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Main Arguments

1. Institutional fragmentation keeps increasing.

2. Institutional fragmentation lacks a deeper theoretical framework.

3. Institutional fragmentation can be built into tenets of different strands of institutionalism.
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1 Introduction and Rationale
What is institutional fragmentation?

Diversity of international and transnational institutions

with different legal status, constituencies, spatial scopes
or predominant subject matters,
which overlap in their mandates and functions for addressing a given issue area.
From regime...

UNFCCC/
Kyoto Protocol
... to regime complex ...

- Adaptation initiatives
- Bilateral initiatives
- UNFCCC/Kyoto Protocol
- Clubs (G8+5; G20; MEF; APP)
- Ozone (Montreal Protocol)
- Subnational action (RGGI; California)
- Investment (BITs)
- Trade (WTO; NAFTA)

Source: Keohane & Victor 2011
... to a fragmented governance architecture.

I: UN Climate Regime
(different working and contact groups)

II: Multilateral climate & energy partn.
(APP, GMI, CSLF, IPHE, ICAP, PPPs, etc.)

III: Other int. environmental institutions
(CBD, Montreal Protocol, UNCCD, CSD)

IV: Int. non-environmental institutions
(WTO, WHO, UN Security Council, G8)

Source: Biermann et al. 2009
The actors of the play...

Source: Abbot 2012
... and the plot

Figure 12 Full network

Source: Widerberg 2014 (conference paper)
Global Climate Finance Architecture (Nakhooda et al. 2013)
State of the art: conceptual fragmentation

- *Institutional fragmentation*
- *Regime complexes*
- *Polycentric governance*
- *Polyarchic governance*

__________________________

- *Orchestration*
- *Bandwagoning*
- *Governance experiments*
- *Institutional diffusion*
Normative divide...?
Institutional fragmentation is...

... a structural characteristic of today’s global governance architectures.
2 Taking Stock
The NAVIGOV project

Aim: To generate new insights into the shape, causes and consequences of institutional complexity of global climate governance

1. **Mapping** the institutional complexity in three key policy domains
2. **Explaining** varying levels of institutional complexity
3. Analysing the **consequences** for legitimacy, effectiveness and for specific groups of actors
Three focus areas in CC policy

potential overlaps on ...

- REDD+
- SHORT LIVED CLIMATE POLLUTANTS
- GEOENGINEERING

- ADAPTATION
- MARINE GOVERNANCE
- CLIMATE CHANGE
- BIODIVERSITY
2a REDD
Institutional arrangements on forests -> evolution over time

Mandate focused on forests and forest products

Mandate related to forests/ indirect impact on forests

Global level

Institutional arrangements on forests – adding the regional level

**Mandate focused on forests and forest products**
- IFU
- FAO
- IMF
- World Bank
- ILO
- UNDP
- Ramsar
- WTO
- CBD
- UNFCCC
- UNCCD
- GEF
- UNPFII
- REDD+ partnership
- UN-REDD
- PEFC
- CPR

**Mandate related to forests/indirect impact on forests**
- IUCN
- WHC
- CITES
- UNEP
- Ramsar
- ILO
- UNDP
- World Bank
- WTO
- CBD
- UNFCCC
- UNCCD
- CBD
- UNFCCC
- UNCCD
- GEF
- UNPFII

**Regional level**
- Western Hemisphere Convention
- ASEAN
- ACTO
- SADC

**Regional arrangements**
- CBFP
- AFP
- CBFP
- COMIFAC
- FLEG

**Regional processes**
- C&I
- ATO
- CACF
- COMIFAC
- C&I
- ATO
- FLEG

**Bilateral arrangements**
- EU
- FLEG(T), bilateral REDD partnerships
2b Short-lived Climate Pollutants
# Types of SLCPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main anthropogenic emission sources</th>
<th>Black carbon</th>
<th>Tropospheric ozone</th>
<th>Methane</th>
<th>HFCs</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident biofuel and coal cooking and heating; Diesel engines; Open biomass burning</td>
<td>Not directly emitted, but a result of a reaction between ozone precursors</td>
<td>Fossil fuel extraction; Agriculture; Sewage and waste</td>
<td>Air conditioning and refrigeration; Mobile air conditioning; Foam agents; Aerosols; Fire extinguishers and solvents</td>
<td>CCAC 2014; UNEP 2011a; UNEP and WMO 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Atmospheric lifetime | 3-8 days | 4-18 days | 9.1 years | 1.5-222 years, depending on the type of HFC; 15 years average | CCAC 2014; Hartmann et al. 2013 |

| Near-term climate impacts of mitigation action | Measures can reduce warming by 0.19°C by 2050 | -- | Measures can reduce warming by 0.28°C by 2050 | 0.1°C by 2050 | Shindell et al. 2012; Xu et al. 2013 |

| Longer-term climate impacts of mitigation action | - Under a 2°C scenario: 0.1°C | - Under a 2°C scenario: 0.7°C | Under a 2°C scenario: 0.2°C | Under a 2°C scenario: 0.1°C | Rogelj et al. 2014 |

<p>| Non-climate benefits of mitigation action | Human health improvements; Enhanced crop yields | Human health improvements; Enhanced crop yields | See tropospheric ozone (with methane being the main precursor) | -- | Shindell et al. 2012; UNEP and WMO 2011 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Legal status</th>
<th>Public/private</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Governance functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montreal Protocol</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>197 parties</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Legally binding instrument</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Protect the ozone layer</td>
<td>Financing; Goal setting; Information sharing; Rule development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRTAP Convention (Gothenburg Protocol)</td>
<td>1979 (1999)</td>
<td>51 parties</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Legally binding instrument</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Protect the environment against air pollution</td>
<td>Information sharing; Rule development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMO</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>171 members</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employs legally binding instruments</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Ensure safety and security of shipping; prevent marine pollution by ships</td>
<td>Information sharing; Rule development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctic Council</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>8 Arctic states (plus 12 non-Arctic states as observers)</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Not legally binding</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Discuss Arctic issues (mainly related to environment/sustainable development)</td>
<td>Agenda-setting; Information sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCAC</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Not legally binding</td>
<td>Public-private</td>
<td>Promote action to address SLCPs</td>
<td>Agenda-setting; Information sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMI</td>
<td>2004 (as Methane to Markets)</td>
<td>42 countries (plus the European Commission), and 1300+ non-state actors</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Not legally binding</td>
<td>Public-private</td>
<td>Reduce methane emissions; enhance methane recovery; use methane as clean energy resource</td>
<td>Information sharing; Financing; Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFCCC</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>196 parties</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Avoid dangerous climate change</td>
<td>Financing; Information sharing; Rule development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2c Climate Engineering
Types of Climate Engineering

- Reflective Aerosols
- Cloud Seeding
- Space Mirrors
- Forestation
- CO₂ Capture From Air plus Storage
- CO₂ Capture From Fossil Fuels plus Storage
- Ocean Iron Fertilization
- Carbon Dioxide Removal

Sources: IPCC / Royal Society | More info: www.get2.cc/5e
Institutions Governing Climate Engineering

- LO&P
- ENMOD Convention
- CBD
- Forum for Climate Engineering Assessment
- Oxford Geoengineering Programme
- SRMGI - Solar Radiation Management Governance Initiative
- CLIMOS
- EuTRACE
Mapping - Comparison

**Commonalities**

- lack of an institutional core
- strong overlaps between environmental institutions of different domains

**Differences**

- number and importance of public international institutions
- level of institutional integration
Mapping – Next Steps

Use Social Network Analysis (SNA) to assess fragmentation and visualize the institutional architecture of different policy areas.
Mapping – Next Steps

Compare cases using Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA)
→ Between different policy areas in Climate Change governance
3 Theoretical Framework
Fragmentation as an intervening variable

Independent Variables

Power Structure

Knowledge Structure

Degree of Complexity

Dependent Variables

Effectiveness

Legitimacy

Inclusion / Exclusion
The degree of institutional fragmentation in a given issue area depends upon...

- ... the preferences of powerful actors (*instrumental multilateralism / hegemonic stability theory*);
The degree of institutional fragmentation in a given issue area depends upon...

- ... the preferences of powerful actors (*instrumental multilateralism / hegemonic stability theory*);

- ... the asymmetry of preferences of different actors (*neoliberal institutionalism / situation-structural approach*)
REDD in Peru (Zelli et al., fc.)
Exclusion across levels
The degree of institutional fragmentation in a given issue area depends upon...

- ... the preferences of powerful actors (*instrumental multilateralism / hegemonic stability theory*);

- ... the asymmetry of preferences (*neoliberal institutionalism / situation-structural approach*);

- ... the degree of uncertainty and / or asymmetry of knowledge bases (*cognitivism / epistemic communities*).
The degree of institutional fragmentation in a given issue area depends upon ...

- ... the asymmetry / competition of norms (*sociological institutionalism*);
## Globale Governance of Plant Genetic Resources

### National Sovereignty:
- CBD
- AU Model Law
- Andean Community
- OAS
- Bilateral agreements on ‘bioprospecting’
- Bonn Guidelines (PIC)

### Private / Patents:
- WIPO
- WTO-TRIPS
- Bilateral ‘TRIPS plus’-agreements
- EU Directive on Patents in Biotechnology
The degree of institutional fragmentation in a given issue area depends upon ...

- ... the asymmetry / competition of norms (*sociological institutionalism*);

- ... the asymmetry / competition of discourses (*discursive institutionalism*);
Global Forestry Governance: Centres of Gravity

- Provisioning services
  - Wood and non-wood products, agriculture

- Regulatory services
  - Watershed regulation, water cycle protection
  - Carbon sinks and sequestration
  - Soil conservation and erosion control

- Supporting services
  - Conservation of biological diversity, flora & fauna
  - Human settlements, livelihoods
  - Ecotourism and recreation
  - Spiritual and recreational services
  - Natural heritage, spiritual & cultural values
The degree of institutional fragmentation in a given issue area depends upon ...

- ... the asymmetry / competition of norms (*sociological institutionalism*);

- ... the asymmetry / competition of discourses (*discursive institutionalism*);

- ... the hegemony of (neo-)liberal values and logics (*critical international political economy; neo-Gramsciansim*).
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