T09P07 / Global Development Agendas as a Challenge for Policy Coordination in Multi-Level Governance Systems

Topic : T09 / Governance, Policy networks and Multi-level Governance
Chair : Smoke Paul (New York University/Wagner Graduate School of Public Service)
Second Chair : Gambhir Bhatta (Asian Development Bank)

GENERAL OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE

The Post-2015 Development Agenda evolves around three global policy agendas: The Agenda 2030 with its 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the Paris Agreement on Climate Change adopted under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP 21) in December 2015, and the New Urban Agenda (October 2016). These agendas are interconnected but distinct in that they derive from separate policy communities with their own institutional contexts.

Adopting country-led implementation strategies and "localization" (involvement of subnational governments and nongovernmental stakeholders) is seen as essential for achieving the ambitious targets. The global agendas are multi-sectoral and multi-level in nature, posing significant challenges for vertical and horizontal coordination among actors facing diverse incentives and accountability channels. National sector agencies will vie for public resources and maintain their sectoral logic. Subnational governments will defend their spheres of influence and discretionary decision-making against undue interference from higher levels. Regulatory agencies, such as ministries of finance, planning bodies, and offices of government chief executives, will have their own agendas. Such a situation requires information and negotiating skills to navigate conflicting demands and agendas in order to ensure that national objectives for global agendas are embedded in public sector processes and work streams at all levels.

A further consideration is that many global agenda elements are more or less local in nature. Still, central governments must dominate on some goals and establish an enabling environment for the others. Often, implementation will occur on the ground, requiring cooperation of local actors. There is also a territorial integration dimension-some goals must be pursued together in specific local jurisdictions, although they may require higher level-support.

Given this diverse array of actors, it is necessary to seek ways to build on existing cooperation mechanisms and networks or create new ones that can meet the challenges at hand. Such mechanisms must be able to generate patterns of interactions that are based on common interests, provide some clarity on authority and roles, and facilitate communication and collaboration among the actors.

This panel seeks to explore to what extent, and how, multi-actor collaboration in the developing and emerging countries of the Asia-Pacific region could determine and influence national agenda-setting for implementing the global agendas. What types of incentives, relationships and arrangements can help achieve cooperation and coordination for developing and implementing strategies among sectors and across levels of government? What is the role of core agencies (e.g. the offices of chief executives or national planning bodies) in dealing with the global agendas? Which existing communication mechanisms can be utilized? How can policy fragmentation (which commonly leads to policy inconsistencies and hinders sustainable progress) be limited by the policy coordination systems put in place?

The panel will include 4-5 papers. Papers can adopt a conceptual and/or empirical perspective, and they may involve a comparative approach or (country- or sector-specific) case studies. The panel intends to provide insights on how developing member countries of the ADB can be better supported in policy coordination related to creating national frameworks and localizing the global agendas.

CALL FOR PAPERS

The Post-2015 Development Agenda evolves around three global policy agendas: The Agenda 2030 with its 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the Paris Agreement on Climate Change adopted under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP 21) in December 2015, and the New Urban Agenda (October 2016). These agendas are interconnected but distinct in that they derive from separate policy communities with their own institutional contexts.

Being multi-sectoral and multi-level, the global agendas pose significant challenges for vertical and horizontal

policy development and implementation. The various actors (central and local, governmental/non-governmental, sectoral and cross-sectoral) face different incentives and accountability channels. Countries must seek ways to build on existing cooperation mechanisms and networks or create new ones that can meet the challenges at hand. Such mechanisms must be able to generate patterns of interactions that are based on common interests, provide clarity on authority and roles, and facilitate communication and collaboration.

This panel seeks to explore how multi-actor collaboration in the developing and emerging countries of the Asia-Pacific region could determine national agenda-setting for advancing the global agendas. What types of incentives and relationships can help to achieve collaboration and coordination among sectors and across government levels? What is the specific role of core/ coordinating agencies? How can policy fragmentation be limited by policy coordination systems?

This panel requests papers especially from researchers and practitioners from developing member countries of ADB that explore policy coordination in the context of the global agendas, with a focus on the developing and emerging economies of the Asia-Pacific region. Papers may be more general/theoretical or empirical, comparative or country specific. They may focus on the general challenge or specific sectors. The goal is to assemble a set of papers that inform further research and practice on advancing the global development agendas.

T09P07 / Global Development Agendas as a Challenge for Policy Coordination in Multi-Level Governance Systems

Chair : Smoke Paul (New York University/Wagner Graduate School of Public Service)
Second Chair : Gambhir Bhatta (Asian Development Bank)

Session 1 Global Development Agendas as a Challenge for Policy Coordination in Multi-Level Governance Systems

Friday, June 30th 08:15 to 10:15 (Li Ka Shing LKS 1 - 1)

Discussants

Claudia Buentjen (Asian Development Bank)

Rainer Rohdewohld (Ciptanet International (Deutschland))

Fragility, decentralization and multilevel governance

Hamish Nixon (Papua New Guinea Governance Facility)

Fragility –understood as institutional weakness and thus poor resilience in the face of risks – and the development challenges confronted by the post-2015 development agenda are closely interlinked. It is well recognized that extreme poverty is increasingly concentrated in fragile contexts, and Sustainable Development Goal 16 is an acknowledgement that weak institutions present key barriers to development progress. Fragility is increasingly seen as having multiple dimensions, and being present in varying degrees across subnational contexts and particularly urban environments. However, there is little discussion of the spatial and intergovernmental dimensions of institutional weakness that underlie much of this fragility in contexts around the world, and in South East Asia in particular. Supporting the 'effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels' called for in SDG 16 requires clearer frameworks for understanding institutional weaknesses across territories and among levels of government. Drawing on theoretical and empirical literature on fragility, subnational conflict, and decentralization, this paper presents potential approaches to understanding the sources of some fragility in terms of weak multilevel governance. This approach goes beyond acknowledging the role of local and subnational government capacity in the post-2015 agenda, to emphasize the needs and potential, of multilevel systems in delivering the coordination and capability to bring the post-2015 agenda to life in fragile contexts.

Evaluating the Network Governance of Rural Development Interventions: A Relational Assessment of Aid Policy in Afghanistan and Pakistan

Elsa T. Khwaja (George Mason University Schar School of Policy and Government)

With over ten years since the OECD Paris Declaration of Aid-Effectiveness, the core principles of "ownership," "alignment," "harmonization," "results," and "mutual accountability," have reshaped international development initiatives in challenging environments. Arguably, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), signifying the 2030 development agenda, offer a new framework for measuring development progress towards more attainable objectives, emphasizing social inclusion, environmental sustainability, and economic development (Sachs, 2015). As a critical time to reevaluate policies and frameworks for aid-effectiveness, innovative approaches are in demand. Though great strides have been achieved, the debate continues to address the relevance of the SDGs and overall effectiveness of external development assistance in various local contexts.

This study contributes to the "social inclusion" factor of the SDG framework, providing critical observations on relational patterns among key stakeholders in aid policy networks. Assessing how power is embedded within development structures can provide crucial insights about their outcomes. Greater social and cultural complexity is evident in fragile and conflict-affected regions like Afghanistan and Pakistan. Establishing development programs based on their unique provincial socio-cultural contexts and collective involvement of local partners has presented significant challenges.

Applying an integrated conceptual framework of social capital theory and social network analysis (SNA), this

paper illustrates the inter-organizational relationships of two prominent rural development interventions: The Afghanistan National Solidarity Program and Pakistan's Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA), Rural Livelihoods and Community Infrastructure Program. Both programs aim to generate social capital among communities, allowing for alternative evaluation methods unique to this objective. This exploratory analysis examines the whole-network organizational structures of these programs, and how the structures can challenge the underlying objectives of Community Driven Development (CDD) initiatives, working to create sustainable solutions through community managed processes.

Findings from the SNA reveal organizational whole network properties that proxy for power, influence, and cohesion. The resulting visualizations depict core-peripheral social structures, hierarchical clustering, alongside measures of high centralization and low cohesion. These results support observations from the aid-effectiveness literature, which imply that the inherent organizational structure may inhibit local actors from acquiring the necessary influence for sustainable, locally-owned processes and outcomes.

The study promulgates a distinct approach of "network evaluations" (Davies, 2006) to enhance impact assessments throughout the duration of programs and upon closeout, responding to the shifting paradigm for conventional development studies. As both development programs aim to improve social inclusion and "localization" processes, this paper elevates the "lessons-learned" through a more contextualized relational assessment, potentially translatable to similar local contexts. Analysis of the structural properties of development assistance will enable improvement of intervening structures to best meet the needs of beneficiaries, by enhancing local social capital and ownership, critical to a vibrant and prosperous socio-economic future for Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Post-Suharto Indonesia Metropolitan Governance Policy: Alternative Solution for Advancing Global Agendas

Ida Widianingsih (Universitas Padjadjaran)

Binahayati Rusyidi (Universitas Padjadjaran)

kodrat wibowo (Faculty of Economics and Business)

Emi Patmisari (West Java Government)

Global development agendas highlight the importance of addressing the urbanization trend and its implication. This paper discusses how the Post-Suharto Indonesia local government responding the issues by using the case of West Java provincial government efforts to respond the fast growing development in the region due to urbanization and industrialization processes. Within the last three decades the proportion of West Java province population changed significantly, Central Statistical Bureau of Indonesia recorded that in 1980, 30% of West Java Province population lived in urban areas and it was dramatically increased to 66.5 % in 2015. The changing landscape of population in the region brought both positive and negative impacts, including growing economy, expanding city center, increasing number of the poor, widening development gap among regions, food, water and energy security issues, etc. In order to reduce the negative impacts of the development processes, the West Java government introduced Provincial Regulation No. 12/2014 on Management of Metropolitan Region and Development Center in West Java Province. The regulation aims to achieve a more sustainable and equitable economic development in the whole region to achieve social welfare of the people. Strategically, the regulation introduces three Metropolitan areas in West Java Province that consist of Bodebekkarpur, Bandung Raya and Cirebon Raya Metropolitan regions. Each region was developed based on special characteristics including geographical position, economic potentials, social, cultural and political aspects. The establishment of three metropolitan regions demanding multi-actor collaboration and coordination among sectors and across government levels. Research found that despite successful and positive efforts of local government in utilizing integrated development approach, the case of West Java Metropolitan governance policy also showed some potential challenges.

Enhancing Governance of Social Health Insurance Systems in the Philippines and Viet Nam: Lessons Learnt and Implications for Policy and Institutional Reforms

Joel Mangahas (Asian Development Bank)

Susann Dr Roth (Asian Development Bank)

Kirthi Ramesh (Asian Development Bank)

Vu Nu Anh (Health Insurance Department, Ministry of Health of Viet Nam)

Governments worldwide have committed to global development agendas such as achieving Universal Health Coverage (UHC) and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to improve health outcomes and promote

well-being for all. Progress towards better access to and quality of basic health services of countries across the globe has been uneven – underscoring the importance of effective policy coordination and operating mechanisms at multi-level governance systems. Middle-income countries like the Philippines and Viet Nam are strengthening their social health insurance (SHI) systems as a key strategy to achieve UHC and SDG 3. Insofar as SHI in both countries has helped bring better health outcomes, challenges persist wherein governance plays a critical role and tends to be overlooked. From a governance perspective, it is therefore important to understand the factors that affect the SHI performance.

In view of the foregoing, the study will discuss and analyze social health insurance systems in the Philippines and Viet Nam within the context of governance principles and international best practice. More specifically, the paper will:

1. Describe and compare the SHI systems in both countries, focusing on key institutions at national and sub-national levels involved in policymaking, regulation, financing, and management;
2. Identify gains, lessons learnt, and key challenges in policy framework, institutional design and organizational processes; and
3. Recommend strategic actions to strengthen the governance of SHI systems in both countries.

The study methodology will be informed by the (i) institutional and organizational assessment of the World Health Organization; (ii) dimensions of good governance for mandatory health insurance of the World Bank; and (ii) literature on effective policy coordination. It will examine the existing policies and institutional arrangements as well as review reports and studies on governance of health insurance systems in both countries. These will be complemented by interviews with key policymakers and other stakeholder groups. The study will also use the authors' professional experiences from working in the health sector and governance theme. The study will add to the literature on SHI policy and governance reforms for achieving UHC and SDG 3, which will be of interest to academicians, researchers, and practitioners.

Carbon Governance Arrangements and the Nation-State: The Reconfiguration of Public Authority in Developing Countries

Harald Fuhr (University of Potsdam)

Numerous scholars have recently observed a relocation of authority in different domains of global policy-making. This development is particularly prevalent in the field of global climate politics. Due to the regulatory gap in this policy area, various new governance arrangements have emerged that operate at different political levels to cope with the issue of climate change. However, despite several descriptions and mapping exercises, we have little systematic knowledge about their workings within national jurisdictions, let alone their impact on political-administrative systems in developing countries. Therefore, this article seeks to open the black box of the nation-state and explores how two different types of governance arrangements, Transnational City Networks (TCNs) and Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) generate changes in the distribution of public authority in nation-states and their administrations. Building upon the conceptual assumptions that the former is likely to lead to more decentralized and the latter to more centralized policy-making, we provide insights from case studies on Brazil, India, Indonesia, and South Africa. While we find little indications that TCNs influence the way climate policies are carried out, the case studies suggest that REDD+ has strengthened competencies in the central government, without recentralizing the whole forestry sector.