

Addressing the Global Governance Deficit

Peter M. Haas

at

European Summer School on Earth
System Governance

The argument in brief

- There is an emergent form of global environmental governance, or at least international
- It is potentially superior to existing forms of governance
- We don't fully understand it, and more research is necessary
- UN reform efforts in light of these changes

Ontology of Earth Systems

- Complexity
- Nonlinear behavior
- Tipping points

Ontology of Governance

- Diffusion of actors
- Change of expectations regarding state behavior (principled sovereignty persists, practical sovereignty changes in terms of representation and expectations)
- Globalization fosters networks
- Emergence of networked governance, multiple functions of governance performed by different actors. Question is mapping this, and assessing performance
- Slaughter, Simon, Axelrod, Jervis, Zuern, Perrow

Core Puzzle of Global Environmental Governance



- How to achieve meaningful governance that is able to take account of the biophysical realities of environmental systems?

Global Governance

- “A purposeful order that emerges from institutions, processes, norms, formal agreements, and informal mechanisms that regulate action for a common good. Global governance encompasses activity at the international, transnational, and regional levels, and refers to activities in the public and private sectors that transcend national boundaries.”
- K. Benedict 2001 “Global Governance” International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences p 6232

Multilevel Networked Governance

- Functions of governance
- Who performs functions of governance
- Key organizational principles
 - Networked
 - Diffused
 - Coordinated
- **Decentralized but not disjointed**

Components of Governance

- Agenda setting/framing (monitoring, conferences, publicity)
- Rule making (negotiations, conferences)
- Enforcement (verification, capacity building)

Participants in Governance

- States
- NGOs
- Scientists/epistemic communities
- IOs
- Private sector

Models of Governance

- Theoretical models
 - Hierarchy
 - Anarchy
 - Negarchy (Deudney)
 - bureaucracy
 - Networks (horizontal)
 - Multi-level networks (horizontal and vertical: EU, two level games) [we still need the state as a target for campaigns and accountability, otherwise too diffuse]

	IOs	MNCs	NGOs	Scientists/ epicoms
Agenda setting (framing)	Monitoring Framing by dominant mission of initiatilizing IO	Media as an MNC	Monitoring, publicity	monitoring
Rule making/negotiations	Drafting, voting rules	Lobbying, private governance	Lobbying, information sharing with delegations	Drafting, framing, consulting
enforcement	Verification Formal legal provisions (rarely) Capacity building (financial transfers, equipment, training)	Capacity building (DFI, technology, overall econ growth)	Verification, shaming Direct observation and training (TRAFFIC)	Training officials

Appraising Models, insights from Organizational theory

- Networks are more resilient, robust, efficient
- Decentralized information rich systems are the best design for addressing highly complex and tightly-coupled problems
- Concerns about redundancy of nodes are exaggerated or wrong (Landau)
- Networks work better than bureaucracies for complex issues, but not simple ones
- Networks engage actors within a dense array of reciprocal obligations and constraints. Effectiveness varies
- Hierarchy and singular bureaucracies (WEO) not flexible, or resilient.

What is the governance deficit?

- Not democratic deficit
- Not the disconnect between standard models and emergent earth system governance (holism and reductionism)
- Administrative notion, between actual and potential effectiveness of current arrangements

Discussions of Reform

- 12 UNEP UN based reform initiatives since 1997 (Andresen)
- Major academic literature
 - Najam et al Global Environmental Governance IISD 2006
 - Chambers & Green eds Reforming International Environmental Governance UNU 2005
 - Biermann & Bauer eds A World Environment Organization Ashgate 2005
 - Kanie and Haas eds Emerging Forces in International Environmental Governance UNU 2004

Major Options

- Upgrade UNEP (France)
- WEO (Germany)
- Functional reorganization (Von Moltke)
- Emphasize networks (Haas)

Constraints/Gaps/Deficits on Networked Governance

- Geographic range of headquarters
 - Geneva 11; London 9; Vienna 4; Rome 4; Montreal 3; Bonn 3
- Financial resources available for governance
 - ODA is 50% of A21 or MDG targets
 - GEF eclipses other available multilateral env funding
 - [see next slide]
- Geographic scope of arrangements and networks

Conclusion

- Improve information nodes
- Further research on the performance of decentralized governance functions
- More thinking about synergies between actor groups in performance of governance functions

Multilateral Resources for Environment (\$1.636 B/yr)
operational activities only

derived from Tadanori Inomata presentation Paris Conference for
Global Ecological Governance 2-3 February 2007

GEF	3.1 billion \$ (2007-2010) 50% of annual resources
UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF, WFP & Specialized Agencies	423.5 million \$ (2004) 25% of annual resources
UNEP	265.8 million (2006-2008) 8% of annual resources
9 global MEAs administered by UNEP & RAMSAR	66.3 million \$ (2006) 8% of annual resources
Other MEAs (UNESCO, IMO, UNFCCC and UNCCD)	81.4 million/year (2006-2007) 6% of annual resources
MOF	400.4 million \$ (2006-2009) 5 % of annual resources

Questions About Governance

- Need social systems reproduce principled rules of physical systems?
- Are all environmental problems equally interconnected (Does the 'environment' require one governance system or can there be several?)
- What are the appropriate measures of governance efficiency?