

## Annex 3: Process for initial “Good” Governance & “Risk” Governance principles

### 1. Principles of Good Governance (initial brainstorm)

Principle	Definition (reference)
<b>Openness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-active communication in understandable language (importance for legitimacy in the public eye), communication is made in an ‘open manner’ <b>(CEC, 2001)</b></li><li>-openness and transparency: “ensuring openness and transparency in order that stakeholders can have confidence in the decision-making and management processes of the scheme” <b>(BIOA, 2009, 3)</b></li></ul>
<b>Participation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-“The quality, relevance and effectiveness of EU policies depend on ensuring wide participation throughout the policy chain – from conception to Implementation” (p.10), stresses also that this is needed to build confidence <b>(CEC, 2001)</b></li><li>-“All men and women should have a voice in decision-making, either directly or through legitimate intermediate institutions that represent their interests. Such broad participation is built on freedom of association and speech, as well as capacities to participate constructively.” <b>(UNDP, 1997, 5)</b></li><li>-<b>(FIG, 2006)</b></li><li>-<b>(Fonseka, 2000)</b></li></ul>
<b>Accountability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-need for clear roles and responsibilities (again at all levels) <b>(CEC, 2001)</b></li><li>-includes both accountability and transparency within this <b>(Graham et al., 2003, 3)</b></li><li>- “Decision-makers in government, the private sector and civil society organisations are accountable to the public, as well as to institutional stakeholders. This accountability differs depending on the organisation and whether the decision is internal or external to an organisation.” <b>(UNDP, 1997, 5)</b></li><li>-“Ensuring that all members of the scheme, including the office holder, staff members and members of any governing body, are seen to be responsible and accountable for their decisions and actions, including the stewardship of funds (with due regard to the independence of the office holder)” <b>(BIOA, 2009, 3)</b></li><li>-<b>(IRGC, 2008, 4)(IRGC, 2006)</b></li><li>-<b>(FIG, 2006)</b></li><li>-<b>(Fonseka, 2000)</b></li></ul>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-decisions taken at “most appropriate level”, policy must have clear objectives and provide evaluation for future implementation <b>(CEC, 2001)</b></li></ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ensuring that the scheme delivers quality outcomes efficiently and represents good value for money” (BIOA, 2009, 3)</li> <li>-Effective and efficient (IRGC, 2008, 4)(IRGC, 2006)</li> <li>-includes effectiveness and efficiency in this (FIG, 2006)</li> <li>-Effectiveness and efficiency (Fonseka, 2000)</li> </ul>
<b>Coherence</b>	need for policies to be easily understood (CEC, 2001)
<b>Legitimacy &amp; Voice</b>	-includes participation and consensus orientation within this (Graham et al., 2003, 3)
<b>Direction</b>	-includes strategic vision within this (Graham et al., 2003, 3)
<b>Performance</b>	- includes responsiveness and effectiveness and efficiency within this (Graham et al., 2003, 3)
<b>Rule of Law</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-“Legal frameworks should be fair and enforced impartially, particularly the laws on human rights.” (UNDP, 1997, 5)</li> <li>-(IRGC, 2008, 4)(IRGC, 2006)</li> <li>-(FIG, 2006)</li> <li>-(Fonseka, 2000)</li> </ul>
<b>Transparency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-“Transparency is built on the free flow of information. Processes, institutions and information are directly accessible to those concerned with them, and enough information is provided to understand and monitor them.” (UNDP, 1997, 5)</li> <li>-(FIG, 2006)</li> <li>-(IRGC, 2008, 4)(IRGC, 2006)</li> <li>-(Fonseka, 2000)</li> </ul>
<b>Responsiveness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-“Institutions and processes try to serve all stakeholders.” (UNDP, 1997, 5)</li> <li>-(FIG, 2006)</li> <li>-(Fonseka, 2000)</li> </ul>
<b>Consensus Orientation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-“Good governance mediates differing interests to reach a broad consensus on what is in the best interests of the group and, where possible, on policies and procedures.” (UNDP, 1997, 5)</li> <li>-(FIG, 2006)</li> <li>-(Fonseka, 2000)</li> </ul>

<b>Fairness</b>	-includes equity and rule of law within this <b>(Graham et al., 2003, 3)</b> -Equitable and fair <b>(IRGC, 2008, 4)(IRGC, 2006)</b>
<b>Equity</b>	-“All men and women have opportunities to improve or maintain their well-being. Effectiveness and efficiency - Processes and institutions produce results that meet needs while making the best use of resources.” <b>(UNDP, 1997, 5)</b> -Equitable and fair <b>(IRGC, 2008, 4)(IRGC, 2006)</b> -includes equity and inclusiveness <b>(FIG, 2006)</b> - <b>(Fonseka, 2000)</b>
<b>Strategic Vision</b>	-“Leaders and the public have a broad and long-term perspective on good governance and human development, along with a sense of what is needed for such development. There is also an understanding of the historical, cultural and social complexities in which that perspective is grounded.” <b>(UNDP, 1997, 5)</b> -Strategic focus <b>(IRGC, 2008, 4)(IRGC, 2006)</b> - <b>(Fonseka, 2000)</b>
<b>Integrity</b>	-(perhaps not as directly related..?) “Ensuring straightforward dealing and completeness, based on honesty, selflessness and objectivity, and ensuring high standards of probity and propriety in the conduct of the scheme’s affairs and complaint decision making” <b>(BIOA, 2009, 3)</b>
<b>Clarity of purpose</b>	-(related to coherence) “Ensuring that stakeholders know why the scheme exists and what it does, and what to expect from it” <b>(BIOA, 2009, 3)</b>
<b>Sustainable</b>	- <b>(IRGC, 2008, 4)(IRGC, 2006)</b>
<b>Feasible</b>	-Politically and legally <b>(IRGC, 2008, 4)(IRGC, 2006)</b>
<b>Acceptable</b>	- <b>(IRGC, 2008, 4)(IRGC, 2006)</b>

## 2. Definition of governance/“good” governance/risk governance considered

Definition of governance/risk governance	Reference
<b>Governance:</b> Says that have similar definition in the <b>New Webster’s</b>	Thomas G Weiss (2000): Governance, good governance and global

<p><b>International Dictionary</b> as well as <b>the New York Times and the Economist</b>: that this is the “‘act, manner, ...or power of governing; government’, ‘state of being governed’, or ‘method of government or regulation’.” (Weiss, 2000, 795)</p>	<p>governance: Conceptual and actual challenges, Third World Quarterly, 21:5, 795-814</p>
<p><b>Governance: Commission on Global Governance</b>: states that they define this as “‘the sum of the many ways individuals and institutions, public and private, manage their common affairs. It is the continuing process through which conflicting or diverse interests may be accommodated and co-operative action may be taken.’5” (Weiss, 2000, 796)</p>	<p>Thomas G Weiss (2000): Governance, good governance and global governance: Conceptual and actual challenges, Third World Quarterly, 21:5, 795-814</p>
<p><b>Governance: “World Bank</b>. Governance is defined as the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country’s economic and social resources. The World Bank has identified three distinct aspects of governance: (i) the form of political regime; (ii) the process by which authority is exercised in the management of a country’s economic and social resources for development; and (iii) the capacity of governments to design, formulate, and implement policies and discharge functions.” (Weiss, 2000, 797)</p>	<p>Thomas G Weiss (2000): Governance, good governance and global governance: Conceptual and actual challenges, Third World Quarterly, 21:5, 795-814  <sup>11</sup> World Bank, <i>Governance, The World Bank’s Experience</i>, Washington, DC: The World Bank, 1994, p xiv.</p>
<p><b>Governance: “UNDP</b>. Governance is viewed as the exercise of economic, political and administrative authority to manage a country’s affairs at all levels. It comprises mechanisms, processes and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations and mediate their differences.” (Weiss, 2000, 797)</p>	<p>Thomas G Weiss (2000): Governance, good governance and global governance: Conceptual and actual challenges, Third World Quarterly, 21:5, 795-814  <sup>12</sup> UNDP, <i>Governance for Sustainable Human Development</i>, New York: UNDP, 1997, pp 2–3.</p>
<p><b>Governance: “OECD</b>. The concept of governance denotes the use of political authority and exercise of control in a society in relation to the management of its resources for social and economic development. This broad definition encompasses the role of public authorities in establishing the environment in which economic operators function and in determining the distribution of benefits as well as the nature of the relationship between the ruler and the ruled.” (Weiss, 2000, 797)</p>	<p>Thomas G Weiss (2000): Governance, good governance and global governance: Conceptual and actual challenges, Third World Quarterly, 21:5, 795-814  <sup>13</sup> OECD, <i>Participatory Development and Good Governance</i>, Paris: OECD, 1995, p 14.</p>
<p><b>Governance: “Institute of Governance, Ottawa</b>. Governance comprises the institutions, processes and conventions in a society which determine how power is exercised, how important decisions affecting society are made and</p>	<p>Thomas G Weiss (2000): Governance, good governance and global governance: Conceptual and actual challenges, Third World Quarterly, 21:5, 795-814</p>

how various interests are accorded a place in such decisions.” (Weiss, 2000, 797)	<sup>14</sup> See: <a href="http://infoweb.magi.com/">http://infoweb.magi.com/</a> , igvn.
<b>Governance: “Commission on Global Governance.</b> Governance is the sum of the many ways individuals and institutions, public and private, manage their common affairs. It is a continuing process through which conflicting or diverse interests may be accommodated and co-operative action may be taken. It includes formal institutions and regimes empowered to enforce compliance, as well as informal arrangements that people and institutions either have agreed to or perceive to be in their interest.” (Weiss, 2000, 797)	Thomas G Weiss (2000): Governance, good governance and global governance: Conceptual and actual challenges, <i>Third World Quarterly</i> , 21:5, 795-814 15. Commission on Global Governance, <i>Our Global Neighbourhood</i> , New York: Oxford University Press, 1995, p 2.
<b>Governance: “UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan.</b> Good governance is ensuring respect for human rights and the rule of law; strengthening democracy; promoting transparency and capacity in public administration.” (Weiss, 2000, 797)	Thomas G Weiss (2000): Governance, good governance and global governance: Conceptual and actual challenges, <i>Third World Quarterly</i> , 21:5, 795-814 16. See <a href="http://www.soc.titech.ac.jp/uem/governance.html">http://www.soc.titech.ac.jp/uem/governance.html</a> .
<b>Governance: “International Institute of Administrative Sciences.</b> Governance refers to the process whereby elements in society wield power and authority, and influence and enact policies and decisions concerning public life, and economic and social development. Governance is a broader notion than government. Governance involves interaction between these formal institutions and those of civil society” (Weiss, 2000, 797)	Thomas G Weiss (2000): Governance, good governance and global governance: Conceptual and actual challenges, <i>Third World Quarterly</i> , 21:5, 795-814 17. See <a href="http://www.britcoun.org/governance/ukpgov.html">http://www.britcoun.org/governance/ukpgov.html</a> .
Governance: “Tokyo Institute of Technology. The concept of governance refers to the complex set of values, norms, processes and institutions by which society manages its development and resolves conflict, formally and informally. It involves the state, but also the civil society (economic and social actors, community-based institutions and unstructured groups, the media, etc) at the local, national, regional and global levels” (Weiss, 2000, 797-798)	Thomas G Weiss (2000): Governance, good governance and global governance: Conceptual and actual challenges, <i>Third World Quarterly</i> , 21:5, 795-814 18. See <a href="http://www.soc.titech.ac.jp/uem/governance.html">http://www.soc.titech.ac.jp/uem/governance.html</a> .
Governance: “governance is a process whereby societies or organizations make their important decisions, determine whom they involve in the process and how they render account” (Graham et al., 2003, 1)	Graham, J., Amos, B. and Plumptre, T. 2003. Principles for Good Governance in the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century. Policy Brief No.15. August 2003. <b>Institute on Governance (IOG). Ottawa, Canada.</b>

### 3. Chosen Good Risk Governance Principles to be used as categories in “good” risk governance analysis tool

#	Principle chosen (risk governance strategies must...)	Meaning in reference to topic & why chosen <i>(all chosen principles have been reiterated in reviewed literature, some have been combined or taken as broader terms incorporating other less prominent principles)</i>	Main connections to research themes: place focused, culture, actors, regulatory frameworks, communication, management, assessment	Literature/supporting references	Potential questions (link to RQs, interview Qs, and indicators)
1	Openness & transparency (be open & transparent)	-availability and accessibility of risk information (during peace time) -regulations are available and coherent <i>(why chosen: importance demonstrated through connection to building trust and legitimacy of decision making processes and outcomes as well as to assisting in reduction of information asymmetries (uneven knowledge distribution), uncertainty (lack of knowledge of some actors), and in some cases reduction in ambiguity (different interpretations of risk assessment data))</i>	-Communication -Management -Assessment -Culture -Actors	-(CEC, 2001; BIOA, 2009, 3; UNDP, 1997, 5; FIG, 2006; IRGC, 2008, 4; IRGC, 2006; Fonseca, 2000)	-What kinds of mechanisms are available which communication information on risk assessment outcomes and management decisions made? -Is the information provided coherent, in an understandable language? Also for laypersons?
2	Accountability (be accountable)	-clarification of roles ( also relates to coherence) -existence of oversight bodies/public abilities to act as check and balance of roles fulfilled <i>(why chosen: importance in terms of avoidance of problems due to fragmentation of roles and overlapping responsibilities as well as issues related to lack of monitoring activities for decision-making processes)</i>	-Actors -Regulatory frameworks	(CEC, 2001; Graham et al., 2003, 3; UNDP, 1997, 5; BIOA, 2009, 3; IRGC, 2008, 4; IRGC, 2006; FIG, 2006; Fonseca, 2000)	-Do responsibilities overlap between and among different actors? -Are responsibilities clear? -Do oversight bodies exist to keep authorities accountable? Are mechanisms in place for the public to keep authorities/actors accountable?
3	Participation (include participation)	-existence of activities which go beyond one-way communication with public and	-Communication -Assessment	(CEC, 2001; UNDP, 1997, 5; FIG, 2006; Fonseca,	-Does two-way communication exist? Between actors? With the

		between actors <i>(why chosen: importance of role in incorporation of local knowledge via involvement of the public and trust building between actors and with the public especially in terms of legitimacy of decision making processes)</i>	-Management -Culture	2000)	public?
4	Strategic Vision/Focus (have a strategic focus)	-existence of an end goal that assessment, management, communication activities work toward within the decision-making process -linked to consensus orientation -link to perceptions of goal orientation <i>(why chosen: importance of risk governance strategies to work toward an end goal as well as the importance of relation to ambiguity in the case that consensus of strategic focus is non-existent)</i>	-Management -Culture -Regulatory frameworks	(UNDP, 1997, 5; IRGC, 2008, 4; IRGC, 2006; Fonseca, 2000)	-Does a specific strategic focus exist? -Is there consensus between actors as to their strategic vision or is there a contrast in understanding and perception of desired goals and solutions pursued?)
5	Effectiveness (be effective)	-regulations are enforced and practices implemented (rule of law is upheld) -enforced regulations and implemented practices achieve primary goals (long term, goal oriented) <i>(why chosen: importance in highlighting the discrepancies between in-practice and legally defined strategies as well as whether regulatory frameworks are effectively enforced – strategies must go beyond design and work toward successful implementation)</i>	-Actors -Regulatory frameworks -Management	(CEC, 2001; BIOA, 2009, 3; IRGC, 2008, 4; IRGC, 2006; Graham et al., 2003, 3; Fonseca, 2000 ; FIG, 2006)	-Are existing regulations enforced? Can existing regulations be improved especially to meet needs that are currently not addressed? -Do in-practice strategies differ from that which is legally defined?
6	Efficiency (be efficient)	-decisions made in a timely manner -available resources put to use (short term, process oriented)	-Actors -Regulatory frameworks -Management	(BIOA, 2009, 3; IRGC, 2008, 4; IRGC, 2006; Graham et al., 2003, 3;	-Are decisions made at the most appropriate level? -Are decisions made in a timely

		-subsidiarity principle, decisions made at lowest most appropriate administrative level <i>(why chosen: importance in relation to both physical and institutional capacities as well as the power distribution between vertical levels in terms of decision-making abilities)</i>		FIG, 2006 ; Fonseca, 2006)	manner? -Are available resources put to use? Are there factors that hinder the efficient use of these resources?
7	Equity (be equitable)	-strategies do not disadvantage particular groups <i>(why chosen: importance in relation to intra-generational equity, spatial solidarity and environmental (in)justice)</i>	-Place focused -Culture	(Graham et al., 2003, 3; IRGC, 2008, 4; IRGC, 2006; UNDP, 1997, 5; FIG, 2006; Fonseca, 2000)	-Under the currently employed strategies are there specific groups of people who benefit less or who are put at a disadvantage compared to other groups or to the wider community? -Is there evidence to support spatial solidarity or, in contrast, to support the existence of environmental injustice?
8	Feasibly Sustainable (be feasibly sustainable)	-Given resources and interests, strategies employed can continue in the long-term -strategies do not disadvantage future generations <i>(why chosen: importance in relation to assessment of given capacities and need for sustainable solutions to a changing environment as well as to connections to the need for intergenerational equity of strategies employed)</i>	-Place focused -Culture	(IRGC, 2008, 4; IRGC, 2006)	-Given current resources and interests, can strategies employed be continued in the long-term? -Do current strategies advantage/disadvantage future generations?
9	Trust (foster trust)	-interactions between actors occur based on assurance (and belief) of mutual reliability, honesty, and integrity. This includes interactions between public and non-public actors. <i>(why chosen: importance in connection to the legitimacy of actions taken and</i>	-Actors -Culture	(Greiving et al., 2007)	-Do actors feel their interactions with other actors occur within foundation of mutual trust? -Do past experiences demonstrate instances that support the existence of an environment of trust or a lack thereof?



<i>decisions made as well as encouraging successful communication between and among both public and non-public actors)</i>					
<b>10</b>	Resources (ensure or work toward adequate resources)	-physical (e.g. money, human capital, equipment) and non-physical (e.g. time, knowledge) are available and used -adequate resources available (related to capacity via knowledge or lack thereof and physical capability within available means) <i>(why chosen: importance in relation to resources enabling capacity to manage and assess risks)</i>	-Regulatory frameworks -Assessment -Management -Communication -Place focused	Greiving et al.,2007	-Are adequate resources (especially information) available? If not, what are the reasons for this? -Is there an even distribution of resources, or are some entities provided with greater resources than others? s
<b>11</b>	Coordination (enable and encourage coordination)	Formal (legally required) interactions between actors responsible for assessment and management (e.g. intra-institutional relations) as well as between these actors and the public run smoothly and are supported by maintaining good communication <i>(why chosen: importance in understanding and assessing the interactions between different actors and between actors and the public as defined by legal requirements. Relates also to participation of the public as well as effectiveness of current regulations)</i>	-Actors -Regulatory frameworks -Culture -Communication	(see also IMRA project)	-Is there a high level of coordination between different authorities that must work together for the overall management of risks? -For legally defined interaction specifically with the public, does there appear to be good communication within these interactions? Are these interactions successful?
<b>12</b>	Cooperation (enable and encourage cooperation)	Informal (not legally required) interactions between actors responsible for assessment and management (e.g. intra-institutional relations) as well as between these actors and the public run smoothly and are supported by maintaining good communication <i>(why chosen: importance in understanding</i>	-Actors -Regulatory frameworks -Culture -Communication	(see also IMRA project)	-Does informal interaction take place between authorities? What about between authorities and the public? -Is this an important part of risk assessment and overall management? Is this successful?

<i>and assessing the informal interactions between different actors and between actors and the public. Relates also to participation of the public)</i>			
<b>13</b>	Risk Culture	This principle was added at a later time after further literature review and support from the policy analysis	-All aspects  Literature considered at later time (in addition to policy analysis): (Mercer et al. 2012; Rao, 2006; Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952; Douglas & Wildavsky, 1982; Melischek et al., 1984; Hewitt, 2012; Pidgeon, 1991)

#### **Addition notes to the above:**

**Trust:** This is also related to past experiences with authorities. Stressed should have this as a separate principle. Interesting because IRGC does not do this. Rather integrates this as part of the other principles. However, cannot just be solved with openness and transparency and accountability. This does not necessarily = trust. There are different perspectives, in the long run, the other principles may create trust, but the current state might be different. Should ask questions that directly relate to trust. Useful to ask interviewees about past experiences, especially for assessing trust (e.g. especially in Italy, can have a transparent process and yet at the same time have a lack of trust in the authorities)

**Effectiveness and Efficiency:** Important to note that these are not always connected, they are not synonymous. This points to the fact that there are contradictions in the application of these principles. Further requires a section to be provided which explains the synergies and conflicts betwixt these principles.

## References

(content based on background literature and especially the following references)

British and Irish Ombudsman Association (BIOA). 2009. Guide to principles of good governance. October 2009. Middlesex. Pp.1-8 Available via link:  
<http://www.ombudsmanassociation.org/docs/BIOAGovernanceGuideOct09.pdf> Last accessed on 19 February 2013

Commission of the European Communities (CEC). 2001. European Governance: A White Paper. COM(2001) 428 final. Brussels, 25.7.2001.

Douglas, M. and A. Wildavsky. 1982. Risk and Culture. An Essay on the Selection of Technical and Environmental Dangers. University of California Press. Los Angeles.

Fonseka, Leo. 2000. Indicator Tools for Assessment and Analysis of City Governance. World Bank Institute Urban and City Management Program.  
<<http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/110657/goa/assets/g-fonseka-mod02.pdf>>

Graham, J., Amos, B. and Plumptre, T. 2003. Principles for Good Governance in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Policy Brief No.15. August 2003. Institute on Governance (IOG). Ottawa, Canada.

Greiving, S.; Wanczura, S.; Voßbürger, P.; Sucker, K.; Fourman, M. (2007): Deliverable 1.2: Scalable resilience and risk governance concept including guidelines on stakeholder involvement. WP 1: Development of a comprehensive risk governance concept. Multidimensional Integrated Risk Governance (MIDIR)

Hewitt, Kenneth. 2012. Culture, hazard and disaster. Chapter 8. In: The Routledge Handbook of Hazards and Disaster Risk Reduction. Wisner, B., Gaillard, J.C., and Kelman, I., Eds. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, London and New York. P.85-96

International Federation of Surveyors (FIG). 2006. The Contribution of the Surveying Profession to Disaster Risk Management. FIG Publication No. 38. A publication of FIG Working Group 8.4. Copenhagen, Denmark.

International Risk Governance Council (IRGC). 2008. An introduction to the IRGC Risk Governance Framework. Geneva.

International Risk Governance Council (IRGC). 2006. White paper on Risk Governance: Towards an Integrative Approach. White paper no. 1. Geneva.

Kroeber, A.L., Kluckhohn, C. 1952. Culture, A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions. Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University. Vo. XLVII – No.1. Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA. Kraus Reprint Co. Millwood, N.Y. 1978.

Melischek, G., Rosengren, K.E. and Stappers, J., Eds. 1984. Cultural Indicators: An International Symposium. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Sitzungsberichte, 416. Band. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Publikumsforschung Nr.8. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Wien.

Mercer, Jessica; Gaillard, J. C.; Crowley, Katherine; Shannon, Rachel; Alexander, Bob; Day, Simon; Becker, Julia (2012): Culture and disaster risk reduction. Lessons and opportunities. In *Environmental Hazards* 11 (2), pp. 74–95. DOI: 10.1080/17477891.2011.609876

Pidgeon, N. 1991. Safety Culture and Risk Management in Organizations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. Vol 22: 129-140.

Rao, S. 2006. Understanding Risk Culture and Developing a 'Soft' Approach to Risk Assessment Methodologies. In B. Morel and I. Linkov (Eds) *Environmental Security and Environmental Management: The Role of Risk Assessment*. The NATO Programme for Security through Science. Springer. New York. pp.201-210

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). 1997. Governance for sustainable human development. Policy Document.

Weiss, T. G. 2000. Governance, good governance and global governance: Conceptual and actual challenges, *Third World Quarterly*, 21:5, 795-814