

Abstracts

Measuring the Negotiation Burden of Multilateral Environmental Agreements

Miguel Muñoz, Rachel Thrasher, and Adil Najam

The Global Environmental Governance (GEG) system has grown significantly since the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro. In this paper we analyze ten leading Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs), reviewing various quantitative indicators (related to time, resources and commitment) to chart their evolution and to measure the “negotiation burden” that the burgeoning GEG system is imposing on states and secretariats. We find that these representative MEAs have not only grown in size but also have become busier over time, although there are indications that as the GEG system “matures,” it may also be stabilizing. Among other things, we find that the reported budget for these ten MEA secretariats has grown nine-fold in sixteen years, from US\$ 8.18 million in 1992 to US\$ 75.83 million in 2007. Counting only the most important of meetings, and using the number of meeting days as an indicator of the “negotiation load,” we find that the negotiation load for the leading MEAs has stabilized, averaging around 115 meeting days per year. Decisions also seem to plateau at about 185 per year.

The Fragmentation of Global Governance Architectures: A Framework for Analysis

Frank Biermann, Philipp Pattberg, Harro van Asselt, and Fariborz Zelli

Most research on global governance has focused either on theoretical accounts of the overall phenomenon or on empirical studies of distinct institutions that serve to solve particular governance challenges. In this article we analyze instead “governance architectures,” defined as the overarching system of public and private institutions, principles, norms, regulations, decision-making procedures and organizations that are valid or active in a given issue area of world politics. We focus on one aspect that is turning into a major source of concern for scholars and policy-makers alike: the “fragmentation” of governance architectures in important policy domains. The article offers a typology of different degrees of fragmentation, which we describe as synergistic, cooperative, and conflictive fragmentation. We then systematically assess alternative hypotheses over the relative advantages and disadvantages of different degrees of fragmentation. We argue that moderate degrees of fragmentation may entail both significant costs

and benefits, while higher degrees of fragmentation are likely to decrease the overall performance of a governance architecture. The article concludes with policy options on how high degrees of fragmentation could be reduced. Fragmentation is prevalent in particular in the current governance of climate change, which we have hence chosen as illustration for our discussion.

The Climate Change Regime Post-Kyoto: Why Compliance is Important and How to Achieve it

Sevasti-Eleni Vezirgiannidou

This paper considers a climate policy architecture that would be conducive to wide participation and successful compliance. Compliance in particular is an aspect of climate policy that has been under-specified in current proposals for an architecture for climate policy. Although admittedly a successful regime would have to satisfy a number of criteria, including environmental goals, dynamic efficiency and cost-effectiveness, any agreement would have to be implemented and enforced. The focus here is both on how to construct a regime that is environmentally effective, and on how to reduce problems of compliance and leakage. Other criteria will be considered in the proposal, such as cost-effectiveness and how to facilitate the negotiation process, but the primary focus will be on participation and compliance. The main argument is that a climate agreement based on both emissions targets and policies and measures is the most conducive to maximum participation and a successful compliance mechanism.

On the Modern and the Nonmodern in Deliberative Environmental Democracy

Kersty Hobson

The “deliberative turn” in green political theory and applied environmental decision-making is now well-established. However, questions remain about the applicability of its concepts and methods to non-Western or “nonmodern” contexts, to use a term from Gupte and Barlett’s 2007 article in this journal that is the stimulus to this article. In such places the societal pre-conditions of modernity deemed theoretically necessary for “authentic deliberation” to occur are mostly absent. Yet, authentic deliberation *does* take place, prompting questions about the geographical and cultural bias of the deliberative environmental democratic project. This article takes up such questions, arguing that in deliberative theory modernity is more than a bias, which is highlighted when the nonmodern is counted in. Instead, in its noun-form modernity suggests a particular type of deliberating subject, replete with specific capacities and knowledge, which the nonmodern is, in true binary fashion, deemed to lack. This arti-

cle draws on qualitative data from deliberative workshops in northern New Mexico, USA, to argue that such categorizations do not hold up to empirical or conceptual scrutiny, particularly in light of Bruno Latour's work on modernity and the Modern. Thus, this article argues that deliberative environmental democracy research should therefore be recast as an ethnographic and context-based project, and explores how such a project could be carried out.

Performing Symbolic Politics and International Environmental Regulation: Tracing and Theorizing a Causal Mechanism beyond Regime Theory

Joachim Blatter

This article demonstrates the empirical relevance and elaborates the theoretical foundation of a "polity-centered" causal mechanism of international environmental regulation which has been only superficially touched upon in international environmental regime theory and which challenges the policy-centrism of this field of research. Motorboat regulations on Lake Constance demonstrate the limits of established approaches in regime theory in explaining the strict regulations of this early regime. Rationalist explanatory approaches are not convincing since there are no helpful structural constellations and no functional need. According to normative-cognitive approaches, the institutional density and differentiation that exists in the transboundary Lake Constance region makes an "advocacy coalition" approach better suited than an "epistemic community" approach. Yet, even this perspective cannot explain the international breakthroughs towards strong regulations. To fill the remaining gap, it is necessary to account for the symbolic value of water in representing emerging transnational identities and institutions. Polity-centered coalitions of political leaders around the lake "performed" innovative regulations in a highly symbolic policy field in order to gain attention and recognition for their institutionalization of the idea of a "Euregio Bodensee." The article ends by demonstrating the empirical relevance of this causal mechanism beyond Lake Constance and discusses the theoretical consequences in the field of transnational water governance.

Environmental Space as a Basis for Legitimizing Global Governance of Environmental Limits

Ton Bührs

The notion of environmental space, based on the principles of environmental limits and sharing environmental resources equitably, offers a starting point for a positive approach to the global "return of scarcity" challenge, notably by providing a basis legitimating and strengthening the global governance of environmental and resource limits. First, it provides a cognitive framework for deter-

mining limits *and* for dealing with these more comprehensively and effectively, at all levels of government. Second, the environmental space approach supports, notably at the global level, a more equitable distribution of access to, and/or the benefits from, increasingly scarce resources. Third, it can be used as a basis for designing and introducing institutions and processes that enhance democracy and community control over the use of resources. Although the adoption of the environmental space approach at the national, international and global levels faces formidable obstacles, more people stand to gain from it, materially, socially, and politically, than from the nationally based “environmental security” approach. The basis of support and agency for the environmental space approach is most likely to be strengthened by the development of institutional designs that enhance economic democracy, giving all people a material and political stake in the management of resources.