Scoping Workshop
Cross-Disciplinary Scholarship & Impact in Global Governance
UCL Institute of Global Governance
Friday, 9 May 2014
Venue: Gordon House 106, 29 Gordon Square, University College London

Convenors:
David Coen & Tom Pegram, UCL Institute of Global Governance

Rationale

The scope of global governance presents both opportunity and challenge. The concept, understood broadly as 'the formal and informal bundle of rules, roles and relationships that define and regulate the social practices of states and non-state actors in international affairs' is of increasing concern to scholars, policy-makers and activists alike (Slaughter 1998).

Underlying its growing prominence in scholarly and policy debate is the promise of integrating diverse research agendas under a unified framework of analysis, one which is purposive and focused fundamentally on problem-solving. However, the expansive scope of the concept as a tool of analysis also poses serious challenges, above all, how to ensure that the promise of global comparison (across levels and scales) is achieved without forfeiting explanatory power.

There is no one understanding of 'governance', let alone of 'global governance'. It functions in many different contexts, on a number of scales, and through a multitude of institutions, with its effects varying accordingly. Many of the most pressing challenges that we face are due to inadequate governance or poor application of governance, and solutions will often necessitate operating across different levels and jurisdictions.

This workshop proposes to engage this debate by probing global governance as a truly multidisciplinary enterprise. Multidisciplinarity is increasingly invoked as vital to innovatively tackling the daunting scale and complexity of challenges in global health, financial regulation, environmental sustainability and management of myriad other global goods (and bads). Yet there remains little rigorous consideration of what this actually means in practice. This exploratory workshop will fill this gap by examining how a multi-disciplinary perspective can generate insight into the descriptive content of the concept, the structures and processes which are material to explaining outcomes, as well as pathways towards a more integrative application across disciplinary boundaries.

This is an opportunity to put UCL's imprimatur on global governance research, providing a powerful statement on the value of multidisciplinary collaboration. The workshop will showcase the unique strengths of UCL as a recognised global leader in multidisciplinary scholarship (including disciplines such as geography, engineering, clinical medicine, humanities and the social sciences). It will gather a core group of scholars to make a significant intellectual

contribution to what remains an emergent field of scholarship and practice, ultimately producing a publication by a top-tier university press.

This project starts from the assumption that identifying practical approaches to major global governance challenges is best enabled by integrating knowledge and research capabilities across multiple disciplines. Such an approach can also serve as the departure point for fundamental disciplinary advances as well as collaboration on funding bids.

The workshop will draw together scholars from a range of disciplines producing scholarship which – explicitly or implicitly – has important implications for how we understand governance within local, regional and global contexts. The purpose is to exchange ideas and further research on the modes, forms and mechanisms of governance encountered across disciplinary fields, as well as encourage more precise evaluation of how individual or configurations of governance features emerge, evolve and effect outcomes. The workshop will firstly serve as an important mapping exercise, canvassing disciplinary experts to produce a taxonomy of governance architecture across discrete domains, examples of successful innovation, vertical and lateral linkages from the trans or inter-national to the domestic level, as well as, importantly, governance deficits and weaknesses.

This descriptive exercise will form a valuable contribution in its own right. The scope and specificity of individual contributions will vary, guided by the issues which motivate each researcher's work. However, by pooling insight from across multiple fields, the workshop proposes to also transcend vertical disciplinary boundaries and engage a horizontal space of knowledge-exchange, motivated by comparative intent. This horizontal agenda will be informed by the contribution of workshop participants, with a focus on key issues which travel across governance domains, such as: participation and responsiveness, legitimate state, non-state and private authority, public-private interactions, institutional transformation and change, methods of transmission, enforcement, monitoring and implementation of formal and informal rules, among others. One further theme is the unintended consequences of governance innovation, the potential for failure, backlash and 'governance fatigue'. There is no necessary presumption that governance mechanisms will invariably work or produce positive results.

This horizontal approach opens up a series of important questions regarding variation across disciplinary domains and issue-areas, including overlap and interplay between regimes, classifying dimensions of comparison, as well as the utility of global governance as an analytical device for examining global societal challenges and uncovering the fundamental nature of the problem as well as potential solutions.

Background

Launched in September 2013, the UCL Institute of Global Governance (IGG) seeks to harness the unique strengths of UCL as a multi-faculty global university to address the challenge of global governance. Central to its core mission, the Institute will undertake cross-disciplinary study of crucial governance 'deficits' in order to explore the nature of the problem, the processes, structures and institutions involved, and potential solutions.

The Institute will address the current gap in the UK market for a major organizational base for global governance scholarship and practice, whilst also bringing the distinctive strengths of UCL to bear on such an enterprise: namely, our ability to integrate disciplines that draw from both a material base (from disciplines such as engineering, clinical medicine, and the physical and natural sciences) and a social sciences and humanities perspective.

The IGG is exceptionally well-placed to become one of the top Global Governance Institutes in the world, reinforcing UCL's track record as a recognised global leader in cross-disciplinary scholarship and research. The Institute will facilitate collaboration with colleagues from across UCL, as well as engage with policy-makers, practitioners, civil society and other actors to promote informed public debate on possible solutions to global societal challenges. This workshop will be an important step towards achieving this vision.

Panel outlines

The event will include a host of leading scholars and practitioners from within and outside UCL whose interest in research which cuts across traditional disciplinary boundaries and engages with questions of globalisation and governance. The workshop is intended to be highly interactive and participatory. A thematic roundtable format with brief presentations will provide the point of departure for discussion. It should be emphasised that researchers are invited to engage generally with these thematics as they see fit. The scope and specificity of sub-thematic activity will be guided by the issues which motivate each project. Panels will be focused on the following thematic areas:

A. Surveying Global Governance across Domains

This workshop session will draw on the combined insight of colleagues from across UCL faculties who will be invited to present a short position paper on governance with a global dimension in their respective fields. This preparatory document is intended to guide individual contributions in this session. As a preliminary guide, participants will be encouraged to locate their respective research within a global governance framework which emphasises four analytical dimensions:

1. *Procedural*: principally descriptive, this domain is focused on specifying the actors and governance stakeholders, the policies they pursue and instruments at their disposal. It also engages with the question of networks of governance and the situation of actors within more or less hierarchical orders; and, their profile along a continuum from international/multilateral to public-private or entirely private governance arrangements.

   Key question: Who are the actors and institutions engaged in the global governance arrangement under analysis and what policies and instruments do they have at their disposal?

2. *Structural:* this dimension is interested in the governance architecture; the formal and informal rules which define and regulate actors; and, the extent to which rules are framed in terms of obligation, precision and delegation. Questions of access and participation in core governance activities are also material to this dimension.

<u>Key question:</u> What is the division of labour among participating actors in terms of delineating governance roles and responsibilities?

3. *Functional:* the third dimension opens up the question of classifying functions performed by the governance architecture under analysis. This focus bridges both the descriptive (how it works) and prescriptive (how should it work). Functions will vary significantly across issue-areas, but the following provides a non-exhaustive list of possible core functions:

- Stewardship: mobilisation, coordination and focalising diverse actors around a common policy solution

- Rule-making: supplying broad-based solutions in the form of norm creation, procedural innovation and frameworks of binding and non-binding norms and policies

- Financing and resource allocation: collection of finances and their disbursement in line with a global strategy and institutional structure, with a particular focus on supply chains

- Monitoring & Evaluation: strengthening monitoring and surveillance systems to feed information into policy formulation, response and coordination efforts, and compliance assessment

- Advocacy: A potentially wide range of public and private actors may utilise diplomatic and non-diplomatic tools to influence the policy agenda towards their preferred set of solutions

- Accountability: holding decision-makers and those responsible for implementation to account for the achievement of agreed norms and standards, with a particular focus on lines of command and control within a globalised context

<u>Key question:</u> what core function(s) does the governance architecture under analysis perform and what modes of governance are best-suited to which governance functions?

Normative: a fourth dimension opens up inquiry into fundamental concerns of legitimate authority and power/resource allocation within governance arrangements. This focus probes the key political and distributional consequences of existing regulatory governance regimes, highlighting how key actors are connected to power structures; whose interests and values are represented; and, how competition for decision-making authority impacts upon coordination at the supranational level. This domain of investigation uncovers the dynamic effects of governance on actors' incentives/disincentives, their positioning within a hierarchy (chokepoints, gatekeepers, enablers), how power is (re-)configured, and the intended and unintended consequences of regime change.

<u>Key question:</u> How is the regulatory framework under analysis connected to power structures and how should that power be structured?

B. Thinking Vertically and Horizontally

The workshop will pool insights from across disciplinary boundaries to engage with a series of cross-cutting first-order questions: What is global governance? How does it work? What is the function of diverse governance arrangements? What are the distributional consequences for key actors in terms of authority and resource allocation? If the presence of supranational governance structures is becoming a settled fact, cross-fertilisation of global governance research and practice outside disciplinary and scholar-practitioner silos has only just begun. By collecting innovative work from leading scholars spanning economics, geography, engineering, law, anthropology, health, among others, the proposed workshop will critically examine the significance of global governance as a common platform for generating advances across disciplines as well as developing practical approaches to major global governance challenges. As a result, the workshop also underscores the broader implications of such cross-cutting research for scholarship and practice.

The discussion will be anchored by the vertical expertise of specialists within their respective fields. However, the workshop will also explicitly encourage participants to think horizontally about comparison and differentiation across governance domains. The objective here is not to elaborate a "quantum theory of global governance" but rather to pursue the more modest aim of encouraging engagement with some of the assumptions, claims and counterclaims which underlie current thinking on the phenomenon. Three principal objectives motivate this horizontal agenda:

1. Contribute to the literature on global regulatory governance, its processes, structures and effects
2. Provide a venue in which interdisciplinary scholars and practitioners can share insights related to critical subsets of the global governance phenomenon
3. Arrive at conclusions on the performance and effects of governance arrangements across thematics and regulatory situations

A first generation of global governance scholarship has introduced a multiplying lexicon of descriptive terms such as regime complex, pluralist governance, constitutionalisation, global administrative law, all of which provide valuable insight into aspects of supranational governance (Keohane and Victor 2010, Kingsbury 2005, De Búrca et al. 2013; Abbott and Snidal 2000). However, underlying its conceptual malleability, there remains little consensus on the fundamentals of global governance. For instance, when transposed to the global level, does governance imply the kind of hierarchy associated with the concept when applied to domestic social systems? Does global governance serve a useful descriptive or prescriptive purpose when applied to highly decentralised or private forms of governance such as private contracting?

With some notable exceptions (Woods and Mattli 2009; Hurrell 2007), still less attention has been given to important areas of variation, such as divergent outcomes at different levels of governance and unanticipated consequences of governance innovation across settings. This workshop will look at global governance from a variety of disciplinary perspectives with a view

to advancing a generational shift towards productive inter and cross-disciplinary global governance research.[1]

As stated above, this project starts from the assumption that identifying practical approaches to major global governance challenges is best enabled by integrating knowledge and research capabilities. This workshop will lay the groundwork for productive cross-disciplinary dialogue, identifying areas of overlapping consensus as well as disagreement. By bringing to the fore normative questions of power asymmetry and norm/value conflict, the workshop will problematise the often implicit, but prevalent, assumption among disciplinary experts that the task of global governance research is to essentially find effective and efficient solutions to a set of well-understood shared global problems. It will also seek to integrate disciplines that draw from both a material base and a social sciences and humanities perspective.

Concerted moves towards breaking out of disciplinary silos is readily apparent in the ascendant science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) research agenda, as well as a highly productive triangular conversation between economics, explanatory political science and international law. There is much to be gained from further interpenetration across disciplinary lines. For many observers, efforts towards comprehensive regulation of human rights, carbon emissions, sustainable resources, and other global public goods and bads are stalled or failing. Harnessing a fuller knowledge of the effects of global regulatory efforts on both actor incentives and functionalist imperatives may be essential to identifying and overcoming fundamental impediments to progress. This workshop is a first step towards generating such insight.

As outlined in Table 1, a global governance matrix will be devised to guide discussion drawing initially on a deductive framework of analysis. This draft template will be elaborated and enhanced in light of workshop contributions and inductive process of refinement. However, this matrix provides a useful point of departure for identifying appropriate dimensions of comparison along which governance patterns and variation may be observed.

Table 1: Global Governance Matrix

Dimension	Sub-dimension	Descriptive
Procedural	Actor	Public
		Mixed
		Private
	Hierarchy	Vertical delegation
		Principal-trustee
		Non-hierarchical
	Linkage	Transnational
		Transnational-Regional
		Transnational-Regional-

---

[1] For some pioneering examples of this shift see Brennan et al. 2013 and Biermann et al. 2012.

Dimension	Sub-dimension	Descriptive
		Transnational-Regional-National-District
	Policy	Narrow technical purpose
		Broad-based public purpose
Structural	Legalisation I	Formal
		Informal
	Legalisation II	Precision
		Ambiguous
	Comprehensiveness	Unitary
		Pluralistic
	Participative mechanisms	Inclusive membership
		Exclusive membership
Functional	Stewardship	Integrated regime
		Fragmented regime
	Rule-making	Authoritative/binding
		Exhortatory/non-binding
	Financing	Public
		Private
		Mixed
	Monitoring	Centralised
		Decentralised
	Advocacy	Supply-side (group activation)
		Demand-side (information)
	Accountability	Enforcement
		Answerability (transparency)
Normative	Logic of appropriateness	Rule agreement
		Rule contestation
	Modes of governance	Managing gatekeepers
		Bypassing gatekeepers
	Social relationships	Cooperative
		Competitive
	Governance objectives	Convergence
		Divergence
	Norm salience	High norm resonance in local
		Low norm resonance in local

This matrix will be further refined in the course of the project. However, it does begin the task of highlighting potential dimensions of governance which travel across substantive domains. To make this more concrete, consider the dimension of legalisation. In global financial regulation,

key focal actors such as the WTO represent highly legalised structures with dispute settlement arrangements and binding authority. Contrast this to other domains which display normative frameworks grounded in non-binding voluntary codes of conduct such as the emergent corporate social responsibility agenda. In turn, if we take stewardship, contrast the multiple jurisdictions of global health governance (the World Health Organization, various public and private agencies such as UNAIDS or the Gates Foundation) with the security domain where stewardship is centrally located within multilateral (UN Security Council) or, increasingly, regional forums (NATO and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization) dedicated to harmonizing the interests of national states.

Mapping out governance along two or more of these dimensions reveals significant variation and patterns which may allow for more generalizable propositions to be advanced regarding the drivers of governance success and failure. Why does the WTO present an example of a highly legalized, comprehensive and integrated governance arrangement in contrast to high profile domains such as climate regulation and migration where efforts to establish a comprehensive framework convention have faltered? It is also important to track change over time, few observers would have predicted that the power configurations of the GATT would be transformed into a far more legalised arrangement under the WTO. A cross-disciplinary approach to such questions can harness both the technical and analytic insight of the material sciences, as well as the social sciences, legal and humanities perspective on the kinds of social relationships, sets of understandings and networks which shape governance in process. This workshop will encourage a more substantive 'two-way' reflection on the technical dimensions of highly political policy domains. In turn, an appreciation of social relations and normative impact may be usefully integrated into technically-grounded policy analyses.

The challenge of elaborating a meaningful analytical framework rooted in a multi-disciplinary approach to global governance should not be underestimated. However, understanding the effects of governance interventions at multiple levels and scales on the behaviour of diverse individuals and organisations is of fundamental concern. This workshop will adopt a pragmatic reflexive approach, based on parity of esteem across disciplines and encourage participants to share insights with a view to making use of diverse perspectives to identify areas of agreement, variation, as well as to highlight blind spots. Such a task also has potentially significant conceptual, theoretical, methodological and empirical implications. It may, in some instances, be a case of learning and retooling across disciplines. For instance, the emphasis of global administrative law on metrics to assess accountability and transparency displays affinities with evaluation methods employed by engineers to assess complex and large knowledge and technological systems. In other instances, it may entail a more ambitious process of identifying cross-cutting conceptual and normative pathways.

C. Policy Interface and Translation

Beyond building cross-disciplinary capacity in the field of global governance, the workshop will also engage with how to capacity-build in the translation and communication of research into actionable policy. Concretely, what does research-policy translation actually mean and when can it have its greatest impact? What principle translation activities can the IGG facilitate? The failure to translate research into practice and policy is a perennial concern across disciplines and

sectors, in particular regarding evidence-practice and policy gaps and the significant opportunity costs that may arise. A growing number of organisations are dedicated to bridging this divide and it has also received some research attention in its own right. For instance, Grimshaw et al. (2012) identify five key questions which should guide translation activities:

1. What should be transferred
2. To whom should research knowledge be transferred
3. By whom should research knowledge be transferred
4. How should research knowledge be transferred
5. With what effect should research knowledge be transferred?

The workshop will engage with this line of inquiry, with a view to situating the IGG as both an enabler of internationally excellent research on global governance and a bridge to impact among policy-makers and practitioners. This approach will be a key differentiator of the IGG within a field which is populated principally by academic research institutes and policy think tanks. The IGG proposes to facilitate high-quality research which will also directly inform real world actors, mechanisms and challenges. Direct interface between scholars and practitioners will reinforce the quality of research by encouraging application and refinement of scholarly output in light of experience. In turn, policy analyses will be connected to a broader research agenda focused on scaling-up and pooling knowledge of global governance phenomena.

To achieve this, the workshop will host a final session with practitioners and experts in research-policy translation in the area of global governance. This session will invite them to share their insights on how they engage with researchers and scholars and how interaction varies across the public and private sector. They will also give their views on the challenges of translating breakthrough innovation at the macro scientific and theoretical level through to the micro-level where it influences the behaviour of key actors, from policy-makers, thought leaders and people's everyday lives.