

T01W05 / Climate Policy Integration at stake

Topic : T01 / Policy Process, Policy Making, Policy Implementation

Chair : Gilles Massardier (Cirad)

Second Chair : hrabanski marie (CIRAD)

Third Chair : Alexandra Lesnikowski (Concordia University)

CALL FOR PAPERS

The main objective of this workshop is to compare various sectorial or/and multi-sectorial climate policy implementation to analyze, in a comparative perspective (between sectors and between countries), the situations of “(des) integration” of adaptation (Biesbroek, Candel, 2020).

In order:

- to compare surveys on the integration about climate issues,
- to question the existence of a “whole-of-government” and a “joined-up-governance” (Bogdanor 2005) in favor of integrated public policies, and their efficiency,

The workshop is structured according to three research topics.

1/ Social process for climate policy “(des)integration”

In the literature, the social and institutional process of integration refers to three elements. First, can we spot “coordination between public sector organizations (Metcalf 1994; Peters 1998; Jordan and Schout 2006). Second, can we spot a learning process between sectors (cross-sector learning) that depends on the recognition of mutual dependencies between subsystems involved and of an associated variety of frames and perspectives on problems and solutions (Nilsson and Nilsson, 2005; Biesbroek, Candel, 2019). Finally, can we spot actors and coalitions of actors involved in the implementation of policies, by asking whether these formed coalitions go beyond the borders of a single sector (“coalition building”). Have they a social capacity for an “interactive approach between sectors”, or is there a “new network configurations in the governance of a particular problem” (Jochim, May 2010). This third element also refers to the question of brokers and policy who have the capacity to go beyond the sectoral boundaries (Jochim and May 2010; Faling, M., Biesbroek, R., Karlsson-Vinkhuyzen, S., & Termeer, K., 2019).

2/ Policy instruments for climate policy “(des)integration”

The literature allows to identify the four following questions. First, the question of the types of policy instruments that are privileged to implement policy integration. The literature on adaptive governance indeed considers that 'nodality' instruments are to be favored insofar “by organizing dialogue between several public policy areas”. Others believe that policy mixes (Flanagan, 2011), capable of combining incentive, communication and/or regulatory instruments, could also tackle sector routines (Pacheco Vega 2020). Second, the integration of climate instruments need to be questioned through the prism of the different temporalities and scales of governance concerned. Are the instruments integrated at

all levels and at all times or, on the contrary, can we identify instruments that are particularly integrated at the time of their design at international or national scale, while their implementation would be exclusively the responsibility of sectors? The third question concerns the efficiency and consistency of the instruments. To what extent are the instruments coherent in the sense that they may or may not refer to a real political work of building a concrete joined-up sectors management, and not only to display effects, symbolic innovations or even frame-based innovations (Upham et al., 2014). To what extent the accountability of stakeholders exists during the instruments' implementation governance (Mees & Driessen, 2019). Indeed, we can legitimately question the clarity of the distribution of responsibilities between stakeholders and inside policy coalitions implementing instruments in this complex and multi-level and multi-sectoral process.

3/ Methodology to investigate climate policy « (des)integration »

The third axis of comparison will aim to identify the contributions and limits of the different methodological approaches to analyze the processes of “(de)sectorization” of climate issues. The transnational comparison, in the North and in the South, carried out on the basis of qualitative data seems to be a particularly heuristic method for questioning these issues. Indeed, south states are still under-studied from this angle apart from a few exceptions (von Lüpke, H., & Well, M., 2020, Milhorange et al., 2020). Studies also analyze these issues by mobilizing quantitative approaches (Schmidt, N. M., & Fleig, A., 2018). Integration issues are more often analyzed on the basis of comparative analyzes between sectors (Biesbroek & Candel, 2019).

We can also observe works on environmental policy integration developed over the long term (Nilsson, M., 2005). Can other approaches complement these methodological options and possibly approaches in terms of network analysis or even process tracing? this line of research will therefore seek to promote innovative and relevant methodologies to grasp these issues.

ABSTRACT

Climate change is a « wicked » and complex problem that transcends borders, and policies across a myriad of domains because they relate to adjacent sectors. According to the international organizations and to the main literature, one crucial part of the response lies in the integration of sectoral responses. However, this workshop wants to bring clarity to this debate that is not yet clear and calls for further study. Its main objective is to compare various sectorial or/and multi-sectorial climate policy implementation to analyze, in a comparative perspective (between sectors and between countries), the situations of “(des) integration” of adaptation.

To do so, the workshop is structured according to three research topics.

1/ Social process for climate policy “(des)integration”. The social and institutional process of integration refers to three criteria : coordination between public sector organizations ; learning process between sectors (cross-sector learning) that depends on the recognition of mutual dependencies between subsystems involved and of an associated variety of frames and perspectives on problems and solutions ; actors and coalitions of actors involved in the implementation of policies (“coalition building”) and the social capacity for an interactive approach between sectors.

2/ Policy instruments for climate policy “(des)integration”. What are the types of policy instruments privileged to implement policy integration : 'nodality' instruments ; policy mixes capable of combining incentive, communication and/or regulatory instruments that could tackle sector routines ? Are the instruments integrated at all levels and at all times or, on the contrary, can we identify instruments that are particularly integrated at the time of their design at international or national scale, while their implementation would be exclusively the responsibility of sectors? To what extent are the instruments coherent in the sense that they may or may not refer to a real political work of building a concrete joined-up sectors management ? To what extent the accountability of stakeholders exists during the instruments' implementation governance?

3/ Methodology to investigate climate policy « (des)integration »

The third axis of comparison will aim to identify the contributions and limits of the different methodological approaches to analyze the processes of “(de)sectorization” of climate issues : qualitative ; quantitative data ; long term approaches ... Can other approaches complement these methodological options and possibly approaches in terms of network analysis or even process tracing?

T01W05 / Climate Policy Integration at stake

Chair : Gilles Massardier (Cirad)

Second Chair : hrabanski marie (CIRAD)

Third Chair : Alexandra Lesnikowski (Concordia University)

Session 3

Wednesday, June 29th 09:00 to 12:00 (C325)

Introduction

Massardier Gilles (CIRAD)

Alexandra Lesnikowski (Concordia University)

hrabanski marie (CIRAD)

(Virtual) Climate Change Adaptation and Housing in Canada: A Policy Integration Analysis at Multiple Levels

Alice Yue (Concordia University)

Alexandra Lesnikowski (Concordia University)

(Virtual) Climate policy integration in the Global South : integrate climate issue into agricultural policy in Senegal

hrabanski marie (CIRAD)

Bétina Boutroue (Université Paul Valéry (Montpellier III))

(Virtual) Can territorialization policy tools help to foster mitigation of climate change? Case-study from the Swiss mountain region of Canton of Valais

Lauren Lecuyer (Colorado State University (CSU))

T01W05 / Climate Policy Integration at stake

Chair : Gilles Massardier (Cirad)

Second Chair : hrabanski marie (CIRAD)

Third Chair : Alexandra Lesnikowski (Concordia University)

Session 4

Wednesday, June 29th 14:00 to 17:00 (C325)

The Hiatus between Policy Integration and Agriculture Sector

Gilles Massardier (Cirad)

(Virtual) Nature-based solutions as the product of climate & biodiversity policy integration? A comparison between France & the US

Joana GUERRIN (INRAE, Strasbourg, France)

Anna Serra-Llobet (University of California, Berkeley)

Julien Pelet (Université de Strasbourg)

Ludovic DRAPIER

(Virtual) The climate policy integration in a labelling instrument for French local authorities: institutional, political and local evolutions around the

Manon PINGUAT-CHARLOT (Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour)

(Virtual) Public development Banks in the challenge of SDGs

regis MARODON (French Development Agency AFD)