**Governance and Economic Development: Problem-Solving at Global, National, and Sub-National Levels**

**Course Description**

The complete scope of governance, as defined by the 1995 *Commission on Global Governance*, includes informal or consensual arrangements for managing aspects of human relationships (from local, customary justice to the Montreal Convention on global atmospheric ozone).[[1]](#endnote-1) For this course, governance emphasizes the objectives of global public policy, including “milieu goals,” which are objectives for shaping an entity’s external environment.[[2]](#endnote-2) Global governance has milieu goals of worldwide scope, as expressed in the UN Charter as well as other key documents for global governance, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The institutions of global, national, and sub-national governance are the “mechanisms for steering” states and societies toward such goals.[[3]](#endnote-3)

The course will focus on institutions and relations that involve some degree of legitimate authority, that is, authority accepted by participants as a right to rule, use power, and leverage compliance.[[4]](#endnote-4) Such authority can be exercised not only by governments, but also various other actors over their respective membership communities, which may be linked by kinship, religion, profession, or business. They participate in global governance provided they “exert authority over communities located in two or more states….”[[5]](#endnote-5)

Global governance is also understood to encompass relations of international actors with national, subnational, and local actors. Thus, for example, UN peacekeeping operations may have a duty and authority from the UN Security Council (global) both to help rebuild the capacity of a post-conflict government (national-level action) and to protect civilians from physical violence (local-level action).

Global public goods: What they are and why they are needed

Governments and global governance arrangements alike exist to provide public goods, which one person can use it without diminishing its availability to others and which people cannot practically be excluded from using.[[6]](#endnote-6) For these reasons, markets have limited incentives to provide them, and governments underprovide global public goods for similar reasons: states that have not contributed to providing such goods cannot be practically excluded from enjoying them.

Different global problems involve different kinds of public goods with different sorts of participation incentives that problem-solving strategies need to recognize. For example, “single best effort” goods are those that can be supplied effectively by one or a few parties, although wider participation may be sought to share costs or to *limit* action; “weakest link public goods” fail if states that contribute the least fail to contribute that share, as with vaccination campaigns against infectious disease; finally, “aggregate public goods” are those whose effectiveness varies depending on who participates in providing them. A successful aggregate public good would be the restoration of stratospheric ozone under the Montréal Protocol. [[7]](#endnote-7)

Global justice and security are “aggregate public goods” that no single state or group of states can provide throughout the world. While some provide more than others, the more states that participate in providing these goods, the stronger both become. At a sub-regional level, however, certain states may be weak links whose low levels of governance threaten not only their own people’s enjoyment of security and justice but security and justice in neighboring states as well.

Global governance as network governance

Global governance is a mix of bilateral, informal multilateral, and treaty-based relations among states that is increasingly influenced by non-state actors’ interests and activities. The largest segment of it, the UN system, is a loose network of organizations that answer to no single administrator (the UN Secretary-General administers the UN Secretariat but coordinates with other parts of the system). The relationships of UN Member States are similarly networked in flat organizations like the General Assembly. Even the Security Council is a two-tiered network of permanent and non-permanent members—the five permanent members (P5) caucus together and influence the Council’s proceedings but cannot *require* that other Council members vote with them.

Three basic forms of network governance are summarized in Table 1. The first form is “participant-governed,” with no central core of management and no lead entity, just a group of organizations collaborating toward more or less common goals. This model corresponds more or less to informal groupings of states, such as the G20, as well as the top level of the UN system. For example, the Secretary-General convenes Chief Executives Board for Coordination with agencies over which he does not have direct administrative control.

The second network model has one member that leads the others “because of its central position in the flow of clients and key resources.” Such a role is mandated to a UN peace operation and its Head of Mission (HoM) when it deploys into a country where other UN entities already operate.

The third model uses a “network administrative organization” to manage the network’s interests and operations on behalf of its members. One example is the UN is the Development Operations Coordination Office. Its 34-person staff supports the UN Development Group, a network of 32 UN agencies, funds, and programs.

**Table 1: Key Forms of Network Governance**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | | |
| **Governance Form** | **Trust** | **No. of Participants** | **Goal Consensus** | **Need for Network Level Competencies** |
| **Shared governance** | High density | Few | High | Low |
| **Lead organization** | Low density, highly centralized | Moderate number | Moderately low | Moderate |
| **Network Adminis­trative Organization** | Moderate density, monitored by members | Moderate to many | Moderately high | High |
| *Source: Provan & Kenis (2007)* | | | | |

**Course Outline**

**Day Two**

**8:00 – 8:30 a.m. Breakfast**

**8:30 – 9:00 a.m. Welcome and Introductions**

**9:00 – 9:45 a.m. Understanding Governance**

The aim of this session is to better understand and introduce students to governance as a basic conceptual framework and how the field has evolved over the past five decades. It seeks to examine the influence of forces from above (globalization) and forces from below (for example, ethnic-sectarian violence) in changing the geopolitical environment for governance at global, national, and sub-national levels.

* Overview of the course;
* Brief history of the field: provide a basic conceptual framework of governance;
* Defining Governance
  + Contest Definitions
  + Core Features and Related Concepts
  + Global Governance
  + National Governance
  + Sub-National Governance
* The evolution of the field:
  + Governance and the safeguarding of Peace and Security
  + Governance and the Environment
  + Governance and Development
  + Governance and Human Rights

**9:45 – 10:45 a.m. Governance at the National Level: A resurgent Westphalian State System?**

This sessions aims to provide a better understanding of how governance has functioned at the level-level for several hundred years. The session also aims to introduce students to the roles and responsibilities of major actors involved in national-level governance.

* Political Institutions
* Bureaucratic Institutions
* Judicial Institutions
* Security Sector Institutions
* Business Community
* Civil Society
* Media
* Governing in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Community compared to Governing in “Normal” States
* Why the Military should care about Governance and why a Professional Security Sector is integral to Effective Governance
* The New Frontier of National Governance: Hybridity and Innovative Pubic-Private Partnerships

**10:45– 11:00 a.m. Break**

**11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Governance at the Sub-National Level: Where people engage governance directly**

This session seeks to examine new challenges facing governance at the level closest to citizens: provincial, municipal, and community-level. The students will learn about a range of trends, risks, and opportunities facing sub-national governance actors from the state, private sector, and civil society, including:

* Migration and refugees
* Climate mitigation and adaptation
* Narcotics trafficking and other criminal activities
* Conflict management and resolution
* Socio-economic development
* Why Sub-National Governance matters for Stability and Effective Peace & Stability Operations

**12:00 p.m. – 1:00p.m.Lunch**

**1:15 – 2:15 p.m. Governance at the Global Level: Problem-solving across borders and regions**

This segment explains the chief traditional (states and international organizations) and non-traditional actors (regional organizations, cities, the business community, and civil society groups and social movements) contributing to global governance problem-solving today. Major impediments to the effective functioning of global governance will be examined, as well as success stories. Key case studies will include:

* Global governance institutional responses to violent conflict and state fragility.
* The Post-2015 Development Agenda (Sustainable Development Goals)
* Combatting corruption and illicit financial flows worldwide.
* Human rights, cultural relativism, and global governance.

**2:15 – 3:00 pm Special Presentation of the Findings and Recommendations of the former U.S. Secretary of State Dr. Madeleine Albright and former Nigerian Foreign Minister Dr. Ibrahim Gambar co-chaired Commission on Global Security, Justice & Governance** (visit: <http://www.globalsecurityjusticegovernance.org/> )

**3:00 – 3:15 p.m. Break**

**3:15 – 4:15 p.m.** **Three Break-Out Groups formed to delve deep on select global governance reform challenges, risks, and opportunities on:**

* Coping with Violent Conflict and State Fragility
* Climate Governance: Global Systems, Local Livelihoods
* Governing the Hyperconnected Global Economy

**4:15 – 4:50 p.m. Three Break-Out Groups report back to the full class and participate in a moderated discussion that will aim to synthesize key global governance characteristics and challenges across efforts to solve problems and create opportunities in the three thematic areas of state fragility, climate governance, and the volatile global economy.**

**4:50 – 5:00 p.m. Review and Reflection**

This session seeks to review and discuss the main themes of Day Two.

**5:00 p.m. Adjournment**

1. Commission on Global Governance, *Our Global Neighborhood* (Oxford Univ. Press, 1995), 2. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. Arnold Wolfers, *Discord and Collaboration: Essays on International Politics* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1962). [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
3. James Rosenau, “Toward an Ontology for Global Governance,” in *Approaches to Global Governance Theory*, eds. Martin Hewson and Timothy J. Sinclair (SUNY Press, 1999), 296. [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
4. David Lake, *Hierarchy in International Relations* (Cornell University Press, 2011), 20–22. [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
5. David Lake, “Rightful Rules: Authority, Order, and the Foundations of Global Governance,” *International Studies Quarterly* 54 (2010): 590. [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
6. Daniel Bodansky, “What’s in a Concept? Global Public Goods, International Law, and Legitimacy,” European Journal of International Law 23 (2012): 652. [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
7. Scott Barrett, “Why Cooperate? The Incentive to Supply Global Public Goods (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 64. [↑](#endnote-ref-7)