effects, the global rise of a complex climate regime, where non-state actors work to reform the structure and institutionalize climate politics in various nations, has resulted in bidirectional interactions between state and non-state actors. Historically, Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have made important contributions to the climate transition worldwide and negotiated advocacy networks for non-state actors since the first conference of the parties (COP) of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCCC) in 1995. (Liu, Wang, and Wu 2017).

1 Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. E-mail: ninda.soraya.psc22@mail.umy.ac.id. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3525-1681

2 Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. E-mail: alimuhammad@umy.ac.id. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6344-3410

3 Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia. E-mail: ba18110066@student.ums.edu.my.

The environmental governance of intergovernmental and transnational organizations has grown significantly over the past several decades since the 1970s, when the expansion of international environmental organizations started (Elsässer et al. 2022). Today's NGOs' activity is a result of globalization, which has facilitated the emancipation of private actors' engagement, including that of multinational NGOs that conduct transnational operations (Rietig 2016). NGO involvement demonstrates that there are three reasons why NGOs are significant players in international relations. First, the growing influence of NGOs in determining the priority of global concerns, as seen by their participation in important international forums. Because activism on certain topics results in the development of competency expertise in particular domains, the second benefit is the building of competence authority in the field of NGOs. Third, the rise of NGO authority as a global force that promotes progressive norms (Wildan Ilmanuarif Shafar & Nurul Isnaeni 2016).

Greenpeace was chosen as one of the examples to represent how NGOs were involved in international climate change governance to better understand its function as an important participant in international climate negotiations. Greenpeace was founded in Canada in 1972, and when it expanded to Europe in 1979, it became Greenpeace International. Greenpeace's first goal was to transform the world using 'media bombs,' which were consciousness-altering sounds and visuals that were broadcast throughout the globe under the pretext of breaking news. The strategy was a complete success, and Greenpeace swiftly gained global media recognition. Their mission is to be an independent, worldwide advocacy group that works to alter people's attitudes and behaviors in order to safeguard and maintain the environment (Pandey 2015). Greenpeace is a hierarchical organization based on global democratic principles with a high degree of internationalism and coordination. In practice, Greenpeace campaign decisions are developed, coordinated, and monitored from the international level by Greenpeace International, with additional input from national and regional offices (Sitorus and Purnama 2023).

The existence of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) provides a level of interest among academics in multi-actor global governance. Where the starting point for researchers is an evaluation that grows institutional interactions and is not too hierarchical so that the researchers are inspired by the climate change governance system. Although the phrase "multilevel governance" was first used to describe multiple levels of decision-making in Europe, it is also used as a framework. Recently there has been increasing use of the phrase "multilevel governance" to describe the interactions between various actors at the scale of government. As a result, some autonomous activities are permitted by less hierarchical

codes of conduct (Strachová 2021). The non-state actors as well as the cities gained impetus because of the Paris Agreement. The national governments' increasing acceptance of transnational city networks broadens their options for addressing climate change (Bäckstrand et al. 2017) In this context, hybrid multilateralism is collaboration between several actors at various levels related to multilateral talks. When combined with orchestration, hybrid multilateralism serves as a tool to focus the efforts of various parties to achieve common goals (Dryzek 2017).

This research requires previous research on Non-Governmental Organizations, Hybrid Multilateralism, Climate Governance, and Greenpeace as a supporting theoretical basis for finding GAP in this research. In addition, research (Giese 2017) examines NGOs based in India, which includes Indian Climate Justice and All India Women's Conference (AIWC) role in international climate governance. He emphasized that these NGOs have a limited impact on the country's environment policies. Because NGOs have influence inside the larger UNFCCC international organization, it is possible to make weaker arguments against Indian governance when it has transitive features. NGOs can provide outlets to influence the UNFCCC, which has an impact on Indian government policy about the UNFCCC. However, NGOs in India have a significant impact on the creation of knowledge and organizational capacity, enabling them to supplement and evaluate government of India policy. In his explanation of the role of NGOs in combating global warming, Lucas J. Giese primarily focused on the case study of India.

The study by Novianti (2013) examines how several environmental NGOs responded to the flood occurrence in Prague, Czech Republic, from the standpoint of an actor-based approach. This research is comparable to that of (Nasiritousi, Hjerpe, and Linnér 2016a) who discussed the role of non-state actors in global governance and their potential impact on states. There is an underlying question in these two studies which both discuss the role of NGOs in national climate change policy. According to (Liu, Wang, and Wu 2017), NGOs such as China Civil Climate Action Network (CCCAN) and China Youth Climate Action Network (CYCAN) have taken a significant role in global climate discussions. Due to diverse political, legal, and even cultural circumstances, each country has a different role for NGOs in domestic climate change governance. According to their research, which examines China is the greatest carbon emitter in the world, therefore if it just depends on top-down administration and voluntary private sector activity, a low-carbon growth path may not be possible. As a result, it is crucial that NGOs participate as civil society actors. However, there is still little research on how NGOs are used in China's control of climate change.

Moreover, Rietig (2016) in her research examines how government representatives in international talks consider the opinions of nongovernmental groups. There are three important NGOs discussed in this paper which are People in Need Foundation (PINF), Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA), and The Czech Catholic Caritas (CCK)The study's conclusions were examined in the context of the 2009–2012 climate change discussions, during which time government representatives took note of advice from international advocacy groups including the Climate Action Network. Given the narrowly defined negotiation mandate that was previously agreed upon, demonstrations and lobbying activities on a global scale are frequently disregarded. To modify the government's position and restart the next discussion after it has drawn significant public attention, this calls for a long-term view. As a result, the Government encourages the participation of NGOs since they lend credibility and garner support from the general population. Only the role of NGOs in talks and NGO tools to show government legitimacy are the subject of this research (Rietig 2016).

In his study, Roberto TalentiI looks at new forms of multilateralism that amplify the function of NGOs and boost the potency of the system of international climate governance. Therefore, Roberto Talentil, based on the relevant prior research, the Climate Regime Hybrid Multilateralism concept was established, with the goal of determining the extent to which Hybrid Multilateralism enhances its position in climate governance. For example, non-governmental organizations at the global climate governance level (Talenti 2022a). And related to Robert's article, namely Kevin Michael DeLuca's article (2009), in which his research explains that Greenpeace as an NGO can organize and publish about global climate change (DeLuca 2009).

Previous research on international regimes, international organizations, and international public administration are just a few of the academic areas that have looked at how institutions interact with one another. Most of the earlier research focused on how NGOs may assist governmental actors in resolving environmental problems in a nation. This study has improved our understanding of how institutions interact at various organizational levels and the effects these have on things like the effectiveness, legitimacy, and authority of global environmental governance. We thus attempted to examine how Greenpeace, one of the influential NGOs combating the climate issue, which plays its role in the global politics of climate change in this research. Therefore, this article raises a few additional concerns in addition to describing how Greenpeace has influenced global climate discussions. First, how did hybrid multilateralism explain Greenpeace's participation in the global climate negotiations? Secondly, do international environmental accords benefit from

Greenpeace's participation in the global governance of climate change? Lastly, what are the indicators to justify Greenpeace's influence in the global climate discussions.

This research uses qualitative methodology. This research fully describes how Greenpeace is involved in international climate governance (Nurhariska, Hayat, and Abidin 2023). This research is also bibliographic in nature which aims to completely describe and analyze events, phenomena and thoughts collected through analysis of existing documents and records so that researchers can provide a clear picture, focused and comprehensive picture of the focus of the research being carried out. The data obtained is secondary data from our findings on several online news sites, official government agency websites, news, and previous research. Qualitative research that focuses on multi-methods includes naturalistic and interpretive approaches to the topic material which means, to understand or interpret events in terms of the meaning given by humans, qualitative researchers investigate objects in their natural environment. In qualitative research, the way to obtain data sources is by collecting, such as case studies, historical texts, previous journals, news, the official Greenpeace website, and official websites about international organizations on climate and annual reports, to explain the moments that occurred. Distinctive characteristics of qualitative research, as well as literature in the broad field of social sciences (Aspers and Corte 2019).

Hybrid Multilateral Conceptual Framework

This research uses the concept of Hybrid Multilateralism developed by Bäckstrand et al. (2017), who define it as a 'heuristic' to capture 'intensive interaction between state and non-state actors in the new landscape of international climate cooperation. According to these scholars, hybrid multilateralism considers two new trends of global climate policy, namely the emergence of a hybrid climate policy architecture, and the intensive interaction between multilateral and transnational climate action. In the same year, Dryzek presented the concept of Hybrid Multilateralism defined by the emergence of linkages between established multilateral negotiations and many self-governance initiatives involving various non-state actors cooperating with each other. Lastly, Strachová recently defined hybrid multilateralism as a form of cooperation among different actors at different levels. The definitions of Hybrid Multilateralism are not only a newfound accent on their role, but also heterogeneity which is when they define hybrid multilateralism as 'heuristics',

as 'linkages', and as forms of 'cooperation'. And Kupyer et al revealed that it is on the Paris Agreement that the Multilateral Hybrid is instituting through the introduction of nationally determined ones that will enable NGOs to increase 'fairness, legitimacy, and effectiveness' on the international climate regime. (Superiore and Anna 2023).

Hybrid Multilateral counseling refers to a concept in international relations in which traditional multilateral approaches to global governance are combined or complemented by more flexible, informal, or non-traditional mechanisms. This involves a mix of traditional international organizations, such as the United Nations, and newer forms of cooperation, often involving many stakeholders outside the nation-state. In a Hybrid Multilateralism where various actors, including states, international organizations, NGOs, civil society, and even the private sector, come together to address global challenges. It is not solely about cooperation between countries, but includes a very wide range of stakeholders (Dryzek 2017).

According to Kyuper, the Paris Agreement instituted a system of Hybrid Multilateralism through the introduction of nationally made contributions with the possibility of NGOs to improve the international climate regime through three points: Authority, Legitimacy, and Effectiveness. From these three points, which is an assessment of how non-state actors can contribute, play their many roles and involvement in international climate negotiations. The hybrid multilateral characteristics of non-state actors' involvement in the UNFCCC under the Paris Agreement continue to raise questions about fairness and equality when it comes to deciding who gets what, when, and how. *Legitimacy* is an essential element of governance of any system, determining whether actors perceive rules as acceptable and legitimate. The participation of non-state actors increases or hinders the effectiveness of the Paris agreement is a third important element in seeing the significance of non-state activities. The effectiveness of an international treaty can be defined as a function of the ambition and firmness of the commitment of the Parties in combination with the degree of participation of States and their compliance with what has been agreed (Kuyper, Linnér, and Schroeder 2018). The Paris Agreement will have a major influence on the ability of states and non-state actors to cope with the demands posed by global warming. And the emergence of a thought, about how this hybrid architecture can work in practice.

Hybrid Multilateralism and Greenpeace Involvement in International Climate Negotiations

The Paris Agreement emphasizes Hybrid Multilateralism, which has the dual effect of encouraging and inhibiting the participation of non-state actors in global climate management, especially NGOs. The idea of Hybrid Multilateralism was later expanded, a list of potential non-state actor entities was provided, and non-state actors were expected to have greater influence after the Paris Agreement (Bäckstrand et al. 2017). The theory of Hybrid Multilateralism seeks to explain the interactions between state and non-state actors in the emerging system of global climate cooperation. Non-state actors are groups that are not part of the government, such as Greenpeace. This explanation will be accepted by the UN Economic and Social Council for observers who have consultative status. In further research on the formation of the post-Paris international climate regime, the idea of "Hybrid Multilateralism" will be the instrument used (Talenti 2022b).

Two of the key developments in the global climate issue may be captured by Hybrid Multilateralism. First, to highlight a hybrid approach that combines nations' voluntarily making climate commitments with a global transparency framework for revaluation on a regular basis. In addition to participating in global diplomacy as observers, Greenpeace also manages the implementation and monitoring of Determined Nation Contributions (NDCs). Second, and hybrid multilateralism pays attention to the link between multilateral and transnational climate action, in which the UNFCCC Secretariat plays the role of facilitator (Bäckstrand et al. 2017). The Greenpeace participation in hybrid multilateralism has been categorized into three characteristics: authority, legitimacy, and effectiveness, as previously mentioned.

Authority

In recent years, the question of where political authority is located in the Hybrid Multilateralism era has consumed scientists studying climate governance. More than 12,000 contributions to the Non-State Actor Zone for Climate Action (NAZCA) database demonstrate the significant involvement of non-state actors in the governance of climate change today. While some database contributions are directly tied to nation-state regulatory activities, many show that non-state climate action experiments have increased since the United Nations Biodiversity Conference (COP 15) (Bäckstrand et al. 2017). According to (Hoffman 2012), Following a meeting in Copenhagen, which is a landmark in global climate management, companies and NGOs decided to take action themselves to address climate change. And this may be a trend

caused by the expansion of global urban networks and urban participation in climate governance. A number of studies have also been conducted on the expansion of commercial emissions accounting standards, public-private partnerships, global city networks, and certification programs in recent years (M. M. Betsill and Corell 2017; Hoffman, 2012).

Cities, companies, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are no longer limited to adhering to intergovernmental treaties or the directions of nation-states as they have started to create their own laws and standards that others have chosen to adopt. They have established personal domains of jurisdiction apart from the sovereign state and have become independent rulers (M. Betsill 2013).

Legitimacy

The form of legitimacy that non-state actors have in the UNFCCC has been a topic of dispute between the Copenhagen and Paris Agreements. Non-governmental organizations are given the opportunity and encouraged to provide valid input and output in the Paris Agreement. The National Designated Authority and regional stakeholders created a self-reporting and monitoring framework for the Green Climate Fund and invited non-governmental organizations to participate in its development. However, the position of NGOs in the hybrid architecture of the Paris Agreement remains unclear (Fisher 2010). NGOs are requested to decrease their emissions by voluntary promises, although at one stage they were asked to work with governments to determine the procedure for monitoring emission reductions. While some NGOs also serve as watchdogs, others do not. Legitimacy binds authority and power. Legitimacy strengthens authorities by legitimizing them in the eyes of the governed (Bernstein 2011). Greenpeace believes that the opinion doing so is not only within their legal rights, but it would also be negligent and irresponsible of them not to (Schmidt 2013).

The effectiveness of the Paris Agreement will also depend on how choices are made. The quality of deliberation, in its most basic sense, concerns how decision makers can convince others of the reasons for their decisions. Countries are not yet required to provide detailed explanations of their NDCs, but more than 170 national commitments are enough to be agreed to in the Paris agreement (Brun 2016). In 2018, States will take part in discussions aimed at supporting their pledges for the long-term objectives of the Paris Agreement. In this, non-state actors will be crucial, especially through the TEM and TEP procedures. At the nexus of hybrid multilateralism, discussions

about non-state contributions to the LPAA, NAZCA, and future Global Climate Action (GCA) are being held more often between the UNFCCC and non-state actors. Because they provide a forum for demonstration and discussion, these orchestration initiatives allow state and non-state actors to participate in the same process (Chan, Brandi, and Bauer 2016).

Effectiveness

The rise of transnational climate governance has prompted many researchers on how the UN can coordinate, mobilize and accelerate non-state and public action to address climate change, as well as keep global warming to 2°C or less, and support climate change resilience and decarbonization (Widerberg and Pattberg 2015). The ambition and strictness of an international agreement's obligations coupled with the degrees of state involvement and compliance determine the effectiveness (Bang, Hovi, and Skodvin 2016). If there is an increase in commitments while maintaining the same level of involvement, effectiveness will be improved.

Non-state actors, in this case NGOs are often seen to support implementation while also monitoring and evaluating conformance. By identifying problems, formulating objectives, setting rules, disseminating information and resources, building capacity, evaluating compliance, and so on, NGOs also promote ambition and involvement. In order to achieve low-carbon futures, Post-Paris effectiveness also entails coordinating non-state and intergovernmental initiatives under a comprehensive framework (Hsu et al. 2015). To reduce the emissions gap, non-state contributions outside the UNFCCC must be increased. How can the NDC achieve its decarbonization and mitigation goals while reducing greenhouse gas emissions through non-state and sub-state voluntary commitments and actions? Apart from climate change adaptation and mitigation, the UNFCCC also does much more (Bäckstrand et al. 2017).

The Paris Agreement aims to end poverty, advance sustainable development, and strengthen the international response to combat climate change. This will encourage growth with low greenhouse gas emissions that do not endanger the world's food supply, keep global temperature rise below 2°C, increase resilience to climate change, and align financial flows with these goals. Non-state players are anticipated to contribute to a number of the agreement's components, which might conflict with (Bäckstrand et al. 2017).

Greenpeace Roles in International Climate Negotiations

After understanding how Hybrid Multilateralism helps us comprehend

Greenpeace's role in global climate governance, we will explore Greenpeace's effectiveness in international climate discussions. Due to their responsibilities and methods, their involvement will yield positive results. Thus, we will first discuss their roles and ways to improve climate negotiations. NGO participation in international environmental discussions and accords has grown dramatically in recent decades. Although many researchers believe that NGOs like Greenpeace impact global environmental politics, their roles, and efforts on international conferences, notably for climate problems, are disputed. UNFCCC is one of the environmental discussions and conferences that focus on climate change. Greenpeace participated in climate discussions through the International Climate Agreements. Over 60% of parties say NGOs help publicize climate change (Nasiritousi, Hjerpe, and Linnér 2016b). NGO perspectives on the matter may vary.

Even though they only act as observers, NGOs have also played an important role in UNFCCC discussions. And also at the Conference of the Parties (COP) has given permission to NGOs as observers (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, n.d.) These NGOs have extensive relationships with different interests or points of view, but most have something in common. And many NGOs are present as observers, and some of them have significantly influenced the party's stance through lobbying and other means such as representing various levels of government, documenting and assessing the negotiation process, or acting as monitors. (The Climate Policy Info Hub 2023).

Greenpeace International is one of the groups that the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC has awarded observer status to. (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, n.d.). Greenpeace has been actively involved, participating in meetings, and discussing ideas with other attendees, including delegates. It is acknowledged that this engagement enables crucial knowledge, skills, views, and experience from civil society to be included into the process to provide fresh ideas and methods. Additionally, Greenpeace's involvement and access as observers to the process encourage openness in an increasingly complicated global issue. Greenpeace's involvement in UNFCCC agendas thrives in an environment of trust where others are respected for their ideas and where consideration is given to the nature of international sessions (United Nations Climate Change Secretariat 2017).

Indicators of Greenpeace Influence in Kyoto Protocol and

Paris Agreement

As NGOs gradually came to be acknowledged as the world's ears and eyes, researchers made substantial attempts to comprehend nonstate actors' effect on the formation of international environmental politics. However, (M. M. Betsill and Corell 2017) claim that there are still open concerns about how and when NGOs may have an impact on the politics of the climate problem. Understanding the circumstances in which NGOs like Greenpeace impact climate change politics, particularly when it comes to influencing the international environmental discussions, depends on taking into account what is meant by their influence. It may be difficult to grasp each party's position in this hybrid multilateralism for addressing the climate catastrophe if there is a hazy concept of what influence means. In order to evaluate if NGOs like Greenpeace have succeeded or failed in influencing any international discussions on the climate problem, we would need to explain what we mean by NGOs impact and what type of indicator may be utilized to characterize their influences in this section.

Influence may occur when one actor communicates information to another across international boundaries that modifies the latter's behaviour from what would have happened in the absence of the information. Therefore, their effect on this idea led to changes in the state actor's behavior in accordance with the information provided. International governmental organizations fighting the climate problem need to know about NGOs because of this sort of effect in the political sphere, where governments typically retained the authority of decision-making over both parts of procedural issues and substance of the agreements or decisions. NGOs need to have a solid foundation of information in order to have an influence on knowledge that can be utilized in international climate discussions or accords (M. M. Betsill and Corell 2017).

Some academics depend on evidence of NGOs' actions, such as making decisions for negotiators on specific positions, providing material, and lobbying, to determine if NGOs really have an impact on international governmental talks (Liu, Wang, and Wu 2017). An analytical framework that provided an index to gauge NGOs' influence in global climate discussions or accords existed. The indicators included the following: (1) the presence of NGOs at the negotiations; (2) the ability to influence the agenda; (3) the opportunity to define the environmental issue under negotiation; (4) the capacity to provide information in writing and orally in support of a position; (5) the capacity to advise government delegations directly; and (6) the capacity to ensure that information can be incorporated into the negotiations or

agreement. The first four indicators must be met to evaluate if NGOs have affected a negotiation. This is because the first four indicators focused on NGOs' participation, which may be utilized to determine the extent of their impact (M. M. Betsill and Corell 2017).

The Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change aims to mitigate catastrophic anthropogenic climate change by assigning to all Parties "common but differentiated responsibilities" that take into account each country's greenhouse gas emissions and the ability to reduce those emissions. (Ki-moon 2017). This global agreement aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions while stabilizing the concentration of these gases in the atmosphere at a level that can prevent adverse human impacts on the climate system. To do this, the Kyoto Protocol incorporates several elements from previous international environmental agreements, such as the requirement that each country reduce its national greenhouse gas emissions by a certain percentage starting from a base year. The Clean Development Mechanism is another tactic under the Kyoto Protocol that allows rich countries to fulfill their obligations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by assisting developing countries' initiatives (Rowlands 2001).

The Kyoto Protocol made an agreement on limiting and reducing GHG emissions bringing together 37 prosperous countries and economies in transition. When President Clinton came to power, the 1997 Kyoto Protocol was created and signed, but the US Senate never ratified it. The United States withdrew from the Kyoto Protocol in March 2001, not long after President Bush took office. President Bush's decision to remove the United States from the Protocol sparked demonstrations and demonstrations in April 2001 in front of the White House and the presidential grounds in Texas. In a letter dated May 2001, Greenpeace addressed 100 of the world's leading companies, some of which had collaborated with the US government to resist climate change efforts. And companies in the world are also asked to openly support the Kyoto Protocol. In June 2001, Greenpeace launched a boycott of gas stations targeting ExxonMobil because the company was a key supporter of Bush's decision to withdraw from the Kyoto Protocol. The following month, Greenpeace continued its efforts to persuade major American companies, such as Ford Motor Company and Coca-Cola, to support the Kyoto Protocol in order to exert indirect pressure on the Bush administration to reverse its rejection of the Protocol (Dib 2021).

At the UN World Summit on Sustainable Development in August 2002, Greenpeace joined the global Business Council for Sustainable Development to call on governments around the world to accept the Kyoto Agreement as the basis for a new set of universal laws to combat global warming. When the

United States was a signatory to the Kyoto Protocol, Greenpeace began small-scale campaigns and demonstrations to urge governments to comply with the Protocol. However, once the Bush administration took office and left the Protocol, Greenpeace concentrated on subtly pressing significant business leaders who had links to and partnerships with the federal government. These business leaders have influence on the federal political agenda due to the financial assistance they gave the government, which indicates that they had influence over the industry (Dib 2021). This proved that Greenpeace succeeded in influencing the industries.

Regarding the Paris Agreement, Greenpeace examines its inability to influence international environmental negotiations. Most countries in the world have ratified the Paris Climate Agreement, an international agreement that promises to fight climate change. After years of discussions, an agreement was reached on the Paris Agreement, which marked the world's first climate agreement. This is seen as significant progress in the global community's search for solutions, despite its shortcomings. Of course, this is usually the intention when the topic of the Paris Agreement is raised in the context of climate change. The Paris Agreement aims to maintain global warming at 1.5 degrees, ideally less than two degrees, so that the bad consequences of climate change are likely to be prevented by doing so (Greenpeace 2021).

The United States formally declared its intention to leave the Paris Agreement on November 4, 2019, and the Trump administration has started the procedure to do so. The unjust economic burden placed on the American workforce, taxpayers, and companies led to the decision. They claimed that between 1970 and 2018, they had effectively reduced air pollution by 74%, and between 2005 and 2017, net greenhouse gas emissions had decreased to 13% while the economy had grown by almost 19% (Pompeo 2019). Unfortunately, this decision has caused the loss of roles of Greenpeace in influencing the Paris Agreement.

Annie Leonard, executive director of Greenpeace US, stated that the United States' decision to withdraw from the Paris Climate Agreement by the Trump administration would transform the country from a global climate leader to the country's biggest climate failure. (Greenpeace 2017a). Protecting the planet and its inhabitants is a moral obligation, no longer a legal or political obligation because protecting the Planet is very important for the environment and Global Society. In the Paris Agreement, more than 200 countries agreed to this, and if the Trump administration intends to violate that commitment, then executives and business leaders who are emitters of greenhouse gases must hold accountable those who cause global environmental pollution (Greenpeace 2017b). According to the statement

released, Greenpeace believes that Trump's decision to withdraw from the accord would make it more difficult to maintain a secure future for life on Earth, and that this task will be too great for national governments to handle alone.

As was previously said, this incident has shown Greenpeace's inability to influence climate change discussions. They are no longer permitted to collaborate with US coalitions of non-federal entities to monitor the Paris Agreement's implementation. They were unable to dictate the agenda of the negotiations, contact directly with government delegations to provide detailed recommendations, and, most importantly, present at any of the discussions (M. M. Betsill and Corell 2017). NGOs are the least capable player in the global governance of climate change. Only pressure and persuasion will allow them to exert influence (Allan and Hadden 2017). Due to their inability to participate in the discussions and the fact that much of the material they sent to the decision-makers did not make it into the final version of the agreement draft, Greenpeace lost influence over the Paris Agreement because of the US decision to leave. Furthermore, the final version could not accurately represent the objectives and guiding principles of NGOs in the battle against the climate disaster (M. M. Betsill and Corell 2017).

Conclusions

The Paris Agreement is a prime example of Hybrid Multilateralism, which involves both state and non-state players in international climate change discussions, according to this study's findings. Non-state actors, such as NGOs, have a significant impact on global climate change indirectly. The fact that Greenpeace participates in Multinational Hybrid, which evaluates organisations on three criteria—authority, legitimacy, and effectiveness—shows that it is an NGO engaged in international climate change discussions. As an observer in international negotiations, Greenpeace promotes openness in increasingly complex global issues by taking an active role in discussions with other participants, including delegates to international conferences. Greenpeace also offers many roles and benefits in global climate change governance.

Greenpeace evidence affected the global discussion on the Kyoto Protocol when the Bush government withdrew from the agreement, in addition to the organization's influence indicators in global climate discussions including the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement. Due to financial support from business owners to governments that have an impact on the industry,

Greenpeace subtly highlighted significant businesses that have partnership relationships with the federal government by taking part and boycotting major American corporations that were Brush's primary backers. However, the Paris Agreement shows that Greenpeace is powerless to sway debates on climate change. Greenpeace is not permitted to work with a coalition of US non-federal organisations to oversee the Paris Agreement's implementation. Therefore, Greenpeace cannot set the topic for the negotiations, speak with government delegations directly to offer specific proposals, and, most significantly, cannot attend any of the meetings. Greenpeace's impact on the Paris Agreement was diminished as a result of its inefficiency.

This study examined Greenpeace's role as an NGO in international climate change, with a focus on Greenpeace's involvement in hybrid multilateral international negotiations, Greenpeace's function and advantages in global climate change governance, and Greenpeace's influence in international discussions. There is a need for recommendations for more study to delve into greater depth on Greenpeace's participation in global climate governance as a non-state actor towards nations who are at war over environmental harm.

References

Allan, J. I., & Hadden, J. (2017). Exploring the framing power of NGOs in global climate politics. Environmental Politics, 26(4), 600–620. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2017.1319017

Aspers, P., & Corte, U. (2019). What is Qualitative in Qualitative Research Content courtesy of Springer Nature. Springer, 42(February), 139-160 retrievied on April 27 2021. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-019-9413-7%0AWhat

Bäckstrand, K., Kuyper, J. W., Linnér, B. O., & Lövbrand, E. (2017). Non-state actors in global climate governance: from Copenhagen to Paris and beyond. Environmental Politics, 26(4), 561–579. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2017.1327485

Bang, G., Hovi, J., & Skodvin, T. (2016). The Paris agreement: Short-term and long-term effectiveness. Politics and Governance, 4(3), 209–218. https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v4i3.640

Bernstein, S. (2011). Legitimacy in intergovernmental and non-state global governance. Review of International Political Economy, 18(1), 17–51. https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290903173087

Betsill, M. (2013). Studying Global Environmental Meetings. Global Environmental Politics, 13(August), 46–64. https://doi.org/10.1162/

GLEP

Betsill, M. M., & Corell, E. (2017). NGO influence in international environmental negotiations: A framework for analysis. International Environmental Governance, November, 453–476. https://doi.org/10.1162/152638001317146372

Brun, A. (2016). Conference diplomacy: The making of the Paris agreement. Politics and Governance, 4(3), 115–123. https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v4i3.649

Chan, S., Brandi, C., & Bauer, S. (2016). Aligning transnational climate action with international climate governance: the road from Paris. Review of European, Comparative and International Environmental Law, 25(2), 238–247. https://doi.org/10.1111/reel.12168

DeLuca, K. M. (2009). Greenpeace International Media Analyst Reflects on Communicating Climate Change. Environmental Communication, 3(2), 263–269. https://doi.org/10.1080/17524030902972734

Dib, V. (2021). A Case Study on Greenpeace's Role in Pressuring United States to Comply with the 1997 Kyoto Protocol. https://presentations.curf.upenn.edu/sites/default/files/poster_upload/2021-08/greenpeace-case-study_-kyoto-protocol.pdf

Dryzek, J. S. (2017). The meanings of life for non-state actors in climate politics. Environmental Politics, 26(4), 789–799. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2017.1321724

Elsässer, J. P., Hickmann, T., Jinnah, S., Oberthür, S., & Van de Graaf, T. (2022). Institutional interplay in global environmental governance: lessons learned and future research. International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics, 22(2), 373–391. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10784-022-09569-4

Fisher, D. R. (2010). COP-15 in Copenhagen: How the merging of movements left civil society out in the cold. Global Environmental Politics, 10(2), 11–17. https://doi.org/10.1162/glep.2010.10.2.11

Giese, L. J. (2017). The Role of NGOs in International Climate Governance : A Case Study of Indian NGOs. 2017, 29. http://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/honors_thesishttp://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/honors_thesis/36

Greenpeace. (2017a). Trump announces U.S. "withdrawal" from Paris Climate Agreement – Greenpeace response. Greenpeace. https://www.greenpeace.org/usa/news/trump-announces-u-s-withdrawal-from-paris-climate-agreement-greenpeace-response/

Greenpeace. (2017b). Withdrawing from the Paris Climate Agreement would turn America from a global climate leader into a global climate deadbeat. Greenpeace. https://www.greenpeace.org/usa/news/withdrawing-paris-climate-agreement-turn-america-global-climate-leader-global-climate-deadbeat-greenpeace/

Greenpeace. (2021). What is the Paris climate agreement and why does it matter. Greenpeace. https://www.greenpeace.org.uk/news/what-is-paris-climate-agreement-and-why-does-it-matter/#:~:text=The goal of the Paris,least to cause this crisis).

Hjerpe, M., & Nasiritousi, N. (2015). Views on alternative forums for effectively tackling climate change. Nature Climate Change, 5(9), 864–867. https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2684

Hoffman, M. J. (2012). Climate Governance at the Crossroads Experimenting with a Global Response after Kyoto. Oxford University Press. https://politics.utoronto.ca/publication/climate-governance-at-the-crossroads-experimenting-with-a-global-response-after-kyoto/

Hsu, A., Moffat, A. S., Weinfurter, A. J., & Schwartz, J. D. (2015). Towards a new climate diplomacy. Nature Climate Change, 5(6), 501–503. https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2594

Ki-moon, B. (2017). Committee : Environmental Committee Issue : Re-evaluation of the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement on climate change in a shifting political landscape Student Officer : Eirini Vyzirgiannaki Position : Co-Chair Introduction Definition of Key-Terms. June, 1–14.

Kuyper, J. W., Linnér, B. O., & Schroeder, H. (2018). Non-state actors in hybrid global climate governance: justice, legitimacy, and effectiveness in a post-Paris era. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 9(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.497

Liu, L., Wang, P., & Wu, T. (2017). The role of nongovernmental organizations in China's climate change governance. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 8(6), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.483

Nasiritousi, N., Hjerpe, M., & Linnér, B. O. (2016). The roles of non-state actors in climate change governance: understanding agency through governance profiles. International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics, 16(1), 109–126. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10784-014-9243-8

Novianti, K. (2013). Peran NGOs (Non-Govermental Oganizations) Lingkungan dalam Mitigasi Banjir di Praha, Republik Ceko. Kajian Wilayah, 4(2),

165–184. http://journal.unair.ac.id/download-fullpapers-12 Kurnia Novianti - Peran NGO sebagai Bagian dari Civil Society dalam Mitigasi Banjir di Praha.pdf

Nurhariska, A., Hayat, H., & Abidin, A. Z. (2023). Analysis of Mobile Village Development Innovation in Technology-Based Public Services. Jurnal Manajemen Pelayanan Publik, 6(2), 116. https://doi.org/10.24198/jmpp.v6i2.39214

Pandey, C. L. (2015). Managing climate change: Shifting roles for NGOs in the climate negotiations. Environmental Values, 24(6), 799–824. https://doi.org/10.3197/096327115X14420732702734

Pompeo, M. R. (2019). Withdrawal from the Paris Agreement. Embassy and Consulate Braziil. https://br.usembassy.gov/on-the-u-s-withdrawal-from-the-paris-agreement/

Rietig, K. (2016). The power of strategy: Environmental NGO influence in international climate negotiations. Global Governance, 22(2), 269–288. https://doi.org/10.1163/19426720-02202006

Rowlands, I. H. (2001). The Kyoto Protocol's "clean development mechanism": A sustainability assessment. Third World Quarterly, 22(5), 795–811. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436590120084601

Schmidt, V. A. (2013). Democracy and Legitimacy in the European Union Revisited: Input, Output and "Throughput." Political Studies, 61(1), 2–22. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2012.00962.x

Sitorus, S. A., & Purnama, C. (2023). Greenpeace Campaigns Against Asia Pulp & Paper and Wilmar International: A Comparative Research. Jurnal Global & Strategis, 17(1), 101–130. https://doi.org/10.20473/jgs.17.1.2023.101-130

Strachová, N. (2021). Cities Towards Global Climate Governance: How the Practices of City Diplomacy Foster Hybrid Multilateralism1. Przeglad Strategiczny, 14, 365–377. https://doi.org/10.14746/ps.2021.1.21

Superiore, S., & Anna, S. (2023). Addressing Complexity The rise of the hybrid multilateral climate regime and its impact on the role played by ENGOs in the governance of climate change Addressing Complexity The rise of the hybrid multilateral climate regime and its climate change . March.

Talenti, R. (2022). Addressing Complexity The rise of the hybrid multilateral climate regime and its impact on the role played by ENGOs in the governance of climate change. Perspectives on Federalism, 14(2), E182–E224.

The Climate Policy Info Hub. (2023). Observer NGOs and the International Climate Negotiations. The Climate Policy Info Hub. https://climatepolicyinfohub.eu/observer-ngos-and-international-climate-negotiations.html

United Nations Climate Change Secretariat. (2017). Guidelines for the participation of representatives of non-governmental organizations at meetings of the bodies of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. March, 5. https://unfccc.int/files/parties_and_observers/ngo/application/pdf/coc_guide.pdf

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. (n.d.). Admitted NGOs. https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/parties-non-party-stakeholders/non-party-stakeholders/overview/admitted-ngos

Widerberg, O., & Pattberg, P. (2015). International cooperative initiatives in global climate governance: Raising the ambition level or delegitimizing the UNFCCC? Global Policy, 6(1), 45–56. https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12184

Wildan Ilmanuarif Shafar & Nurul Isnaeni. (2016). The Influence of Greenpeace Advocacy Towards CIMB International on the Issue of Coal Power Plant Financing Discharge in Indonesia. E-Journal. Unair.Ac.Id, 2, 379–410. https://e-journal.unair.ac.id/JGS/article/download/40446/23360

ABSTRACT

The study seeks to explain the non-state actors' roles in international climate negotiations. The existence of the Paris Agreement in our view strengthens the hybrid multilateralism architecture that makes it possible encouraging non-state actors to take part in global climate governance, such as Greenpeace. Based on literature research, this study uses qualitative research approaches. In addition, we utilize secondary information relevant to the subjects covered in this research from academic publications and online news sources. From this research, we found that three main key points, authority, legitimacy, and effectiveness in hybrid multilateralism best explain Greenpeace involvement in international climate negotiations. Furthermore, by following certain indicators of non-governmental organizations' influence, Greenpeace is seen to have succeeded in influencing the Kyoto Protocol yet lost its role in influencing the Paris Agreement upon the United States' withdrawal under Trump's administration.

KEYWORDS

Greenpeace; Authority; Legitimacy; Effectiveness; Non-Governmental Organisation.

Received on January 14, 2024
Accepted on November 2, 2024