

## Global Public Policy Networks

### *Methods for Authors of the GPP Project*

- I. Overview
- II. Concept and Key Reference Terms
- III. Organization of the Case Studies
- IV. Visualization
- V. Length
- VI. Timetable
- VII. References

### **Overview**

The purpose of the individual case studies that form the heart of the report (briefly discussed in the cover letter) is to examine the successes and failures of trisectoral public-private partnerships or coalitions (ideally tri-sectoral, in some cases bi-sectoral) in addressing global challenges. To broaden the perspective of the report, we have decided to also select a few cases from local/national/regional levels. Note, that although some of the cases might not be trisectoral throughout the entire policy cycle they nevertheless conform to our definition of global public policy networks.

Due to the narrow timeframe and the practical, policy-oriented nature of the report, we ask that all authors work closely within the conceptual framework and follow the roster laid out below. Obviously, if you feel that the roster grossly neglects an important dimension critical to the operation of any or your particular network, you should (a) alert us and (b) include it in the analysis. However, only by sticking to a relatively consistent structure can we use individual cases for a comparative analysis. The project aims to explain the similarities and variations in global public policy-making across different problem areas; to draw out the lessons learned; and to consider policy implications for upgrading existing GPP networks or mobilizing new ones. Only then can the report serve as a useful resource and tool for the UN and other IOs. Only then can these organizations determine if, when and how they can best facilitate and support the emergence and maintenance of GPP networks, e.g., by ensuring open and easy access; by providing resources such as finance and knowledge; and eventually by promoting implementation of the outcomes that have been agreed upon in the networks.

Thus, while the importance of the ultimate **substantive** outcome of a GPP network should not be neglected, the principal focus of this study is the **process**, the **procedural** outcome, that both precedes any substantive outcome and subsequently shapes its implementation. Given the current lack of understanding of GPP processes themselves, a close look at the process seems vital both from a theoretical and policy-oriented

perspective. Indeed, unless the process is considered a success by critical stakeholders, no tangible outcomes (usually a compromise) can ever emerge in today's global reality. The MAI is a case in point. Notwithstanding the fact that some stakeholders would consider recent developments a success, this study would not, and thus would highlight the mistakes that characterized the process.

The study has two broad objectives to which it attaches different priorities, with implications for project management and the timeframe:

- *First* and most important, the immediate goal is to produce a GPP "learning diary," which forms one pillar of the UN report. Such a diary should discuss experiences of network initiation and management; highlight conditions critical for success or failure during setup and negotiation; consider the legitimacy and accountability of GPP networks; and describe --if any—the challenges of implementation, as well as other elements such as formal vs. informal processes that define the complex architecture and dynamics of GPP. The immediate audience is the UN system (Secretariat and specialized agencies), its senior officials and other IOs, though surely this should be of interest to stakeholders in the networks as well.
- *Second*, following on from the report, your case study should contribute to an edited volume of (mostly) trisectoral policy networks. To our knowledge, this has not been done and is a timely and useful task that we want to accomplish with the edited volume in the hopes of stimulating further research in this area. Virtually all of the issue areas we have chosen are topics of widespread concern. The case studies would offer an analysis of these issues with a particular emphasis on process and practice pointing to alternative and novel approaches to address global challenges. As such, there will be time to revise and adapt your case study for a more formal academic publication after the report has been submitted to the UN.

## **Concept and Key Reference Terms**

We have included a set of short readings that discuss the key *concept* of GPP both in its earlier form and in more recent incarnations. We ask you to read these carefully and hope that they provide sufficient background for you to fulfill your task. No doubt the concept can be improved and updated. We plan to do just that for the edited volume and hope to rely on your input. Of course we are ready to answer any additional questions that you might have. Under no circumstances should you hesitate to contact us.

In order to successfully utilize the case studies, we need all authors to share a common understanding of some key concepts.

### 1) Global Governance

Governance is a term borrowed from public policy theories. The OECD defines governance as "*the use of political authority and exercise of control in society in relation to the management of its resources for social and economic development.*" (OECD 1993: 14). Thus governance originally emerged as a concept within the context of domestic politics. Until now, its use in the field of international relations often remains unspecified or indefinite (Smouts 1998: 81; Jessop 1998: 29). Building on the research of James Rosenau and others, this research project argues that it is useful to think of international and transnational politics in terms of global governance (Rosenau/ Czempiel 1992; Zürn, 1998; Jessop 1998; Senarclens 1998; Rosenau 1995; Commission on Global Governance) instead of mere inter-state cooperation and domestic politics. Whereas formerly scholars of IR defined international co-operation mainly in terms of intergovernmental regimes (see Krasner 1983), it is fair to argue that we have entered an era of multi-level governance in which non-state actors come into play at all levels. Globalization, it can be argued, is a process that requires new approaches toward governance that go beyond the sum of intergovernmental cooperation. A "global public policy" is needed that complements domestic politics and traditional international cooperation. Such a "global public policy" is conceptualized as a process that transcends traditional multilateralism and involves governmental actors/international organizations, non-profits, and the for-profit sector in trisectoral networks.

## 2) Global Public Policy (the process)

A global public policy transfers elements of internal sovereignty (governance) from its formal territorial foundation (the nation-state) and institutional environment (the government). This, however, presumes that sovereignty in its operational sense (and, as a consequence, also in its formal dimension) can be detached from the concept of the nation-state. The basic idea behind this strategy is that political actors in nation-states have to cooperate with other actors and institutions by forming networks possibly better suited to fulfill these tasks. This means the sharing of operational sovereignty among different levels and actors. The relationship to the classical understanding of "subsidiarity," as it is known primarily in the European Union, is no coincidence. It is important to note, however, that the term "subsidiarity" is used here in a much broader sense: The prefix "sub" no longer refers only to the traditional narrow spatial context of policymaking at a lower or higher organizational level, which can be labeled vertical subsidiarity. Rather, it is applied in a functional sense, referring to actors and institutions that are in the best position to guarantee a successful operationalization of internal sovereignty. This broader definition includes non-state actors (profit and nonprofit), in effect applying *horizontal* (network) as well as *vertical* (hierarchy) subsidiarity in the process of governance.

### 3) Global Public Policy Networks (GPPNs)

The global public policy approach seeks to apply the network concept at a global level. The network concept has been used extensively for the analysis of domestic and regional politics (van Waarden 1992; Rhodes 1997; Thatcher 1998) and helps us to understand not only formal institutional arrangements but also highly complex informal relationships in the policy process. Global public policy networks are one answer to the enormous demand for cooperation, coordination and communication created by the multiplicity of actors in global politics. They could also potentially provide an answer to the growing problem of accountability and legitimacy in international/transnational politics. Furthermore, GPPNs may provide a forum in which a more equal representation of women in key decision-making positions could be achieved as compared to traditional hierarchical models of international cooperation.

GPPNs fill an organizational deficit/vacuum in the global public space (*see below*) and create global social capital (*see below*). They create bridges on a global scale between governments and non-state actors, including profit (enterprises) and nonprofit organizations (NGOs), to:

- reflect the changing balance of power among them;
- pull diverse resources together; and
- address issues that no group can resolve by itself in a sustainable fashion.

They generate a *tri-sectoral* stakeholder perspective that transcends the participating organizations' values and visions. They create a forum for defining best practices, standards and norms that critical stakeholders identify with and make a commitment to implement. In most cases, GPPNs do not provide global public goods, but ensure that there is a process for doing so.

### 4) Soft Law

To garner credibility and trust, and eventually success, global public policy networks must also be embedded in an international legal context. In this context, so-called Non-Binding International Legal Agreements (or soft law) can and do play a crucial role in establishing public-private partnerships -- the institutional foundation of global public policy networks. Following Bernhardt, soft laws are defined as "*rules which are neither strictly binding nor completely void of any legal significance.*" (Bernhardt 1984: 62). Important in this context is that NBILAs can take a wide variety of forms, but are not subject to national ratification. Multinational codes of conduct as promoted by the OECD and the ILO are examples, as well as the Basle Accord on banking regulation.

NBILAs are thus understood as tools that state and non-state actors choose to strengthen and sustain the operability of internal sovereignty in a non-territorial space – namely, global public policy-making. The fact that NBILAs, in principle, permit the integration of

all interested parties in a process of transnational law-making is one of their major advantages compared to the structures and politics of traditional hard law-making. Moreover, NBILAs do not require the ceding of formal sovereignty.

### 5) Global Public Space

Assuming that further globalization requires a growing number of public policy issues to be addressed on a transnational level, the process of global public policy-making has to be embedded in a global public space. This global public space would allow for open discourse and facilitate public exchange on political issues of a transboundary nature and ensure open access and participation for all those affected and concerned. . Whereas some observers argue that the proliferation of global media and increasing interaction between the different actors on different levels (also propelled by technological advances in communication) has already constituted such a space, we maintain that this global public sphere is still very shallow. Global public policy networks may provide a forum and help foster cross-border policy debates, thereby deepening the emerging global public space. This project is interested in the extent to which existing networks have been accompanied by cross-border public debates, the role modern technology (e.g., e-mail, the Internet) has played in the debates, and how open these debates were (insiders-outsiders; elite-oriented/technocratic or open discourse).

### 6) Global Social Capital

According to social exchange theory, human culture primarily serves as a tool to stabilize behavioral expectations based on reciprocity: Exchanges between social individuals require trust relationships. Common rules and institutions (both formally and informally) that enforce such rules may help in overcoming interaction problems and facilitate cooperation. Without such institutions, however, potential gains from interaction and cooperation will not be realized. (see also Habisch 1999).

Robert Putnam defined the existence of trust and cooperation as social capital. *"By analogy with notions of physical capital and human capital—tools and training that enhance individual productivity – ‘social capital refers to features of social organization such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit."* (Putnam 1995: 66) And further, such *"[...] networks of civic engagement foster sturdy norms of generalized reciprocity and encourage the emergence of social trust. Such networks facilitate coordinate and communication, amplify reputations, and thus allow dilemmas of collective action to be resolved."* (Putnam 1995: 66) The notion of **global** social capital points to the possibility that trisectoral global public policy networks may, at least in the medium- or long-term, help in building up such trust relationships across boundaries and therefore facilitate social capital building not only within societies, but also across societies, critical for constituting a global public space.

One could go even further and argue that the establishment of GPP networks are investments in social capital that, although causing initial costs, will pay out in the long-run.

### 7) Non-State Actors/ (for-profit/non-profit)

The inclusion and participation of non-state actors becomes a constitutive element and essential part in the global public policy process addressing global challenges. No doubt terms such as "non-state actor" or "civil society" leave many interpretations open. For the purposes of this report, we advance a simple division:

- *For-profit non-state actors* (the business community/ private enterprises)
- *Non-profit non-state actors* (NGOs/ INGOs; churches; epistemic communities)

If you feel that a further subdivision within a category (e.g., manufacturing vs. financial) is helpful, you should do so.

### 8) Learning

*Learning* is a central concept for the analysis of global public policy networks. We assume that network participants' ability and willingness to learn is crucial for the success of a network. Building on Haas, we distinguish between two forms of learning (see Haas 1990). *Simple* learning (or adaptation) involves a change of means, not ends, in response to changes inside or outside the network. *Complex* learning involves a change of behavior due to the questioning of underlying values and a redefinition of ends, not just means. Complex learning is often based on newly available knowledge and is the result of successful knowledge management in decision-making dynamics. Organizational learning is a shorthand way of expressing that the actors cooperating in the network to search for solutions to a problem have agreed on new means to address the problem (simple learning) or on a new way of conceptualizing the problem (complex learning, see Haas 1990: 26).

Our understanding of learning assumes that interests are not assumed to be exogenously given but changeable during the course of social interactions. For this reason, the case studies should focus on to what extent the interactions within the network are not only based instrumental rationality (bargaining processes in which actors pursue given aims according to the basic parameters of a simple rational choice approach) or given rules but also on argumentative rationality (processes of arguing and persuasion in which actors discuss the validity of their respective positions) (see Risse, 1998).

## 9) Knowledge Management

According to the Global Knowledge Partnership (itself a trisectoral public-private partnership), in today's increasingly interrelated world, knowledge is the foundation for equitable and sustainable development. We are aware of the fact that "knowledge management" is supposed to be the new panacea in solving policy issues or responding to global challenges. Knowledge management depends on the understanding and co-operation of a range of stakeholders. It also includes lessons learned (bad and good) and best practices. Taking into account the process of global public policy-making, global public policy networks add important substance to the notion of knowledge management in bringing together different types of key actors and different forms of knowledge to develop sustainable solutions. Ideally, global public policy networks bridge knowledge 'gaps' both among the actors and about the issue itself. This in turn might tackle information problems and result in knowledge creation through cooperative processes of learning.

### **Organization of the Case Studies**

Of course, we do not want to impose an oversimplified template on all case studies. However, for the sake of compatibility, coherence and clarity we would like to ask the authors to keep a number of general guidelines in mind.

#### **I. Introduction**

The introduction should provide a brief overview of the issue area concerned (e.g., why do we need a global approach toward corruption, forest management, etc.?). What is the nature and character of the problem? The identification and analysis of the issue at hand should give a good overview but should not be excessively detailed or require previous knowledge of the case at hand.

#### **II. Structure of the main section**

The main part of the case study should focus on attempts that have been made to solve the issue at stake. Though it might be interesting to have a closer look at older, possibly failed approaches to address the problem(s) at hand (for example defensive or offensive national intervention, see Reinicke 1998: 76-80, or inter-state regimes), we would prefer to keep such a section as short as possible. This research project is particularly interested in trisectoral global public policy networks. Our intended focus is not on a detailed description of the actors as such but on the *relations* among the actors in the network.

The main body of the case study should also focus on the lessons learned by scholars and practitioners (state and non-state). In this context, the following policy cycle might be useful from an analytical point of view (see Reinicke 1998): initiating the network, policy formulation/negotiation, implementation, compliance/enforcement, and policy

reformulation. Analytically, these components can be separated into "phases" of governance. In the actual policy process they often tend to occur simultaneously.

- **Initiating the network** involves raising awareness of issues and bringing together motivated key actors in order to create momentum for action.
- **Policy formulation/negotiation** involves the organization of decision-making processes in global public policy networks.
- **Implementation** involves translating the global public policy governance framework, whether formal or informal, into action and developing methods that encourage all parties involved to comply.
- **Compliance** refers to the degree to which parties adhere to the provisions of an agreement and implement the measures they have adopted. **Enforcement** requires developing responses to non-compliance.
- **Policy reformulation/institutional learning** involves the extent to which built-in mechanisms facilitate learning and change in global public policy networks. Often discussed with regard to organizations (see Haas 1990), we are interested in how such networks "manage change."

The following sample sets of questions should be taken into consideration within the analysis of the case studies. We would appreciate if all authors could cover all main sections laid out below. As was already mentioned above, the case studies and the summarizing report are primarily directed toward an audience of policymakers.

## **II.1 Origin and purpose of the global public policy network**

- What was critical in the agenda-setting phase for identifying the specific issue-area as a problem?
- Who identified the challenges and pointed to the possibility of such public-private networks? (Was there a crisis? Individuals? A treaty?)
- What obstacles or difficulties had to be dealt with? What role was played by public actors (governments, international organizations, etc.) in this initial setup-phase – entrepreneurs or lagging behind?
- Who selected the actors, using what criteria? Bottom-up evolution vs. top-down authority?
- Why did certain actors choose *not* to participate in the network? Were certain actors excluded and if so, why?
- What were the incentives/disincentives (monetary and non-monetary) for the different actors to participate? Did the "time horizon" play a critical role (short-term vs. long-term gains)?
- What was the initial outcome that actors hope(d) to achieve from participating in the network and how, if at all, did it change over time ("raising the stakes")?
- What different resources do the various actors bring to the table (money, knowledge, platform, etc.)? Do actors mobilize synergies? If so, what kind of

synergies? If there is a process of knowledge exchange, to what extent does this interaction lead to new knowledge creation?

## **II.2 Roles of different actors**

- Who are the actors? Did the composition of actors change over time?
- What were the expectations/motivations of the actors involved?
- Who represents the respective actors in the network? How are the representatives chosen?
- What is the division of labor between actors? Equal bargaining power? Do they share implementation, enforcement, monitoring?
- How do these actors finance their participation? To what extent are there transfers of financial resources within the network? Are there transfers from multilateral organizations? Is their financing structure transparent?
- Does the network attract new participants after its initial setup-phase? If so, why? Success? Why do actors stay in the network? Do they become dependent on the network (e.g., in terms of financial assistance provided by the network)?
- How do actors perceive their own role in the network, and how do they perceive the role of others (also in terms of legitimacy)?
- What role do IOs/ governments (if any) play in the network? Do they raise awareness of GPP issues on the international scene? Support the development of entities representing Southern interests? Convenor? Knowledge provision? Help implement key global regulations? Enforcement? Monitoring? Or are they simply at the receiving end of initiatives from the private sector?
- How is the role of international organizations evaluated by other participants?
- If international organizations do not play an active role, is there a need and scope for broader involvement? In what form? What kind of risks would be attached to direct involvement by international organizations?

## **II.3 Structure of and processes in the network**

- How often do actors meet? How are the meetings organized?
- Is there a formal dimension to the network? Treaty, contract? Is there a secretariat? Does the network rely on non-binding international legal agreements?
- Which crucial events during the initial phase of the network had a lasting impact on the development of the network (a specific conference, a certain constellation of actors, impact of an important personality, etc.)?
- Did the relations between the actors improve (or deteriorate) over time? Was initial mistrust and preconceptions overcome? Would you describe this as a learning process? To what extent can we describe the interaction between the different actors as "trust relationships"?

- To what extent does the environment (i. e. actors and power structures external to the network) determine the workings and ultimate success of the network? How is the network ‘nested’ within existing institutional environment?
- What mix of modes of governance can one observe? To what extent can power asymmetries be observed and how do they matter?
- How would you describe the level of transparency of the network? (Meetings open to the public? Minutes openly available?)
- How important is modern information technology for the communication within the network? Does participation in the network depend on access to modern information technology?
- How would you describe the boundaries of the network (open/fluent or closed/monopolistic)?
- Is there a clear ‘division of labor’ within the network? Is there a certain actor or a group of actors taking the lead? Can one observe a differentiation in sub-networks?
- How can one characterize the relations within the network (conflictual, cooperative, competitive)? How many partners are involved in the network? Is there a limit to the number of partners?
- Which different strategies on the part of the actors account for policy influence – bargaining (instrumental rationality) and/or arguing (e.g. power of persuasion or moral authority)?
- Is there an established process by which new actors are admitted into the network? Who determines/supervises this process?
- Compared to traditional hierarchical governance systems (as implemented in multilateral organizations or nation-states), do global public policy networks provide a more fertile ground for the equal participation of women in key decision-making processes (flat vs. vertical hierarchical structures)?
- Is there room for gender-related issues in the network? Do they play an important role? If yes, who initiated the gender-dialogue among the different actors?
- If there is Southern participation in the network, do they play an equal role to their Northern counterparts? Are there any special features related to Southern participation in the network (e.g., bargaining power, financial resources, etc.)?
- What kind of improvements, if any, are being discussed for the network’s governance structure?

#### **II.4 Outcome and prospects of the network**

- What criteria do actors use to define success? Process (interaction) and/or substance (policy goal)?
- Speaking in relative terms, is the network "successful"? Why/why not? Are there specific reasons why the network does not produce the outcome it was expected to produce?

- Do certain actors consider it a success? How can an asymmetric interpretation among participants be explained? Does it have an impact on the future of the network?
- Who, if anybody, "lost"? Who "won"? In what terms (financial, prestige, etc.)? What did the network do in order to empower certain actors?
- To what extent did participation (the process) in the network change perceptions a) of the initial problem and b) of other participating actors (conflicts between NGOs and businesses? NGOs and international organizations? Business and international organizations?)
- Given their actual impact on public policy outcomes, how legitimate/representative do actors see the network's role?
- What would actors change first if they could?

### **III. Outlook**

Finally, we would like you to consider whether any of the lessons learned in your problem area might be relevant or applicable to other problem areas. If so, provide examples. If not, explain.

### **Visualization**

As we already noted in the introduction, we are trying to pursue this research project in a rather unconventional but hopefully also innovative way. As a small contribution to innovation, but also for the sake of clarity and comparability, we strongly encourage all participants to visualize their case study in any way possible. Particularly interesting from our perspective would be some kind of an "organigram" (i.e., organizational chart/graph) that shows the setting and structure of the global public policy network at hand. There might be, in some cases, three or even more such graphs for different time phases the networks have gone through.

### **Length**

Your case study should be between 12,000 and 15,000 words in length, including notes). Please submit your paper in either Word for Windows (any format), Word Perfect (5.x), or Rich Text Format. Please avoid macros or layout, as we will probably have to reformat at some point.

Manuscripts should be double-spaced. We will attach a format style sheet (quotations, etc.) to reduce editing work, as time is pressing and our money and staff capacities are severely constrained

## Timetable

Outlines for the case studies are due by August 20 and should be 4-6 pages long (approximately 2,000 – 2,500 words). Drafts of the case studies are due by October 15.

We will, if financial circumstances allow, convene a workshop on the outlines of the case studies in Washington, D.C. (probably September 10, 1999 – date not yet confirmed). Applications for funding have been made but we do not have a final decision yet.

We would like to ask all participants to stick to the timetable, as the project operates under great time pressure. We will not be able to include your case study in the project or pay the honorarium if the final case study is not handed in by **November 19, 1999**. Please attach your address to the final version of your paper.

### Time Table GPP Report and Book Project

Outline due	August 20, 1999
Workshop on Outlines	September 10, 1999
Drafts due	October 15, 1999
Final drafts due	November 19, 1999

## References

Bernhardt, Rudolf (1984): Customary International Law, 7 *Ency. Pub. Intl. L.* 61, 62.

Commission on Global Governance (1995) *Our Global Neighborhood* (Oxford, Oxford University Press).

Haas, Ernst B. (1990) *When Knowledge is Power. Three Models of Change in International Organizations* (Berkeley, University of California Press).

- Habisch, André (1999) *Social Capital, Poverty Reduction and 'Gesellschaftsordnungspolitik'*. Paper to be presented at the 'Workshop on the Workshop' 2 Conference, held at IUB June, 9-13, 1999 (Eichstätt, Catholic University of Eichstätt).
- Jessop, Bob (1998) 'The rise of governance and the risks of failure', *International Social Science Journal* 155, pp. 29-48.
- Krasner, Stephen (1983) (ed.) *International Regimes* (Cornell, Cornell University Press).
- Mathews, Jessica T. (1997) 'Power Shift', *Foreign Affairs*, 76 (1), pp. 50-66.
- OECD (1993) *Development Assistance Committee Orientations on Participatory Development and Good Governance. GD (93) 191* (Paris, OECD).
- Reinicke, Wolfgang H. (1998) *Global Public Policy. Governing without Government?* (Washington, D.C., Brookings Institution Press).
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (1997) 'The New Governance: governing without government', *Political Studies* 44 (4), pp. 652-667.
- Risse, Thomas (1998) "Let's Argue!" *Persuasion and Deliberation in International Relations. Paper presented at the ECPR-ISA conference in Vienna, 16-19 September 1998* (San Domenico di Fiesole, European University Institute).  
[<http://www.iue.it/Personal/Risse/Rissedoc/Welcome.html>]
- Rosenau, James N./Ernst-Otto Czempiel 1992 (eds.) *Governance without government: order and change in world politics* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).
- Rosenau, James N. (1995) 'Global Governance in the Twenty-First Century', *Global Governance* 1, pp. 5-29.
- Senarclens, Pierre de (1998) 'Governance and the crisis in the international mechanism of regulation', *International Social Science Journal* 155, pp. 91-104.
- Smouts, Marie-Claude (1998) 'The proper use of governance in international relations', *International Social Science Journal* 155, pp. 81-90.
- Thatcher, Mark (1998) 'The Development of Policy Network Analyses. From Modest Origins to Overarching Frameworks', *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 10 (4), pp. 389-415.
- Waarden, Frans van (1992) 'Dimensions and Types of Policy Networks', *European Journal of Political Research* 21, pp. 29-52.
- Zürn, Michael (1998) *Regieren jenseits des Nationalstaates. Globalisierung und Denationalisierung als Chance* (Frankfurt am Main, Suhrkamp).