

Partnerships, International Organizations, and Global Environmental Governance¹

Maria H. Ivanova

Introduction

The intensification of economic transactions across national borders; the ascendance of economic actors, means, and ends as potent instruments in foreign policy; the swift transfer of ecological impacts across physical and temporal boundaries; and the increased role of private actors and individual citizens in world affairs have all prompted analysts to declare that we live in a world of “complex interdependence.”² Two traditional forms of governance have dominated world affairs until recently – national governance through governmental regulation and international governance through collective action facilitated by international organizations and international regimes. However, governing human relations has become a complicated endeavor that has transcended the national and interstate scale and moved to a global level involving multiple actors across national borders and multiple levels of regulatory authority – from subnational to supranational.

In this context, institutional arrangements for cooperation are beginning to take shape more systematically and have now been recognized as critical to the effective tackling of any global problem. Public-private partnerships, multi-stakeholder processes, global public policy networks, and global issue networks are regarded as important tools for global governance (Reinicke 1998; Reinicke and Deng 2000; Hemmati 2001; Rischard 2001). In this

¹ This chapter was prepared as part of the Global Environmental Governance Project at the Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy. My thanks to Kathleen Campbell for research assistance.

² One definition of interdependence is that “interdependence exists when changes in one nation produce significant changes in one or more others, or where the effects of one government’s actions are partially determined by what other governments do” (Morgan 1981).

chapter, I focus the analysis on the recent establishment of partnerships as outcomes of traditional intergovernmental conferences and as means of implementation for official governmental agreements. I trace the debate that emerged in Johannesburg and analyze the implications for global environmental governance.³ The World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) ushered into the formal debate the notion of informal collaborative arrangements, or “Type II” outcomes. Although not a new concept (the Rio Earth Summit in 1992 asserted the importance of partnerships to environmental governance and sustainable development), partnerships enjoy very little clarity regarding their objectives and mechanisms for delivering results, monitoring performance, and assessing outcomes.

The last fifty years have seen an explosive multiplication of new international bodies for economic, social, political, health, and human rights issues. Even within this context, the growth of agreements and organizations in the environmental domain has been unparalleled. The main question for policymakers therefore has centered on the optimal design of governance structures in order to reduce the overlap, fragmentation, and conflicts within the international environmental regime. International organizations are the traditional facilitators of collective action at the international and global level and provide a particularly interesting analytical lens for partnership arrangements. International organizations may perform a range of roles in a partnership context – enabler, facilitator, supporter, or active participant – and influence the shape, form, and function of the collaborative arrangements. On the other hand, the growth and institutionalization of partnerships is likely to impact the operation of international organizations and have substantive consequences on the architecture for global governance.

This chapter addresses the following three questions: Why are partnerships necessary? What can international organizations do to improve partnerships? What are the implications for global environmental governance?

³ When talking about governance, global governance, and global environmental governance, I adopt Keohane and Nye’s definition of governance as “the process and institutions, both formal and informal, that guide and restrain the collective activities of a group” (2000).

Partnerships for Global Environmental Action

International environmental issues typically raise one of three types of policy problems: 1) management of global commons or provision of “global public goods;” 2) transboundary pollution or “externalities;” and 3) ubiquitous environmental problems with worldwide implications (Haas 1991; Esty and Ivanova 2002).

Common pool resources such as the atmosphere and the oceans are outside the territorial jurisdiction of any state. They are examples of global public goods – “goods whose benefits reach across borders, generations, and population groups” (Kaul, Grunberg, and Stern 1999). The two main features of public goods are jointness of supply and non-excludability. This is to say that once the good is provided, it can be enjoyed by a large number of consumers without detracting from the ability of others to do the same. The challenge public goods pose is that, unless carefully managed, they trigger behavior that is individually rational but collectively suboptimal or even disastrous (Hardin 1968). For example, if fishermen aim to maximize their personal gain by catching as many fish as possible, their practices may lead to the depletion of the fishery and leave everyone worse off than they would have been with common rules regulating catch. However, without strong enforcement, which is difficult to attain at the international level, some individuals may choose to “free ride” on the efforts of others, creating what is often termed a collective action problem (Olson 1965). International cooperation and policy coordination by the *various* users of a common resource are therefore necessary.

Transboundary spillover of pollution from one country to another leads to “super externalities” (Dua and Esty 1997). These too can only be managed through international coordination. At the national level, a regulatory agency is usually given authority to direct (and coerce if need be) the behavior of private actors so as to ensure cooperation. In the absence of an overarching sovereign at the global level, the incentives to free ride are even stronger (Young 1999). Moreover, the impacts of such super externalities are often hard to grasp, as they may be spread out both spatially and temporally. In the case of climate change, for example, the abatement and adaptation costs can be transferred

not only across space – to other countries – but also over time – to future generations. Cooperation is also difficult to obtain when the impact is unidirectional, i.e., when activities in one country cause damage only in another jurisdiction. Upstream users of a shared river, for instance, have little incentive to limit their extraction of water or curb pollution, as the costs they impose will largely be borne by others downstream. Innovative institutional arrangements are therefore necessary to shift incentives and alter preferences.

The third category of international environmental issues consists of ubiquitous problems encountered nationally that have wider ramifications, such as desertification and deforestation. These problems are seemingly confined within national borders and a result of domestic practices. Their impacts, however, may extend regionally and in some cases even have global consequences through various feedback loops and mechanisms such as decrease in rainfall, loss of biodiversity, and even climate impacts.

International cooperation is often necessary to coordinate national activities for all three categories. States have created international organizations to serve as facilitators of collective action in the management of the global commons and transboundary pollution (Keohane and Nye 1977; Abbott and Snidal 2001). International organizations have also proven valuable for dealing with ubiquitous environmental problems by channeling information, training, and financial resources to affected countries (Peterson 2000). Nevertheless practical coordination is politically difficult, as states are often unwilling to bear the sizable cost of environmental protection, and regional and global environmental problems overlie many traditional policy antipathies. For example, while industrialized countries have been mostly concerned with commons and transboundary issues, developing countries are much more interested in ubiquitous issues (Haas 1991; Biermann 2000).

Issue-focused partnerships among interested stakeholders have emerged as one possibility for addressing the challenges of complex and interdependent issues management. Dynamic in both process and structure, partnerships and networks can provide an alternative means to finding solutions where traditional policy approaches have not or cannot deliver effective results (Streck

2002). The diversity in composition and approaches, the flexibility of strategies and openness of process, the speed of constitution and action, and their legitimacy make partnerships appealing as governance tools. Partnerships bring together the advantages of the public sector (the authority, social responsibility, environmental awareness, and local knowledge of governments and non-governmental organizations) and of the private sector (innovation, access to resources, technical expertise, and managerial efficacy) and are often gelled together by the convening power, facilitation abilities, and support framework (financial and political) of international organizations.

In the broad area of sustainable development, such new collaborative arrangements are heralded as the implementation tools for Agenda 21. Agenda 21 emphasizes that sustainable development will only happen if it is explicitly planned. It firmly rejects the notion that markets alone can solve the serious problems of integrating environmental, economic, and social concerns. Governments, if acting alone, are equally ineffective for addressing these issues. The formation of partnerships among stakeholders is the precondition for developing a viable sustainable development strategy. The concept has been readily embraced by the United Nations. As emphasized by the UN Secretary-General, Kofi Annan: "Partnerships among major groups have become more common since UNCED [United Nations Conference on Environment and Development], including productive relationships between NGOs and business. Such partnerships now involve dozens of multinational companies and NGOs, focusing on both social and environmental objectives. These partnerships are changing strategies and practices in both the business and NGO sectors, with important implications for future sustainable development efforts and broader coalition and partnership building" (UN Secretary-General 2001).

Every issue around which a partnership is built requires a patient and thorough process of considering a wide range of questions by all parties involved, making explicit decisions about priorities, trade-offs and sacrifices, and creating and refining long-term frameworks of control, incentives, and motivation complete with quantitative, time-bound targets in order to achieve what has been decided.

Defining the Terms – “Type I” and “Type II”

The preparatory process for the Johannesburg Summit introduced a new term into the bureaucratic lingo of the day. The “Type I”/“Type II” debate suddenly took over the discussions and the agenda and launched the negotiation process onto a new course, one that many hail as the most substantial achievement of the Summit (UN/DESA 2002) and others criticize as a hypocritical cover-up for work left undone and commitments gone by the wayside (Parmentier 2002; Friends of the Earth 2002). In December 2001, General Assembly Resolution 56/226 encouraged “global commitment and partnerships, especially between Governments of the North and the South, on the one hand, and between Governments and major groups on the other.” This commitment was further elaborated in Decision 2001/PC/3, which states that governments and major groups should “exchange and publicly announce the specific commitments they have made for the next phase of work in the field of sustainable development. In the case of major groups, commitments and targets are expected to emerge from national, regional and international consultations of major group organizations. A record of the commitments announced and shared would be made and released as part of the Summit outcome.”

Before launching into an evaluation of the relevance, desirability, and feasibility of the “Type II” initiatives, or partnerships, as they will be called throughout this paper, it is necessary to provide a short definition of the concepts.

What the Johannesburg Summit termed “Type I” outcomes is the traditional output from intergovernmental meetings – governmental commitment to delivering results on a set of agreed upon goals and objectives of common concern and significance. Political declarations, action plans, resolutions, and decisions entered into freely by the governments of the world constitute some of the possible outputs. Two types of political agreements emerged from the Johannesburg deliberations – a Plan of Implementation and a Political Declaration.⁴

“Type II” outcomes, or “partnerships for sustainable development,” are defined as commitments to specific targets and

⁴ For the texts of these documents, see <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/documents/documents.html>

objectives for the implementation of sustainable development made by coalitions of actors and aimed at translating political commitments into action. “Type II” outcomes do not require consensus among member states and were not to be negotiated within the formal Summit process. The purpose of the partnerships is to “reinforce the implementation of the outcomes of the intergovernmental negotiations of the WSSD (Programme of Action and Political Declaration) and to help achieve the further implementation of Agenda 21 and the Millennium Development Goals” (Kara and Quarless 2002). Partnerships are expected to improve the quality of implementation by involving those stakeholders whose activities have a direct impact on sustainable development.

Origins of the “Type II” Rhetoric

Many observers and participants in the Johannesburg Summit were taken by surprise at the sudden diversion of attention from formal Summit outputs to informal partnerships. The roots of the concept of alternative governance arrangements, however, are much deeper than what appears at first glance. The notion of a “Type II” outcome emerged from the juncture of two trends within the broader political context at the turn of the century and a specific political event in the World Summit on Sustainable Development.

The Political Context

At the end of the Cold War in the late 1980s, the liberal capitalist paradigm found itself without a rival. With the advance of globalization, the neoliberal market economy and political system model now enjoys close to universal acceptance. The implications of the neoliberal model extend through the economic system, giving primacy to market dynamics, and through the political sphere, emphasizing democracy and flexibility. Environmental policy concerns have been institutionalized within this context in the concept of sustainable development. Asserting the compatibility of environmental concerns, economic growth, the basic tenets of a market economy, and a liberal international order is now conventional wisdom among many policymakers, diplomats, and a large number of NGOs throughout the world (Bernstein 2001).

In the last two decades, the prominence of environmental concerns has risen on the international agenda. However, environmental issues have only been considered within the context of an economic paradigm that is preconditioned on the presence of economic growth. As a result, we see the emergence of what Steven Bernstein has termed “liberal environmentalism,” a philosophy that “accepts the liberalization of trade and finance as consistent with, and even necessary for, international environmental protection. It also promotes market and other economic mechanisms (such as tradable pollution permit schemes or the privatization of commons) over “command-and-control” methods (standards, bans, quotas, and so on) as the preferred method of environmental management. The concept of sustainable development, while it legitimated this shift in norms, now masks this compromise that characterizes international environmental governance” (2001). The result is a contemporary conventional view that touts the importance of business as a main driver of necessary economic growth as well as the need for flexible regulation.

The Political Event

The WSSD provided the impetus and platform for institution-alizing a new regulatory approach that conforms to the new convention of liberal environmentalism. The notion of partnerships as a major tool emerged from two features characterizing the Summit as a political event.

First, there was widespread recognition and concern that governments had not done enough to implement the Rio agreements, and that they might not be able to do so in the future. The Johannesburg Summit was conceived as an assessment of the progress made since the Rio Earth Summit in 1992. While the notion of sustainable development has since then been firmly established in the policy discourse, progress toward achieving this vision has been difficult to measure and hard to assess. In fact, as some analysts have put it, during the last decade, we have been wandering around “equipped with a sense of geography and the principles of navigation, but without a map or a compass” in fact we have been “flying blind” (Hales and Prescott-Allen 2002). The

lack of measurable progress on which to report created an uncomfortable dynamic for many governments that did not want to appear at a conference where they would be denounced for having achieved too little, too late.

Second, there was recognition and acknowledgement that governments alone cannot attain the vision of sustainable development and that the multilateral system cannot cope with a constantly increasing number of intergovernmental programs. The 1992 Earth Summit produced a foundation of principles (the Rio Principles), commitments (political and financial), and a comprehensive Action Agenda of over 600 pages (Agenda 21). The overwhelming sense was that no new declarations were necessary. Rather, it was widely felt that there is an urgent need to deliver on what had been promised in 1992. The Johannesburg Summit was thus dubbed “the Summit on Implementation.”

To this end, governments alone were not seen as sufficient. Industry and individuals are important agents of change and their full and conscious participation was seen as critical to effective implementation of any governmental commitment – old and new alike.

The conflation between the dynamics of the general political climate and the specific political sentiments around a concrete high level event resulted in an emphasis on new, informal governance approaches. Governments have made promises and delivered little in terms of results. Business has grown in importance, not only economically but also socially. Civil society has gained influence and power. International organizations have become stronger actors in world affairs. Central regulatory power has thus decreased in parallel with the rise of a new regulatory ethic emphasizing flexibility and voluntarism. Given the complexity of the issues at hand and the reconfigurations in the formal regulatory structures, partnership arrangements have logically emerged as a promising governance approach. This is not to say, however, that partnerships are effective by definition. They could be used as easily to perpetuate an illusion of progress as to attain concrete and tangible results. Their ultimate effectiveness will hinge upon their internal structure as well as their relationship to the broader forms of global governance.

Partnerships for Sustainable Development – Stocktaking

More than 220 partnerships were identified before the start of the WSSD, and approximately 60 additional partnerships were announced during the Summit. As of mid-September 2002, the funding for partnerships was estimated at U.S. \$235 million. The registration of collaborative initiatives continues after the Summit through the electronic means provided.⁵ The Chairman's Paper of 12 February 2002 specified the development of partnerships as a goal of several of the principal sustainable development focus areas:

- *Sustainable Development in a Globalizing World*: “Promote public-private partnerships and voluntary initiatives through which economic actors, particularly multinational companies, are encouraged to assume their social, environmental and economic responsibilities.”
- *Health and Sustainable Development*: “Promote public-private partnerships for the development and dissemination of technologies for safe water, sanitation and waste management for rural and urban areas in developing countries and countries with economies in transition, with international financial and technological support.”
- *Sustainable Development Initiatives for Africa*: “Encourage increased international financial and other support for the struggle against HIV/AIDS and other communicable diseases in Africa, and support North-South and South-South partnerships in that regard.”
- *Means of Implementation/Transfer of Technology*: “Promote public-private partnerships at the national, regional, subregional, and global levels geared towards assisting developing countries through the provision of financial and technical assistance for productivity enhancement and ecological management.”
- *Means of Implementation/Science and Education*: “Facilitate building greater capacity in science and technology through

⁵ See http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/sustainable_dev/partnership_initiatives.html

improved collaboration among research institutions, the private sector and Governments, and facilitate improved collaboration and partnerships between and among scientists, Governments and all stakeholders on research and development and its widespread application.”

- *Means of Implementation/Capacity Building*: “Promote partnerships for a global capacity-building initiative that would be delivered through effective regional and subregional institutions to respond to both immediate and long-term needs of people in developing countries and countries with economies in transition.”

Guiding Principles for “Type II” outcomes were also developed in the course of the preparatory process for the Summit. These principles stipulate that voluntary partnerships are to complement, not substitute for, the outcomes of intergovernmental negotiations in Johannesburg. Furthermore, the Guiding Principles also include a list of recommendations to steer the partnership process. It is suggested that partnerships be based on mutual respect and shared responsibility; that partners be included from a very early point in the process; that partnerships should be developed in an open and transparent manner; that all partners be equally accountable; that partnerships be evaluated to test for results; that partnerships follow clear objectives; and finally, that partnerships be new, and able to add to the WSSD process.

While the list of Guiding Principles does indeed capture a number of important issues to be considered in the context of proper “partnership management,” it fails to go beyond the generic set of management principles (Nelson and Zadek 1999). The Guiding Principles do not take into account, for example, the diversity of the partnership phenomenon as outlined in the contribution by Witte, Streck and Benner to this volume. But most importantly, the Guiding Principles fail at the critical stage of implementation. The principles do not specify how partnership outcomes are to be tied into the intergovernmental environmental agenda, how the recommendations on partnership management would be turned into action, and, most significantly, what the future role of the public sector – governments and international

organizations – should be in promoting sustainable development and environmental governance.

International Organizations – Instrument, Arena, Actor

International organizations provide an interesting entry point into the discussion on partnerships and global environmental governance. Conceived as tools for collective action among states, international organizations exemplify the inherent tensions in the global governance system. They are a forum where global governance is formulated as well as actors in that forum; they are influential in their own right yet also subservient to member state interests; they shape negotiations but their own mandate is shaped by these discussions; they are supranational entities, yet expected to deliver practical results at subnational levels.

Partnerships offer a particularly propitious opportunity for international organizations to regain a leading role in global governance. International organizations can provide a forum and arena for convening participants; act as facilitators of negotiations establishing cooperative arrangements among parties by helping to articulate, aggregate, and mediate interests; or be active supporters by providing necessary financial resources. International organizations can also participate as full-fledged partners by taking on programmatic responsibilities. These roles are summarized in the box at right, outlining the relationship between international organizations and global public policy networks.

The new emphasis on partnerships is likely to reinvigorate many international organizations that have been active in forming and sustaining such initiatives across issues and sectors. The table at the end of this chapter provides an overview of the major partnerships where international organizations play a leading role. The featured initiatives illustrate the breadth of categories and objectives of partnership arrangements, the constellation of actors involved, the funding reality, the monitoring and evaluation provisions, and the status of the partnership.

International Organizations and Global Public Policy Networks

International organizations can help to create and sustain global public policy networks through various roles:

- International organizations may act as *convenors*, bringing all the parties to the table, mobilizing key constituencies and providing a forum to exchange views. UN agencies in particular have acted as convenors, successfully making use of their credibility across different sectors.
- International organizations can provide a *platform* or “*safe space*” for people and institutions coming together in a network, by establishing a level playing field for negotiations. In highly contentious policy domains, providing such a haven and bringing together outside parties may also have a catalytic effect on negotiations.
- One of the clear lessons learned from the empirical work that has been done on trisectoral networks is that social entrepreneurship is of crucial importance for the setup of a network. While there is no reason to believe that such leadership must necessarily emerge from the public sector, *political high-profile leadership* on the part of international organizations in the initiation phase has in some cases proven to be decisive.
- International organizations can *advance norms* developed by public policy networks. Sustainable development and human rights are two realms where the interplay between public policy networks and international bodies has helped to change global understanding and expectations.
- International organizations also serve as *multilevel network managers*. With the dual trends of greater devolution of authority through decentralization and the strengthening of supranational forms of governance, the challenge for international organizations is to develop strategies for simultaneously interacting with the appropriate levels of governance on particular issues at appropriate stages of the public policy cycle. By serving as a hub, international organizations can facilitate multi-tier linkage (local-national-global) in public policymaking.
- Despite often limited budgets, international organizations sometimes act as *financiers*, providing resources for a range of operational programs related to the implementation of global public policies.

(Source: Benner and Witte 2001)

The key observations from this empirical analysis are outlined below:

- *International Organizations in the Lead*
In partnerships where international organizations are involved, the lead/convening role is performed by an international organization. Additional international organizations are also brought in to support the process.
- *Uncertain Funding*
Funding has not been confirmed for most partnerships. While the level of financial support required has been estimated for most initiatives, sources of finance have not yet been firmly identified. Most of the available funding comes from the budgets of current international organization programs. Additional financial support is expected from other participants as they join the initiative.
- *Lack of Adequate Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanisms*
Monitoring and assessment mechanisms for most partnerships are perfunctory at best or even absent. Only a couple of initiatives – the Great Apes Survival Partnership and the International Coral Reef Action Network (both led by UNEP) – specifically refer to external reviews. Several partnerships have committed to developing performance measurements and indicators. The vast majority, however, only refer to internal monitoring and evaluation and the constitution of a Steering Committee.
- *Old Ideas with New Labels*
Most of the showcased partnership initiatives are not new. While some are major expansions of programmatic activities, most of them are extensions of current work, sometimes even with the same title.
- *Private Sector Still Unconvinced*
The private sector has been cautious in signing on to partnership initiatives. As of November 2002, there are only two industry-led partnerships (The World Business Council on Sustainable Development's (WBCSD) Cement Sustainability

Initiative and Novartis' Institute for Tropical Diseases). There are a number of others, however, where business organizations figure as an important partner (most notably in the water sector).

The preparatory process of the WSSD put emphasis on cooperative arrangements in all areas of sustainable development, and international organizations seized the opportunity to showcase their efforts. Thus, the impressive number of partnerships announced at the Summit was to a large extent a repackaging of already existing initiatives to fit the "Type II" outcome definition. This comes as no surprise since the inherent role of international organizations is to serve as facilitators of collective action. International organizations have traditionally acted as conveners of various stakeholders involved in the resolution of collective action problems and their very mandate calls for participation in such arrangements. UNEP's mandate, for example, is "to provide leadership and encourage partnership in caring for the environment by inspiring, informing and enabling nations and peoples to improve their quality of life without compromising that of future generations" (UNEP 2001). The "repackaging" trend, however, has both positive and negative implications.

On the positive side, the fact that most of the partnerships were already under way long before the Summit shows that implementation work has been going on for quite some time and has not been as neglected or shunned as many have feared. Cooperative arrangements among various participants and concerned parties have been a significant part of the global environmental governance system for some time and have produced significant results in a number of cases. Before Johannesburg, partnerships had been regarded merely as a means of achieving common goals. The new emphasis on such collaborative initiatives during the WSSD has elevated their status and brought in new funding or new partners with fresh ideas.

On the negative side, however, the recasting of old initiatives as bold new endeavors reflects the fact that not much new has indeed come out of the Johannesburg process and attests to the paucity of ideas and the complacency regarding environmental concerns. It

is also a convenient way for governments to sidetrack the debate on their own commitments to sustainable development and its components, including environmental protection, public health, provision of services, etc. The existing set of initiatives that are neither monitored nor assessed for results may in fact jeopardize effective action. Promoted as a viable substitute for systematic action on the part of governments, partnerships need to show that they can effectively harness the power of all involved, deliver results, and maintain a high ethical standard.

Whither Global Environmental Governance

At the eve of the Rio Earth Summit in 1992, New Zealand's Prime Minister, Geoffrey Palmer, remarked: "[T]he methods and techniques now available to fashion new instruments of international law to cope with global environmental problems cannot meet the challenge. The emerging issues are so big and so all-embracing that current ways of doing things will not solve these problems. The institutional mechanisms within the United Nations system are not capable of handling the issues. The time has come for something more innovative, for a conceptual leap forward in institutional terms" (Palmer 1992).

Many have put their faith in partnerships and networks as a promising new alternative to traditional modes of governance. The contemporary task of fast and effective global problem solving requires 1) a move away from hierarchies, 2) effective alternatives to the obsolete territorial problem definitions by nation states, and 3) new arrangements between governments, civil society, and business (Rischar 2002). The speed, diversity, and legitimacy of global networks and partnerships hold great potential for effective "governance without world government." However, they do depend on governments and international organizations for their existence and effectiveness. What then are the implications for global environmental governance?

First, governments will remain key actors in international affairs. Partnerships and networks cannot supplant the role that governments play and do not seek to do so. They do not legislate or regulate. Rather, the expertise they mobilize complements governmental expertise, their speed of action and reaction induces faster governmental response, and their horizontal, cross-border

source of legitimacy complements the traditional vertical representation processes and legitimacy of nation-states (Rischarde 2002). Unfortunately, if not properly managed, partnerships and networks can easily be used as smokescreens behind which unwilling governments can hide inaction and indifference.

Second, international organizations will not become obsolete with the rise of partnerships and issue networks. Quite the contrary, partnerships need international organizations. International organizations have become the conveners and enablers of such collaborative arrangements, and a traditional intergovernmental conference like the WSSD can provide the necessary impetus and favorable launching site for a wide array of partnerships.

Third, while making use of existing institutions, the networked approach to governance will demand a more agile organizational architecture at the global level. Better management of our collective interdependencies – ecological, economic, and social alike – requires equitable representation and participation of all interests, especially those of the weak and vulnerable sectors of society (Gemmill, Ivanova, and Chee 2002). Networked governance may offer a way of coordinating and consolidating the multiplicity of international environmental organizations into a more coherent framework with a focus on results delivery, efficiency, and ethics.

In conclusion, it is important to note that the inability of traditional organizations to respond to contemporary demands both in terms of effectiveness (results) and social responsiveness (values) has been long lamented. In an attempt to forecast a future organizational mechanism for better governance, Warren Bennis wrote in 1970: “Adaptive, problem-solving, temporary systems of diverse specialists, linked together by co-ordinating and task-evaluating specialists in an organic flux – this is the organizational form that will gradually replace bureaucracy as we know it. As no catchy phrase comes to mind, let us call this an *organic-adaptive structure*” (Bennis 1970). Today we do have the catchy phrases – network, partnership, and maybe even “Type II” outcome. What we need is the leadership that will translate the theoretical concepts into action.

26 PROGRESS OR PERIL? THE POST-JOHANNESBURG AGENDA

Table: International Organization-Led Partnerships: An Assessment

	Title	Purpose	International Organizations
UNEP-led Partnerships			
Biodiversity			
	Great Apes Survival Partnership	Lift the threat to apes and develop capacity of great ape range states to conserve ape habitat and foster alternative livelihoods	UNEP (lead) UNESCO 4 biodiversity conventions
Capacity-building			
	Capacity Building for Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns	Improve ability of decision makers to implement sustainable consumption/production policies	UNEP (lead) UNESCO UNIDO
	Capacity Building Task Force on Trade, Environment and Development, Phase II	Assist beneficiary countries in developing mutually supportive policies that would maximize the net benefits of trade for sustainable development	UNEP (lead) UNCTAD (lead)
Energy			
	Dams and Development	Link national initiatives to improve decision-making, planning and management of dams and alternatives	UNEP (lead) WB
	Global Network on Energy for Sustainable Development	Facilitate development and implementation of environmentally-sound energy sources	UNEP (lead) UNDP UNIDO UN-DESA ESMAP WB
	Global Partnership on Clean Fuels and Vehicles	Improve air quality in developing countries through clean fuels and vehicles	UNEP UN-DESA
	Market Facilitation Partnership for Concentrating Solar Power Technologies	Promote the concentration of solar power by removing investment obstacles and promoting market penetration	UNEP (lead) IEA
Oceans/Coastal Areas/Fisheries			
	The H20 (Hilltops-2-Oceans) Partnership: Working Together to Protect Coastal and Marine Environments	Increase the environmental, economic, and social importance of oceans, coasts, and islands. Facilitate the Montreal commitment by governments to reduce pollution	UNEP (lead) UNESCO
	International Coral Reef Action Network	Halt and reverse decline of coral reefs	UNEP (lead) ICRI UNFIP WB GEF
Poverty Eradication			

Other major partners	Funding	Monitoring	Status
23 governments NGOs UN Foundation	<u>Committed:</u> UNEP \$750,000 UK, Norway, Belgium <u>Seeking:</u> Foundations Private sector UN member governments Local stakeholders	- External review - Internal monitoring and evaluation	Major expansion of current activities
"Most interested" governments NGOs Industry associations Research institutes	<u>Committed:</u> UNEP <u>Anticipated:</u> Governments Development assistance agencies Industry associations	- Internal monitoring and evaluation	Extension of current activities
Governments NGOs Research institutions	<u>Committed:</u> EU Canada Germany Norway Sweden UK USA	- Internal monitoring and evaluation	Extension of current activities
Governments IUCN and other NGOs Private sector Industry associations Research institutes Multi-lateral development banks	<u>Anticipated:</u> UN Trust Fund Individual country support	- Internal monitoring and evaluation	Extension of current activities
Governments Research institutions NGOs Private sector Industry associations UN Foundation	<u>Committed:</u> Germany France United Kingdom Denmark UN Foundation <u>Seeking:</u> Cash and in-kind contributions	- Steering Committee evaluation - Internal monitoring and evaluation	New partnership
USA (lead) and other governments Private sector Industry associations NGOs	Partners will fund activities	Not specified	New partnership
Germany (lead) Private sector Financial organizations Research institutions German Development Bank California Energy Commission	<u>Seeking:</u> Public and private financing	- Steering Committee evaluation - Internal monitoring and evaluation	New partnership
Governments Private sector Industry associations NGOs Research institutions	<u>Committed:</u> Partners (\$US 8M) <u>Seeking:</u> Partners (\$US 29.1M)	- Internal monitoring and evaluation	Major expansion of current activities
Coral range and donor governments Regional coastal associations NGOs Industry associations UN Foundation	<u>Committed (\$US 3M):</u> UN Foundation USAID <u>Anticipated:</u> Governments International organizations Foundations Private sector Global Coral Reef Fund (developing)	- External review - Steering Committee evaluation - Internal monitoring and evaluation	Extension of current activities

28 PROGRESS OR PERIL? THE POST-JOHANNESBURG AGENDA

	Title	Purpose	International Organizations
	Integrated Approach to Prevention, Preparedness for and Response to Environmental Emergencies in Support of Sustainable Development	Ensure that emergency management is implemented in a systematic way	UNEP (lead) OCHA (lead) Other UN agencies
Transfer of Technology			
	Global Technology Transfer and Knowledge Management	Facilitate information exchange, finance and investment in sustainable products and services in the energy, agriculture, textile, waste, water and forestry sectors	UNEP (lead) GEF/SANet UNOPS IEA
Other			
	Regional Study for Sustainable Development for the Mediterranean: Policy and Tools	Prepare regional strategy for sustainable development	UNEP-MAP (lead) EC WB UNDP EIB
UNDP-led Partnerships			
Capacity-building			
	Capacity 2015: Building capacity to benefit from globalization and realize the Millennium Development Goals while achieving sustainable development	Assist countries with implementation of Millennium Development Goals	UNDP (lead) Other international institutions
Energy			
	Global Village Energy Partnership	Create a 10-year program to reduce poverty and enhance sustainable development through the accelerated provision of modern energy services to those un-served or underserved	UNDP (lead) WB ESMAP UNEP Regional development banks
	The LPG Challenge	Address and overcome market and technical barriers to the expanded use of LPG in developing countries	UNDP (lead)
Freshwater			
	Dialogue on Effective Water Governance	Convene stakeholders to examine water governance systems and plan action strategies to improve them	UNDP (lead) GWP (lead)
Poverty Eradication			
	Coalition for Sustainable Urbanisation - Millenium Cities Partnership	Assist local authorities to design implementation plans for the Millenium Declaration	WB UN-Habitat
	Coalition for Sustainable Urbanisation - Partnership for Local Capacity Development	Promote cohesion and collective efficiency in the international support available to the development of local capacities for sustainable urbanisation	UN-Habitat (lead) UNEP UNDP
	Coalition for Sustainable Urbanisation - Demonstrating Local Environmental Planning and Management	Strengthen the capacities of local authorities to achieve socially, economically, and environmentally sustainable urban development	UN-Habitat (lead) UNEP (lead)
	Coalition for Sustainable Urbanisation - Local Capacities for Upscaling Local Agenda 21 Demonstrations	Build the capacities of local and national governments to integrate the lessons from local demonstrations into sustainable urbanisation and poverty alleviation policies and associated legal frameworks	UN-Habitat (lead) UNEP (lead)
	Coalition for Sustainable Urbanisation - Local Capacities for Global Agendas	Develop global norms for sustainable urbanisation and strengthen local capacities for responding to local needs	UN-Habitat (lead) UNEP (lead) ILO (lead) UNDP (lead) GEF
	Coalition for Sustainable Urbanisation - Training Local Authorities for Sustainable Urban Development	Provide local training in sustainable development, based on needs identified in regional seminars	UNITAR (lead) UN-Habitat (lead) UNOPS UNDP UNAIDS WHO UNECE

Other major partners	Funding	Monitoring	Status
NGOs Industry groups	<u>Committed:</u> UNEP and OCHA <u>Seeking:</u> Partners International financial institutions Industry associations	- Internal monitoring and evaluation	Extension of current activities
Governments Industry associations	<u>Committed:</u> GEF (\$US 4M) SANet (in-kind technical support)	- Internal monitoring and evaluation	Extension of current activities
20 Mediterranean governments NGOs	<u>Committed (2002-3):</u> UNEP-MAP (\$US 100K) Spain (\$US 100K) <u>Anticipated:</u> Donor governments Funding agencies International organizations	- Steering Committee evaluation - Internal monitoring and evaluation	New partnership
Governments NGOs Academic institutions Development banks	<u>Committed:</u> UNDP <u>Anticipated:</u> Governments Other participants	- Internal monitoring and evaluation	New partnership
Developing country governments Private sector NGOs	<u>Anticipated (US\$ 15M):</u> Governments International organizations Foundations Financial institutions Private sector	- Internal monitoring and evaluation	Extension of current activities
Industry associations Private sector NGOs Governments	<u>Committed:</u> UNDP WLPGA <u>Anticipated:</u> Bilateral donors	- Internal monitoring and evaluation	New partnership
ICLEI (lead) Governments NGOs Academic institutions	<u>Committed (startup funding):</u> Lead partners and others <u>Anticipated:</u> GWP Financial Partners Group Further funding from partners	- Steering Committee evaluation	Extension of current activities
WACLAC Cities NGOs	Not specified	Not specified	Extension of current activities
WACLAC NGOs Governments	<u>Anticipated:</u> \$US 100K startup \$US 300K annual	- Internal monitoring and evaluation	Extension of current activities
Cities NGOs Funding agencies Private sector	<u>Anticipated:</u> US\$ 5M	- Internal monitoring and evaluation	Extension of current activities
Governments Cities Academic institutions Funding agencies	<u>Anticipated:</u> \$US 3M	- Internal monitoring and evaluation	Extension of current activities
WACLAC (lead) IULA (lead) Governments Cities Private sector NGOs Funding agencies	<u>Anticipated:</u> \$US 5M	- Internal monitoring and evaluation	Extension of current activities
WACLAC Governments Private sector NGOs	<u>Anticipated:</u> \$US 5+M	Not specified	Extension of current activities

30 PROGRESS OR PERIL? THE POST-JOHANNESBURG AGENDA

	Title	Purpose	International Organizations
	Coalition for Sustainable Urbanisation - Model City-to-City Cooperation Partnership	Mainstream city-to-city cooperation for the systematic transfer of knowledge, expertise and technology in support of sustainable urbanisation	UN-Habitat (lead)
	Coalition for Sustainable Urbanisation - Partnership for Learning from Best Practices, Good Policies, and Enabling Legislation	Mainstream lessons learned from successful practices, policies and legislation in urban development	UN-Habitat (lead) UNDP UNITAR UNHCR
	Coalition for Sustainable Urbanisation - Water for Asian Cities	Provide access to water and sanitation for the urban poor in Asian cities	UNEP
	Equator Initiative	Contribute to efforts to sustain local livelihoods and reduce poverty through the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity by fostering, supporting and strengthening community partnerships	UNDP (lead)
World Bank-led Partnerships			
Climate Change/Air Pollution			
	Global Gas Flaring Reduction Partnership	Support the petroleum industry and national governments in their efforts to reduce the flaring of gas	WB
WHO-led Partnerships			
Health and Sustainable Development			
	Healthy Environments for Children	Accelerate global action to address priority health dangers and risks in the places where children live, are educated, and play	WHO (lead) UNICEF UNEP UN-Habitat
	Nutrition and SD	Implement recommendations in WHO/FAO expert consultation on diet, nutrition and the prevention of chronic diseases	WHO (lead) UNFAO (lead)
	Transport, Health, and the Environment Pan-European Program (PEP)	Achieve transportation patterns that are sustainable for health and the environment by focusing work at the Pan-European level	UNECE (lead) WHO (lead)
Other Key Partnerships			
Freshwater			
	EU Water Initiative	Raise policy profile of water, translate political commitments into coordinated action, improve water governance, and increase efficiency of EU aid flows	UNEP UN-ECE
Capacity-Building			
	Partnership for Principle Ten	Improve national public participation systems to support SD implementation at the local and regional level	WB UNEP UNDP

Other major partners	Funding	Monitoring	Status
Cities IULA WACLAC NGOs	<u>Committed:</u> UN-Habitat (core funding) <u>Anticipated:</u> Participants	- Internal monitoring and evaluation	Extension of current activities
WACLAC Cities NGOs Research institutions	<u>Committed:</u> UN-Habitat Finland UK Together Foundation <u>Anticipated:</u> Participants	- Internal monitoring and evaluation	Extension of current activities
Asian Development Bank (lead) Cities Governments Water and sanitation organizations	<u>Committed:</u> Asian Development Bank Netherlands Sweden Japan <u>Anticipated (\$US8M):</u> Partners Donors	- Steering Committee evaluation - Internal monitoring and evaluation	Extension of current activities
UN Foundation Governments NGOs Private sector Foundations	<u>Committed (\$US2.5M):</u> UN Foundation Canada IUCN IDRC The Nature Conservancy Television Trust for the Environment BrasilConnects UNDP <u>Anticipated (US\$28M):</u> Partners and others	- External review - Steering Committee evaluation	New partnership (as of 1/1/02)
Norway Shell Sonatrach	<u>Anticipated:</u> Participants	- Steering Committee evaluation - Internal monitoring and evaluation	New partnership
Industry associations NGOs Governments Research institutions Private sector	<u>Anticipated:</u> Partners Governments	- Internal monitoring and evaluation	Extension of current activities
Governments Research institutions NGOs Media	<u>Committed:</u> Partners <u>Anticipated:</u> Governments Foundations	- Internal monitoring and evaluation	Extension of current activities
Governments Cities NGOs Private sector Research institutions	<u>Committed:</u> UNECE WHO Several member states <u>Anticipated:</u> Other member states Other international organizations International financial institutions	- Steering Committee evaluation - Internal monitoring and evaluation	New partnership
EU (lead) Other governments NGOs Private sector	Not specified	Not specified	Major expansion of current activities
WRI (lead) Governments NGOs Research institutions	<u>Anticipated:</u> Partners	- Steering Committee evaluation - Internal review and monitoring	Major expansion of current activities

LEGEND

Abbreviation	Complete Name
EC	European Commission
EIB	European Investment Bank
ESMAP	World Bank Energy Sector Management Assistance Programme
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GWP	Global Water Partnership
ICLEI	International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives
ICRI	International Coral Reef Initiative
IEA	International Energy Agency
ILO	International Labour Organization
IUCN	The World Conservation Union
IULA	International Union of Local Authorities
OCHA	UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
UNCTAD	UN Conference on Trade and Development
UN-DESA	UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNDP	UN Development Programme
UN-ECE	UN Economic Commission for Europe
UNEP	UN Environment Programme
UNEP-MAP	Mediterranean Action Plan
UNESCO	UN Educational, Social and Cultural Organization
UNFIP	UN Fund for International Partnerships
UNHCR	UN High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	UN Children's Fund
UNIDO	UN Industrial Development Organisation
UNITAR	UN Institute for Training and Research
UNOPS	UN Office for Project Services
WACLAC	World Associations of Cities and Local Authorities Coordination
WB	World Bank
WHO	World Health Organization

REFERENCES

- Abbott, Kenneth W., and Duncan Snidal, 2001. "Why States Act Through Formal International Organizations." In *The Politics of Global Governance: International Organizations in an Interdependent World*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Benner, Thorsten and Jan Martin Witte. 2001. "Brücken in globalen System. Neues Leitbild für Internationale Organsationen," in: *Internationale Politik* 56 (5), pp. 13-20.
- Bennis, Warren. 1970. "Beyond Bureaucracy." In *Organization Theories*, edited by W. P. Sexton. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.
- Bernstein, Steven. 2001. *The Compromise of Liberal Environmentalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biermann, Frank. 2000. "The Case for a World Environment Organization." *Environment* 42 (9): 22.
- Calder, Fanny. 2002. *The Potential for Using the Multistakeholder Network Model to Develop and Deliver Partnership for Implementation ("Type Two Outcomes") for the World Summit on Sustainable Development*. London: Royal Institute for International Affairs
- Dua, Andre, and Daniel C. Esty. 1997. *Sustaining the Asia Pacific Miracle: Economic Integration and Environmental Protection*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for International Economics.
- Esty, Daniel C., and Maria H. Ivanova. 2002. "Revitalizing Global Environmental Governance: A Function-Driven Approach." In *Global Governance: Options & Opportunities*, edited by D. C. Esty and M. H. Ivanova. New Haven, CT: Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies. <<http://www.yale.edu/environment/geg/geg.html>>
- Friends of the Earth. 2002. *Position Paper on International Environmental Governance, 2002*. Accessible at <<http://www.foei.org/wssd/governance.html>>
- Gemmill, Barbara, Maria Ivanova, and Yoke Ling Chee. 2002. *Designing a New Architecture for Global Environmental Governance*. World Summit for Sustainable Development Briefing Papers, International Institute for Environment and

Development (IIED), London. <http://www.poptel.org.uk/iied/test/searching/ring_pdf/wssd_21_international_environmental_governance.pdf.

Haas, Peter M. 1991. *International Environmental Issues: an ACUNS Teaching Text*. Hanover, NH: Academic Council on the United Nations System.

Hales, David, and Robert Prescott-Allen. 2002. "Flying Blind: Assessing Progress Toward Sustainability." In *Global Environmental Governance: Options & Opportunities*, edited by D. C. Esty and M. H. Ivanova. New Haven, CT: Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies. <http://www.yale.edu/environment/publications/geg/geg.html>.

Hardin, Garrett. 1968. "The Tragedy of Commons." *Science* 162 (3859): 1243-1248.

Hemmati, Minu. 2001. *Multi-Stakeholder Processes for Governance and Sustainability: Beyond Deadlock and Conflict*. London: Earthscan Publications.

Kara, Jan, and Diane Quarless. 2002. *Guiding Principles for Partnerships for Sustainable Development*. UN Department for Economic and Social Affairs, June 7, 2002. Accessible at <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/documents/prepcom4docs/bali_documents/annex_partnership.pdf>, accessed 8 November 2002).

Kaul, Inge, Isabelle Grunberg, and Marc A. Stern. 1999. *Global Public Goods: International Cooperation in the 21st Century*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Keohane, Robert O., and J. S. Nye. 1977. *Power and Interdependence. World Politics in Transition*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Keohane, Robert O., and Joseph S. Nye. 2000. "Introduction." In *Governance in a Globalizing World*, edited by J. D. Donahue. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Morgan, Patrick M. 1981. *Theories and Approaches to International Relations*. 3rd ed. New Brunswick: Transaction Books.

Nelson, Jane and Simon Zadek. *Partnership Alchemy: New Social Partnerships in Europe* (Copenhagen: Copenhagen Centre, 1999).

- Olson, Mancur, Jr. 1965. *The Logic of Collective Action*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Palmer, Geoffrey. 1992. "New Ways to Make International Environmental Law." *American Journal of International Law* 86 (2): 259-283.
- Parmentier, Rémi. 2002. *Type 1 Versus Type 2 Outcomes: Explaining the Jargon, Exposing the Trap*. Greenpeace International, May 8, 2002. <http://archive.greenpeace.org/earthsummit/docs/jargon.pdf>, accessed 31 October 2002.
- Peterson, M.J. 2000. "International Organizations and the Implementation of Environmental Regimes." In *Global Governance: Drawing Insights from the Environmental Experience*, edited by O. R. Young. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Reinicke, Wolfgang. 1998. *Global Public Policy: Governing Without Government?* Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Reinicke, Wolfgang H., and Francis Deng et al. 2000. *Critical Choices: The United Nations, Networks, and the Future of Global Governance*. Ottawa: International Development Research Council.
- Rischar, Jean-Francois. 2001. "High Noon: We Need New Approaches to Global Problem-Solving, Fast." *Journal of International Economic Law* 4 (3): 507-525.
- _____. 2002. *High Noon: 20 Global Problems, 20 Years to Solve Them*. New York: Basic Books.
- Streck, Charlotte. 2002. "Global Public Policy Networks as Coalitions for Change." In *Global Environmental Governance: Options & Opportunities*, edited by D. C. Esty and M. H. Ivanova. New Haven, CT: Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies. <<http://www.yale.edu/environment/publications/geg/geg.html>>.
- UN Secretary-General. 2001. (December 19). *Implementing Agenda 21*. New York: United Nations. E/CN.17/2002/PC.2/7. Accessible at: <<http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/documents/no170793sgreport.pdf>>, accessed 13 November 2002).

UN/DESA. 2002. *Key Outcomes of the Summit*. UN Department of Social and Economic Affairs, September, 2002. Accessible at: <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/documents/summit_docs/2009_keyoutcomes_commitments.doc>, accessed 2 November 2002.

_____. 2002. *Partnerships/Initiatives to Strengthen the Implementation of Agenda 21*. UN Department of Social and Economic Affairs, 2002. Accessible at: <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/documents/prep2final_papers/wssd_description_of_partnerships2.doc>, accessed 5 November 2002.

_____. 2002. *Vice-Chairs' Summary of the Informal Meetings on Partnerships/Initiatives*. UN Department of Social and Economic Affairs, April 5, 2002. Accessible at <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/documents/prepcom3docs/summary_partnerships_050402.doc>, accessed 5 November 2002.

_____. 2002. *Vice-Chairs' Summary of the Informal Meetings on Partnerships for Sustainable Development*. UN Department of Social and Economic Affairs, June 7, 2002. Accessible at: <http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/wssd/download%20files/prep4_summary_partnership.pdf>, accessed 10 November 2002.

UNEP. 2001. *International Environmental Governance: Report of the Executive Director*. Nairobi: United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). UNEP/IGM/1/2. Accessible at: <<http://www.unep.org/ieg>>, accessed 13 November 2002.

Witte, Jan Martin, Wolfgang Reinicke, and Thorsten Benner. 2000. "Beyond Multilateralism: Global Public Policy Networks." *International Politics and Society* 2. Accessible at: <http://www.fes.de/IPG/ipg2_2000/artwitte.html>, accessed 13 November 2002.

Young, Oran R. 1999. *The Effectiveness of International Environmental Regimes: Causal Connections and Behavioral Mechanisms*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.