

Realizing Global Development Governance at the United Nations

-Two Competitive Regimes and the Roles of Three East Asian Countries-

Tsuyoshi OHIRA

(Department of International Relations, Faculty of Foreign Studies,
The University of Kitakyushu)

Summary

Introduction

Today we are witnessing the changing international order. This situation is caused by two main factors: weakening leadership of the developed countries and the increasing power of the emerging economies like China and India in international political and economic scenes. We can no longer undervalue the decisions and the movements of these emerging economies, because they have already showed their power in recent some occasions. Judging from the power-shift occurring in the international political and economic scenes, it can be assumed that the paradigm shift will also take place. In other words it can be said that we are in the midst of a transition period from the traditional order to a new order which is still obscure. In such a situation power struggles are taking place in the sphere of development cooperation regarding the creation of a new regime. In this paper the two competitive regimes on development cooperation will be examined to consider the realization of global development governance in a new era.

Emerging Two Competitive Regimes

The two competitive regimes have just come into being and a regime complex is emerging. The creation of the United Nations Development Cooperation Forum (hereafter as DCF) was proposed at the World Summit held in 2005, and the DCF has come into being since 2008. The creation of the DCF was one of the efforts to strengthen ECOSOC which has not worked effectively enough as it was originally designed. Reforming ineffective and inefficient ECOSOC has been a long-time problem of the UN.

UNDCF

The idea of holding a biennial high-level Development Cooperation Forum was decided at the World Summit, and the purposes of the Forum were proposed by the Secretary-General Kofi Annan in the next year. After receiving the report of the Secretary-General, the Forum's mandate was defined in the General Assembly resolution which requires the DCF will:

- a. Review trends and progress in international development cooperation, and give policy guidance and recommendations to promote more effective international development cooperation;
- b. Identify gaps and obstacles with a view to make recommendations on practical measures

and policy options to enhance coherence and effectiveness and to promote development cooperation for the realization of the internationally agreed development goals, including the MDGs;

c. Provide a platform for Member States to exchange lessons learned and share experiences in formulating, supporting and implementing national development strategies; and

d. In accordance with the Rules of Procedure, be open to participation by all stakeholders, including the organizations of the United Nations, the international financial and trade institutions, the regional organizations, civil society and private sector representatives.

GP-EDC

After the four times forums on aid effectiveness, a new forum was established to ensure development cooperation to be effective. The Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (hereafter as the GP-EDC) has just come into being in June 2012 after the discussions of the Post Busan Interim Group meetings.

Its main functions are defined that it will be to:

a. maintain and strengthen political support for effective development co-operation;

b. carry out monitoring of the implementation of the Busan commitments;

c. facilitate knowledge exchange and lessons learned; and

d. support the implementation of the Busan commitments at the country level.

The functions and the purposes of the GP-EDC overlap to a considerable extent with those of the DCF. Both forums will support members by giving political support or policy guidance for the purpose of achieving effective development cooperation. Moreover, both forums provide members with chances to exchange and share both knowledge and experiences of development. We will examine what these overlaps imply from the regime theory perspective in the next section.

An Analysis from the Regime Theory Perspective

According to the regime theory, we will have a situation of the so-called “forum shopping” if the overlapping regimes coexist. Each actor can choose the most suitable regime for itself in such a situation. The creation of the GP-EDC has brought about the situation where two competitive regimes coexist, and some actors seem to be practicing the “forum shopping”. Also, it is pointed out that coexistence of the overlapping regimes has a problem with regard to efficiency. The larger the scope of the overlap becomes, the more difficult solving the problems will be. Moreover, if inconsistency exists between these two regimes, effects of each regime might be set off.

We have to examine to what extent these two regimes overlap. As we have already examined the similarities of the mandates of them, we will then compare the structures of these two regimes (see Table 1). We can observe the similarity again in the structures of these two regimes. As to the memberships, the members in the category of countries and territories overlap

to a great extent. Theoretically, the DCF is open to all the UN member countries, but it assumes that gaps of attitudes may exist among the countries toward the DCF. On the other hand, the countries and territories of the GP-EDC are those who promised to carry out the commitments of the Busan outcome document. Therefore, the discussions in the GP-EDC can be more vital than those in the DCF.

Table 1. Comparison of the structures of the DCF and the GP-EDC

	DCF	GP-EDC
Members	193 countries, multilateral institutions, CSOs, parliamentarians, local government, private sector	158 countries and territories, 38 international organizations, 7 other organizations (CSOs, parliamentarians, UN Global Compact, private sector)
	Advisory Group (22)	Steering Committee (15)
Chair/Co-chairs	UNDESA-USG	Ms. Armida Alishabana (Indonesia) Recipient (R) Ms. Justine Greening (UK) Provider (P) Ms. Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala (Nigeria) R and P
Recipient countries	(3) Ghana, Afghanistan, Rwanda	(5) Chad, Guatemala, Bangladesh, Samoa, Timor-Leste*
R and P	(3) India, Brazil, Mexico	(1) Peru
Providers	(4) European Commission, Finland, Austria, Switzerland	(3) European Commission, Korea, USA
Parliamentarians	(1) Inter-Parliamentary Union	(1) Inter-Parliamentary Union
CSO	(3) Action Aid, CIVICUS, IBON	(1) BetterAid
Academia	(1) Novartis Foundation	----
Private Sector	----	(1) Center for International Private Enterprise
Multilateral institutions	(2) NEPAD, IMF	----
Multilateral development bank	(1) Islamic Development Bank	(1) World Bank
UNDP	(2) BRSP, SSC	(1) UNDP/UNDG
OECD	(2) WP-EFF, DCD	(1) OECD-DAC

* representative of g7+ group of fragile and conflict-affected states

Sources: <http://www.un.org/en/ecosoc/newfunct/advismem/shtml>

<http://www.aideffectiveness.org/busanhlf4/en/about/global-partnership/748.html>

If we examine these two regimes from the viewpoint of legitimacy, we can say that the DCF has a “democratic legitimacy” and the GP-EDC has a “functional legitimacy”. It is desirable to seek “democratic legitimacy” for the purpose of realizing global governance.

Table 2. Comparison of the Four Organizations

	“INCLUSIVENESS”	EFFECTIVENESS
IFI	👍👍	👍👍👍
DCF	👍👍👍	👍
OECD-DAC	👍	👍👍👍
WP-EFF	👍👍	👍👍

Source: Brenda Killen and Andrew Rogerson (2010) “Global Governance for International Development: Who’s in Charge?,” *Development Brief* (Consultation Draft) Issue 2, OECD.

Killen and Rogerson (2010) examined which existing organization was best suitable to be in charge of global governance for international development. Existing organizations they listed were International Financial Institution (IFI) represented by the World Bank and the IMF, the DCF, the OECD-DAC, and the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF) which led the four forums on aid effectiveness and can be regarded as the predecessor of the GP-EDC. They analyzed these four organizations from two respects: “inclusiveness” and “effectiveness”. Judging from their results, the DCF was superior to the other organizations with respect to “inclusiveness” but was inferior to the others with respect to “effectiveness” (see Table 2). However, as the members of the GP-EDC becomes almost same as that of the DCF, the score of the GP-EDC can be thought to be higher than that of the WP-EFF with respect to “inclusiveness”. Then, if we follow the judgment by Killen and Rogerson, the total score of the GP-EDC will be higher than that of the DCF.

The Roles of Three East Asian Countries to Realize Global Development Governance

We should remember that China, South Korea and Japan have significance on determining the future course of international development cooperation. China’s influences on both political and economic scenes will increase beyond question, and China as a leading emerging power has a role and responsibility to represent other developing countries. South Korea will also show more presence in both political and economic arenas as an emerging power, and we should keep in mind that South Korea is in a key position in the GP-EDC. In spite of the decreasing economic power, Japan is still the third largest country with regard to the GDP and has a considerable influence on the international development cooperation. If these three countries collaborate with each other fulfilling each role and responsibility, we may be able to dissolve the current regime complex.

Conclusion

We may be able to dissolve the regime complex if we establish a hierarchy between the two regimes. We should set two stages in the decision-making process on international development cooperation. In the first stage we discuss the matters practically in the GP-EDC and confirm the results of the discussions in the next stage of the DCF. This way of dividing the roles is like the case of “the DAC new strategy” which later became the foundation of the MDGs at the UN. In other words, we should position the GP-EDC as a sub-regime of the DCF. Three East Asian countries, China, South Korea and Japan should aim to establish such a structure between the two regimes to realize global development governance in which both “democratic legitimacy” and “functional legitimacy” can be secured.