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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.”

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]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda setting (framing)</th>
<th>Monitoring Framing by dominant mission of initiating IO</th>
<th>Media as an MNC</th>
<th>Monitoring, publicity</th>
<th>monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rule making/negotiations</td>
<td>Drafting, voting rules</td>
<td>Lobbying, private governance</td>
<td>Lobbying, information sharing with delegations</td>
<td>Drafting, framing, consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enforcement</td>
<td>Verification formal legal provisions (rarely)</td>
<td>Capacity building (DFI, technology, overall econ growth)</td>
<td>Verification, shaming Direct observation and training (TRAFFIC)</td>
<td>Training officials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
  – 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Percentage of Annual Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>3.1 billion $ (2007-2010)</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF, WFP &amp; Specialized Agencies</td>
<td>423.5 million $ (2004)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>265.8 million (2006-2008)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 global MEAs administered by UNEP &amp; RAMSAR</td>
<td>66.3 million $ (2006)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other MEAs (UNESCO, IMO, UNFCCC and UNCCD)</td>
<td>81.4 million/year (2006-2007)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOF</td>
<td>400.4 million $ (2006-2009)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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?