# Mayors on the global stage – a political star is born

**Emmanuelle Pinault, Head of City Diplomacy, C40**

**Simon Hansen, Director of Regions, C40, shansen@c40.org**

It may sound counterintuitive that mayors from some of the largest cities in the world spend time participating in and contributing to international cooperation on climate challenges. After all, they are primarily accountable to their local electorate. However, the fact is that a global city network such as C40 offers these mayors resources such as new ideas, a closely knit, exclusive and confidential community of peers, and some very concrete solutions that can be directly implemented in order to meet some of the acute climate challenges in the large cities. In this way, cities and their global networks contribute to filling the governance void that states have created in the area of climate change.

## Mayors are now everywhere on the global stage

City Diplomacy is undoubtedly one of the major political innovations of our generation. For the long-term observers of the international system, it is stunning to see that mayors are now everywhere on the global stage, adding their voice to the international debates on issues whose causes and effects go well beyond the limit of their jurisdictions, such as climate change, sustainable development, inequality, violent extremism and migration. Once paradoxical, the idea that local leaders are also global politicians now appears, on the contrary, as a common fact. And a natural phenomenon for the 21st century, an era both largely urban and globally connected.

Academia is starting to catch up on it, with several interesting works recently published on the matter. One of the key references is of course the book by Benjamin Barber, *If Mayors Ruled the World: Dysfunctional Nations, Rising Cities*, published in 2013, concluding with a provocative call for the establishment of a Global Parliament of Mayors, seen as a more effective body than the United Nations to address the major challenges of our time (Barber, 2013). Since then, several universities as well as think tanks like the Chicago Council on Global Affairs (Acuto et al., 2018), have produced literature on city diplomacy, analyzing its boom from different angles – history, scope, typology and benefits for participating cities (Boston University, 2018), and building this new object of research for faculties of political theory and the social sciences. Interestingly, most of these works come from the United States.

How are mayors participating in global politics? What for? On which topics are they most engaged? Based on our personal experience working within municipal governments and global city networks,[1] we are happy to contribute to the collective thinking on global city leadership from a practitioners' point of view, looking at the specific case of the engagement of cities in the global climate change

discussion through the C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group (C40).

We will do this firstly by describing the growing field of global city politics, and note some illustrative examples of the forms and frequency of global city engagement in recent years. Secondly, we will take a more detailed look at C40, one of the most influential city networks, and analyze some of the key motivators keeping mayors engaged in it. Thirdly, we will discuss why climate change has emerged as maybe the most important topic to bring mayors onto the global stage.

## The rise of 'glocalism': forms and signs of global city leadership

*Global city networks and international urban programmes*
The engagement of mayors on the global stage is sometimes described as »glocalization[2]« of politics, or global city leadership. This phenomenon is growing and hardly a week goes by in municipal governments without an invitation to join an international network, alliance, initiative, platform, campaign, statement or Summit. There are, indeed, many forms of global engagement for cities.

Global city networks or »Transnational Municipal Networks« (TMNs) are one of the most distinctive forms of urban international engagement. A very diverse group in terms of scope, mission, conditions of membership and impact, city networks have multiplied by four in 30 years, and are now counting more than 200, spanning issues from climate to gender, health, security and democratic accountability (Acuto, 2016). Being probably the most powerful expression of global, collective city leadership, later in this article we will look in detail at C40 as case study of a successful and influential city network.

In recent years there has also emerged numerous urban programmes or city initiatives created by global organizations. Here again, the scope and objectives vary: at the UN, they often serve as consultative bodies, such as the Local Governments and Municipal Authorities (LGMA) major group at the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and UNACLA (UN Advisory Committee of Local Authorities) at UN Habitat. In some cases, city programmes are created to support the implementation of a global mission at the local level: a few examples are the OECD Champion Mayors for Inclusive Growth Initiative, the UNESCO Creative Cities Network, or the Global Sustainable Cities Platform created by the Global Environment Facility (GEF). Even the exclusive G20 and G7 are starting to think 'urban': in 2016, the G7, under Japanese presidency, organized for the first time a session between mayors and Ministers of Environment; and in 2018, Mayors will make their entrance in the G20 process with the launch of Urban 20 as part of the Argentinian G20 Presidency, created by the Mayor of Buenos Aires and with the blessings of President Mauricio Macri, the former Mayor of Buenos Aires.

It is however important to distinguish between urban programmes created by international organizations, some of them to work *with* cities, some of them to work *on* or *in* cities, and the associations of cities or city networks like UCLG, ICLEI or C40, created *by* municipal governments, and governed by them. These are two different groups with different models in terms of governance, mission and accountability.

*Summits and campaigns as accelerators of political engagement*
Another highly visible form of glocalization is the multiplication of international mayors Summits and city conferences. While every city network convenes its membership on a recurrent basis (every two years for C40, every three years for UCLG and ICLEI), it seems that most global conferences now provide an opportunity for mayors to join, to showcase

their urban activities, advocate and influence other stakeholders including national governments.

Mayors Summits are important moments in city diplomacy, as they send strong signals of political engagement around a common message, and capture impressive images of mass mobilization of mayors. The Climate Summit for Local Leaders held at the Paris City Hall on December 4, 2015, with more than 400 mayors and around 1.000 local elected officials, can be seen as the paradigm for this new, celebratory form of global city participation. According to Christiana Figueres, this powerful moment had an influence on the adoption of the Paris Agreement by the UN a few days later,[3] and it might be to reproduce this experience that there are now city tracks in all sorts of fora – from the very exclusive annual World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland to the trendy South by South West Festival in Austin, Texas.

Equally important to the displays of mayoral unity described above are the final declarations, statements, calls for action and commitments concluding such events. They constitute a »written picture« of the political debate at one point in time with their specific terms and signatories and as such are key milestones in the process of shaping up the global debate on a specific issue. Most of the declarations, campaigns and announcements are developed specifically for the occasion of those events, making them effective accelerators of action.

Summits also offer unique opportunities for mayors to meet each other in person and listen to their peers. Inspiration, peer-to-peer exchange and gaining recognition as a global leader are some of the most important drivers of political action in the world of »glocalism«, as described extensively in the next part of this article. However, in the digital age, mayors do not necessarily need to travel to engage politically or to build relationships with their peers. Both traditional and social media as well as new communication platforms offer them a myriad of ways to participate remotely, voice their opinions through »op-eds«, engage in »global conversations« on Twitter, launch or support online campaigns and petitions, collect political support from citizens or peers and measure their influence in numbers of »followers« and »impressions«.

*Balancing local and global priorities*
Global engagement will of course never outperform in number or in political attention the demands coming from the community, and a Mayor is likely to always prioritize the local agenda over global interests. That being said, it is clear that global activity has become a new normal in most city halls, at least in big cities. Most local governments now have dedicated international affairs departments and have established some sort of international strategy. Their size, relevance, and capacity varies greatly from city to city and is often highly dependent on the interest of the Mayor and his/her wish to engage globally on a specific political issue.[4]

An illustrative example could be seen when Gustavo Petro was elected Mayor of Bogotá in 2012 and he named a high-profile candidate as Director of International Affairs, who went on to recruit a large and skilled team of urban diplomats, raising Bogotá's capacity to act on the global arena to an unprecedented level for local government in Colombia. The strategy of internationalization »Bogotá Global« was designed to mobilize global support for the Mayor's political agenda centered on peace, human rights, attention to victims of the Colombian armed conflict, fight against corruption and inequality and climate change. As a result, during these years the city of Bogotá became an active local government in the global climate discussions, convening two international climate summits in 2012

and 2015, leading on the C40 Clean Bus Declaration[5] and hosting the UCLG World Congress in 2016.

## C40 Cities – what holds the global network together?

To further investigate some of the key factors motivating mayors to engage globally, we will look closer at one of the most active city networks to examine on a case basis what is the glue that holds the network together and why do cities invest resources in global network activity?

### *What is C40?*

C40 has been around for about 12 years and is one of the more recent networks of cities to have emerged on the global arena, but representing 96 of the world's largest cities and more than a quarter of the global economy measured in GDP, it has nevertheless established itself as a fast growing and influential city organization. C40's focus is climate change, and it enables its member cities to exchange best practice examples of how to advance policies that most effectively addresses the impacts and causes of global warming e.g. through reducing Green House Gasses (GHG) in municipal energy, transportation and waste systems.

C40 has no membership, but the network is only open to a category of Megacities (with a population of 3 million inhabitants or more within its metropolitan area) and a smaller group of 'Innovator cities', which due to their exceptional track record in climate action has been approved as C40 member cities by the 17 mayors which make up C40's Steering Committee. To remain within C40, member cities must comply with a number of Participation Standards which determine a minimum level of network activity and climate policy ambition for C40 cities e.g. they must set targets to reduce their GHG emissions and report annually on their progress. Cities that do not comply can be moved into an 'Inac-

tive' membership category which limits their opportunities to get access to C40 support and technical assistance. Ultimately they can have their membership annulled.[6]

With no direct monetary costs in connection to their C40 membership, it could seem self-evident that cities would be interested in joining the network and get engaged in C40 activities. But as noted previously in this article, it was once seen as paradoxical that mayors should be working on issues outside their constituencies, and engagement with C40 is not without political risks and resource implications. It is not unusual for mayors to face criticism at home if they are seen as prioritizing global engagements and the C40 participation standards prevents cities from staying within the C40 network if they and their staff are not willing to invest the time and resource needed to participate. Why then, do mayors and cities find it to be in their interest to engage actively in C40?

### *C40 as a catalyst for resources*

Generally, it is presumed that cities will be active within global city networks because it creates value for them and provides them with certain resources, that they would otherwise not get access to (or at least not as easily). It is therefore worth understanding the types of support that cities can access through C40.

In C40, these resources are essentially *catalytic*. As a network organization, C40 enables cities to learn from each other and support each other in achieving their climate goals and objectives. Where other types of organizations such as certain NGOs provide direct support to cities e.g. through project grants, in C40 the majority of programmes and initiatives are centered on peer-to-peer activities.

C40 operates more than 15 thematic networks within areas such as buildings and energy, transportation and waste management where groups of 20-35 city officials connect virtu-

ally as well as in-person to exchange their experience with developing and implementing climate change related policies and actions. In C40 networks the advice is not coming directly from a group of external experts, rather C40 catalyzes such advice by bringing city officials together with peers from other cities that have already found solutions to the problems they are trying to tackle. And by creating a frame in which such an exchange can happen regularly and systematically and with mechanisms to follow up on results. The network exchange can be very detailed and specific to particular types of action, such as 'Bus Rapid Transit' solutions or sustainable food systems.

Even where C40 does offer more direct technical assistance to cities it will often involve a strong peer-to-peer component. For example, C40's flagship 'Deadline2020' programme,[7] which provides technical assistance to cities to develop climate action plans that are aligned with the Paris Agreement's target to limit global warming to 1.5 degrees, started as a group of 8 cities working collaboratively to develop a common climate action planning framework.[8] And the C40 Cities Finance Facility (CFF) which aims at supporting cities to get access to finance for climate change initiatives, does not carry means to directly fund city projects. Instead, it assists cities in the process of seeking funding from other and larger global economic institutions by helping cities with preparing professional proposals and project descriptions.

In recent years, there is a growing tendency also in C40 to offer direct technical assistance to cities, especially in initiatives where C40 is aiming to support the dissemination of a particular, global standard or methodology. Still, as demonstrated by the above examples, C40 support for cities is generally catalytic in kind and C40 cities are always both receiving and providing resources when partaking in C40 activities.

*C40 as a catalyst for recognition*
It is therefore interesting to investigate another characteristic of C40, which might help explain why cities are increasingly engaging in network activities on the global arena. For mayors, C40 provides an opportunity to engage with other city leaders which are recognized as *peers*, and where exchange and comparisons of ideas can bring great insights and inspiration. Through C40, a mayor will understand what are the solutions that in cities of similar size and importance have proven effective and could potentially be replicated. As expressed by C40 chair Anne Hidalgo: »*As Mayors we often face similar challenge and have to innovate to solve them, often in the same ways. The C40 network connects us all, enabling us to share ideas and knowledge*«.

C40 cities will often find that they have more in common with other cities in the global network than with cities within their country. For example, a city like Copenhagen might find it more meaningful to engage with another Nordic capital city such as Stockholm or with a city like Vancouver, which in size, economic opportunities and the level of climate ambition is a suitable benchmark. The same is true of the rapidly growing megacities of Sub-Saharan Africa which share many similarities and find meaningful comparisons with the fast growing cities in South and West Asia for example in terms of managing urban growth and building economic opportunities for the rising number of urban dwellers.[9]

C40 is enabling these city comparisons in a number of different ways. Firstly, by developing and helping to proliferate global city standards in measuring, planning and reporting on city climate action, so cities can benchmark their performance against that of other C40 cities. For example, through the active support to cities adopting the global GPC standard for measuring their GHG emissions. Secondly, C40's data driven approach

requires that cities report annually on their climate action performance and the information is disclosed publicly (though sometimes in anonymised and aggregate form) through C40 publications like the Climate Action in Megacities Reports.[10] The levels of city participation in C40 is scored every 6 months and the highest scoring cities (3 cities per region) are announced on C40's website. Thirdly, C40 actively encourages the recognition of the most innovative and ambitious climate actions in cities for example though its annual »Cities Climate Leadership Awards« and also through reporting on city best practice in the Cities100 report.[11]

An interesting characteristic of the ways in which cities seek recognition and even »compete« through C40 is that it is *productive*, in the sense that what seems to give cities opportunities to position themselves favorably vis-à-vis their peers is the high level of ambition they display in their climate action. International climate change negotiations have sometimes resembled a zero sum game where the risk of some participants free-riding on the willingness of others to make difficult climate choices can act as a barrier to action. City engagement through C40 is more like a »race to the top« where cities »compete« to be amongst the first to adopt the most ambitious climate policies. An example is the Fossil Fuel Free Streets Declaration where four cities pioneered an initiative to turn parts of their city center into »Fossil Fuels Free zones« by 2030 – e.g. by banning Diesel powered vehicles.[12] This initiative was then followed by a group of cities and today 14 cities have made this commitment. Not seeing all 96 C40 cities committing to this from the beginning did not prevent the initial four cities making such a pledge. On the contrary it might have added to the attraction that not all cities where willing or able to adopt such a policy.

But recognition does not only come from peers and is not only a benchmarking exer-

cise. City networks like C40 also provide advocacy platforms for mayors and city governments to gain recognition from national governments and other global stakeholders. Formal recognition is pursued through the mention of »all levels of governments« in the preamble of the Paris Agreement, the Article 34 of the Addis Ababa Agenda for Action, or the reference to the »World Assembly of Local Leaders« in the New Urban Agenda (Klaus and Singer, 2018). Cities also seek more informal recognition as global climate leaders and the acknowledgement of the importance of cities in driving the transformational change needed in the world today e.g. to tackle climate change, poverty and health issues.[13] The way cities are included in the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda adopted in 2015 is a good example of those two steps of recognition: while cities are formally included in the Sustainable Development Goals through SDG#11, their social contribution to the achievement of all other SDGs is championed by UCLG through a global campaign for the »localization of the development agenda«.

*The power of 'closed' social relationships*
C40's effectiveness as a catalyst for resources and recognition also stems from the fact that C40 as a city network is exclusive on a number of levels. Being open only to Megacities (and a select group of Innovator cities) and with an expansion strategy which limits the maximum number of C40 cities to around 100, C40 is a city network where access is restricted for most cities.

C40 is what Max Weber would characterize as a *closed social relationship*, defined by its exclusion of outsiders based on binding rules and as opposed to *open social relationships* that do not deny participation to anyone. Weber observes that a principle motive for closure of relationships are »*the maintenance of quality often combined with the interest in prestige and the consequent opportunity*

*to enjoy honor*« (Weber, 1978: 44). In C40, exclusivity is expressed in the thematic networks described above, which are deliberately kept as closed door gatherings for a limited number of 20 to 35 C40 city officials considered as experts in their area to ensure the *quality* of discussions and the depth and value of the knowledge exchange between city officials.

Another expression of this dynamic is the C40 Steering Committee, which as the formal decision making body in C40 is setting the strategic direction for the organization. Steering Committee mayors are expected to actively participate in meetings three times per year (with one meeting being an in-person meeting) and to represent C40 in the global climate change arena. In spite of such requirements, steering committee seats are most often fought for in a competitive process, which is determined by vote, as being on C40's steering committee comes with the *prestige* of being among a small, peer-selected group.[14]

As a network of the greatest cities of the world, the mayors admitted in it are poised to be the most powerful and high-visibility leaders of their constituency, and are getting access to an extensive »social capital«. In this context, it is not hard to imagine the appeal for any politician to join this club for the benefits it brings in terms of raising their political profile, both locally and globally, but also, and perhaps more importantly, nationally. In the past decade, several C40 Steering Committee mayors moved on to become leaders in their countries (e.g. President Mauricio Macri in Argentina, President Joko Widodo in Indonesia), or at the UN (Mike Bloomberg as Special Envoy of the UNSG for Global Climate Action).

## Climate change catalysing global city leadership

Many city networks to emerge in the past 15-20 years are focused on climate change. Unlikely to being coincidental, to bring the recent growth of international city collaboration into perspective we will end by suggesting a few reasons why climate change seems to be such a strong driver of city collaboration and global city leadership. On the one hand, it is a global challenge of enormous magnitude where the actions of one city can seem like a drop in the ocean. On the other hand, Climate change seems to bind cities together by a shared challenge.

*Filling the void of National leadership*
For years, cities have been filling the void left by nation states, which have not always been displaying firm and uniform support of climate action. In 2005, the Mayor of London Ken Livingstone, receiving a G20 Summit in his city, was shocked to observe that climate change was not even on the G20 agenda. In response, he invited 20 of his fellow mayors of the greatest cities of the world to discuss the issue. C40 was born. During the following decade, as the climate intergovernmental discussion got stranded in a sterile North/South opposition, mayors progressively intensified climate actions in their cities, illustrating strongly the idea that »while Nation talks, cities act«. In parallel, their engagement in the climate talks increased exponentially, from 30 mayors at COP13 in Bali, to 100 in Copenhagen in 2009, to 1.000 at COP21 in Paris in 2015.[15] Another example is what happened in the US in 2017 when a large number of US mayors came out against President Donald Trump's decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement. Under the flags of 'Climate Mayors', 'We are Still in' and 'America's Pledge', 350 US mayors committed publicly to uphold the Paris Agreement and deliver their share of the US contribution to the Paris Agreement (Pinault and Cavicchioli, 2017).

But recent developments in city diplomacy have transcended such oppositions. In this ten-year long journey of climate advocacy, ci-

ties have crossed a number of symbolic frontiers towards recognition, from the outside to the inside,[16] and from the status of observers to actors, particularly thanks to the creation in 2014 of the 'Action Agenda', now called Marrakech Partnership on Global Climate Action, where both Nations and Non-State Actors meet to exchange on joint solutions for climate mitigation and adaptation, under the leadership of UNFCCC.

Indeed, it is more accurate to see cities and nations as separate but collaborating entities working towards the shared goal of delivering against the objectives of the Paris Agreement. Cities might be acting at a quicker pace than most nation states, but they are following the direction set by nation states when they agreed on the Paris Accord on Climate Change. In recent years, there are also examples of cities and Nation states working together to advance the climate agenda. The Danish Government announced the Partnering for Green Growth and Global Goals initiative in New York City in September 2017 with C40 as a key partner alongside the global think thank WRI and a number of »hub-countries« such as Mexico, Ethiopia and South Korea. In China, the national government is relying on cities to deliver its national targets, and have identified a number of Chinese megacities as »Peaking Pioneer Cities« with a clear mandate to reach the peak point of the GHG emissions well before 2030, which is the national target.

*The Impacts of Climate Change are felt in every city*
Another reason that climate change mobilizes mayors on the global stage could have to do with the fact, that every city across the globe face the consequences of global warming, and that it is a growing concern for urban populations. Cities are for historical reasons often situated close to waterways, river deltas or natural harbors where goods and people can be transported by boat, as this was the primary means of transportation before motorized vehicles or airplanes. Cities are therefore often vulnerable to the risk of flooding, and C40 research has demonstrated that more than 70 pct. of C40 cities have already felt the impact of climate change.[17]

Due to the vulnerability of cities, urban dwellers will often have an incentive to demand from their leaders that they act on the climate related risks, and that they aim hard to manage urban growth so cities become environmentally sustainable, healthy and »liveable«. Unlike traditional diplomacy, which is often the work of diplomats negotiating behind closed doors, city diplomacy is to a larger extent driven by citizens' concerns, as mayors and city officials have no choice but to be transparent about their global engagement.

**Conclusion: Mayors engaging in the global stage – what for?**
In this article, we have looked at the growth and development of global city engagement and city diplomacy bringing mayors firmly onto the global stage. And we have noted that mayors are increasingly prioritizing global action, even if it could seem counterintuitive when considering that their responsibility is firmly rooted in the locality of the city. We have looked at the various forms and expressions of global city leadership, and focussed on the C40 network as a case to understand what holds city networks together, and why climate change is such a powerful cause for mayors to engage globally. At the end of our reflections, it appears that cities and mayors engage at the global level in order to achieve four objectives:

1. To gain access to *resources* to advance their political agendas »at home«. This includes the opportunity to learn from peers and take inspiration from their most innovative climate initiatives, as well as direct support, for instance in the form of technical assistance to implement global

standards on measuring emissions and planning for their reduction, or finance through grants. We also noted that resources generated through the C40 network are catalytic and that C40 cities are always both giving and receiving support when engaging in the network.

2. To get *recognition* from their peers and from other constituencies. C40 connects cities of similar size and importance and as such provide opportunities for mayors to benchmark themselves against comparable cities. Mayors will thereby gain a better understanding of what it takes to be a global leader and what makes their cities attractive as venues for global investments, talents and economic opportunities. Collective recognition, both legal and social, is another powerful driver of global engagement.

3. To fill the void of leadership at the National level and to push for ambition, reasons particularly relevant for city climate diplomacy.

4. Finally, to be empowered by the *exclusiveness of the C40 network*, which raise the status of membership by defining a number of binding Participation Standards. Status is also achieved through electing a leadership of Steering Committee mayors (C40 vice chairs) from within the group. As such, C40 resembles a club, where membership admission and obligations are determined by club members.

We hope those ideas will inspire researchers to go deeper into the notion of glocalization outlined here. To this end, here are a few final hints from a practitioners' viewpoint: while there is a need for continuing to explore the role and influence of cities in shaping global agendas, perhaps the most urgent task in this field is to start working on the impact of global engagement at the local level, and study the benefits of city diplomacy on the local policy development and implementation. This, jointly with training and capacity-building for the new »glocal leaders« in city halls all around the world, will be key to maintain meaningful and impactful engagement of cities on the global stage in the years to come, for the benefits of their citizens and the planet.

## Notes

1. Simon Hansen is the Director of Regions at C40 since 2014, and previously from 2006 to 2013 held various positions in the City of Copenhagen including head of its »city development« department and Chief of Staff of the Lord Mayor Frank Jensen of Copenhagen. Emmanuelle Pinault was Senior Adviser for International Affairs to the Mayor of Bogotá Gustavo Petro, and leads C40 City Diplomacy Programme since 2015.

2. The term »glocal« is a contraction of 'global' and 'local' and describes the engagement of local leaders on global processes. It is now commonly used among practitioners in the City Diplomacy field.

3. »*When I saw all the Mayors gathered at Paris City Hall on the 4th of December 2015, I knew COP21 would be a success.*« Christiana Figueres, former UNFCCC Executive Secretary, interviewed by Vanessa Hauc, December 2016, Mexico City.

4. For an extensive typology of institutional forms of paradiplomacy, see Tavares (2016).

5. The C40 Clean Bus Declaration, launched in Buenos Aires in March 2015 under the leadership of London and Bogota, was an unprecedented action by cities, documenting the growing city interest in adopting clean bus technologies, as well as providing data that illustrates the global market potential for manufacturers. 26 cities signed it in 2015 and 2016.

6. At the time of writing this article 7 C40 cities were in the Inactive membership category.

7. The program gets its name from the report by C40 and Arup: »Deadline 2020 – How Cities Will get the Job Done«, London 2015. The report provides a comprehensive analysis of the contribution C40 cities can make to delivering the Paris Agreement objective of limiting global warming to 1.5 degrees.

8. See C40's Climate Action Planning Framework https://resourcecentre.c40.org which describes the process that led to its development, including workshops involving the 8 pilot cities: Paris,

London, New York City, Los Angeles, Boston, Mexico City, Durban and Melbourne.

9. Peer-to-peer learning is also common between cities in the global north and in the global south. For example, many global north cities have taken inspiration from the Chinese cities which are leading the transition to 100% electric bus fleets, and cities from the global north has also been looking for inspiring examples of waste and green finance initiatives in Global south cities such as Cape Town.

10. See for instance the latest version of the Climate Action in Megacities report, C40 Cities and Arup, 2015. http://www.cam3.c40.org/images/C40ClimateActionInMegacities3.pdf

11. http://sustainiaworld.com/cities/

12. https://www.c40.org/other/fossil-fuel-free-streets-declaration

13. An interesting example is the Novo Nordisk initiative »Cities Changing Diabetes« which aims at addressing the growing diabetes numbers in global megacities.

14. C40's Steering Committee consists of 17 mayors and is chaired by a C40 mayor elected by C40 cities for a two-year term (with an opportunity for a one-year extension). In each of C40's 7 regions cities vote for two cities to represent them on the C40 Steering Committee. There are no permanent members, nor any fixed rotation of seats. Mayors remain on the Steering Committee until their term as mayor expires and they face potential re-election in their city, at which time they must step down (but are free to run for re-election for the C40 Steering Committee if they are successful in securing another term as mayor).

15. For the complete timeline and detailed milestones of the Local Governments Climate Roadmap coordinated by ICLEI between 2007 and 2015, visit: http://www.iclei.org/index.php?id=1197

16. Marcelo Ebrard, former Mayor of Mexico City, and leader of the Mexico Pact on Climate Change (2010), often noted that he was not allowed to enter the negotiation space ('blue zone') at COP16 in Cancun in 2010. Indeed, the first official dialogue between Mayors and Ministers of Environment during a COP happened at COP19 in Warsaw in 2013. The Climate Summit convened by UNSG Ban-Ki Moon at the UN Headquarters in NYC in September 2014 mobilized Mayors and other public and private leaders. At the first 'Action Day' held at COP20 in Lima in December 2014 the Lima-Paris-Action-Agenda, now Marrakech Partnership on Global Climate Action, was inaugurated as a permanent forum for Parties and Non-Party stakeholders (including cities) to showcase progress in the official ('in') COP agenda.

17. https://issuu.com/c40cities/docs/cam_3.0_2015

## References

Acuto, Michele (2016), *Give Cities A Seat At The Top Table,* Nature, Vol. 537.

Acuto, Michele et al. (2018), *Towards City Diplomacy: Assessing Capacity In Several Global Cities*, Chicago Council on Global Affairs

Barber, Benjamin (2013), *If Mayors Ruled the World: Dysfunctional Nations, Rising Cities*, Yale University Press

Boston University, Initiative on Cities (2018), *Cities Joining Ranks – Policy Networks on the Rise*

Klaus, Ian and Singer Russel*, (2018), Local Authorities in Four Frameworks*, Penn Institute for Urban Research.

Pinault, Emmanuelle and Cavicchioli Agathe (2017), *Trump's Withdrawal from the Paris Agreement Shines Light on City Climate Leadership*, in University of Southern California, *Public Diplomacy Magazine*, Issue 18 »City Diplomacy«.

Tavares, Rodrigo, (2016), *Paradiplomacy: Cities and States as Global Players*, Oxford University Press

University of Southern California (2017), *Public Diplomacy Magazine*, Issue 18 »City Diplomacy.«

Weber, Max (1978), *Economy and Society*, Berkeley.