Monitoring systems of good governance

By Simona Kustec Lipicer, Damjan Lajh and Ivana Grgić, University of Ljubljana, Centre for Political Sciences Research, Ljubljana, Slovenia

The aim of this first draft report on the role of monitoring and indicators, prepared by the research team from the University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences is three-fold:

1. To give a general theoretical overview of the role of monitoring and monitoring systems, on the basis of which it will be possible to tailor the monitoring alternative for the AGGIS project's purposes;
2. To present the EU's so-called soft law tool, the open method of coordination (OMC), in which the monitoring-like approaches, as described in the theoretical introduction of this report, can be traced in practice;
3. To present a general overview of the three system broad approaches for monitoring governance issues that are already established and applied worldwide, with a future aim of selecting those indicators/variables that could possibly be directly used for AGGIS monitoring purposes.

Theoretical insight

Why monitor?

Each organisation, institution, as well as the state and all the sub-systems that embody them, strive for feedback about their making. This feedback represents the basis for their future attitudes and orientations, as well as the attitudes and orientations of the environments around them. This is why the public's pursuit of existing and implemented practices and patterns in democratic societies and institutions is of fundamental importance.

Monitoring is a special analytical procedure used to produce information about the results of the work of organisations or policies that they implement – either in the private or the public sector. As such monitoring is regarded to be one of the crucial procedures that is supposed to provide information about an organisation's performance or policy, be it from the perspective of the organisation's resources, processes (actions and activities) or the perceptions of the wider environment in which it operates.

Based on the described broader mission, monitoring performs at least four major functions: explanation, accounting, auditing and compliance (Dunn, 2004, p. 355-356):

1. Explanation: The explanatory function of monitoring yields information about the outcomes of the implementation and it can help explain why the outcomes differ or not;

2. Accounting: The accounting function of the monitoring process is important for delivering information that can help in accounting various changes that follow the implementation of a process or policy (e.g. social, economic, environmental);

3. Auditing: The auditing function of monitoring enables it to be determined whether resources and services that have been targeted to the beneficiaries or certain target groups have actually reached them;

4. Compliance: Monitoring in the case of the function of compliance helps to determine if the processes, activities and resources, staff, and others involved are in compliance with the standards and procedures that are defined in advance either by the organisation itself or the external environment.[15]

Due to the functions outlined above, the specific aims and expectations for monitoring the implementation of work of organisations and their policies can vary, and as such be synthesised into three aims that can either have 1) internal organisational motives 2) external environmental motives or 3) each of these motives:

1. Monitoring as the operational, managerial procedure which through information and evidence provides feedback on the performance;

2. Monitoring as a necessary prerequisite procedure that enables further assessment of the impacts of implementation for the past and future state of the affairs, and further on the platforms for policy learning and potential introduction of policy changes;

3. Monitoring as the procedure that provides information about the impacts that the implementation of one organisation and its making have on system's wider governance practices, norms and values, such as democracy, transparency, human rights and wellbeing.

According to the exposed monitoring of organisations' implementation is supposed to have two main missions:

1. To give ex-post or feedback information about the characteristics of already or currently implemented work and activities that have been developed and undertaken in previous periods;

2. To give ex-ante platforms for the planning of future implementation activities, which fundamentally refers to the need to evaluate past implementation practices in order to make decisions about their future direction.

What to monitor

Parallel to the points addressed above, it is especially important that a set of fundamental issues that need to be covered and monitored on the basis of the monitoring motives, mission and applied procedures is clearly established. Usually the framework and monitoring of each implementation is supposed to give answers to the following sets of questions (Chase 1979), and hence information about the organisations' democratic, transparent, accountable governance outlooks:

---

15 Here we need to differentiate between policy and legal compliance, where the former relates to the question of how extensively the normative standards are being considered in the actual, day-to-day policy implementation, while the latter relates most often to the question of the formal acceptance of the agreements/ standards.

- Who are the people to be served and who are serving?
- What is the nature of the services to be delivered?
- What are the potential distortions and irregularities?
- Is the implementation controllable (e.g. can the implementation be measured)?

Based on the abovementioned functions, expectations, motives and aims for the application of monitoring procedures, the next crucial challenge is to decide which type of data needs to be collected and which methods and procedures are applicable to the reasons for applying a monitoring system. In this sense the crucial task is to decide which type of data is needed for those purposes and how to contextually define the issues that need to be monitored. Mostly the authors of implementation studies (see Hogwood and Gunn, 1984; Parsons, 1999; Hill and Hupe, 2002; Dunn 2004) classify the content of the data needed to monitor the implementation practices into two crucial categories which relate to at least one of the four types of indicators according to their relevance:

1. Input,
2. Process,
3. Output and
4. Impact indicators.

The macro data category relates to the characteristics of the wider system, e.g. to the broader context of political, social and economic environment(s) in which individual international sport organisations are established and operate. This category partly covers/overlaps with input and impact indicators and represents a necessary precondition for in-depth monitoring of good governance. This category mainly relates to the data on:

- Regime/Legal type and status of the state: type of democracy or type of legal status, legal basis/origins, elections and election rules,
- Economy of the state,
- Social welfare index,
- Perception of corruption and transparency.

The micro category relates to the prevailing characteristics of the individual organisation, its processes and work. This category again consists of a combination of all four types of indicators (input, process, output and impact) and relates mainly to the following:

- Institutional structure characteristics: legal status, elections and election rules for the organisation's leadership, structure of the leadership, structure of the membership, yearly budget, number of employees in the organisation etc.
- Process characteristics: general internal decision-making rules, procedures and practices
- Project and policy characteristics: data on the implementation of the concrete programs, projects

a. Cadre resources: number and profiles of the employees (full-time, part-time, voluntary, gender)
b. Financial resources: data that relates to the relevant budget aspects, including both the operation of the organisation itself as well as the implementation of concrete programs and activities
c. Other relevant data: sources of knowledge, etc.

Who and how to monitor

The data gathered for the purposes of monitoring performance mostly come from two sources:

1. Some data already exist and are either: a) already available as they have been gathered for other purposes (like the monitoring of the profiles of the states) and can thus be extracted from existing data-sets or indexes (like Transparency International, World Governance Index and Global Reporting Initiative); or b) being gathered for the internal organisational purposes and are not publically available although they exist;
2. Data are not yet gathered. In this case data collection needs to be conducted, mostly through applying the following methods:

- Review of relevant existing documentation and data: statistics, financial records, policy documents
- Surveys
- Interviews
- Focus groups, panels and similar methods of gathering perspectives on the implementation practices

Subsequently the data that are relevant for the implementation and from which performance can be monitored are defined in the so called codes of conducts, organisational/policy guidance, guidelines, standards, etc. (see for example IFAC at www.ifac.org).

The case of the open method of coordination (OMC) as the selected monitoring practice of the EU

Within the European Union, the so-called open method of coordination was introduced as a part of a broader movement toward "new governance" and democratic experimentalism in the EU. For advocates of the OMC and other "new governance" approaches, traditional forms of "command and control governance" are viewed as exclusive, incapable of addressing societal complexity, static and unable to adapt well to changing circumstances, and limited in their production of the knowledge needed to solve problems. They cite the need to move from a centralised command and control regulation, consisting of rigid and uniform rules and hard law, toward a system of governance that promotes flexibility

and learning through the use of soft law[16] (Trubek et al. 2006: 12). One of the claims put forward by policymakers and academics that supports and promotes the use of the OMC is the claim that the OMC represents the "architecture of policy learning" (Ferrera et al. 2002; Knill and Lenschow, 2003; Eberlein and Kerwer, 2004). Seen in this way, the OMC is an institutional arrangement which organises policy learning processes among member states. The process of policy learning with its elements, policy diffusion, transfer, change and convergence, is thus often used for describing new modes of governance like the OMC. The OMC operates through iterative processes, aiming to:

- Share best practices,
- Organise peer learning/reviews,
- Set benchmarks and
- Monitor policy-making processes/implementation.

Two most prominent policy fields where the OMC had been introduced so far are employment and education. On the one hand, in relation to employment, the OMC was introduced to encourage the exchange of information and joint discussion between member states, and to attempt to find joint solutions and best practices for creating a greater number of better jobs in all member states. The OMC requires that member states coordinate among themselves in order to define the guidelines, recommendations and a set of common indicators as measurable employment targets. The OMC also encourages mutual learning among the various stakeholders regarding the European Employment Strategy (EES) and its implementation (Casey and Gold, 2004; Nedergaard, 2006). According to Nedergaard (2006, p. 311), the purpose of the EU's employment policy is to foster mutual learning between member states through three strands of activities: a) twice-yearly EU-wide thematic review seminars on key challenges or policy priorities; b) a peer review in individual member states, focusing on specific policies and measures within the broader policy priority; c) follow-up and dissemination activities to involve a broader group of national stakeholders and to further the cooperation and exchange of good practices between member states (Lajh and Silaj, 2010, p. 7).

On the other hand, in relation to education policy field, as part of the OMC process (with the working programme Education and Training 2010) 13 common objectives were defined and a work organisation was set up around these objectives to include the following: diversified clusters and working groups which bring together national experts and the partners concerned (eight clusters and one working group were established); the sharing of practices and experiences on common objectives adopted by ministers (peer learning activities were organised by clusters and the working group); defining indicators for monitoring progress (16 indicators were defined in accordance with 13 common objectives); producing European references for supporting national reforms (five benchmarks were agreed); and monitoring common progress (with annual quantitative and biannual qualitative reports). Every two years, the Ministers of Education from the

---

16 The term "soft law" characterises texts which are on the one hand not legally binding in an ordinary sense, but are on the other hand not completely devoid of legal effects either (Peters and Pagotto 2006). In the EU context specifically, soft law refers to action rules which are not legally binding but which are intended to influence member state policies, such as recommendations, resolutions, or codes of conduct (Snyder 1993; Kenner 1995).

member states publish a joint report with the European Commission on the overall situation in education and training across the EU and assess what progress has been made towards the common objectives. This report uses data from the EC's annual progress reports, but adopts a strategic view, delivering a series of key messages and recommendations for future approaches.

Review of the relevant existing wider system governance monitoring systems

In this chapter we synthesise the 'whys', 'whos', 'whats' and 'hows' of the three selected worldwide-referred monitoring systems. The main aims of the chapter are twofold:

1. To apply the usefulness and sensitiveness of the above presented approaches and aims of monitoring practices to the concrete cases of the monitoring systems of: a) Transparency International, b) World Governance Index and c) Global Reporting Initiative;
2. To select the indicators that could potentially, either directly or indirectly, be used for the purpose of preparing guidelines for monitoring good governance in sport organisations – to be done when an agreement about the indicators is achieved within the project team.

What we know so far is that many examples of monitoring practices and systems can be detected all over the world. Their aims are either to monitor their implementation or their attitudes towards the sets of wider system norms, standards and values, like democracy, governance and transparency, or their own internal ones. As a result of these activities methodological indicators and indexes are being defined and calculated, and many guidelines, codes of conduct and good practices are being published.

The following examples of challenges that arise when organisations decide to monitor, be it from their own individual organisations' or wider system perspective should be addressed:

1. *Why* monitor: what are the aims/expectations of monitoring the work? Is it an internal need in the organisation or is it in response to expectations from the external environment (clients, international organisation's demands, etc.) to:

   a. Review existing performance,
   b. Assess performance,
   c. Introduce policy changes,
   d. Learn,
   e. Fulfill the obligations,
   f. Something else.

2. *What* to monitor: this relates to the concrete information that can be used to describe the processes and activities that comprise an organisation's work and can be communicated transparently. The process of selecting the content that

needs to be monitored during the implementation is determined by the specific questions that need to be answered, e.g. which types of data are needed if we want to describe our own work? Generally those data relate to the following information:

a. General external environmental regime structures (e.g. the state where the organisation has its official seat):

- Type of authority: type of political system, government structures and division of powers, membership in key international organisations (UN, OECD, EU, etc.)
- Elections: electoral rules and procedures, mandates
- Economy: yearly GDP, structure, growth, income and expenditure, TI corruption index
- Society: population, poverty rate

b. Organisational structure specifics:

- Type of organisation: type of organisation, governance structures of the organisation and its members (by gender, geographics), number of organisational units (organisational charter)
- Membership: number of members, share/continental coverage, inclusion of disabled sport federations, organisation's membership in other organisations
- Elections: electoral rules and procedures, mandates
- Regulation: number and type of basic organisational rules
- Economy: yearly GDP, structure, growth, income and expenditure, final yearly accounts
- Employees: number of employees, gender balance, type of their position
- Experts: number of employed internal/external experts, fields of expertise

c. Organisation process specifics:

- Policy-making procedures: who, how, when it is allowed to initiate what

d. Organisation resource specifics:

- Policy: number/types of on-going projects, programs
- Finances/individual organisation's projects and programs: yearly budget, share of financial sources, final account
- Staff/individual organisation's projects and programs: number of employees, gender balance, type of their position
- Knowledge and expertise/individual organisation's projects and programs: number of employed internal/external experts, fields of expertise
- Other resources /individual organisation's projects and programs

3. *How* to monitor: how to gather and analyse the data and what types of data are to be used – e.g. statistics, qualitative assessments:

    a. Application of existing monitoring data, indicators, indexes, systems;

    b. Benchmarking, peer-reviews, compliance reports, etc.;

    c. Collection and application of the monitoring system and data the organisation has either newly acquired or not already gathered for purposes a) and b).

In the coming sections of this report analyses of the selected three governance systems are made according to the frameworks outlined in the table below. Each of the three systems is first described in general and then the main 'why', 'who', 'what', 'how' characteristics for each are shown in the table.

In all three cases the monitoring system relates to the so-called macro or system monitoring perspective, while the micro, organisationally relevant ones can be traced indirectly, tailored according to our project definitions and needs.

Table 1

	Why?	Who?	What?	Who?
Macro	Monitoring governance, democracy and transparency practices of the wider political-economic-social circumstances in which international sport organisations operate	A combination of internal organisations, existing external data-sets + additional expert assessments	General external environmental regime structures: • Authority • Elections • Economy • Society	Primary data collection Secondary sources from the existing datasets Benchmarking type of reports + ????

Transparency International[17]

"Transparency International (TI) is the global civil society organisation leading the fight against corruption. TI brings people together in a powerful worldwide coalition to end the devastating impact of corruption on men, women and children around the world. TI's mission is to create change towards a world free of corruption. TI challenges the inevitability of corruption, and offers hope to its victims. Since its founding in 1993, TI has played a lead role in improving the lives of millions around the world by building momentum for the anti-corruption movement. TI raises awareness and diminishes apathy and tolerance of corruption, and devises and implements practical actions to address it" (Transparency International, 2012).

---

17 More on Tranparency international (2012): Homepage. Available at: http://www.transparency.org/, March, 2012.

"Through more than 90 chapters worldwide and an International Secretariat in Berlin, they raise awareness of the damaging effects of corruption and work with partners in government, business and civil society to develop and implement effective measures to tackle it" (Transparency International, 2011).

Key elements of TI's work include analysing and diagnosing corruption, measuring its scope, frequency and manifestations through surveys and indices, as well as other research. TI has developed particular indexes and other measurement tools to assess corruption[18] in general.

Table 2

Index (name)	Why?	Who?	What?	How?
Corruption Perception Index (CPI)	Because of political (major obstacle to democracy and the rule of law), economic (depletion of national wealth), social (undermining trust in the political system) and environmental (environmental degradation) corruption costs.	External organisations for TI's purposes: e.g. 2011: 17 sources from 13 independent institutions – emphasis on governance.	Measuring perceptions of corruption in the public sector (183 countries included worldwide).	Annually conducting a mixture of: a) Opinion surveys among business people and b) Assessments provided by country experts or analysts from international institutions.
Global Corruption Barometer (GCB)	As a pool of the general public, it provides an indication of how corruption is viewed at the national level and how efforts to curb corruption around the world are assessed on the ground.	Gallup International Association on behalf of TI.	Public opinion survey on views and experiences of corruption and bribery (86 countries worldwide).	Annually carrying out interviews either a) Face-to-face using self-administered questionnaires; b) By telephone, internet or c) Computer-assisted telephone interviewing.
Bribe Payers Index (BPI)	Because of the role both public and private sectors can play in tackling corruption. It also	Data for the BPI is drawn from Bribe Payers Survey. Furthermore, Bribe Payers Survey was	Unique tool capturing the supply side of international bribery – focusing on bribes paid by	Interviews are carried out by common survey questionnaires either through a) Telephone;

---

18 3 TI defines corruption as: "the abuse of entrusted power for private gain".

	makes actionable recommenda-tions on how businesses and governments can strengthen their efforts to make substantial progress in reducing the prevalence of foreign bribery around the world.	carried out on TI's behalf by Ipsos MORI.	the private sector (i.e. the likelihood of firms from included countries to bribe when doing business abroad) (28 countries worldwide).	b) Face-to-face or c) Online. Interviewers were business executives from particular countries.
National Integrity System (NIS)	A framework anti-corruption organisations can use to analyse the extent and causes of corruption in a given country as well as the effectiveness of national anti-corruption efforts –building momentum, political will and civic pressure for relevant reform initiatives.	Assessments are conducted by local in-country organisations, generally TI's national chapters comprising individual researchers or/and groups of researchers and advisory group.	Comprehensive evaluations of integrity systems in given countries including key public institutions and non-state actors in a country's governance system – since its inception more than 70 national integrity assess-ments were carried out in different countries.	Analysis of laws, policies and existing research studies, Inter-views with experts in certain fields/pillars of assessment; Field test (when possible).

Source: Transparency International, 2012.

Global reporting initiative [19](GRI)

The GRI Reporting Framework is intended to serve as a generally accepted framework for reporting on an organisation's economic, environmental and social performance. It is designed for use by organisations of any size, sector, or location. It takes into account the practical considerations faced by a diverse range of organisations – from small enterpris-es to those with extensive and geographically dispersed operations. The GRI Reporting Framework contains general and sector specific content that has been agreed by a wide range of stakeholders around the world to be generally applicable for reporting an organisation's sustainability performance (Global Reporting Initiative, 2012).

---

19 More on Global Reporting Initiative (2012): Homepage. Available at:
https://www.globalreporting.org/Pages/default.aspx , March, 2012.

Table 3: GRI Indicators Matrix

Indicator type	Indicator name	Aspect
Economic	Economic performance indicators	Economic performance
		Market presence
		Indirect economic impacts
Environmental	Environmental performance indicators	Materials
		Energy
		Water
		Biodiversity
		Emissions, effluents and waste
		Products and services
		Compliance
		Transport
		Overall
Social	Labour practices and decent work performance indicators	Employment
		Labour/management relations
		Occupational health and safety
		Training and education
		Diversity and equal opportunity
		Equal remuneration for women and men
	Human rights performance indicators	Investment and procurement practices
		Non-discrimination
		Freedom of association and collective bargaining
		Child labour
		Forced and compulsory labour
		Security practices
		Indigenous rights
		Assessment
		Remediation
	Society performance indicators	Local communities
		Corruption
		Public policy
		Anti-competitive behaviour
		Compliance
	Product responsibility performance indicators	Customer health and safety
		Product and service labelling
		Marketing communications
		Customer privacy
		Compliance

Source: Global Reporting Initiative (2011).

World governance index[20] (WGI)

A survey of these objectives and these basic texts has made it possible to determine and select five large fields, called indicators, which, aggregated, constitute the WGI:

20 More on Forum for a New World Governance (2012): Homepage. Available at: http://www.world-governance.org/, March, 2012.

- Peace and security
- Rule of law
- Human rights and participation
- Sustainable development
- Human development

Each of these indicators is broken down into several sub-indicators. A total of 13 sub-indicators are used and each of these sub-indicators is the result of the aggregation of several indexes (41 in all). Finally, the data used to calculate the indexes and determine the WGI is taken from the databases published annually by the main international organisations and by NGOs specialising in the area of governance (New World Governance, 2012).

WGI Composition:

- 5 main indicators
- 13 sub-indicators
- 41 indexes

Usefulness of the WGI

The WGI has a twofold dimension: a) an analytical dimension which tries to provide as true a reflection as possible of the state of world governance and b) an operational dimension which must enable players to act or to react in the direction of a more efficient, more democratic world governance more in phase with the environment. The WGI was designed mainly to offer political decision makers, whatever their level (national, regional or international), companies and NGOs reliable, independent and scrutinised information that will allow them to evaluate the state's degree of governance and to identify its strengths and weaknesses in governance to monitor its evolution over time (New World Governance, 2012).

Basic indicators that constitute the WGI are (New World Governance, 2012):

a. Peace and security: Broken down into two sub-indicators: the national security sub-indicator and the public security sub-indicator. The national security sub-indicator comprises conflicts, refugees and asylum seekers, and displaced persons. The public security sub-indicator comprises political climate, degree of trust among citizens, violent crime, and homicides per 100,000 inhabitants;
b. Rule of law: Refers exclusively to how laws are designed, formulated and implemented by a country's legal authorities;
c. Human rights and participation: This indicator is broken down into three sub-indicators: the civil and political rights sub-indicator, the participation sub-indicator, and the gender discrimination/inequality sub-indicator;
d. Sustainable development: The concept of sustainable development is based on two core principles: on the one hand, intergenerational solidarity (seeking improvement of the wellbeing of future generations); on the other, intergenerational solidarity (sharing wellbeing or the conditions for wellbeing within the same generation). These two principles are expressed in the normative statement of the goals

that make up the different dimensions of sustainability: the economic sphere, the social dimension (inequality and poverty), and the environmental sphere;

e. Human development: In the realm of human development, the most fundamental of an individual's possibilities consists of leading a long and healthy life, being well-informed, having access to the resources necessary for a decent standard of living, and being able to take part in the life of the community.

Table 4 represents WGI as a whole – covering main indicators, sub-indicators and indexes.

Table 4: WGI Indicators Matrix

Indicator	Sub-indicator	Index
Peace and security	National security	1. Conflicts (number and types – latent, manifest, crisis, severe crisis, war – of conflicts documented in the previous year)
		2. Refugees and asylum seekers
		3. Displaced persons
	Public security	4. Political climate (level of political violence)
		5. Degree of trust among citizens
		6. Violent crime (rate of violent crime)
		7. Homicides per 100,000 inhabitants
Rule of law	Body of laws	8. Ratification of treaties (degree of ratification of particular international treaties and conventions currently in force[21])
		9. Property rights (country's degree of commitment to the protection of private property and the way in which the authorities apply this right)
	Juridical system	10. Independence (assessment of judicial system independence, the bodies that oversee the police force, legal protection, and the guarantee for equal treatment for all)
		11. Effectiveness (ratio of remain prisoners to convicted prisoners)
		12. Settlement of contractual disputes (average time that national judicial institutions use to settle disputes related to commercial contracts)
	Corruption	13. Corruption Perception Index
Human rights and participation	Civil and political rights	14. Respect of civil rights (freedom of movement, political participation, worker's rights, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly and association)
		15. Respect for physical integrity rights (Torture, disappearance or political abductions, extrajudicial killing and political imprisonment)
		16. Freedom of the press
		17. Violence against the press (number of murders, abductions and disappearances of journalists and media workers as well as the number of imprisoned journalists)
	Participation	18. Participation in political life (degree of participation in political life)
		19. Electoral process and pluralism (effective share of pluralism in the different electoral processes)
		20. Political culture (political culture of citizens degree)
	Gender	21. Women's political rights (number of internationally recognised

---

21 Convention names are available online at: http://www.world-governance.org/IMG/pdf_WGI_full_version_EN-2.pdf.

	discrimina-tion/inequality	rights: voting rights, the right to run for political office and the right to hold elected and appointed government)
		22. Women's social rights (right to equal inheritance, the right to enter into marriage on a basis of equality with men, the right to travel abroad, the right to initiate a divorce)
		23. Women's economic rights
		24. Rate of presentation in national parliaments
Sustainable development	Economic sector	25. GDP per capita
		26. GDP growth rate
		27. Degree/level of economic openness
		28. Cover rate
		29. Inflation rate
		30. Ease in starting a business (bureaucratic and legal hurdles an entrepreneur must overcome to start a commercial or industrial business – number of procedures, cost and time expressed in days)
	Social dimension	31. GINI coefficient (poverty and inequality)
		32. Unemployment rate
		33. Ratification of international labour rights texts
	Environmental dimension	34. Ecological footprint (1) and Biocapacity ((1): necessary per capita surface area (terrestrial, marine and freshwater) to meet humankind's needs and to eliminate waste; (2): per capita surface area (in terms of agriculture, breeding, forest and fish resources) available to meet humankind's needs
		35. Environmental sustainability (ability of nations to protect the environment over the next several decades)
		36. CO_2 emission rate per capita
		37. Environmental performance (environmental health, air pollution, aquifer resources, biodiversity and habitat, natural resources and climate change)
Human development	Development	38. Human development
	Wellbeing and happiness	39. Subjective wellbeing (result of a combination of economic wellbeing, environmental wellbeing and social wellbeing)
		40. Happiness (result of combination of satisfaction index, life expectancy at birth, and the environmental impact)
		41. Quality of life (cost of living, culture and leisure, economy, environment, health, freedom, infrastructure, safety and risk, climate).

Source: Forum for a New World Governance (2011).

References

Casey, B. H. and Gold, M. (2004) *Peer review of labour market policies in the European Union: what can countries really learn from one another?* Online. Available HTTP: <http://eucenter.wisc.edu/OMC/Papers/EES/caseyGold.pdf> (accessed 8 May 2008).

Chase, G. (1979) 'Implementing a human services program: How hard will it be?' *Public Policy, 27,* 385-434.

Dunn, W. (2004) *Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction.* Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River.

Eberlein, B. and Kerwer, D. (2002) 'Theorising the New Modes of European Union Governance', *European Integration online Papers,* 6 (5): 1–16.

Ferrera, M., Manos, M. and Saccchi, S. (2002) 'Open Co-ordination Against Poverty: The New EU "Social inclusion process"', *Journal of European Social Policy,* (12) 3: 227–239.

Forum for a New World Governance (2011) *World Governance Index.* Available at: http://www.world-governance.org/IMG/pdf_WGI_short_version_EN_web-2.pdf, March, 2012.

François, R. (2009) *World Governance Index. Why Should World Governance Be Evaluated, and for What Purpose?* Available at: http://www.world-governance.org/IMG/pdf_WGI_full_version_EN-2.pdf, March, 2012.

Global Reporting Initiative (2011) *Sustainability Reporting Guidelines.* Available at: https://www.globalreporting.org/resourcelibrary/G3.1-Sustainability-Reporting-Guidelines.pdf , March, 2012.

Global Reporting Initiative (2012) Homepage. Available at: https://www.globalreporting.org/Pages/default.aspx, March, 2012

Hill, M. and P. Hupe (2002) *Implementing Public Policy.* Sage Publications.

Hogwood, B. and L. Gunn (1984) *Policy Analysis for the Real World.* Oxford. University Press, Oxford.

Kenner, J. (1995) 'EC Labour Law: The Softly, Softly Approach', *The International Journal of Comparative Labour Law and Industrial Relations*, 1 (4): 307–326.

Kenner, J (1999) 'The EC Employment Title and the "Third Way". Making Soft Law Work?', *Journal of Comparative Labour Law and Industrial Relations* 15(1), 33-60.

Knill, C., and Lenschow, A. (1998) 'Coping with Europe: The Impact of British and German Administration on the Implementation of EU Environmental Policy' *Journal of European Public Policy,* (5) 4: 595–614.

Lajh, D. and Silaj, T. (2010) 'The open method of coordination in the field of employment policy: Slovenian experiences', paper presented at the Open Method of Coordination International Conference, Ljubljana, September 2010.

Nedergaard, P. (2006) 'Policy Learning in the European Union: The Case of the European Employment Strategy', *Policy Studies,* 27 (4): 311–323.

Parsons, W. (1999) *Public Policy: An Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Policy Analysis.* Cheltenham, Northampton: Edward Elgar.

Peters, A. and Pagotto, I. (2006) Soft Law as a New Mode of Governance: A Legal Perspective. Online. Available HTTP: <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1668531> (10 July 2010).

Peters, A. and Pagotto, I (2006) Soft Law as a New Mode of Governance: A Legal Perspective, presentation given at a NewGov project workshop, Basel.

Snyder, Francis (1993) 'Soft law and Institutional Practice in the European Community'in Steve Martin (ed), The Construction of Europe – Essays in honour of Emile Noel, *Kluwer Academic Publishers*, pp. 197-225.

Transparency International (2011) *Annual Report 2011*. Available at: www.transparency.org/annualreport/2011, March, 2012.

Transparency International (2012) Homepage. Available at: http://www.transparency.org/, March, 2012.

__(2012a) *Policy and Research*. Available at: http://archive.transparency.org/policy_research, March, 2012.

__(2012b) *The Corruption Perceptions Index*. Available at: http://www.transparency.org/cpi2011/in_detail, March, 2012.

__(2012c) Global Corruption Barometer. Available at: http://gcb.transparency.org/gcb201011/, March, 2012.

__(2012d) Bribe Payers Index. Available at: http://bpi.transparency.org/bpi2011/, March, 2012.

__(2012e) National Integrity System Assessment: http://archive.transparency.org/policy_research/nis/national_integrity_system_assessments, March, 2012.

__(2012f) Annex 3. NIS Indicators and Foundations. Available at: http://archive.transparency.org/content/download/49652/794096/ANNEX+3+-+NIS+Indicators+and+Foundations.doc, March, 2012.

 Trubek, D. M., Cottrell, P. and Nance, M. (2005) *"Soft Law", "Hard Law", and European Integration: Toward a Theory of Hybridity.*' Online. Available HTTP: <http://law.wisc.edu/facstaff/trubek/hybriditypaperapril2005.pdf> (accessed 8 May 2011).

World Governance Index (2012) Homepage of the Forum for a New World Governance. Available at: http://www.world-governance.org/, March ,2012.