



DEVELOPMENT RESOURCE CENTRE  
ENVIRONMENT – WATER – SANITATION

## **Environmental Governance Reading List**

29 February 2008

## Environmental Governance

- ◆ Readings have been categorised by sector, beginning with a key readings section on International Environmental Governance which is arranged according to history, current and future thinking.
- ◆ Readings are arranged alphabetically. Those in bold are those thought to be the most important though all those included are thought to be relevant and informative.
- ◆ Guidance is provided for key readings texts and some others in the list.

### 1. Key Readings: International (Global) Environmental Governance (GEG):

#### History of Global Environmental Governance

**Chasek, Pamela S. *Earth Negotiations*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2001.**

This detailed text displays familiarity with and understanding of the negotiation process of environmental issues within the United Nations. *Earth Negotiations* contains a review of historical examples rather than current analysis. It features eleven case studies of multinational treaties and conventions covering a wide range of environmental regimes. Each of the case studies analyzes the phases and turning points of the negotiations and how internal and external events influenced the resulting agreements. The main focus of the work is a meticulous analysis of the process of negotiation itself, from the development of the problem as part of international consciousness to the post-negotiation phases. This book includes information about the inner workings of the United Nations, but is quite specific and institutionally focused. Chasek's analysis of the successes and failures of the historically cumbersome negotiating process reveals important insights that need to be accounted for when considering reform for institutions of international environmental governance.

**Ivanova, Maria. "Designing the United Nations Environment Programme: A Story of Compromise and Confrontation," in *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law, and Economics* Vol. 7, Issue 3, September 2007.**

Not much has been written on *why and how* the system for global environmental governance and the organization at its core – UNEP – were designed. Yet, a critical assumption has been reinforced in the literature and in policy circles, that UNEP was purposefully designed as a weak organization. The implications from this thinking are that reform is meaningless and futile.

The role of the United Nations in global environmental governance was determined in 1972 when a new international body for the global environment was created as a programme within the United Nations rather than as an autonomous specialized agency. A set of political dynamics between developed and developing countries led to the decisions on the functions, form, financing, and location of the new intergovernmental organization—the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). This article traces the historical roots of these choices and exposes the motivations behind them. The article debunks the myths that UNEP was created as weak and ineffective and opens a new line of analysis in the context of current UN environmental reform. If the system was not deliberately designed as ineffective, change in course becomes possible and even practical.

## Present thinking on Global Environmental Governance

Boehmer-Christiansen, Sonja, and Aynsley Kellow. *International Environmental Policy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2002.

This volume approaches global environmental governance through analysis of the Kyoto process. Unlike the majority of the other texts concerning GEG, the editors of *International Environmental Policy* say that their skepticism about the potential effects of environmental change motivated them to write this book. Their stated purpose for writing this text is to explain how environmental policy that contradicts the interests of nations and people is inherently ineffective. To do this, the editors follow the Kyoto negotiation process from the 1980s when interest in climate change was just beginning through the final ratifications of Kyoto in 2001. Ultimately, the authors expand their analysis beyond the climate change regime to explore general problems associated with international environmental policy making. This is an interesting example of a GEG work because it begins from an unconventional starting point but uses the analytical style of academic international policy texts. While the analysis of only one environmental regime limits the usefulness of this work as a general GEG text, the criticisms it contains about the tactics and sophistication of the “green movement” are insightful and appropriate and should be recognized.

Hempel, Lamont C. *Environmental Governance: The Global Challenge*. Island Press, 1996.

This volume is a true “introductory GEG text.” While the book is now nearly twelve years out of date, it addresses a wide range of issues including international relations theory and political economy, history of the global environmental movement, international environmental institutions, causes of environmental degradation, a brief discussion of climate change, and a critical section entitled “global ecology.” While the coverage is indeed broad, many of the issues discussed are only discussed briefly (~20 page chapters).

### **Hoare, Alison and Tarasofsky, Richard (Ed.s) International Environmental Governance. Report of a Chatham House Workshop. 26 – 27 July 2007.**

**Published: 2008**

This publication reports on an expert workshop held at Chatham house that aimed to find a way forward within ongoing discussions on reform of the International Environmental Governance (IEG) system. A particular goal was to consider how best the UK and EU can contribute to and facilitate progress on these issues. Key sections of this report are;

- Appendix 1: Building Blocks for Reform: options suggested in the informal consultations of the UN General Assembly and in the Chatham House IEG workshop.

- Appendix 2: International Environmental Governance Workshop.

Session 1: What Needs To Be Fixed and What Are the Optimal Outcomes?

Henrike Peichert, Ecologic.

- Appendix 3: International Environmental Governance Workshop.

Session 2: Options and Implications

Maria Ivanova, College of William and Mary, Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy. International Environmental Governance Workshop.

- Appendix 4: International Environmental Governance Workshop

Session 3: Scenarios: Criteria for assessing reform proposals.

Assessing the return on political capital: how can we profit from the most recent round of discussions on international environmental governance?

Jacob Werksman, World Resources Institute.

The report can be downloaded from

<http://www.chathamhouse.org.uk/research/eedp/papers/view/-/id/595/>.

**Ivanova, Maria and Jennifer Roy. “The Architecture of Global Environmental Governance: Pros and Cons of Multiplicity,” in *Global Environmental Governance: Perspectives on the Current Debate*, (Lydia Swart and Estelle Perry, eds.), New York: Center for UN Reform Education, 2007.**

<http://www.centerforunreform.org/node/251>

Organizational multiplicity in the global environmental governance system has been cited by some as reflecting a productive overlap of goals and efforts and as indicative of fragmentation, conflict, and inefficiency by others. This article outlines a systematic approach to understanding the pros and cons of the multiplicity of organizations in global environmental governance. The basis for the analysis is a set of empirical data on the environmental activities of the forty-four international organizations which are members in the Environment Management Group. A preliminary result of an ongoing research project (see [www.environmentalgovernance.org](http://www.environmentalgovernance.org)), this data set provides the first step toward an analytically based assessment of multiplicity and fragmentation. Future analysis will reveal a more nuanced picture, identify areas of complementarity and conflict, and point out possible collaborative initiatives.

**Ivanova, Maria, David Gordon and Jennifer Roy. “Towards Institutional Symbiosis: Business and the United Nations in Environmental Governance,” in *Review of European Community and International Environmental Law RECIEL*, Vol. 16, Issue 2, 2007.**

This article analyses the potentially symbiotic role of business and the United Nations in global environmental governance. Contending that a stronger and more coherent UN in the realm of the environment is in the interest of the business community, the article focuses on three main issues: what the UN needs to become stronger in environmental affairs; what business could provide on this behalf; and how business could benefit from a strengthened UN. The authors consider the current structural dilemmas of the UN environmental system, including concerns about institutional multiplicity and how these may affect business engagement. After reflecting on perceived and actual challenges and opportunities for business participation, they conclude with three substantive solutions towards more efficient collaboration. These solutions centre on the continuation of an interactive database begun by the Global Environmental Governance Project, a joint initiative of the Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy and the College of William and Mary.

**Ivanova, Maria. *Can the Anchor Hold? Rethinking the United Nations Environment Programme for the 21st Century*. New Haven, CT: Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies. 2005.**

This report assesses UNEP’s performance as an “anchor institution” for the global environment and identifies key factors that have shaped its performance over the past thirty years. Analysts of UNEP offer a wide range of opinions regarding the effectiveness of the organization, yet few of these statements are grounded in empirical evidence, as no systematic assessment of UNEP’s performance has been carried out to date. The report evaluates UNEP’s performance more systematically by examining three core functions – monitoring and assessment; agenda setting and policy processes; and capacity development. The report identifies four key factors that have limited UNEP’s ability to fulfill its mandate: formal status, governance, financing structure, and location. It also outlines institutional options and advances a set of concrete and operational recommendations for UNEP, as well as for governments.

## The Future of Global Environmental Governance

**Swart, Lydia and Estelle Perry, eds. *Global Environmental Governance: Perspectives on the Current Debate*, New York: Center for UN Reform Education, 2007. Available at <http://www.centerforunreform.org/node/251>**

This volume includes a well organized and well researched collection of essays focusing on the reform of the environmental policy making within the United Nations. Published by the Center for UN Reform Education, this collection of articles is divided into three sections: a description of current reform proposals and initiatives, analysis of the current structure of the system, and options for policy and institutional reform. This text is targeted towards an audience with understanding of the GEG system and more specifically the role of the United Nations in this system. The collection brings together a comprehensive overview of the current state of GEG within the United Nations. *Global Environmental Governance* presents an overview of different scholarly views on UN reform without promoting any specific agenda to readers.

**Kanie, Norichika, and Peter M. Haas, eds. *Emerging Forces in Environmental Governance*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2004.**

*Emerging Forces in Environmental Governance* is a collection of essays analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of the current institutional arrangement of the global environmental governance system. The topic of GEG reform is extremely well suited to treatment by a compilation of essays because this format allows for the inclusion and presentation of many original viewpoints. This compilation includes creative and progressive analysis of both the problems associated with the current institutional system as well as potential reforms. The book is well organized into subthemes that catalog interactions between the institutional system and various social, political, and economic variables. The focus on GEG institutions as part of an extensive and interactive system encourages discussion on the problems that developed as environmental policy has become more complex. Additionally, the editors encourage real consideration of both the costs and benefits associated with change in the international system. Understanding the pieces in this book requires significant knowledge of the GEG system, especially the institutional arrangements within the United Nations. This text would be best suited for supplemental use to address in depth specific issues within the institutional system of GEG.

**Najam, Adil, Mihaela Papa, and Nadaa Taiyab. *Global Environmental Governance: A Reform Agenda*. Winnipeg, Canada: International Institute for Sustainable Development, 2006.**

This report focuses mostly on the current state of GEG and what should be done to remedy the multiplicity and inefficiency in the system. The report gives a strong overview of the multiplicity, lack of coordination, lack of implementation, and non-state actors. It offers a “Primer on the GEG Reform Debate” and a reform agenda. The report highlights key aspects of the evolution of GEG, identifies the challenges that have accompanied this evolution, categorizes broad reform packages that have been proposed, and explains some of the ongoing and recent GEG reform initiatives.

**Ayre, Georgina, and Rosalie Callway, eds. *Governance for Sustainable Development: A Foundation For The Future*. Earthscan, 2005.**

This environmental governance text uses an “issues-area” framework to explore the subjects of environmental governance and sustainable development. The editors identify areas including water, agriculture, energy, biodiversity, economy, and society in order to unpack the challenges and opportunities of GEG. The work is a “baseline” introduction for policy makers and serves that purpose well. It is more a description of the state of GEG rather than an attempt to explain exactly why institutions are designed the way they are and how such institutions can be improved to take advantage of how states (and institutions) make decisions. While useful to understand environmental concerns, the issue-area framework

overlooks some of the key aspects of the GEG system including domestic, international, and institutional politics.

Esty, Daniel and Maria Ivanova, eds. *Global Environmental Governance: Options & Opportunities* New Haven, CT: Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies. 2002. Translated into Portuguese (*Governança Ambiental Global: Opções & Oportunidades*) and published in Brazil, São Paulo: Editora Senac São Paulo, 2005. This book is a collection of articles by scholars and policymakers that outlines key concepts in global environmental governance and offers reform options. The book includes analysis of the information and knowledge gap and the need for reliable indicators, the role of NGOs and global public policy networks, and innovation in development finance. It offers an economic case for a new world environment body and presents a function-driven agenda for reform.

**Biermann, F (2007). Earth System Governance as a Crosscutting Theme of Global Change Research. *Global Environmental Change*, 17(3-4):326-337.**

Elli L (2006). *International environmental law: fairness, effectiveness, and world order*, Cambridge University Press.

Environmental science should not be seen as a neutral backdrop for political analysis of environmental problems, but should be exposed to political analysis as well. This book argues for ways of politicizing scientific techniques without reverting to simple relativism.

Berkes, F (2007) *Community-based Conservation in a Globalized World*. PNAS 104:15188-15193

This paper brings together various writings on CBC, natural resource management and the need for multi-level governance.

**Saunier, Richard and Meganck, Richard (2007) Dictionary & introduction to global environmental governance**

This dictionary and introduction to global environmental governance (GEG) provides a compilation of over 5000 terms, organizations and acronyms, drawn from hundreds of official sources. An introductory essay frames the major issues in global environmental governance and outlines the pitfalls of talking past one another when discussing the most critical of issues facing the planet. It challenges those who are concerned with the management of our planet and its inhabitants to understand and accept a vocabulary common to the often-opposing objectives sought in the many GEG instruments.

## 2. General

**Acheson, J. M. (2006). Institutional failure in resource management. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 35: 117-134.**

**Adams W M, Brockington D et al. (2003). Managing Tragedies: Understanding Conflict over Common Pool Resources. *Science* 302(5652): 1915-1916.**

**Agrawal, A., 2001. Common property institutions and sustainable governance of resources. *World Development* 29 (10), 1649-1672.**

**Agrawal, A., 2003. Sustainable Governance of Common-Pool Resources: Context, Methods, and Politics. *Annual Review of Anthropology* (32): 243-262.**  
**Axelrod, R., Downie, D.L. and Vig, N.J. (2005) (eds), *The Global Environment: Institutions, Law and Policy*, CQ Press, Washington.**

**Dietz, T., E. Ostrom, et al. (2003). The Struggle to Govern the Commons. *Science* 302(5652): 1907-1912.**

Summarises the work of Ostrom et al on factors facilitating common-pool resource management.

**Durant, R.F., Fiorino, D.J. and O’Leary, R. (2004) (eds), *Environmental Governance Reconsidered: Challenges, Choices, Opportunities*, The MIT Press.**

**Forsyth, T. 2003: *Critical Political Ecology: The Politics of Environmental Science*, London and New York: Routledge, 320pp.**

**Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend, Michel Pimbert, M.Taghi Farvar, Ashish Kothari and Yves Renard (2004) *Sharing Power: Learning by Doing in Co-management of Natural Resources throughout the World* (IIED: London)  
[http://www.iapad.org/sharing\\_power.htm](http://www.iapad.org/sharing_power.htm)**

**Hildyard, N. et al 1993 *Whose Common Future: Reclaiming the Commons* (New Society Publishers)**

**Jordan, A.J (2002). *The Europeanization of British Environmental Policy: A Departmental Perspective*. Palgrave: Basingstoke. 214 pp + biblio  
<http://www.palgrave.com/products/title.aspx?is=0333946316>**

**Keeley, J. and Scoones, I (2003). *Understanding environmental policy processes: cases from Africa*: Earthscan Publishers, 224pp**

**Leach M, Mearns R and Scoones I (1999). *Environmental Entitlements: Dynamics and Institutions in Community-Based Natural Resource Management*, *World Development*, 27(2):225-247.**

**Liverman D M (1999). *Geography and the Global Environment*, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 89(1):107-120.**

**Olsson, P., C. Folke, et al. (2004). *Adaptive Comanagement for Building Resilience in Social-Ecological Systems*. *Environmental Management* 34(1): 75-90.**

Examines role of local ecological knowledge and social networks for environmental management and proposes 'adaptive co-management'.

**Paehlke R (2001). *Environment, Equity and Globalization: Beyond Resistance*, *Global Environmental Politics* 1(1):1-10.**

**Paavola, J (2007). *Institutions and Environmental Governance: A Reconceptualization* *Ecological economics*. 63(1): 93-103.**

**Peluso N L (2003). *A Theory of Access*, *Rural Sociology* 68(2):153-181.**

**Robert F D, Daniel J. F, and Rosemary O’Leary (eds) (2004). *Environmental Governance Reconsidered : Challenges, Choices, and Opportunities*. MIT Press.**

**Scott, James (1998) *Seeing Like a State. How Certain Schemes to Improve the Hunman Condition Have Failed* (Yale University Press: Newhaven & London)**

Sheila Jasanoff and Marybeth Long Martello (Eds.), 2004. *Earthly Politics: Local and Global in Environmental Governance*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA. 356 pp.

Sikor, T. (ed.) (2008). *Public and Private in Natural Resource Governance: A False Dichotomy?* Forthcoming with Earthscan Publications, London.

### 3. Water Governance

Abers R N (2007). Organizing for Governance: Building Collaboration in Brazilian River Basins. *World Development* 35(8):1450–1463.

Boelens R and Zwarteveen M (2005). Prices and Politics in Andean Water Reforms. *Development and Change* 36(4): 735–758.

Brunckhorst, D.J. (2002) 'Institutions to sustain ecological and social systems', *Ecological Management & Restoration* 3(2), pp. 109-17.

Franks T and Cleaver F (2007). Water governance and poverty a framework for analysis. *Progress in Development Studies*, 7(4):291-306

Hooper, Bruce P. (2005). *Integrated River Basin Governance: Learning from International Experiences*, IWA, London.

Kashyap A. (2004). Water Governance: Learning by Developing Adaptive Capacity to Incorporate Climate Variability and Change. *Water Science and Technology*, 49(7):141-6.

Lankford, B.A (2007). **Integrated, adaptive and domanical water resources management. International Conference on Adaptive and Integrated Water Resources Management. CAIWA 12 – 15 November 2007. Basel, Switzerland.**

Lebel L, Garden P, and Imamura M (2005). The Politics of Scale, Position, and Place in the Governance of Water Resources in the Mekong Region. *Ecology and Society* 10(2): 18. online: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol10/iss2/art18/>

McGranahan, G and Satterthwaite, D (2006). Governance and Getting the Private Sector to Provide Better Water and Sanitation Services to the Urban Poor, Human Settlements Discussion Paper, Water-02, IIED, London.

Montero S G et al (2006). Collaborative governance for sustainable water resources management: the experience of the Inter-municipal Initiative for the Integrated Management of the Ayuquila River Basin, Mexico. *Environment & Urbanization*, 18(2):297-313.

Mukherji A and Shah T (2005) **Groundwater Socio-ecology and Governance: A Review of Institutions and Policies in Selected Countries. *Hydrogeology Journal* 13:328–345.**



Perret S, Farolfi S and Hassan R (eds) (2006). *Water Governance for Sustainable Development - Approaches and Lessons from Developing and Transitional Countries*. Earthscan, London.

Rouse M (2007). *Institutional Governance and Regulation of Water Services - The Essential Elements*, IWA, London.

Scholz J T and Stiffler Bruce (eds) (2005). *Adaptive Governance and Water Conflict - New Institutions for Collaborative Planning*. RFF Press.

**Trawick P (2003). Against the Privatization of Water: An Indigenous Model for Improving Existing Laws and Successfully Governing the Commons. *World Development* 31(6):977–996.**

UNDP (2004). *Water Governance for Poverty Reduction - Key Issues and the UNDP Response to Millennium Development Goals*. UNDP, New York. online: [http://www.undp.org/water/pdfs/241456%20UNDP\\_Guide\\_Pages.pdf](http://www.undp.org/water/pdfs/241456%20UNDP_Guide_Pages.pdf)

Walsh C (2004). *Aguas Broncas: The Regional Political Ecology of Water*

**Wester, P., Merrey, D. J., and de Lange, M. (2003). Boundaries of Consent: Representation in River Basin Management in Mexico and South Africa. *World Development*, 31 (5):797-812.**

## 4. Fisheries and marine

**Allison E.H. (2001) Big laws, small catches: global ocean governance and the fisheries crisis. *Journal of International Development* 13 (7): 933-950**

**Allison, E. H. and B. Horemans (2006). "Putting the principles of the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach into fisheries development policy and practice." *Marine Policy* 30(6): 757-766.**

Chong J (2005). *Valuing the Role of Wetlands in Livelihoods: Constraints and Opportunities for Community Fisheries and Wetland Management in Stoeng Treng Ramsar Site, Cambodia*. IUCN Water, Nature and Economics Technical Paper No. 3, IUCN — The World Conservation Union, Ecosystems and Livelihoods Group Asia, Colombo. online: <http://www.iucn.org/themes/wani/Asia%20website/Publications/2005-4.pdf>

Gammage, S., Benitez, M., and Machado, M., 2002. An entitlements approach to the challenges of mangrove management in El Salvador. *Ambio* 31(4): 285-294.

Hilborn R et al (2004). When can marine reserves improve fisheries management? *Ocean & Coastal Management*. 47. (3-4): 197-205

IUCN, MOFi (2006). *Marine And Coastal Wetlands: Education Network, Capacity Building, And Training*. Hanoi, Viet Nam, 180 pp.

**Jentoft S (2000). The community: a missing link of fisheries management. *Marine Policy*. 24(1):53-60.**

Jentoft, S. (2004). **Institutions in Fisheries: What They Are, What They Do, and How They Change.** *Marine Policy* 28(2): 137-149.

Jentoft S. *et al.* 2007. **Marine Protected Areas: A Governance System Analysis .** *Human Ecology* 35(5): 611-622.

Nielsen J.R., Degnbol P., Viswanathan K.K., Ahmed M., Hara M. and Abdullah N.M.R. (2004) Fisheries co-management — an institutional innovation? Lessons from South East Asia and Southern Africa. *Marine Policy*. 28. (2): 151-160

Oh, E.J.V., B.D. Ratner, S.R. Bush, K. Kolandai and T.Y. Too (eds.). 2005. Wetlands Governance in the Mekong Region: Country Reports on the Legal-Institutional Framework and Economic Valuation of Aquatic Resources. WorldFish Center, Penang, Malaysia. 233 pp. online:  
[http://www.worldfishcenter.org/resource\\_centre/WetlandsGovernance.pdf](http://www.worldfishcenter.org/resource_centre/WetlandsGovernance.pdf)

Olsen, S.B. and Nickerson D (2003). *The Governance of Coastal Ecosystems at the Regional Scale: An Analysis of the Strategies and Outcomes of Long-Term Programs* Coastal Management Report #2243. University of Rhode Island Coastal Resources Center. Narragansett, RI. Online:  
[http://www.crc.uri.edu/download/GovLargeEcosystems\\_OlsenNickerson.pdf](http://www.crc.uri.edu/download/GovLargeEcosystems_OlsenNickerson.pdf)

Satria A. and Matsuda Y. (2004) Decentralization of fisheries management in Indonesia. *Marine Policy*. 28. (5): 437-450

Susan S. Hanna (1999). Strengthening Governance of Ocean Fishery Resources, *Ecological Economics* 31(2): 275–286.

## 5. Biodiversity governance

Stoll-Kleemann, S. (2005). Voices for Biodiversity Management in the 21st Century. *Environment* 47 (10), 24-36.

Stoll-Kleemann, S. (2004). The rationale of socio-economic research for the successful protection and use of wetlands: the example of participatory management approaches. *Hydrobiologia*, 527, 15-17.

Smith R J, Muir R D, Walpole M J, Balmford A, Leader-Williams N (2003). Governance and the Loss of Biodiversity. *Nature* 426(6962):67-70.

Rosendal K (2001). Impacts of Overlapping International Regimes: The Case of Biodiversity. *Global Governance* 7(1):95-117.

Barrett C B, Gibson C C, Hoffman B and McCubbins M D. (2006). The Complex Links between Governance and Biodiversity. *Conserv Biol.* (5):1358-66.

Langholz J and Krug W (2004). New Forms of Biodiversity Governance: Non-State Actors and the Private Protected Area Action Plan, *Journal of International Wildlife Law & Policy* 7(1-2):9-29.

**O’Riordan, Tim and SAusanne Stoll-Kleemann ed.s (2002) Biodiversity, Sustainability and Human Communities: Protecting Beyond the Protected (Cambridge University Press)**

Sampford C (2002). Environmental Governance for Biodiversity. *Environmental Science & Policy* 5(1):79-90.

## 6. Climate Change

Adger W N, Paavola J, Huq S and Mace M J (2006). Fairness in Adaptation to Climate Change, MIT Press.

Adger, W. N, Brown, K., Fairbrass, J. Jordan, A. Paavola, J., Rosendo, S. and Seyfang, G. (2003) Governance for sustainability: towards a ‘thick’ analysis of environmental decision-making, *Environment and Planning A* 35: 1095-1110.

**Adger, W N (2001). Scales of governance and environmental justice for adaptation and mitigation of climate change. *J of International development*. 13(7): 921-931.**

**Biermann, F., Pattberg, P., van Asselt, H. and F. Zelli (2007) Fragmentation of Global Governance Architectures: the case of climate policy. Global Governance Working Paper 34, December 2007, <http://www.glogov.org/images/doc/WP34.pdf>**

**[Other related working papers available on <http://www.glogov.org/?pageid=4>]**

**Oberthür, Sebastian (2006). The Climate Change Regime: Interactions with ICAO, IMO, and the EU Burden-Sharing Agreement. In *Institutional Interaction in Global Environmental Governance. Synergy and Conflict among International and EU Policies*, edited by Sebastian Oberthür and Thomas Gehring, pp. 53-77. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.**

**Paavola, J. (2005) Seeking justice: International environmental governance and climate change, *Globalizations*, 2(3): 309-322**

## 7. Forest Governance

Anderson, K.P., C.C. Gibson, and F. Lehoucq (2006) Municipal Politics Forest Governance: Comparative Analysis of Decentralization in Bolivia and Guatemala. *World Development* 34(3), pp. 576-595.

Gibson, C C, McKean, M A and Ostrom, E (eds) (2000). People and Forests: Communities, Institutions, and Governance. MIT Press . Cambridge, MA.

Mayers J and Bass S (2004). Policy that Works for Forests and People: Real Prospects for Governance and Livelihoods, Earthscan, London.

Menzies, N K (2007). Our Forest, Your Ecosystem, Their Timber: Communities, Conservation, and the State in Community-Based Forest Management. Columbia University Press, New York.

Ostrom E (1999). Self-Governance and Forest Resources. Occasional Paper No. 20, Center for International Forestry Research, Indonesia.

Rival, L. 2003. The meanings of forest governance in Esmeraldas, Ecuador *Oxford Development Studies* 31, no.4 (2003) p. 479-502

Sikor, T (2004). The Commons in Transition: Agrarian and Environmental Change in Central and Eastern Europe, *Environmental Management*, 34(2):270-280.

Sikor, T (2006). Agri-Environmental Governance and Political Systems in Central and Eastern Europe, *International Journal of Agricultural Resources, Governance and Ecology*, 5(4):413-427.

Sikor, T (2006). Analyzing Community-based Forestry: Local, Political and Agrarian Perspectives, *Forest Policy and Economics*, 8(4):339-349.

Sikor, T., Nguyen Q.T (2007). Why May Forest Devolution not Benefit the Rural Poor? Forest Entitlements in Vietnam's Central Highlands. *World Development*, 35(11):2010-2025.

Sikor, T., Tran N.T (2007). Exclusive versus Inclusive Devolution in Forest Management: Insights from Forest Land Allocation in Vietnam's Central Highlands, *Land Use Policy* 24(4):644-653.

Springate-Baginski O and Blaikie P (2007) *Forests, People and Power The Political Ecology of Reform in South Asia*, Earthscan, London.

Svendsen, M (2005). Irrigation and River Basin Management: Options for Governance and Institutions. CABI, Wallingford.

## 8. Land governance

Alden Wily, L. (2003). Governance and Land relations: a review of decentralisation of land administration and management in Africa. IIED, London.

Dearden, P; Bennett, M; Johnston, J (2005). Trends in Global Protected Area Governance, 1992-2002. *Environmental Management* 36 (1): 89-100

Fitzpatrick, D (2005). 'Best Practice' Options for the Legal Recognition of Customary Tenure. *Development and Change*. 36(3):449-475

Folke, C; Hahn, T; Olsson, P, et al (2005) Adaptive Governance of Social-Ecological Systems. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*. 30:441-473.

Hellum, A, Derman, B (2004). Land reform and human rights in contemporary Zimbabwe: Balancing individual and social justice through an integrated human rights framework *World Development* 32(10): 1785-1805

## Contributors

Overseas Development Group, School of Development Studies  
(DEV/ODG), UEA.



**Dr. Maria Ivanova, Director of the Global Environmental Governance Project, Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy. and Assistant Professor, The College of William and Mary.**