

**Chapter 1 : Polycentric Governance and Development**

*The readings collected in Polycentric Governance and Development show the achievements of scholars associated with the Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis at Indiana University in understanding how communities have dealt with dilemmas of collective action. Their analyses also have profound implications for broader issues of.*

The first efforts to understand this were descriptive, spawning concepts that have generated an extensive literature. Multi-level, polycentric, and multi-layered governance emphasize the dispersion of decision making from the local to the global level. In recent years these concepts have cross-pollinated subfields of political science including European studies and decentralization, federalism and international organization, public policy etc. Though scarcely recognized at the time, this research revives a rich tradition in political science represented by Karl Deutsch on the effect of societal transactions on government structure, Robert Dahl on the virtues and vices of multilevel democracy, and Stein Rokkan on identity and territorial politics. Application of the concept [edit] Multi-level governance and the European Union [edit] The study of the European Union has been characterized by two different theoretical phases. The first phase was dominated by studies from the field of international relations; in the second phase these studies were revised and insights from among others, public policy were added. The most straightforward way of understanding this theoretical shift is to see it as a move away from treating the EU as an international organisation similar to others e. NATO to seeing it as something unique among international organisations. The uniqueness of the EU relates both to the nature and to the extent of its development. This means that in some areas of activity the EU displays more properties related to national political systems than to those of international organisations. The theory of multi-level governance belongs to the second phase. Multi-level governance characterizes the changing relationships between actors situated at different territorial levels, both from the public and the private sectors. The multi-level governance theory crosses the traditionally separate domains of domestic and international politics and highlights the increasingly fading distinction between these domains in the context of European integration. Multi-level governance was first developed from a study of EU policy and then applied to EU decision-making more generally. An early explanation referred to multi-level governance as a system of continuous negotiation among nested governments at several territorial tiers [3] and described how supranational, national, regional, and local governments are enmeshed in territorially overarching policy networks. As such, multi-level governance raised new and important questions about the role, power and authority of states. No other international form of cooperation is characterized by such far-reaching integration as the European Union. This becomes evident by the number and scope of policy areas covered by the European Union and the way policy is developed. The European Union can be characterised by a mix of classic intergovernmental cooperation between sovereign states and far-reaching supranational integration. Multi-level governance within the EU is understood as respecting competences, sharing responsibilities and cooperating between the various levels of governance: In this context, it refers to the principle of subsidiarity, which places decisions as close as possible to the citizens and ensures that that action at Union level is justified in light of the possibilities available at national, regional or local level. This entanglement is one of the basic principles of the multi-level governance theory. The multi-level governance theory describes the European Union as a political system with interconnected institutions that exist at multiple levels and that have unique policy features. These layers interact with each other in two ways: Concerning with the changes of the institutional design of the European Union, the current model governance has been shaped as a setup of constraints upon political margin of discretion, applying the central tenet of ordoliberalism with the aim to use strong rules in order to reduce the discretionary exercise of powers by institutions so as to avoid an arbitrary use of them. This principle has achieved an extreme effect at the European level, that one not to avoid arbitrary use of political powers but to keep political responsibility and participation out of the decision-making process. This means that there is a control exercised by rules over the European citizens rather than a control by the European citizens over rules and policies. Multilevel Governance in Practise Within the European Union nearly 95, local and regional authorities currently have significant powers in key

sectors such as education, the environment, economic development, town and country planning, transport, public services and social policies. They help ensure the exercise of European democracy and citizenship. Special rights and competences for regions, cities and communities are supposed to enable and preserve diversity of governance at local and regional level. In a broader sense, this concept also includes the participation of non-state players like economic and social partners and civil society in the decision making process of all levels of governance thus taking up the vertical and horizontal dimensions of multilevel governance. The Treaty of Lisbon as an important step towards Multilevel Governance The Treaty of Lisbon represents an important step towards institutional recognition of multi-level governance in the way the European Union operates. It strengthens the competences and influence of local and regional authorities in the Community decision-making process giving roles to national and regional parliaments and the Committee of the Regions and enshrines the territorial dimension of the European Union, notably territorial cohesion as part of the process of European integration. The Committee of the Regions has established a system to monitor the compliance with the subsidiarity through the whole EU policy and law making process. On 16 June the Committee of the Regions adopted a White Paper on multi-level governance which recommended specific mechanisms and instruments for stimulating all stages of the European decision-making process. As a follow up to the White paper on Multi-level Governance, the Committee developed a "Scoreboard on Multi-level Governance" to monitor on a yearly basis the development of multi-level governance at European Union level. Decentralization has been at least as marked in Latin America as in Europe over the past two decades, and several Asian countries have decentralized in the past decade. A recent survey counts 32 regional IGOs pooling authority over quite wide areas of policy and which cover all but a handful of states in the world today. Here, local capacity building and incentives for effectiveness of sub national levels of government are crucial issues for improving the quality and coherence of public policy. The "horizontal" dimension refers to co-operation arrangements between regions or between municipalities. These agreements are increasingly common as a means by which to improve the effectiveness of local public service delivery and implementation of development strategies. Consequences and practical relevance of multi-level governance[ edit ] There has been an intensification of research on the consequences as well as the character of multi-level governance. The concept was developed as a tool of pure research, but it now motivates policy makers. From the late s the European Commission began to refer to its own mission as one of achieving multilevel governance, especially in cohesion policy. However, the consequences of multilevel governance are debated. Research on both causes and consequences of multi-level governance is ongoing and more and more information about the subnational as well as the international dimension of multi-level governance is available in the context of larger data sets. It has become increasingly clear that nation-states will be unable to commit to and meet international targets and agreements for offsetting climate change without engaging with the activity of sub-national and local action. Greenhouse gas GHG emissions stem from certain activities that originate from specific places, bringing about thought that the local scale is the most appropriate political scale to produce necessary offsets in emissions. The levels of governance authority handed down to local governments within cities has been perceived to out-do policy goals within the national and international arena, [30] with some local governments taking on their own initiatives for tackling urban climate change. This sets an important stance to which the local scale of multi-level governance is important for tackling global climate change within the urban arena. Four distinct modes of governance exist within the dynamics of climate change in cities. Each stems from the local level with the ability of being implemented on multi-scales to mitigate and adapt to urban climate change. Self-governing is the capacity of local governments to govern its own activities [31] such as improving energy efficiency within a designated city, without the burdening pressure to meet targets of increased energy efficiencies set by national governments. A form of self-governing within multi-level systems is horizontal collaboration where cities may collaborate with regions demonstrating multi-levels of governance to tackle urban climate change, [32] imperative to the success of city climate change policy. Governing through enabling is the co-ordination and facilitation of partnerships with private organisations by the local government. Governing through provision, a form of vertical collaboration along with governing through enabling, applies itself to the multi-levels of governance. Climate

change in cities is tackled here through the shaping of and delivery of services and resources, with additional support aided to local governments from regional and national authorities. Such regulation characterises traditional forms of authoritative governance, exemplifying local to nation-state relations, [35] almost nearly covering the entirety of the multi-level governance scale. The SNI-WG realizes several activities at global and regional levels including organizing panels at multiple regional and global forums, hosting peer-learning discussions, publishing reports and case studies, along with facilitating technical workshops, webinars and providing advisory Remote Expert Assistance on LEDS REAL support upon request. This process has generated observations, feedback and insights on the potential of the vertical integration and coordination of subnational climate actions to accelerate and scale-up both local and global emission reductions. Improving coordination and integration between the different levels of authority in a country is critical in determining both national and global capacity to govern climate change. City and subnational governments require support from the national government, and vice versa, in order to design and implement intersectoral policies and actions for domestic decarbonization pathways. Scale up, as well as unlock, additional and new mitigation opportunities at the subnational level. Enable safe learning and strengthen domestic institutions. Address recognized challenges and limits to sub-national non-state actor NSA climate actions. Expand and accelerate the flow of international public and private climate finance to cities, urban infrastructure and local priorities. Help address some of the persistent collective action challenges to multilateral climate agreements. Membership consists of 40 large cities worldwide Large Cities Climate Leadership Group , with local governments often working in close connection with national governments. However, the CCP can overlook the activity of nation-states giving local governments the opportunity to amend positions of policy implementation and regulation for offsetting urban climate change, which may be of a controversial nature to national governments. Criticism on multi-level governance theory[ edit ] Many of the problems associated with multi-level governance revolve around the notion of levels. The very idea of levels and levels of analysis is imbued with hierarchical implications. However, different levels or social spaces often interact or cut across with one another in complex ways that are not strictly hierarchical. The notion that international bodies constitute a discrete level of authority and governance is contestable. International regulatory networks may not be separate sources of authority but instead represent the reconstitution of state authority and the pursuit of state-level governance by other means. While territorial levels make sense when we are referring to public forms of authority, they seem less compatible with private and market forms of authority. The main difference between multi-level governance and other theories of integration is that it gets rid of the continuum or grey area between intergovernmentalism and supranationalism and leaves in its place a descriptive structure. This theory does not address the sovereignty of states directly, but instead simply says that a multi-level structure is being created by subnational and supranational actors. One of the main questions of integration theory, namely, the transfer of loyalty and sovereignty between national and supranational entities and the future of this relationship in the EU is not specifically addressed in this theory. The identification of partial political measures and general macroeconomics is divided on diverse decisional levels. National governments maintain an important decisional role but the control unlocalizes at supranational level. Individual national sovereignty is diluted in this decisional process and the supranational institutions have an autonomic role. Arguments for multi-level governance[ edit ] Security[ edit ] The use of security as a means of instituting ideals of democracy. The shift to a multi-level governance perspective of enforcing the ideals prevents one nation from imposing its personal agenda or perception of what these ideals entail. Additionally, the use of supranational judgement creates a uniformity for the international portrayal and enforcement of democratic principles. The supranational level merely acts as a medium for allowing the promotion of mutually beneficial security. With the rise of transnational threats, a method for ensuring international security without the reliance on a single policing nation is required. Multi-level governance provides functional means of dealing with the deficiencies of merely national actors dealing with transnational issues on the international stage. Striving for the concept of European peace the nations sought to bind the nations through economic interdependence. It provided the European peace the nations sought, and would evolve into the European Union seen today. It was not a new concept as trade has historically been viewed as a catalyst for peace between nations. The linking of nations

through a sharing of capital creates an adhesiveness that deters the escalation of political conflict from reaching a state of war. On the international stage, political conflict leads to war as a result of perception of potential gains being larger than the opportunity costs. Interdependence created by multi-level governance is shown to greatly reduce the probability of war by increasing the opportunity costs. It is seen by noting that economic ties between participatory nations makes the cost of disruption to the system through the escalation of the political sphere towards war illogical. To elaborate, the establishment of a supranational institution can be used to set standards for the way cooperating nations run their environmental, industrial, and safety policies. Nations consent to the terms as they face a common issue of international policy that has to deal with collective-action problems making it nonsensical to attend to by themselves. Agreements between nations to form a multi-level government creates an efficiency gain that allows them to all share in the positive benefit.

**Chapter 2 : Multi-level governance - Wikipedia**

*Polycentric Development and Polycentric Governance. 2 The 21st C. is the first urban century* – Before , no society was – The concept of polycentric.

Polycentricity Bibliography October Abel, T. A Principal- Agent Perspective. University of Michigan Press. What Lessons for Africa? A Passage to a Democratic Society in Nigeria. A Constitutional Gateway towards Nigerian Democratization. Working Paper Aligica, P. From Polanyi to Ostrom, and Beyond. Lessons from Elinor Ostroms Work. Applying the Polycentric Model. A Comparison of Institutional Arrangements. Working Paper Barnett, A. Learning from Local Governments. A Festschrift for Elinor and Vincent Ostrom: Working Paper Brie, M. Pathways for Polycentric Praxis. Polycentricity and the Conservation of Biodiversity. Self-Governance, Polycentrism, and the Social Order: Ideas and Influence of Elinor Ostrom. Variations on Some Themes by the Ostroms. Reflections on Watershed Management in Costa Rica. Constitutional Creation in the Gold Coast, Scale, Decentralization and Polycentrism. An Overview of the Institutional Landscape. Types of Multi-Level Governance. Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques. Analyzing the Politics of Policy-making on Environment and Development. A Metatheoretical Synthesis of Institutional Approaches. A Study of Irrigation Associations in Taiwan. The Case of Forestry in the Russian Federation. The Sub-Districting of Cities: Testing the Polycentric Model. Working Paper Marks, G. A Critique of Neoclassical Theory. Polycentric Governance and Development: Polycentricity and Local Public Economies: Polycentric Games and Institutions: Comments on Peter Boetkke and Christopher Coyne. Politics as Problem-Solving in Polycentric Settings. Examples of Correlated Equilibria. Polycentric Governance, Adaptation, and Petrification. Challenges to Governance in Indian Wetlands. Les Carnets du Centre de Philosophie du Droit, no. Multi-organizational, Multi- level Institutional Analysis and Development. Propositions Derived from Two Traditions. Essays in Progress and Public Policy. New Challenges for Poverty Reduction. Polycentric Governance of Complex Economic System. Political Theory and Policy Analysis: A Handbook of Selected Papers. Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis. Conjectures on Mixed Systems of Metropolitan Organization. The Case of Police in Black Communities. East and West, Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia, October. The Meaning of American Federalism: Constituting a Self-Governing Society. Institute for Contemporary Studies. The Constitutional Level of Analysis. Some Economic and Institutional Considerations. The Case of the Grand River Watershed. Failure of Structural Solutions and the Polycentric Alternative. A Polycentric Planning Perspective. Toward Democratic Governance in Liberia. The Future of Tradition: The Evolution of Institutions of Comanagement. Agriculture and the WTO: Decentralization of Water Resources Management. A Theoretical and Empirical Exploration. The Interplay of Pillarisation and Administration. Het Werk van Vincent Ostrom. The Analysis of Public Organisational Pluralism. The Role of Governance and Institutions. Experiments on Blocking Coalitions.

**Chapter 3 : polycentric governance and development | Download eBook PDF/EPUB**

*Polycentric governance is characterized by an organizational structure where multiple independent actors mutually order their relationships with one another under a general system of rules (V. Ostrom ).*

Conversely, the watershed population may desire the rivers to be sustainably managed in order to ensure future use for all. To confront these collective action problems, stakeholders must cooperatively craft effective rules and norms to guarantee the sustainability of resource systems. For instance, smallholders at higher elevations receive more rainfall on average each year due to the cooling of air moving over Mount Kenya. As a result, upstream farmers theoretically benefit from being within zones of more abundant rainfall and from residing within CWPs closer to the headwaters of many rivers. The threat of a collective action dilemma is clear: These types of dilemmas are referred to as collective action appropriation problems<sup>4</sup>, and in the s it was not uncommon for water appropriation problems to result in violence throughout the Mount Kenya region. From the early s, efforts to reform water management began at both the regional and national levels. These were designed to become independent catchment level entities responsible for coordinating water use across CWPs and ensuring equal water access for all members of a catchment. In turn, the reforms of the early s put in place a multilevel and polycentric “ie, multiple independent yet overlapping centers of decision making” system of water governance. Governance scholars have theorized particular benefits of polycentric resource management. For instance, the presence of overlapping spheres of management may guarantee the continued provision of services should one entity neglect its responsibilities. As a result, the current study aimed to empirically investigate governance strategies within the Mount Kenya region to determine if the decision-making and rules crafted by CWP and WRUA managers matched the behaviors and processes predicted by polycentricity theory. CWP managers “who often craft rules in coordination with a management board selected from the community” were asked about the processes by which individuals obtain membership with a CWP, strategies for penalizing illegal water use, approaches for monitoring compliance with rules, and mechanisms used to resolve water related disputes. As the dry season sets in and river levels recede, CWP managers work with WRUA officials to devise a schedule of water delivery to the various communities within a catchment. For example, if a catchment consists of four CWPs, the two communities closest to the headwaters may be allowed to receive river water on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday of the dry season, while the two downstream communities would access water on Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday. These water rotation periods are often accompanied by rationing within CWPs: Additionally, CWP managers partner with WRUA personnel on other issues, including patrolling riparian zones for illegal water use and resolving disputes between CWPs in the same catchment. The fieldwork also obtained information about the flow of water to individual households within CWPs. Water flow rates were collected on a weekly basis at ten to twenty households per CWP from July to January. These measurements allowed for comparisons of water availability across CWPs with differing governance strategies. Within this WRUA, an employed care-taker, known as a scout, is responsible for patrolling the water distribution infrastructure to monitor for leakage and illegal water use. In addition to the scout, representatives for individual water distribution lines also monitor water usage, thereby ensuring that if one entity neglects their responsibilities another will be able to step in. Polycentric governance is also expected to encourage rule experimentation stemming from the multiple independent decision units. Again, this pillar of polycentricity theory was witnessed across a range of governance strategies, one of which was the approach to membership. Of the twenty-five CWP managers that were interviewed, eight had made the decision to cap their membership out of fear that their existing members would no longer be able to meet their livelihood needs if they had to share their limited water supplies with additional smallholders. Of the remaining seventeen CWPs where memberships were increasing, several managers acknowledged that they were contemplating implementing a membership cap in the near future. It must be noted, however, that approval was not unanimous for several of the post-reform measures meant to resolve collective action challenges. For example, all CWPs are required to have the same size intake pipe and gauges on these pipes in order to ensure that equal water flows into each

community. The costs of these infrastructure repairs was passed on to the CWP memberships, frustrating both the water managers and the water users. Additionally, several upstream CWP managers expressed displeasure that their memberships no longer had as much irrigation water at their disposal given that water needed to be made available for downstream users. Thus, while much of the literature on polycentricity describes an organic process of resolving collective action dilemmas, we found some displeasure and a need for interventions from other water authorities ie, WRMA in the case of replacing the intake pipes and guages to ensure that measures were put in place to allow for equal water access. Two children playing in the rain. Conclusions Collective action problems pose numerous challenges to resource managers, particularly when the resource is an absolute necessity in sustaining life. Through these findings, we believe this research can be used to illustrate both the benefits and challenges of water reform and provide constructive insight to resource managers confronting their own complex collective action dilemmas. A video of this research can be viewed here: Forward to the future: A conceptual framework for water dependence. The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups. The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action. Robustness and vulnerability of community irrigation systems: The case of the Taos valley acequias. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management Assessing and managing scarce tropical mountain water resources: Mountain Research and Development 25 2: Polycentric governance and irrigation reform in Kenya. Community water governance on Mount Kenya: Mountain Research and Development 36 1: Coping with tragedies of the commons. Annual Review of Political Science 2: His work focuses on operationalizing the telecoupling framework by modeling interactions between coupled human-natural systems. He is an environmental social scientist interested in the political economy of natural resources, in particular water. Elizabeth Baldwin is Assistant Professor at the University of Arizona where she researches energy and water policy implementation in the U. His work addresses the intersection of social and environmental systems with an emphasis on household-level decision making in the context of diverse governance arrangements.

**Chapter 4 : Project MUSE - A Polycentric Approach to Global Climate Governance**

*Policy brief analyses various governance, planning and financial tools used to support the polycentric development of the territory at EU, national and regional level illustrated by case studies in a range of diverse territories.*

This article has been cited by other articles in PMC. Abstract To effectively address the drivers and impacts of land degradation requires polycentric governance systems that facilitate international development projects IDPs. This paper analyses an IDP aiming to reduce land degradation in Swaziland. A longitudinal-style qualitative approach draws on repeat household surveys, semi-structured interviews and focus groups. We aim to identify the changes that have taken place since the departure of the IDP funders, and the subsequent dynamics between stakeholders. Lack of meaningful participation at various stages of the PMC caused the project to lose momentum following the departure of the funders. We discuss these findings in relation to a polycentric approach, and identify how multi-stakeholder IDP can be facilitated as part of wider polycentric governance approaches to inform policies to combat land degradation within Swaziland and more widely. Efforts to prevent, reduce and rehabilitate degraded areas are enshrined in international policies and development frameworks, including the sustainable development goals SDGs. Major causes of land degradation include: These causes and consequences occur over multiple interacting temporal and spatial scales see Reynolds et al. Land degradation is therefore a complex, uncertain and multi-scale phenomenon, affecting multiple actors and agencies, and requiring transparent decision making that is responsive to changing circumstances Stringer et al. There is growing acknowledgement that centralised, top-down mechanisms are inadequate for tackling land degradation as well as ensuring the sustainable use of natural resources more widely Nagendra and Ostrom This has led to a shift in design and implementation of international development projects IDPs towards decentralisation and community participation Stringer et al. Central concepts Participation often takes place in IDP that form part of a broader programme approach. Indeed, international agencies such as the United Nations UN and World Bank WB advocate community participation within their IDP for building effective, efficient and equitable natural resource governance. However, IDP typically faces time, cost and quality constraints, making them largely social and political undertakings Bixler IDP implementation also typically occurs at the local level, in specific locations and by particular groups of people Nagendra and Ostrom Whilst IDP can facilitate sustainable development if designed, implemented and managed appropriately Ika , they can exacerbate land degradation challenges if not MEA Ensuring the wellbeing of populations faced with the challenge of land degradation requires multi-tier governance solutions that facilitate IDP to address both the drivers and impacts of the problem Nagendra and Ostrom Polycentric governance enhances participation by fostering inclusive decision making from divergent groups, between and among multiple centres of authority and scales of governance Andersson and Ostrom The types of ecosystem service that natural resources provide, change as the physical scale of the resource changes Nagendra and Ostrom For example, soils support the provision of food at the local level, and carbon to regulate the climate at the global level. No single level of governance can provide incentives for users to safeguard the long-term delivery of such a variety of services, while bestowing management of natural resources to external experts is unlikely to be sustainable. The complexity of natural resources at local, regional, national and global levels requires complex governance systems involving input from local resource users in diverse fashions. Polycentric governance can foster the necessary relationships between and among actors who have a stake in the resource at multiple scales. Hence, it is a useful approach for encouraging flexibility, interlinkages, adaptation and resilience into the system through developing structures and processes to match the multi-scale nature of such resources Ostrom IDP progress in broadly similar ways regardless of the issue being targeted Crawford and Bryce Activities typically follow a project management cycle PMC as a rational way of conceptualising and managing such projects Biggs and Smith Academic analyses focus predominantly on evaluating the success of either project implementation or project outcomes, overlooking aspects pertinent to distinctive phases of the PMC where changes to governance, and therefore opportunities for stakeholder participation, can occur Khang and Moe Biggs and Smith present a framework Fig.

Furthermore, the framework considers processes of participation at every stage, and can incorporate a range of assessment criteria at various points in the cycle, e. Recognising the intangible nature of many IDP results, the framework can be used to assess and forecast project success by analysing the complex relationships between stakeholders, progressively assessing performance at each stage of the PMC to provide insights into the problems and challenges of governance. Hence, a dynamic framework is developed that identifies various success criteria and institutional aspects at different phases that shape IDP success or failure.