

The Method of Network Governance of Supranational Organizations: The Examples of the UN, EU, EAEU

Anna Maria Rada Leenders, MGIMO University

Regional and global governance models are analyzed using network analysis for the level of international regime density and functionality. Thus the regional and UN approach to global governance are evaluated comparatively.

a) A world of regions

A world of regions is a composite of civilizations and types of systems of governance centered on a regionally accepted logic of order. Several authors propose variants on this issue.

b) The region of one world

Can be described and created through reforms of the UN and international Global Governance regimes.

The result is institutional design and reform based on network analysis: the creation of networks allows the design of smart government networks in both scenarios.

The report develops the methodology of network analysis in a relatively new subject area: how the international community of states participates in global governance, and contains the results of the analysis. The result of the research study is that from global governance networks according to the network typology developed, there is only one set of characteristics that can satisfy the requirements of the supranational level of governance. Applying the network method in the interpretation of global governance at the supranational level reveals the main advantage of using the network approach in analyzing and mapping institutions and networks of global governance. One advantage is being able to systematically describe and compare new supranational governance structures that are still in the process of formalization and institutionalization. The methodology of network analysis works differently in considering the system of supranational governance in Europe as a whole and its elements (actors), in particular. This regional governance systems is compared to the global regime of institutions of supranational governance. The personal networks of actors participating in supranational

governance are described in full measure with the help of network analysis language. However, the system of supranational governance in Europe can be regarded as a full network due to some specific features of its typology. In comparison the supranational and transnational networks of global governance form a community of supranational actors that is an object of a special kind of complexity, whose unity is ensured not by the links between the elements but by the common tasks and challenges, shared mandates and jurisdictions, and above all the shared values and norms of bringing peace, order, transparency, human safety, and liberty supplementing the capabilities of its individual state nodes.

The ultimate objective is aligning all levels of political authority into a unified international system. New supranational and transnational institutions can increasingly be characterized as knowledge sharing arrangements. The paper presents the results of the preliminary application of the methodology of network analysis in a relatively new subject area, studying the participation of the international community in global governance. From the types of governance networks developed, these types of networks can be useful in implementing international agreements .

Networks have the design of the architecture of global governance. The design of the architecture of global governance are the distributed networks. This type of global governance networks should have characteristics of: Resilience (Defense, Response, Stabilization), Task (Cooperation, Collaboration, Innovation), Scale (Replication, Coordination Accumulation) (A.M., 2017, 'The Chessboard and the Web')

These are all functionally defined networks with specific network design to fit the function intended. The challenge is to make the networks pluralistic and collaborative network to serve the interests of the groups they are supposed to help, represent, educate or empower. Using the network method in analyzing and creating of global governance at the supranational level allows to transform the international regime (as envisioned by constructivists A. Wendt and institutionalists S. Krasner, R. Keohane, and A. Lake), and create a new global governance order that can be not only balanced in conditions of multipolarity, but can perpetuate peace in a polycentric world system compatible for cooperation in a multi civilizational world. The diplomatic advantage of using the network approach is its ability to create agreements amongst

subnational units via transnational links in support for intra, inter, supranational agreements. The academic advantage of the network methodology is the ability to describe supranational and transnational networks or organization with a variable a degree of institutionalization and operating across multiple levels.

The methodology of network analysis works differently when considering the supranational governance in the world as a whole and its regional parts. The networks of regional actors of supranational governance are fully described with network analysis, as whole networks. However, the global system of supranational governance cannot be considered as a full network due to its particular characteristics of pluralism of types of actors and multiple levels. The community of supranational actors of technology governance is an object of a special kind of complexity, the unity of which is ensured not by the links between the elements, but by the common tasks of developing the institutions, common values and commonality of the object of controlling influence.

The method of network analysis through the theories and approaches of international relations (dominating the main schools of thought) allow the development of a new method for the analysis of the international regime (in correspondence with the process of constructivism (A. Wendt) and its potential development in the direction of global governance. The category of International networks are applied to the study of the member states of the supranational and international organizations. In comparison there will be regional supranational organization, UN structure, and the most significant cooperation as the means of development of global conditions for peaceful global governance. The network method is applied both as a tool of analysis, definition, and tool of institutional design, to institutionalize, formalize whole, centralized dense issue networks of governance on carefully devised criteria.

The report develops the methodology of network analysis in a relatively new subject area: how the international community of states participates in global governance, and contains the results of the analysis. The result of the research study is that from global governance networks according to the network typology developed, there is only one set of characteristics that can satisfy the requirements of the supranational level of governance. Applying the network

method in the interpretation of global governance at the supranational level reveals the main advantage of using the network approach in analyzing and mapping institutions and networks of global governance. One advantage is being able to systematically describe and compare new supranational governance structures that are still in the process of formalization and institutionalization. The methodology of network analysis works differently in considering the system of supranational governance in Europe as a whole and its elements (actors), in particular. This regional governance systems is compared to the global regime of institutions of supranational governance. The personal networks of actors participating in supranational governance are described in full measure with the help of network analysis language. However, the system of supranational governance in Europe can be regarded as a full network due to some specific features of its typology. In comparison the supranational and transnational networks of global governance form a community of supranational actors that is an object of a special kind of complexity, whose unity is ensured not by the links between the elements but by the common tasks and challenges, shared mandates and jurisdictions, and above all the shared values and norms of bringing peace, order, transparency, human safety, and liberty supplementing the capabilities of its individual state nodes. The functional approach is thus combined with the network approach to create a symbiosis between network and structure of institutional design.