THE UNIVERSITY OF
WARWICK

Original citation:
Stone, Diane, 1964- and Ladi, Stella. (2015) *Global public policy and transnational administration.* Public Administration . ISSN 0033-3298

Permanent WRAP url:
http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/73159

Copyright and reuse:
The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:
"This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Stone, D. and Ladi, S. (2015), Global public policy and transnational administration. Public Administration. doi: 10.1111/padm.12207, which has been published in final form at http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/padm.12207 . This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving."

A note on versions:
The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP url' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: publications@warwick.ac.uk

warwick**publications**wrap

highlight your research

http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk

1. **Introduction**

In this article we open the debate on, and examine signs of, global public policy and emergent transnational administration. These processes need to be understood through the lens of policy studies and public administration scholarship and not only that of international law and international relations. What would a change in the lens signify for new findings and insights in the changing face of public administration and public policy processes globally?

First, adopting the terms 'global public policy' and 'transnational administration' forces consideration of public problems extant beyond the state where a vastly reconfigured international civil service works alongside new transnational actors of administration. A second contribution offered in this article and this symposium is a move from methodological nationalism towards 'methodological transnationalism' where public administration is not viewed simply as being the repository of states, or state actors operating internationally, to recognise the interconnectedness of different hierarchical and network structures of both a public and private nature at the transnational, international and/or global level. A third contribution is to highlight several theoretical frameworks from policy studies and public administration that can be conceptually stretched as various 'lens' of 'global public policy' and 'transnational administration'. Symposium contributors develop some of these in greater detail such as Deborah Alimi adapting the 'multiple streams' model or Sarah Wolff adopting a policy design approach to address the instruments of transnational administration.

We begin with a couple of working definitions as a starting point with which to frame discussion.

Global (Public) Policy (GPP) is a set of overlapping but disjointed processes of public-private deliberation and cooperation among both official state based and international organisations with non-state actors around establishing common norms and policy agendas for securing the delivery of global public goods or ameliorating transnational problems.

Transnational Administration (TA) refers to the regulation, management and implementation of global policies of a public nature by both private and public actors operating beyond the boundaries and jurisdictions of the state but often in areas beneath the global level.

A point of commonality in the definitions of global (public) policy and transnational (public) administration is that we place 'the public' in parentheses. Traditionally, the rights and responsibilities of 'the public' – as well as the citizen – have been associated with a sovereign order. In the absence of a sovereign power at global, regional (notwithstanding some supra-national functions of the European Union – EU) and transnational levels, the notion of the public is often lost from analytical sight. When we drop the 'public' it is also in recognition that authority becomes more informal and privatized.

The study of public administration and policy has been bound by the concept of sovereignty but is a concept that has been more extensively outlined and debated by International Relations (IR) scholars. 'Westphalian sovereignty' is based on the principle that one sovereign state should not interfere in the domestic arrangements of another. By contrast, Stephen Krasner's notion of 'interdependence sovereignty' is the capacity and willingness of public authorities to control or regulate flows of people, goods and capital in and out of a country. 'Domestic sovereignty' is the capacity of a state to choose and implement policies within its territory (Krasner 1999). Clearly, globalisation has constrained interdependence sovereignty and challenged domestic sovereignty.

In this symposium of *Public Administration* – the oldest such journal of its kind – we seek to challenge policy and public administration studies by arguing an increasingly important locus of policy power, decision-making processes and implementing authority operates above and beyond the state and is executed by transnational policy actors. Yet, we see little analysis of global (public) policy and transnational administration. Whilst there are notable exceptions, in the main, public policy and public administration studies have tended to undertake analysis of the capacity of public sector hierarchies to globalize national policies rather than to ask if there is transnational policy-making and administration above and beyond the state. The focus of much policy scholarship has been to address the impact of extra-state dynamics upon domestic politics.

The following discussion is structured into two main parts. The first part focuses on some manifestations of global policy processes and transnational administration. The second part assesses some of the conceptual tools in the arsenal of policy studies that could be utilized for

further analysis. In order to 'ground' our discussion we have selected one policy issue – 'gas flaring' – to illustrate the discussion. Firstly, gas flaring can be described as a global policy issue and problem that is global in the sense of being trans-planetary in its effects. Secondly, gas flares are also highly localized. Gas flaring exemplifies GPP and TA: the norm of pollution reduction, climate protection and poverty reduction is increasingly global although application of such norms may be specific to certain industries in specific locales where tackling it falls as an administrative burden upon relatively few national administrations and expert communities. Launched at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in August 2002, Global Gas Flaring Reduction is a public-private partnership (GGFR). While we cannot do full justice to the activities, and importance, of this global policy initiative, it provides an excellent exemplar of global policy-making and transnational administration which we thread throughout this article and in tandem with the cases developed by the other contributions in this symposium.

2. Issues and Actors in Global (Public) Policy and Transnational Administration

Traditionally, in both policy practice and scholarship, the concepts of 'public policy' and 'public administration' have been directly linked to the sovereign powers of the nation-state. But the phrase 'Global Public Policy' has sometimes been used in international organisations (see Gerrard *et al.* 2001), or more regularly, the phrase 'global policy'. Yet, the term remains both under-specified and poorly understood (see Deardorff Miller 2014 for a review). Sometimes, global public policy is equated with the financing and delivery of global public goods (Kaul 2005). Or it is equated with 'global public-private partnerships' that engage in policy activities of standard setting, co-financing and co-regulation (Schäferhoff, Campe and Kaa 2009). Likewise the terms 'transnational policy innovation' (De Francesco 2013), 'global public administration' (Bonimy 2007, p. 47; Walker 2011) and 'global managers' (Patriota *et al.* 2013) have entered the scholarly literature while the concept of 'global administrative law' (Kingsbury, Krisch, and Stewart 2005) is increasingly redolent in legal studies. Within the specialized financial press, we see increasing reference to bodies like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) as 'global bureaucracies' (Tett 2014).

It could be argued with some justification that the term 'global governance' is both better established as a term and also sufficient to convey the concept of global, regional or transnational policy. However, we wish to argue that the artificial divide that has persisted in

the social sciences between political science, public administration and public policy with the cognate fields of international relations, international political economy and security studies, has seen the dominance of the concepts of the latter (and some other fields) to the detriment of the full development of understanding 'global governance'. Accordingly, firstly we posit global (public) policy and 'transnational administration' as an important but under-developed tributary of thinking for the wider inter-disciplinary field of global governance. Secondly, grappling with these concerns provides ample scope for theoretical advancement and conceptual evolution *within* the field of administrative studies.

We would also argue that the concept of *transboundary governance* maintains the artificial binary divide prevalent in both public administration and IR of distinguishing between what is done inside the state and outside of it. We wish to destabilize this assumption via methodological transnationalism to argue there are authoritative domains of public policy separate from the state, de-linked from International Organisations and functioning in an autonomous manner that deviates from conventional Westphalian understandings of boundaries.

There are five key issues with GPP and TA which make their analysis methodologically, empirically and theoretically challenging: First, public policy is associated as being the purview of states and executed inside states. Policy studies tend towards 'methodological nationalism' (Beck 2005). The state is treated as the analytical unit and locus of power and authority, or as cartographic territorial units where legalist notions of sovereignty prevail (Strandsbjerg 2010). This serves us poorly in contemporary times as to what can constitute the public domain and the remit of public policy when new public places and spaces are being carved out by first, the international activities of governments, business and non-state actors; and second, the cross-border movement of goods, organisms and information.

These dynamics call for what both Kauppinen (2015) and Yeates (2014) have described as a 'methodological transnationalism'. Importantly, this does not mean 'methodological anti-nationalism' as the power and vitality of the nation-state as a political unit remains unquestioned notwithstanding the reconfigurations of the state and sovereignty that have come with the pressures of globalisation. As an analytical framework, 'methodological transnationalism' permits the description and assessment of multiple and simultaneous fora of policy making and administrative practice within various socio-spatial jurisdictions without prejudging the primacy of one of them. Nevertheless, where 'methodological nationalism' emphasizes domestic politics and policy processes *within countries,* 'methodological

transnationalism' highlights global problems, international politics and policy processes *cutting across countries* (Yeates 2014, pp. 2-3). In subsequent articles in this symposium, Phil Cerny and Gabriella Kütting put conceptual flesh to this approach with their discussion of 'transnational neo-pluralism' while Timothy LeGrand develops the idea of 'network transgovernmentalism'.

Second, there are considerations of scale and different meanings attached to regional, international, supranational and transnational (Coleman 2012). As has already been suggested, transnational administration is a multi-scalar endeavour having manifestations, depending on the policy issue or problems, at the local, urban, sub-regional, sub-national, regional, national, supranational, supra-regional, transnational, international, and global scales. Spatial scales are not pre-given or natural arenas of social interaction but are historical products whereby: 'National scale is the historical product of certain social forces, just as transnational scale is a socially and technologically produced achievement that has been partly made possible by, for instance, information technology and the development of transportation' (Kauppinen 2013, p. 12). These scales of 'local' and 'global' are not neatly bounded and nested spaces. Instead they are articulated together in complex patterns which 'implies the need to study the local, national, regional, international, and/or transnational administrative bodies, policy groups, (inter)governmental agencies, and/or transnational epistemic communities affecting those linkages either by enabling or restricting them' (Kauppinen 2013, p. 13).

Third, implementation of global policies is not necessarily global. While policy norms and agendas may be designed with global resonance, the pattern of policy implementation and compliance varies significantly, and cross-border and co-jurisdictional problem contexts can be concentrated or localized. Hence our use of the term 'transnational administration' to reflect realities that policy applications can be geographically specific and limited to a few countries. For instance, the GGFR partnership brings around the table representatives of governments of oil-producing countries, state-owned companies and major international oil companies in order to overcome jointly the barriers to reducing gas flaring by 'sharing global best practices and implementing country specific programs' (GGFR 2014). However, governance location also matters as policies are operationalized in different socio-political and historical contexts. The dynamics of presidential versus parliamentary systems differentially affect patterns of implementation. And as Timothy LeGrand (this issue) argues, 'cultural propinquity' is also a basis for cultivating 'transgovernmentalism'. Similarly state

capacity has significant bearing on implementation of global policies: so-called 'failed' states generally cannot meet international standards. In gas flaring developing countries like Nigeria, Algeria, Kazakhstan and Angola, the political and economic challenges are significant for efficient and effective project implementation up-stream and downstream along the gas value chain as it involves developing domestic gas markets and pricing, harnessing viable technologies and building partnerships with multiple players in various industries such as power and petrochemicals.

Fourth, the administrative expansion of transnational governance increases regime complexity, for both regulators and the regulated (Büthe and Mattli 2011). The negative externalities of complexity are inconsistency, duplication and regulatory arbitrage. For instance, Kai Schultze and Jale Tosun (in this issue) note competition between regulatory regimes on Biosafety. Positive externalities may occur if that diversity permits interlinked institutions to forge strong de facto regulatory regimes. For example, the adverse impact of gas flaring on the environment has been addressed by a panoply of official and semi-official structures: the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the Kyoto Protocol, and the GFFR public-private partnership which supports national governments, development agencies, and oil producing companies but which also has in its orbit other overlapping global programmes like the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative – EITI. This attempt by international organisations to improve their regulatory capability by engaging with private actors and institutions through orchestration mechanisms has also been labelled 'Transnational New Governance' (Abbott and Snidal 2010).

Finally, global 'public' policy is not necessarily 'public'. International organisations formed from World War Two (World Bank, IMF and the United Nations) are no longer the sole determinants of global policy (see: Cerny 2010, Ruggie 2004, Trondal, Marcussen, Larson and Veggeland 2010). Newer organisations—be they networks, private standard-setting regimes, 'global commissions' or regional forums—have exposed the limits of traditional international organisation in promoting development and addressing economic and other crises. Governments and International Organisations design and deliver policy as partnerships with business (Cutler 2003, Ronit 2011) alongside philanthropy and expert groups. In these 'global programs' (see *inter alia*, OED 2002), policy activity does not conform to the standard distinction of simply public or private (Fraser 2013, Steffek 2010), but occurs across them. For example, Deborah Alimi (this issue) notes that the privately convened Global Commission on Drug Policy has effectively blurred the distinctions between public and

private to its advantage. Similarly the paper by Henk Erik Meier and Borja Garcia discusses the transnational regulatory role of a private organisation – FIFA – in football.

Whether positive or negative in their attributes, where new policy spaces of public action are being formed they invariably give rise to transnational teams of managers and administrators. International decision-making, policy implementation and regulation is fractured between public officials, private stakeholders and communities of scientific experts. Multiple quasi-public transnational policy communities exercise growing power and authority over cross-national problems in many issue-areas: migration, disease, water, crime and others. Where issues of policy coordination and 'joined up government' are well-established concerns of complex modern states, the problems of coordination are even more pronounced in transnational contexts. Alongside the governance fragmentation among proliferating partnerships and global initiatives are concerns of fraying accountability in global affairs. Another scenario is the 'rise of the unelected' (Vibert 2007); that is, closed, technocratic transnational administrations. 'Questions that are left unexplored in the public administration literature are what… the globalization of production mean for governments and their relationships with business and civil society, and what the implications are for public administration' (Abonyi and van Slyke 2010). Or as Cerny and Kütting ask in this symposium: Who rules?

 If the study of public administration is centrally concerned with the organization of public policies as well as the behaviour of officials formally responsible for their conduct, then there is a need to grapple with the idea of public administrators who are not public servants or who are not working in public sector organisations but are nonetheless operating in the global public domain. For example, while the GGFR secretariat is hosted by the World Bank – an international organisation that can easily be deemed a public agency – nevertheless, the execution of policy is handled by a range of public and private actors.

The constitutive actors of global policy processes and transnational administration may be different from the domestic level or they may have demonstrated increased power beyond the state. Clearly, business plays a role. Experimentation with new international organisations such as the G20 has spawned groups like 'Business 20' to provide private sector support to global economic management. And there are issue-specific formal public-private partnerships like ALLFISH (the Alliance for Responsible Fisheries) or the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative – EITI (Haufler 2010). In the case of gas flaring, industry representatives are crucial players in the GGFR public-private partnership. Alongside

government partners, companies such as BP, Chevron, Pertamina, ExxonMobil are amongst a dozen others that have signed the GGFR Charter and are working towards application of the global standard on gas flaring reduction. The GGFR case is illustrative of the general diversity of administrative agents in global and regional policy.

We can immediately identify four types of professional groups that have become well entrenched in various transnational policy communities as evidence providers, as policy makers and often as administrators. Firstly, *international civil servants (ICS)* are directly associated with the development of intergovernmental organisations. According to the ILO and its 'Standard of Conduct' for the ICS with respect to the UN system:

> The international civil service ... relies on the great traditions of public administration that have grown up in member States: competence, integrity, impartiality, independence and discretion. But over and above this, international civil servants have a special calling: to serve the ideals of peace, of respect for fundamental rights, of economic and social progress, and of international cooperation (ILO 2002, p. 2).

However, the majority of IOs are not part of the UN system. Accordingly, the notion of a 'special calling' among ICS may be of limited relevance. Nevertheless, the motivations and interests of international civil servants, and their 'tribal nature' (Tett 2014) are important for understanding the way agendas of international organisations in relation to global policies are promoted. As a result of mission creep in international organisations, there is an emerging literature on the management responsibilities of international civil servants (e.g., Kim *et al.* 2014, Kellow and Carroll 2013).) ICS have an international and not a national mandate and that depending on the formal institutional conditions and on the informal opportunities they develop, their role can be significant (Yi-Chong and Weller, 2008). The bureau shaping model (Dunleavy, 1991) claims that national bureaucrats attempt to shape their organisations and duties in order to enhance their power, salaries and opportunities and if applied to the international level could provide an interesting insight in the way ICS attempt to maximize their status, quality of work and their overall utility. This is another way into understanding IO tendency to expand their capacity which often leads to overlaps of mandate between different IOs and transnational structures.

ICS has been seen as a distinct category from national civil servants. Yet, this distinction is becoming increasingly blurred with the 'internationalized public sector official' often found

operating in intergovernmental networks to partner with their colleagues either in international organisations or in counterpart ministries and agencies of other countries. Timothy LeGrand (this issue) analyses an elite cadre of Anglosphere government officials driving trans-governmental policy and who do so, we would argue, as a necessary response to the incursions upon interdependence and domestic sovereignty they experience. Likewise, Eva Heidbreder (this issue) identifies cooperation of horizontally linked autonomous national administrations within the EU context but which is potentially spilling over beyond the EU. Furthermore, as we continue below, the boundaries of civil service are further blurred in that both international and national civil servants also develop policy and deliver public services in conjunction with other 'transnational policy professionals' (Stone 2013) detailed immediately below.

Secondly, *scientific and expert groups* use their (social) scientific and technical knowledge to shape global policy agendas or implementation. Research institutes, think tanks, university policy centres create knowledge-specific networks (sometimes called epistemic communities) interacting with global and regional policy programs on matters of problem identification, monitoring of technical procedures, and program evaluation. These groups provide 'cause and effect' explanations and theoretical justifications (such as the theory of global public goods) to help legitimate global policy interventions. Transnational policy makers need reliable theories and scientific rationales to pursue policy and contract experts to provide the 'evidence base'. They also need the skills and training to effectively absorb and apply this knowledge. As André Broome and Len Seabrooke demonstrate in their article in this symposium, IMF policy training at the Joint Vienna Institute 'diagnostic coordination' is facilitated across technocratic economic policy communities equipping new generations of transnational economic administers with a common policy language and set of analytical tools. Similarly, Kai Schultze and Jale Tosun conclude their article with the need to study more closely the role of scientific expertise in the decisions of states to ratify multilateral environmental agreements.

Thirdly, *philanthropic actors,* such as the Ford, Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations have long been established in international development. They are now complemented by new actors; the Soros Foundations Network and the Aga Khan, Bill and Melinda Gates and Gatsby Foundations, among others, as well as the significant economic development and public policy impact that remittances now play. Yet, foundations are interacting in a web of relationships with corporate donors, grantees, and governments (Moran 2013, Hammack and

Heydemann 2009). Their partnerships can be of practical relevance in securing policy coordination and legitimacy as well as in avoiding duplication. Lack of concern for 'global public bads' can have equally telling consequences: Shell has long been criticized for its inadequate corporate social responsibility focus in Nigeria, while the Gates Foundation sought to divert from polluting companies in the Niger delta following criticism that the aims of the Foundation to improve human health were at odds with its investments in companies that caused illness and disease through pollution and exploitation.

Fourthly, *management consultants* also shape transnational administrative practices with their professional advice (*inter alia*, Bouteligier 2011). While there is a raft of analysis of these actors such as Deloitte, Price Waterhouse Coopers, and KPMG concerning public sector reform at the national level, discussion of their roles in international monitoring, the use of their services by international organization, or the diffusion of 'best practices' and their roles as 'global assemblers' (Prince 2012) is extremely limited. These and other 'transnational policy professionals' based in the private and/or third sectors we suggest provide fruitful field of future analysis and would deliver further insight into the evolving shape and constitution of transnational policy communities and their public service orientation. In her article, Deborah Alimi identifies the agenda setting influence of private policy entrepreneurs promoting new international standards for harm reduction as well as key roles of specific foundations and 'celebrity diplomats' in providing material backing.

Already many stress the 'communicative' prospects and deliberative potential for democracy within a global public sphere (*inter alia*, Dryzek, 2014) or one composed of networks and civil society (Steffek 2010). Some argue that the 'global public domain' is a 'transnational arena concerned with the production of global public goods' (Ruggie 2004, p. 499) while more radical ideas suggest a 'global polity' (Sending and Neumann, 2010) or 'transnational constitutionalism' (Kjaer 2011, Zumbansen 2012). Yet, this 'sphere' remains conceptually shapeless in its institutional, professional and policy practice dimensions. One ramification of the mixed public-private character of global policy and transnational administrations are that the roles, rights and responsibilities of the world's various 'publics' are de-emphasized and often lost from analytical consideration in the elite and expert professional domains of policy and administration beyond the state. Public policy and administration scholars have much to offer that will allow us to go beyond vague amorphous 'spheres' to identify concrete manifestations of 'transnational administration' within, and across, networks and global partnerships.

3. Conceptualising Global (Public) Policy and Transnational Administration

Policy scholarship has been relatively slow to apply its own analytical approaches, core concepts and methods to global governance dynamics. Indeed, one Dean of Public Administration has said the field is 'too comfortable for that' (Fritzen 2010). Despite some deep seams of interest in areas such as 'global health policy' (McInnes and Lee 2012, Kay and Williams 2009), 'global refugee policy and migration (Deardorff Miller 2014) or 'global environmental policy' (Andonova *et al*. 2009, Biermann and Siebenhüner 2009, Bell and Hindmoor 2012), there is little theorising of what constitutes 'the global public' or 'global policy'. Nor is it the case that the new policy architectures such as global public private partnerships represent or portray themselves as components of the global public sector or sphere. Indeed, the 'partners' to bodies like GGFR (in this case, the 20+ governments, private oil companies, government owned oil companies and a few international organizations) cannot be conflated with the global public on this particular issue of gas flaring. And while there are associate partners, these stakeholders and interested parties are also too few in number to be considered representative. In any event, notwithstanding how the 'global public' might be defined, the geographically concentrated nature and highly technical character of policy solutions to the gas-flaring problem puts it low in public cognition in most countries around the world. Yet, a recent review has noted that aside from the economic loss of an energy source, flaring and venting of associated gas creates local, environmental and public health impacts, as well as contributing to the potential for climate change necessitating an 'aggressive global mitigation program' (Buzcu-Guven and Harriss 2012, p. 95).

When it comes to the idea of 'global policy', most text-book definitions of public policy are an inadequate guide as they identify *government* as the primary agent and executor of public decisions or undertake comparative investigations of the global dimensions of public administration (e.g. Raadschelders *et al*. 2014). Notwithstanding the revolution in cross-disciplinary analysis of global governance (in legal studies, Kjaer 2011, Walker 2012 or political geography, Peck 2011, Prince 2012 or in management studies Djelic and Quack 2012, Morgan and Whitely 2012), there is wide scope to innovate policy studies beyond its long held nationalist methodologies. Today, most introductory textbooks on public policy and administration devote the obligatory chapter to 'globalisation'. More often than not, these chapters revolve around the question of how globalisation impinges on sovereign powers and

decision making autonomy in national policy polities. This 'Westphalian political imaginary' maintains a sharp distinction between domestic and international space (Fraser 2013, p. 181). There remains a challenge to traditional policy and public administration studies for conceptual innovation and critical engagement with policy processes and administrative structures that are not only inter-connected with, but also analytically and potentially politically 'autonomous' from, national policy processes and bureaucracies.

The preceding paragraph presents the less proactive picture of public administration and policy studies. Yet, we also see signs of the wakening of these scholarly communities to the idea of international, transnational or global policy and administration (e.g. Kennett 2008, Kim *et al*. 2014, Skogstad 2011, Walker 2011). For example, while it could not be said that *Public Administration* has published extensively in this area in its 94 year history, nevertheless, there are articles addressing topics as diverse as networks, policy transfer, global corporate codes, Europeanization, and the Forestry Stewardship Council. A January 14th, 2015 search of the journal using the terms 'global policy' and 'transnational administration' jointly generated 81 articles or reviews since 1978 with the bulk appearing after 1999. When sorted by 'best match', 18 of the first 20 were published since 2009. 'Transgovernmental' merits only 10 hits. However, incommensurate terms for analysing transnational administrative phenomena between disciplines and in other journals confounds development of a common conceptual language.

In support of their call for a 'global administrative law', Kingsbury, Krisch and Stewart (2005) argue that enough global and transnational administration exists that we can talk about a 'global administrative space' encompassing various regulatory institutions and entities. They offer a classification of five types of global administration: a) *international administration* where formal international organisations are the main actors (e.g. the UN Security Council), b) *transnational networks* which are dominated by informal cooperation between state regulators (e.g. the Basle Committee), c) *distributed administration* when domestic agencies take decisions on issues of global and transnational concern (e.g. national environmental regulators implementing decisions on biodiversity conservation or greenhouse gas emissions) similar to that identified by Heidbreder in this issue on 'horizontal administrative cooperation', d) *hybrid intergovernmental-private administration* where private and governmental actors interact (e.g. Codex Alimentarius Committee on food safety standards) and e) *administration by private institutions* when regulation is carried out by private bodies (e.g. the International Standardization Organization, ISO or as discussed in this

issue, FIFA as a transnational regulator of football). Although these five types of administration often overlap in the running of specific global policies they are a useful starting point for making two observations: first, it is more accurate to talk about transnational administration rather than transnational public administration since the presence of private actors is prominent. Second, it is worth focusing on transnational rather than global administration since most of the regulation, management and implementation of global policies does not take place across the whole globe at the same time.

Also of note are 'global social policy' scholars who develop the idea of 'methodological transnationalism' and focus on the ways in which social policies alongside national welfare states and systems are influenced by global politics, actors, polices and institutions (Yeates 2014, p. 3). Global social policy studies have tended to focus on the social policies of international organisations (e.g. Deacon 2007). This leaves considerable scope for further study from those concerned not only with the transnational dimensions of public administration but also the institutional features of, and power dynamics within, emergent global public sectors of both public and private actors. However, the opening towards global policy studies and transnational administration is best seen in the extensive innovations in curriculum development in higher education institutions. There are now a plethora of graduate degrees for students desirous of concepts and frameworks to use in their careers in international organisations and NGOs to 'manage' global problems.

We now turn to well-known public policy models and public administration classifications to suggest some avenues for a more in depth understanding of global policy processes and transnational administration. Some of them have been applied by the authors of this symposium while others are part of this emerging research agenda and remain to be tested in the future. Network analysis is one of the dominant models of domestic public policy analysis and it has proven to be valuable at the global level with the elaboration of metaphors such as global public policy networks, transnational executive networks, or knowledge networks (Stone 2013). A rich resource bank of network typologies, the actors participating and the global policies pursued has been achieved. Analyses of the 'new public management' reveal how NPM has encouraged private and public policy entrepreneurship, international devolution and supra-national delegation of policy delivery (McNutt and Pal 2011). Similarly, Henk Erik Meier and Borja Garcia in their article provide an overview of the applications of regulatory studies to transnational problems but nonetheless argue that there

are still short falls in analytical discussion of how transnational private regulators "establish rules modifying domestic policies against governments' will".

When explaining agenda setting and decision-making processes of global policies the multiple streams perspective can prove particularly revealing since it allows the exploration of policy windows, the dynamics of coupling and the key role of policy entrepreneurs. Zahariadis (2008) applied multiple streams to European public policy and showed that the absence of a centralized authority increases the importance of power and the way policy entrepreneurs can manipulate policy windows in order to promote specific policies and interests. At the global level the lack of a centralized authority is even more pronounced. Global policies emerge as the result of coupling by policy entrepreneurs of three streams – problems, politics and policies – when policy windows open. Similar to Zahariadis (2008) observations, and that also of Ackrill, Kay and Zahariadis (2013) who apply multiple streams to the EU level, organizational technology is opaque at the global level because a variety of institutions with overlapping responsibilities exist. This is the finding of Deborah Alimi in this issue concerning the opaque status of the Global Commission on Drugs. More generally, participation in these institutions is fluid since national officials rotate and given that new actors and organizations can gain influence by bringing new funding or expertise. For example, the entry of the Gates Foundation into the global health landscape brought private foundation spending on global health to 1.6 billion US$ in 2005 (McCoy *et al.* 2009). Policy entrepreneurs can join the streams together when a policy window opens taking into account this fluidity. Applying the multiple streams perspective at the global level also sheds light on the increased role of individual and organisational policy entrepreneurs (again in the case of the Global Drug Commission) in the more open and fluid global policy processes..

A well-known framework that has been developed as an alternative to the policy cycle approach is the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith 1993). The application of the ACF at the global level allows for a more in depth exploration of formal and informal networks. The identification of competing advocacy coalitions in policy sectors of global interest such as climate change and public health can reveal not only how agenda-setting and decision-making processes take place but also how networks and actors can block policy implementation at a later stage. The loose processes of implementation oversight of global policies, makes this aspect of the ACF particularly relevant. In one of the few articles applying the ACF at the global level, Princen (2007) showed how competing advocacy coalitions promoted or slowed down anti-smoking and alcoholism policies at the

international level but also how the international governance structures favoured one coalition over another. More research can be done on the role of policy brokers in global policy making and the way they are mediating between conflicting strategies and ideas proposed by different coalitions. A comparison of the roles and resources of policy brokers and policy entrepreneurs and the way they move in and out of coalitions can reveal interesting aspects of global policy making and financing but also refine the use of these two concepts.

Another critique to the policy cycle when applied at the global level comes from Hamdii Mamudi, Paul Cairney and Donley Studlar (this issue). They explain why, despite international agreements reached on important issues such as the global tobacco policy, implementation at the domestic level lags behind. First, they turn to 'evolutionary' theories and in particular to punctuated equilibrium theory which sees international agreements as one among many other influences to implementation during policy 'punctuations' (e.g. crisis, profound policy failures). Second, they turn to complexity theory which challenges the linearity of the policy process and shows that the interaction with the domestic environment can block the implementation of an international agreement. They conclude that global tobacco policy is now led by the World Health Organisation (WHO) and actors are more likely to find a favourable environment at the global level where policies are decided than at the domestic where policies are supposed to be implemented.

'Policy design' is a re-invigorated field of public administration. As noted, there has been a proliferation of public-private partnerships like GAVI, the CGIAR or GGFR. But little work has been done to drill down to the concrete issues of the design and construction of global or regional programmes. These partnerships generate new challenges of institutional design and specific tools for financial allocations, new governance instruments of shared decision-making and specific mechanisms of joint implementation. The levers of policy design can rest upon incentives, sanctions or norms. But these levers can be operationalized through multiple mechanisms. The policy instruments, or 'tool-box' are divided into different types: That is, legal and regulatory, financial, information and organisational tools. Some tools of policy design require public officials to remain firmly in control; other approaches lead to the delegation of important public services to charities, community groups, and profit-making organizations. Yet other devices rely more on market mechanisms of price, competition and profit to ensure efficient delivery of public goods and service. In short, transnational administration operates with different patterns of instrumentation. The benefit of policy

design approaches is the focus on both the mix and sequencing of policy instruments and market mechanisms which allow for a better recognition of private actors and private delivery of global public goods at different points of the policy process. That is, a spectrum of 'public' public policy, partnership approaches and 'private' public policy. With her focus on budgetary support, Sarah Wolff (this issue) directly engages with this literature in her analysis of this policy instrument as an EU tool of political control in international development policy.

Likewise, policy diffusion and policy transfer have been popular models in the discussion of the way global structures and actors affect domestic ideas about public policies and programmes (e.g. Ladi 2011, Stone 2012). Policy transfer is a mechanism of globalization and Europeanization, leading to convergence of institutions, policies and paradigms which provide further opportunities for policy transfer to occur. The GGFR was launched specifically to 'share global best practice' on gas flaring reduction with informal institutionalisation occurring via the GGFR Voluntary Global Standard. Think tanks and knowledge institutions play a key role in the dissemination of ideas and thus of policy transfer in the international domain (Ladi 2005). Yet, policy transfer and diffusion studies also note that adoption, implementation and/or compliance vary due to national traits (Stone 2012). Moreover, Kai Schultze and Jale Tosun also note the regulatory competition that has emerged with the US and the EU both seeking to 'export' rival regimes to third states.

Since the aim of this symposium is to move away from the discussion on the impact of global processes upon the domestic level and concentrate on the global policy processes and on transnational administration in new realms of public sector activity, policy diffusion and policy transfer frameworks provide the conceptual tools to explore how IOs spread policy practice between themselves and via global public-private partnerships and transnational policy communities rather than to states (De Francesco 2013). This illuminates the dominant ideologies and the strategies of coalitions and networks for the promotion of controversial ideas. For example, Tsarouhas and Ladi (2013) discuss the role of the EU in transferring the discourse of 'flexicurity' to the ILO and show how Europe is active in shaping globalization.

The implementation of global policies is of particular theoretical and empirical interest since it is not only the level of decision-making and implementation that can vary but also the geographical space. Decisions are often made at the global level by a combination of public, private and non-governmental actors and implementation takes place at the transnational level from a variety of actors. The multi-level governance and Europeanization literatures –

developed in an attempt to understand a similar type of differentiation of policies implementation decided at the EU level and executed at the national and regional levels – can provide hypotheses for the global level (e.g. Bache 2008, Cowles *et al.* 2001). One area ripe for future analysis is an application of the idea of 'street-level bureaucrats' especially as transnational administrative functions often occur in places very distant from the offices of international organizations. The way street-level bureaucrats interpret global policies, but also what is actually possible on the ground, defines the implementation of global policies. Similarly, the evaluation and monitoring of global policies can be conducted by international organizations (e.g. OED 2002) but also by consultants, think tanks, NGOs and scientific panels. This multiplicity of actors needs to be taken into account when trying to estimate the validity of the evaluations undertaken and when proposing new methods for the evaluation and monitoring of global programmes.

Another field of policy studies concerns itself with 'evidence-based policy' the impact of science and/or research on policy-making and the roles of experts (Broome and Seabrooke, this issue). As transnational policymaking also relies heavily on technical information and expert knowledge, it is another set of dynamics that can lead towards *global private policy* and *private authority* (Cutler 2003; Porter and Ronit 2010). Governments sometimes presume that policy areas are so technically demanding that the private sector or expert communities or indeed international civil servants are best suited for designing rules and procedures. Some institutions of private authority may not involve governments at all (credit rating agencies). Epistemic and professional knowledge resources that experts and consultants bring to transnational administration, and the financial or symbolic resources private foundations also shape global policy. Returning to the GGFR example, its Technical Network deals with matters such as measurement and reporting of flare volumes and associated gas flare technologies. A particular 'data challenge' has been inconsistent data between countries, as well as under-reporting. In cooperation with scientists based in the US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the GFRR initiated the first globally consistent satellite survey of gas flaring in 2006 and which has since allowed for more effective annual estimates of flaring and accurate monitoring of reduction.

As also argued by Eva Heidbreder in this symposium, the study of EU governance and policy-making processes as well as its impact upon member-states and beyond can be inspiring for the development of theoretical propositions on global public policy and transnational administration. For a long time, the EU has been perceived as a unique

governance structure for which new models and concepts need to be developed. Sabel and Zeitlin (2008) in their discussion of experimentalist governance which sheds light on the deliberative aspects of EU governance argue that it is not as distinct as perceived and that similarities can be found both above (e.g. WTO) and below (e.g. the US) the EU level. This observation reinforces our argument that theoretical frameworks from domestic and EU public policy and administration can be adapted and applied to global and transnational dynamics. Three theoretical paths have been developed at the EU level that can be explored. First, multi-level governance as well as networked governance and experimentalist governance attempt to explain the way a non-hierarchical system which is by large based on consensus between various decision-making bodies (i.e. European Council and European Parliament) and with diverse levels of implementation (i.e. national, regional or local) functions (e.g. Bache 2008, Sabel and Zeitlin 2008). Second, the four neo institutionalisms (historical, rational, sociological and discursive) have been central in the Europeanization literature which discusses the way institutions, policies and norms are first developed at the EU level and then transferred at the domestic level (e.g. Radaelli 2003, Knill 2001). The uploading and downloading of policies from the national to the EU level and back to the national is a useful heuristic to use outside the EU (Boerzel 2002). Third, network analysis, including ACF and epistemic communities, has been popular in EU studies, in an attempt to map and to understand the multiplicity different resources and interests of the actors (NGOs, interest groups, lobby organisations) that participate in policy processes (e.g. Richardson 2006, Rozbicka 2013). While EU studies are distinct from studies on global policy making and transnational administration, they offer an insight on how we can explore power in non-hierarchical systems and the role of diverse actors and levels in policy implementation. The bureaucratization of EU policy making processes can provide lessons of what not to do at transnational administration while the frequent achievement of consensus between member-states, EU institutions and interest groups can be seen as an example of successfully managing a complex governance system.

The claims we make do not reject mainstream international relations scholarship, or overlook an impressive empirical catalogue of analysis of global governance. The independent variable in the international relations discipline is, however, the state (as both black box and actor). A focus on 'global policy processes' transfers the status of the state from that of an independent to a dependent variable for most analytical purposes. Relegating the state in this methodological transnationalism to the status of just one socio-political jurisdiction of policy

making and administration amongst others, allows us to analytically recognize authoritative decision making and public goods provision in multiple (and admittedly often fragmented and incoherent) transnational public sectors.

In conclusion, the next articles in this symposium each tackle a specific aspect of global policy and apply different public policy and administration concepts and theoretical frameworks. This provides 'added value' on two fronts: first, value to the study of global governance by deploying classic concepts from public administration in novel contexts: 'punctuated equilibrium' with regard to global tobacco policy; 'policy entrepreneurship' in global drug policy; the 'policy design' of EU budget support in international development assistance policy or in the proliferating mechanisms of horizontal administrative cooperation among EU member states; 'policy learning' and the IMF's transnational policy training programmes; transgovernmental 'policy networks' and 'policy transfer' in the Anglosphere; the 'bureaucratic politics' of international organisations; the transnational industry self-regulation in the case of football; the competition of rival 'regulatory regimes' in multilateral environmental agreements; and a macro-level account of power, inequality and (lack of) order in global environmental policy. Second, and our final point concerning 'added value', a 'window of opportunity' has opened to the wider community of policy and administration scholars for different vantage points and closer interdisciplinary engagement with conceptual developments in the wider study of global governance.

Bibliography

Abbott, K. and Snidal, D. 2010. 'International Regulation without International Government: Improving IO Performance through Orchestration', *The Review of International Organisations*, 5, 3, 315-344.

Abonyi, G. and van Slyke, D. M. 2010. 'Governing on the Edges: Globalization of Production and the Challenge to Public Administration in the Twenty-First Century', *Public Administration Review*, 70, 33–45.

Ackrill, R., Kay, A. and Zahariadis, N. 2013. 'Ambiguity, Multiple Streams and EU Policy', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 20, 6, 871-87.

Andonova, L., Bulkeley, H., and Betsill, T. 2009. 'Transnational Climate Governance', *Global Environmental Politics*, 9, 2, 52-73.

Bache, I. 2008. *Europeanization and Multi-level Governance: Cohesion Policy in the European Union and Britain*. Lanham (US) and Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.

Beck, U. 2005. *Power in the Global Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bell, S. and Hindmoor, A. 2012. 'Governance with Government? The Case of Forest Stewardship Council', *Public Administration*, 90, 144–159.

Biermann, F. and B. Siebenhüner (eds). 2009. *Managers of Global Change: the Influence of International Environmental Bureaucracies*. Boston: MIT Press.

Boerzel, T. 2002. 'Member States Responses to Europeanization', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 40, 2, 193-214.

Bonimi, M. 2007. 'Planning for Change: Globalization and American Public Administration', in A. Farazmand and J. Pinkowski (eds), *Handbook of Globalization, Governance, and Public Administration*. Boca Raton, FL: Taylor and Francis, pp 39-50.

Buzcu-Guven, B. and Harriss, R. 2012. 'Extent, Impacts and Remedies of Global Gas Flaring and Venting', *Carbon Management*, 3, 1, 95-108.

Bouteligier, S. 2011. 'Exploring the Agency of Global Environmental Consultancy Firms in Earth System Governance', *International Environmental Agreements,* 11, 43–61.

Büthe, T. and Mattli, W. 2011. *The New Global Rulers: The Privatization of Regulation in the World Economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cerny, P. 2010. *Rethinking World Politics: A Theory of Transnational Pluralism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Coleman, W. D. 2012. 'Governance and Global Public Policy', in D. Levi-Faur (ed) *Oxford Handbook of Governance*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 673-87.

Cowles, M. G. et al (eds). 2001. *Transforming Europe: Europeanisation and Domestic Change*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Cutler, A. C. 2003. *Private Power and Global Authority: Transnational Merchant Law in the Global Political Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Deacon, B. 2007. *Global Social Policy and Governance*. London: Sage.

Deardorff Miller, S. 2014. 'Lessons from the Global Public Policy Literature for the Study of Global Refugee Policy', *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 27, 4, 495-513.

De Francesco, F. 2013. *Transnational Policy Innovation: The Role of the OECD in the Diffusion of Regulatory Impact Analysis*. Colchester: European Consortium of Political Research Monographs.

Djelic, M.-L. and Quack, S. 2012. 'Transnational Governance through Standard Setting: The Role of Transnational Communities', in G. Morgan and R. Whitley (eds), *Capitalisms and Capitalism in the Twenty-First Century*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 116-207.

Dryzek, J. (2014). Global deliberative democracy. *The Essential Guide to Global Environmental Governance*, 76.

Dunleavy, P. 1991. *Democracy and Public Choice*, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Fraser, N. 2013. *Fortunes of Feminism: From State Managed Capitalism to Neoliberal Crisis*, Brooklyn N.Y.: Verso.

Fritzen, S. A. 2010. 'Envisioning Public Administration as a Scholarly Field in 2020: Toward Global and Comparative Administrative Theorizing', *Public Administration Review*, 70, s300–s301.

Gerrard, Ch. D., Ferroni, M. A., and Mody, A. 2001. *Global Public Policies and Programs: Implications for Financing and Evaluation: Proceedings from a World Bank Workshop*, Washington D.C..: World Bank Group.

GGFR - Global Gas Flaring Reduction. 2014. 'About GGFR', http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTOGMC/EXTGGFR/0,, contentMDK:21022944~menuPK:828161~pagePK:64168445~piPK:64168309~theSite PK:578069,00.html

Hammack, D. and S. Heydeman (eds). 2009. *Globalization, Philanthropy, and Civil Society: Projecting Institutional Logics, Abroad*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Haufler, V. 2010. 'Disclosure as Governance: The Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative and Resource Management in Developing World', *Global Environmental Politics,* 10, 53-73.

ILO - International Labour Organisation. 2002. Standard of Conduct for International Civil Service, http://www.ilo.org/public/english/ethics/standards.pdf Access 5th November 2014.

Kaul, I. 2005. 'Exploring the Policy Space between Markets and States: Global Public-Private Partnerships', in I. Kaul and P. Conceição (eds), *The New Public Finance: Responding to Global Challenge,* Oxford: UNDP and Oxford University Press (http://www.ingekaul.net/pdf/GlobalPublicPrivatePartnerships-Chapter-w-cover.pdf).

Kauppinen, I. 2015. 'Towards a Theory of Transnational Academic Capitalism', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 36, 2, 336-353.

Kay, A. and O. Williams (eds). 2009. *Global Health Governance: Crisis, Institutions and Political Economy*, Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke.

Kellow, A. and Carroll, P. 2013. 'Exploring the Impact of International Civil Servants: The Case of the OECD', *International Journal of Public Administration*, 36, 7, 482-91.

Kennett, P. (ed.). 2008. *Governance, Globalization and Public Policy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Kim, S., Ashley, S. And Lambright, W. H. (eds). 2014. *Public Administration in the Context of Global Governance*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Kingsbury, B., Krisch, N. and Stewart, R. 2005, 'The Emergence of Global Administrative Law', *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 68, 15, 15-61.

Kjaer, P. F. 2011. 'The Concept of the Political in the Concept of Transnational Constitutionalism: A Sociological Perspective', in J. Christian and R. Tommi (eds), *After Globalization – New Patterns of Conflict and their Sociological and legal Reconstruction*, Oslo: Arena Report Series, pp. 285 - 321.

Knill C. 2001. *The Europeanisation of National Administrations,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krasner, S. 1999. *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy*, Princeton University Press.

Ladi, S. 2005. *Globalization, Policy Transfer and Policy Research Institutes*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Ladi, S. 2011. 'Policy Change and Soft Europeanization: The Transfer of the Ombudsman Institution to Greece, Cyprus and Malta', *Public Administration*, 89, 4, 1643-63.

McCoy, D., Chand, S. and Sridhar, D. 2009. 'Global Health Funding: How Much, Where it Comes From and Where it Goes', *Health Policy and Planning*, 24, 6, 407-17.

McInnes, C. and Lee, K. 2012. *Global Health and International Relations*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

McNutt, K. and Pal, L. A. 2011.'"Modernizing Government": Mapping Global Public Policy Networks', *Governance*, 24, 439–467.

Moran, M. 2013. *Private Foundations and Development Partnerships: American Philanthropy and Global Development Agenda.* London and New York: Routledge.

Morgan, G. and R. Whitely (eds). 2012. *Capitalisms and Capitalism in the Twenty – First Century*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

OED — Operations Evaluation Department. 2002. *The World Bank's Approach to Global Programs: An Independent Evaluation Phase 1 Report*, Washington D.C..: World Bank.

Patriota, G. et al. 2013. 'Coordinating Knowledge Transfer: Global Managers as Higher-Level Intermediaries', *Journal of World Business*, 48, 4, 515-26.

Peck, J. 2011. 'Geographies of Policy: From Transfer-Diffusion to Mobility-Mutation', *Progress in Human Geography*, 35, 6, 773–797.

Porter, T. and Ronit, K. (eds). 2010. *The Challenges of Global Business Authority: Democratic Renewal, Stalemate, or Decay*? Albany: SUNY Press.

Prince, R. 2012. 'Policy Transfer, Consultants and the Geographies of Governance', *Progress in Human Geography,* 36, 2, 188-203.

Princen, S. 2007. 'Advocacy Coalitions and Internationalization of Public Health Policies', *Journal of Public Policy*, 27, 1, 13-33.

Raadschelders, J., Vigoda-Gadot, E. and Kirsner (eds). 2014. *Global Dimensions of Public Administration and Governance: A Comparative Voyage*. New Jersey: Jossey Bass.

Radaelli, C. 2003. 'The Europeanization of Public Policy', in K. Featherstone and C. Radaelli (eds), *The Politics of Europeanization.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 27-56.

Richardson, J. 2006. *European Union: Power and Policy Making*, 3rd edition, Oxon: Routledge.

Ronit, K. (ed.). 2011. *Global Public Policy: Business and the Countervailing Powers of Civil Society.* London: Routledge.

Rozbicka, P. 2013. 'Advocacy Coalitions: Influencing the Policy Process in the EU', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 20, 6, 838-53.

Ruggie, J. G. 2004. 'Reconstituting the Global Public Domain — Issues, Actors, and Practices', *European Journal of International Relations,* 10, 4, 499-531.

Sabatier, P. and Jenkins-Smith, H. 1993. *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Sabel, C. And Zeitlin, J. 2008. 'Learning from Difference: the New Architecture of Experimentalist Governance in the EU', *European Law Journal*, 14, 3, 271-327.

Schäferhoff, M., Campe, S. and Kaa, Ch. 2009. 'Transnational Public-Private Partnerships in International Relations: Making Sense of Concepts, Research Frameworks, and Results', *International Studies Review*, 11, 3, 451–74.

Scott, C., Cafaggi, F. And Senden, L. 2011. 'The Conceptual and Constitutional Challenge of Transnational Private Regulation', *Journal of Law and Society,* 38 , 1, 1–19.

Sending, O. J. and Neumann, I. B. 2010. *Governing the Global Polity: Practice, Mentality, Rationality*. Ann Arbor (Michigan): University of Michigan Press.

Skogstad, G. (ed.). 2011. *Policy Paradigms, Transnationalism and Domestic Politics*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Steffek, J. 2010. 'Public Accountability and the Public Sphere of International Governance', *Ethics & International Affairs*, 24, 45–68.

Stone, D. 2013. *Knowledge Actors and Transnational Governance: The Public-Private Policy Nexus in the Global Agora,* Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Stone, D. 2012. 'Policy Transfer and Policy Translation', *Policy Studies*, 33, 4, 1-17.

Strandsbjerg, J. 2010. *Territory, Globalization and International Relations: The Cartographic Reality of Space*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tett, G. 2014. 'A Rare Peek at the Tribal Nature of our Global Bureaucracies', *The Financial Times*, July 18.

Trondal, J., Marcussen, M., Larson, T. and Veggeland, F. 2010. *Unpacking International Organisations*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Tsarouhas, D. and Ladi, S. 2013.'Globalization and/or Europeanization? The Case of Flexicurity', *New Political Economy*, 18, 4, 480-502.

Vibert, F. 2007. *The Rise of the Unelected: Democracy and the New Separation of Powers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walker, N. 2012. 'Postnational Constitutionalism and Postnational Public Law: A Tale of Two Neologisms', *Edinburgh School of Law Research Paper* No. 2012/20.

Walker, R. 2011. 'Globalized Public Management: An Interdisciplinary Design Science?', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21 (suppl 1), i53-i59.

Yeates, N. (ed.). 2014. *Understanding Global Social Policy*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Yi-Chong, X. and Weller, P. 2008, '"To Be, but not to Be Seen": Exploring the Impact of International Civil Servants', *Public Administration*, 86, 1, 35-51.

Zahariadis, N. 2008. 'Ambiguity and Choice in European Public Policy', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 15, 4, 514-530.

Zumbansen, P. 2012. 'Comparative, Global and Transnational Constitutionalism: The Emergence of a Transnational Legal-Pluralist Order', *Global Constitutionalism*, 1, 16-52.