

Tackling Cross-Sectoral Challenges to Advance Health as Part of Foreign Policy

Miriam Faid



Tackling Cross-Sectoral Challenges to Advance Health as Part of Foreign Policy

A report of the international research initiative
'Foreign Policy as Part of Global Health Challenges'¹

Commissioned by the Fridtjof Nansen Institute, Oslo

Miriam Faid

miriam.faid@graduateinstitute.ch

January 2012



FRIDTJOF NANSENS INSTITUTT
FRIDTJOF NANSEN INSTITUTE

¹ The initiative is a collaborative venture involving the following institutions: Center for Global Health, Fiocruz, Brazil; University of Oslo, Norway; the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, Norway; South African Institute of International Affairs; Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia; Harvard University, USA and the Fridtjof Nansen Institute, Oslo.

Copyright © Fridtjof Nansen Institute 2012

Title

Tackling Cross-Sectoral Challenges to Advance Health as Part of Foreign Policy

Publication Type and Number

FNI-rapport 2/2012

Pages

39

Authors

Miriam Faid

ISBN

978--82-7613-642-5
online version

ISSN

1504-9744

Abstract

This report is based on the general assumption that the integration of global health into foreign policy-making is beneficial for advancing global health goals. This is based on the statement laid down in the 2007 Oslo Declaration. This view is also reflected in various relevant UN Declarations. Using an exploratory comparative approach the report draws empirical lessons from three global issues, selected on the basis of their similarities to global health: Environment as regards climate change and biodiversity and their integration into global trade governance; migration and its integration into global security governance and gender and its emergence into global development governance. Issue linkage and mainstreaming were used as analytical devices. From the documentation provided, we derive policy lessons on how to advance health as foreign policy is 1) Government actors need to build greater capacity for managing complex governance structures. 2) New policy concepts require new substance that can help generate concrete action and changed practices. Finally, the report suggests new points of analytical entry for further research on global health and foreign policy.

Key Words

Global health, governance for global health, environment, gender, migration, mainstreaming and issue linkage

Orders to:

Fridtjof Nansen Institute
Postboks 326
N-1326 Lysaker, Norway.

Tel: (47) 6711 1900

Fax: (47) 6711 1910

Email: post@fni.no

Internet: www.fni.no

Contents

List of acronyms and abbreviations	ii
Report synopsis	iii
1 Introduction	1
2 Methodology	4
3 Integrating health into non-health global governance arenas: Opportunities and challenges	7
4 Learning lessons from cross-sectoral governance challenges	10
a) The integration of environment into global trade governance	10
Climate change and its integration into global trade governance	11
Biodiversity and its integration into global trade governance	13
b) The integration of migration into global security governance	18
c) The emergence of gender from global development governance	21
5 Comparing lessons learned – insights for how to advance health as part of foreign policy	23
Policy lesson 1: Build capacity to manage complex governance structures	24
Policy lesson 2: New policy concepts require new strategies to help generate concrete action	25
Research observation 1: Different actors in the global arena utilize strategies of mainstreaming and issue linkage differently	26
Research observation 2: Strategies work differently to address horizontal versus vertical interplay	28
Research observation 3: How do we assess the high-politics vs. low-politics character of a global issue?	28
Future research lesson 1: How can foreign policy areas open up to global health?	29
Future research lesson 2: Lack of knowledge on policy implementation, outcomes and impact	30
6 Bibliography	32

List of acronyms and abbreviations

CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GAD	Gender and Development
GCIM	Global Commission on International Migration
ILO	International Labour Organization
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IP	Intellectual property
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IR	International relations (as an academic discipline)
ITPGRFA	International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources
NCDs	Non-communicable diseases
NGO	Non-governmental organization
PGR	Plant genetic resources
TRIPS	Trade-related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights
WID	Women in Development
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization

Report synopsis

This report is based on the general assumption that the *integration* of global health into foreign policy-making is beneficial for advancing global health goals. This follows the appeal of the Oslo Ministerial Group, which posited in their Oslo Declaration (2007)* that health should be integrated into various sectors of foreign policy. This study explores *how* health can emerge in global governance areas in which the political importance of health has long been poorly understood. The study examines the lessons learned from other trans-sectoral issues in international affairs. We believe that *more knowledge is needed on how health can be integrated into other sectors of global governance as an approach to strengthen the global health and foreign policy relationship.*

Political recognition of the need for cross-sectoral integration of global health is growing, as witnessed by the accumulating global momentum concerning the structural conditions impacting on health. This is reflected in the recent report *Global Health and Foreign Policy* prepared by the Director General of the WHO to the UN Secretary-General (A/66/497), which documents the rise in linkages between global health and non-health sectors.

The report to the Secretary-General also highlights how recent high-level UN meetings on health issues have directed attention to non-health sectors as crucial areas for action, with opportunities for mitigating risk factors in ways beyond the reach of the health-care sector. The effect of the high-level deliberations aimed at spanning issue-specific spheres of governance, the report argues, is to: ‘(...) raise the profile of health while introducing opportunities for non-health sectors to consider how their actions and priorities could have an impact on health outcomes’ (A/66/497). As cross-sectoral integration of global health issues, or *governance for global health*, is recognized as an untapped potential by diplomats and international policy-makers and scholars alike, it seems timely to look into strategies that can ultimately lead to improved health outcomes. The scope of this work thus lies explicitly *outside* the traditional realm of global health – *global health governance*.

Using an exploratory comparative approach, this report draws empirical lessons from three global issues, selected on the basis of their similarities to global health. They all were traditionally seen as rather low-politics issues, but have recently experienced a significant upsurge of attention in connection with the making of foreign policy at the global level. The three are:

- a) *Environment* (selected global issue) and its integration into *global trade governance* (selected global governance area); more specifically as regards *climate change* and *biodiversity* and their integration into *global trade governance*;
- b) Migration and its integration into global security governance;
- c) Gender and its emergence from global development governance.

In comparing these, the focus is on *issue linkage* and *mainstreaming* as exemplary strategies for influencing interaction with governance areas traditionally alien to the issues under scrutiny. The strategy of ‘mainstreaming’ is in the IR literature associated with changing approaches to policy-making across sectors to take into account specific interest, values or goals. Issue linkage is raised as a more formal mechanism for connecting issues in negotiations as part of international agreements, rules and norms.

This study has sought a new entry point, tracing lessons learned across issues of international relations, with a view to answering two key questions: (i) How can we begin to substantiate and build more specific knowledge on the challenges and opportunities for integrating health further into different foreign policy and global governance areas? (ii) How can we better connect international policies and health outcomes by developing analytical frameworks to assess the impact of foreign policy domains on the conditions for human health?

This report does not aspire to arrive at final answers to those questions, but – within the limits of its mandate and resources – to scope widely beyond the confines of global health and identify commonalities. This allows for first steps of policy advice as well as suggestions for areas where more knowledge is needed.

From the documentation consulted for this report, the policy lessons for governmental actors on how to advance health as part of foreign policy can already be presented as follows:

(1) Governmental actors need to build greater capacity for managing complex governance structures that not only deal effectively with the multi-layered challenges of global policy issues, but also take a more holistic approach toward integrating all public and private actors relevant for policy solutions.

(2) New policy concepts require new substance that can help to generate concrete action and changed practices. The increasing attention to a broader approach to *governance for health* suggests a direction for future efforts. However, as the approach will require a change in the status quo of international politics, it becomes necessary to define how such a vision can be translated into real policy-making practice, as well as to identify the means for resolving the political dilemmas that are bound to arise. A major challenge is to capture the sincere interest of stakeholders across sectors. This report highlights the concept of *shared value* as an example of an innovative solution for integrating social goals with established parameters of economic success, as a way to orient the global governance of public and private actors towards a shared bottom-line.

Policy lessons are drawn from observations of how states, international organizations and also non-state actors regularly employ strategies to manage cross-sector interactions for diverse reasons: for example, states often use issue linkage as a means to overcome divergent interests or fault-lines between countries in order to reach agreement. On the other hand, states in particular seem to have rather low incentives for em-

ploying issue linkage *outside* of governmental negotiations – even though the increasingly complex political environment demands such strategies to overcome conflict situations often located outside of negotiation settings. International organizations are also known to pursue strategic linkages with regimes that are directly relevant to their concerns, and may serve to even raise awareness among other actors. Issue linkage can also be a means for actors to position themselves and increase their relevance in an increasingly dense global arena.

The strategy of mainstreaming, on the other hand, has worked more as a form of an advocacy movement across governance institutions and civil society pressing for broader and transformed policymaking within established sectors. While mainstreaming efforts seem able to raise the political salience of an issue, there are associated risks that upward movement on the international political agenda and high-level policy statements becomes the ultimate goal, with implementation and transformation of practice fading into the background as too difficult or controversial. While issue linkage is often anchored in an established institution for a given issue, mainstreaming can spread responsibility to multiple sectors and institutions.

The documentation of policy experience also suggests that issue linkage and mainstreaming work differently to address horizontal (across policy-making sectors) versus vertical interplays (across policy-making levels). The knowledge on issue linkage reflected in the literature focuses on interaction among global governance sectors. The description or promotion of mainstreaming is most often in relation to the field of development assistance, where the emphasis is on flows of funding and knowledge between national and international authorities. On the other hand, this distinction may reflect the attention given to the issues by the scholarly community rather than realities on the ground. In fact, scholars suggest that the *practice* of managing interactions is vast compared to what has been documented through empirical research. There appears to be a generic unmet need in international affairs in terms of establishing knowledge about the true reach and potential of various strategies.

What the issues explored in this study have in common is that the documented knowledge focuses largely on policy outputs (statements, agreements and decisions), but is limited in its assessments of implementation, that is, outcomes and impact. Nevertheless, for environmental issues in particular, research on interlinkages shows that an issue stands to both gain and lose from integration with other governance sectors. It is thus important to be aware that in the encounter with a high-politics governance area like trade, environmental issues may actually lose ground and be subordinated to trade dynamics and interests, in which case outcomes may also be negative. This observation counters the initial expectation of this study that traditionally low-politics issues will gain political salience if integrated with higher politics governance areas.

Exploring how cross-sector interactions unfold triggers an aspiration to more fully comprehend the possible implications, pitfalls and potentials

of this increasingly prevalent phenomenon in international politics. There is clearly a need for a more nuanced understanding of the conditions which affect whether global issues gain from interlinkages and integration across sectors. Furthermore, the observation that implementation and outcomes of interaction forms part of the current research front of global environmental governance indicates that frameworks to link international politics to outcomes and impact should be a generic topic for both policy-makers and researchers. A key message is therefore that further understanding and knowledge about the relation of global health to foreign policy and global governance stands to gain from cross-fertilization of issue-specific research.

Finally, this report suggests new points of analytical entry for further research on global health and foreign policy. Questions that merit further attention include: (1) To what extent does interplay occur, intentionally and unintentionally, among global health and other sectors (also within the global health sector in disease-specific initiatives)? (2) Are stakeholders in other governance areas aware of – and incorporating – health issues into their decision-making? (3) Under what conditions (types of policy mechanisms and incentives) do they open up and take health increasingly into account? (4) How do state and non-state actors seek to manage the interplay of global health with other issues? (5) What are the benchmarks of success for measuring performance on global interplay management? (6) What is required from foreign and domestic policies to ensure complementary integration of issues at the national level?

New knowledge is needed to substantiate whether, how and where global health can emerge and link to global governance areas traditionally seen as less related to health, as well as to substantiate what it really means to integrate health into foreign policy. The answers will help in building knowledge about the most promising strategies for cross-sectoral integration of global health and conditions for successful implementation. The links between policy integration and outcomes are of key importance if the advancement of health objectives worldwide is the ultimate aim. Stronger abilities to demonstrate such links can also serve as tools in helping decision-makers to recognize where decisions can help to create and strengthen positive links, minimize negative outcomes, and raise awareness of existing or potential conflicts of interest between other policy fields and health.

Together, these initial insights are envisaged to complement the political momentum needed for a multi-governance approach to global health challenges that can adequately take account of the multi-faceted character of global health. This awareness may also spark efforts to develop more rigorous analytical frameworks to address the under-conceptualized (or over-conceptualized and under-analyzed) challenges and opportunities generated by the global health/ foreign policy relationship.

1 Introduction²

This study is the second report of the International Research Initiative *Foreign policy as part of global health challenges* ('the Initiative'). It has been commissioned by the Fridtjof Nansen Institute, Oslo, with work carried out between September 2011 and January 2012. The initiation phase of the Initiative in 2011 aims to identify key areas, questions and approaches for building knowledge about the interlinkages of foreign policy and health. The first report *Recent Contributions to Research on Health and Foreign Policy* surveyed the literature on health, foreign policy/diplomacy and global governance in general (Eggen/Sending, 2012). This second report builds on this initial mapping of the research field, but reaches out farther in both thematic and conceptual approaches to explore the key question: **How can global health be made integral to foreign policy realms and associated global governance processes?**

This study represents the widest mandate among the four deliverables of the Initiative's initiation phase. Its general objective is to map relevant spheres of governance that have a bearing on health outcomes in order to identify knowledge gaps, opportunities and challenges. The work builds on the conference paper 'Tackling Cross-Sectoral Challenges to Advance Health as Part of Foreign Policy: The Role of Research', presented on behalf of the Initiative at a global health conference at Chatham House in London in June 2011.³ The key impetus both for the conference paper and for this study has been the interest expressed by diplomatic representatives of the Oslo Ministerial Group during the Initiative's first meeting in March 2011 to draw lessons from other global issues. Interest was observed during discussions about the diverse experiences of issues such as environmental governance, global economic policies as well as development policies and ways in which these can be harnessed to provide valuable lessons for policy-makers engaged in advancing global health. The Initiative includes researchers from the social sciences (political science, international relations and anthropology) as well as public health, with experience from research on global governance of a diverse range of issues. Therefore, this study also scopes the research experience and frontiers of cross-sectoral global governance to offer a sounding board for research on global governance for health, and moreover to serve as building blocks towards a conceptual framework for creative thinking and new knowledge about cross-sectoral governance challenges at the global health and foreign policy nexus.

² The author of this report would like to thank Research Professor Steinar Andresen and Dr Kristin Ingstad Sandberg for their constructive support to this study during its conceptualization and drafting, as well as Dr Kristin Rosendal and Dr Øyvind Eggen for factual insights and valuable contributions. A draft version of this study was discussed at a research workshop of the Research Initiative *Foreign policy as part of global health challenges*, held in October 2011 in Rio de Janeiro. Insightful suggestions contributed by researchers there have also been taken into consideration in the finalization process of this study.

³ <http://www.chathamhouse.org/events/view/157257>

The following three global issues with experience of cross-sectoral integration were selected for review:

- a) Environment (selected global issue) and its integration into global trade governance (selected global governance area); specifically the environmental spheres of climate change and biodiversity and their integration into global trade governance;
- b) Migration and its integration into global security governance; and
- c) Gender and its emergence⁴ from global development governance.

These three are characterized by several similarities, which they also share with global health: They are widely recognized as global issues that require collective action among countries. Moreover, they all used to be discussed mainly in the low-politics spheres, but have become global issues touching on high-politics dynamics, as this study will show. Further, the selected global issues follow their own trajectories as dynamic areas of global governance, but are not entirely separate; some even overlap partially (e.g. environment and migration).

Against this background, several key terms need to be defined. We regard a *global issue* as a question or a problem that most or all countries are concerned about because it has the potential to impact, or is already impacting, on many countries. Resolving a global issue is beyond the capacity of a single or few countries and thus requires a global regulatory approach. Our definition of *global governance* derives partially from the definition offered in the Report on the UN Commission on Global Governance *Our Global Neighbourhood* (1995): a complex set of structures and processes of both public and private nature (The Report of the Commission on Global Governance, 1995; Weiss, 2000). In addition, ‘there is no single model or form of global governance, nor is there a single structure or set of structures. It is a broad, dynamic, complex process of interactive decision-making that is constantly evolving and responding to changing circumstances’ (The Report of the Commission on Global Governance, 1995: 4). Global issues may or may not be characterized as distinct *global governance areas* or *sectors*, depending on the extent to which action and responses are organized. As seen over the past decade with the issue of global health, governance arrangements are dynamic, capable of expanding rapidly to involve new structures.

This report starts from the assumption that global issues gain from being integrated across various global governance sectors, but the three cases under review open a Pandora’s Box of how to judge the effects of such integration. When an issue is integrated into the spheres of foreign policy, it is not automatically translated into favourable changes in norms, regulations and policies as *outputs* of global decision-making. Nor is it

⁴ This case does not discuss the *integration* of gender into a selected governance field, but deals with the *emergence* of gender in global development governance. The reason is that the policy issue of gender, at least in the scholarly literature consulted, has been largely confined to the governance field of development from which it emerged. Nevertheless, we believe that also the emergence of gender in global development governance offers pertinent insights for the research objectives of this study.

given that such integration processes will lead to improved *outcomes* in a given issue area, such as greater biodiversity or improved health. **Another key question is therefore: under what conditions can strategies to integrate health into other governance areas contribute to the advancement of health objectives worldwide?**

The idea of cross-sectoral governance as a link between foreign policy and improved health outcomes lies at the core of the Oslo Ministerial Group as well as recent deliberations in the UN General Assembly. The Oslo Ministerial Declaration from 2007 stipulates that in order to move health forward, attention must be paid to interlinked areas of global governance or issues that span sectors like trade, humanitarian response, pharmaceutical regulation, ownership to genetic resources, health effects of climate change and humanitarian responses to natural and human-induced disasters (Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Brazil, France, et al., 2007). The 2011 report on Global Health and Foreign Policy (A/66/497) prepared by the Director-General of the WHO to the UN General Assembly provides an overview of how several health issues are currently addressed in interaction with other governance areas, and explores the extent to which policies of other sectors support global health. The report concludes by noting that current financial, food price and fuel crises make cross-sectoral approaches particularly relevant and that decision-makers need to better understand both how decisions in non-health governance areas can make a difference to health outcomes, and the potential for reaping joint benefits (UNGA A/66/497, 2011). Decision-makers need to be able to recognize where decisions can help create and strengthen positive links, minimize negative outcomes, and help raise awareness about existing or potential conflicts of interest between health and other policy fields.

The ambition of this study is to provide practical and policy-relevant insights for member countries of the Oslo Ministerial Group and beyond, as well as suggesting how the research community can approach the need for more knowledge. The first report of the Initiative, a review of the literature on global health, foreign policy and global governance, found a need for new empirical knowledge on these interrelations (Eggen/Sending, 2012). If we understand global health as far more complex than health in its traditional sense – encompassing not only the whole universe of health, but equally all non-medical and non-technical, increasingly social, economic and political processes at the global level that impact on health – then building knowledge on how to advance global health poses a considerable challenge. We must start envisioning analytical frameworks that can link disciplines (such as public health and the social sciences), issue areas (e.g. health, environment, trade), or governance levels (global, national and local) to outcome results.

This study is informed by a research tradition developed at the Fridtjof Nansen Institute that has shown how the problem-solving capacity of a governance area is often a balance between relevant academic and policy-making knowledge (Andresen et al., 2000:1). This report can thus be seen as a start at identifying and grouping relevant knowledge so as to

generate new findings and insights that may be transformed into and actively used as premises for future policy decisions (Ibid.:3).

Despite these ambitious objectives, there are of course topics which this work does not discuss, due to time constraints of the Initiative's initiation phase, to be concluded early 2012. A few disclaimers therefore need to be made. This study focuses exclusively on the global level, although acknowledging the importance of the local, national and regional levels, as well as their interplays with the global level. Moreover, while we discuss how the review of the three selected issue areas can inform frameworks for more systematic research on the integration of global health into various fields of global governance, we do not delve into how such research should be complemented with measuring the implementation, effects and impact of such integration processes on health. The question of how to approach health outcomes as evidence for global policy-making will be taken up in the third report of the Initiative, pointing towards a future research agenda to be outlined in the fourth report. Together, the reports of the initiation phase are meant to indicate how such a future research agenda can evolve as part of a division of labour with the recent establishment of the *The Lancet–University of Oslo Commission: Global Governance for Health*, which is to produce recommendations on solving controversial challenges related to effective protection and promotion of public health in selected key domains of policy-making.⁵

We begin by examining some key methodological and conceptual issues that underpin the comparison of the three selected global issues, drawing on how integration can be viewed as part of the general interaction between governance areas and strategies that actors may use to steer such interaction. The third section provides a backdrop overview of the global health issue and how existing cross-sectoral linkages can inform conceptualizations of foreign policy in relation to global governance. Section four summarizes experiences from the fields of the environment (climate change and biodiversity), migration and gender. The fifth and final section offers advice as to the critical role diplomats can play in utilizing strategies to enhance synergies between governance sectors. Our advice builds on the experiences of the three global issues, which are subsequently highlighted. Moreover, we also suggest how to move research forward on inter-sectoral linkages of global health. Such future research steps will be critical for providing systematic and comprehensive knowledge on making health needs more integral to the spheres of foreign policy and global governance.

2 Methodology

As noted, at the core of this report is a synthesis of existing knowledge (lessons learned) from the three selected global issues and how these are addressed in other global governance sectors. This was done through a

⁵ For more information on the newly established Commission, see <https://www.med.uio.no/helsam/english/research/global-governance-health/about/>

secondary literature review for each of the global issues in question. For two cases (the environment/biodiversity/climate change, and gender), the literature search relied on peer recommendations, and we consulted academic experts in each field. Literature reviews undertaken for the selected global issues were narrowed down to a specific time frame from about 1995 until the present. This is the period where global governance dynamics arguably affected all the global issues in question. Here we have relied primarily on two scholarly search engines: Web of Knowledge⁶ and Google scholar.⁷

In early discussions within the Initiative for the Chatham House conference paper that preceded this study, ‘issue linkage’ and ‘mainstreaming’ were selected as key phenomena to be compared across issues and their integration into foreign policy realms. For each global issue, a systematic topic search was made (1) on the issue in general, (2) in connection with ‘issue linkage’ and the selected foreign policy sphere, as well as (3) in connection with ‘mainstreaming’ and the selected foreign policy sphere. The resulting hits were further narrowed down to those articles published in IR/interdisciplinary social sciences/political sciences journals. In addition, secondary literature reviews were conducted on the two concepts ‘mainstreaming’ and ‘issue linkage’ to provide a more general overview of documentation on the concepts. References cited in relevant books and articles identified further publications. Only materials published in English were reviewed.

This report assumes as a starting point that overlap and interaction between issue areas and other sectors may occur unintentionally and with positive or negative outcomes and externalities. Actors may also engage deliberately in strategies to generate, maintain or maximize the positive outcomes of such interactions – and here, mainstreaming and issue linkages are two such strategies.

In the IR literature, mainstreaming is generally associated with altering processes of policy-making and implementation to take into account specific interests or values. In one of the most cited works on mainstreaming, the Council of Europe noted that ‘mainstreaming requires procedural changes, such as the rethinking of approaches to policy-making, shifts in organizational culture or the creation of new channels for consultation and co-operation’ (Booth/Bennet, 2002:432). Once applied in a policy-making process, successful mainstreaming usually requires tighter coordination among policy departments that may never have worked together to achieve specific policy goals. Its successful application requires political will not only on the part of those initiating the process, but also across policy sectors, challenging long-standing mentalities of pigeon-holing and ‘silo-thinking’. Successful mainstreaming can ‘involve a reorganization of the policy process and the

⁶ <http://www.webofknowledge.com>

⁷ www.scholar.google.com

cooperation of new external political actors' (Council of Europe, 1998:14).

Issue linkage offers another approach. Issue linkage emerges as a more formal mechanism as part of international agreements, rules and norms, and has been defined as 'multilateral cooperation across different issues' (Conconi/Perroni, 2002). Issue linkage can be seen, according to Young (2002), as 'conscious efforts to make use of (regime) interplay to promote both cooperative and competitive ends constituting a domain of activities that can be thought of as the politics of institutional linkages' (Young, 2002). In a similar effort, Haas (1990:76) used the term 'issue linkage' simply to indicate a process of 'bargaining that involves more than one issue'. In short, issue linkage 'has been identified as a means to overcome collective action failure' (Betts, 2011:87). Therefore, it has generally been discussed as a negotiation strategy that 'opens up opportunities for strategic behaviour' (Young, 2002:112). This behaviour is expected to occur particularly when the actor uses issue linkage to promote his own interests rather than a solution to the common problem (Ibid.). In this way, issue linkage may at times 'play a destructive role, undermining the prospects for cooperation by introducing issues that provoke veto' by the others (Keohane, 1984). However, in most cases, countries use issue linkage to create additional side-payments that can incentivize cooperation (Keohane, 1982; Haas, 1980; Aggarwal, 2000). According to the literature, issue linkage occurs especially in asymmetric situations, when powerful countries negotiate with less powerful countries, and hence asymmetric benefits are on the horizon. Issue linkage has emerged from rather theoretical approaches and usually entails extensive reflections based on game theory. More recently, issue linkage has also been documented in the global environment literature, notably in the context of climate change, as we will see below.

As our work proceeded, this report was also informed by a new publication on global environmental governance. Involving researchers from the Fridtjof Nansen Institute, *Managing Institutional Complexity: Regime Interplay and Global Environmental Change*, edited by Oberthür and Stokke (2010), shows how *interaction* between governance areas or sectors occurs as part of a general rise in institutional complexity. This new study has informed the present report in terms of showing how mainstreaming and issue linkage are two among a range of strategies in a wider landscape where the role of various actors, the cross-sectoral nature of global challenges, and the question of implementation and effects all form part of the research frontier. The contributors' insights can be seen as complementary ways of understanding our selected strategies of issue linkage and mainstreaming. Indeed, the two strategies are embedded in a wider landscape of forms of governance and issue interactions. Although initially regarded as almost inevitably generating conflictual situations, institutional interplay has gradually come to be recognized as 'interactions between regimes (that) can produce mutually beneficial and even synergetic results' (Oberthür/Stokke, 2011; Oberthür/Gehring, 2006).

Other academic attempts have shown what other forms such overlaps can assume. Raustiala and Victor (2004), for example, discuss the regime

complex, as a ‘collective of partially overlapping and non-hierarchical regimes’ that are ‘laden with legal inconsistencies because the rules in one regime are rarely coordinated closely with overlapping rules in related regimes’. This circumstance may lead to disaggregated decision-making processes in the various regimes, often resulting in poorly coordinated and thus incoherent action-making for the policy issue involved (Raustiala/Victor, 2004; Alter/Meunier, 2009). Together, these overlaps like regime complex, international regime complexities or institutional interplay have become increasingly prominent in many global governance realms. Indeed, in the case of global environmental governance, they are more at the research core than issue linkage or mainstreaming, as the section on the global issue of environment will demonstrate.

3 Integrating health into non-health global governance arenas: Opportunities and challenges

The global health issue – and here the Oslo Ministerial Group is a case in point – shows how global governance sectors increasingly work as complex multi-actor and multi-sector compositions where countries adjust their conduct of foreign policy-making. Foreign policy is traditionally seen as the relations of one country vis-à-vis other countries, yet it is constituted and conducted in complex domestic and international settings. Increasingly, however, foreign policy also concerns the roles that countries play in various arenas of global governance. The Oslo Ministerial Group started among ministries of foreign affairs in its member countries, guided by the question of how health can be integrated into the sectors and departments within each ministry. At the same time, the Oslo Ministerial Group evolved in ways increasingly characterized by a tightening of relationship and consultation exchange among member-country diplomats at their Permanent Representations to the United Nations in Geneva. In the world’s ‘health capital’, the global health and foreign policy relationship unfolded itself much more around the question of how global health can be integrated into global governance areas beyond the organizations and initiatives set up to address health specifically. Strategies to integrate health into other global governance sectors must be seen as an approach to capture *one* realization of the global health/foreign policy relationship (that which plays out on the global level) – and, in particular, the role that state actors can play.

References to today’s unique interdependence between health and foreign policy usually point to economic and technological interconnectedness, accompanied by mention of the unprecedented rise in travel worldwide: all factors that have caused public health risks to become global and that have therefore necessitated new forms of international cooperation (Council of Foreign Relations, 2010). As noted in the introduction, the 2011 report of the Director-General of the WHO to the UN General Assembly on Global Health and Foreign Policy offers an overview of how ‘governments and the multilateral system are working with a number

of sectors to address health issues in order to influence better health outcomes', or *global governance for health* (United Nations General Assembly A/66/497, 2011:2). Three examples highlighted in the report occurred in 2011: The Open-Ended Working Group on Pandemic Influenza Preparedness (WHO, with contributions from WIPO), the collaboration between the ILO and WHO on the *Social Protection Floor* as an integrated set of policies addressing health and social inequities; and the collaboration between WHO and the International Telecommunications Union on the *UN Commission on Information and Accountability for Women's and Children's Health* (Ibid.:8). Other examples include earlier negotiations on intellectual property rights (under the WTO) and access to medicines, as well as the interactions between the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control and international trade policy. The report A/66/497 also notes how health is linked to climate change, sustainable development, development assistance and labour migration. Clearly, then, there is considerable policy experience with how health links in with other governance sectors.

Documentation of experiences with negotiations, governance and policy-making indicates that many global health issues are becoming increasingly politicized. The UN General Assembly report mentions the World Health Assembly and the WHO as a unique 'point of convergence' for discussions on global health, but notes that the issues have moved out of purely technical arenas of global public health and now touch on more complex and controversial issues. According to the report, due to such developments, 'the World Health Assembly has engaged more frequently and proactively', indicating greater involvement of member states and thereby also stronger links to foreign policy (Ibid.:6).

Along with the politicization of global health issues, many global health-relevant conferences showcase a pattern where political obstacles block concrete cross-sectoral action. For example, it was noted that, during the negotiations leading up to the UN High-Level Meeting on Non-Communicable Diseases (NCDs):

The toughest disagreement, according to several people who attended the sessions, was over whether NCDs should be referred to as an epidemic and a public health emergency. The decision is more than rhetoric. Such a designation could allow countries to invoke flexibilities in World Trade Organization rules that permit manufacturers to make cheaper generic versions of patented drugs needed to protect the public's health. Developing countries with large generic drug industries clearly favoured the move.⁸

The developed/industrialized countries successfully repressed the official recognition of the cross-sectoral character of health and trade in order to safeguard their own trade interests. Similarly, the Rio Declaration from the 2011 World Conference on Social Determinants of Health makes no mention of trade, although it is widely acknowledged that most social determinants of health are intricately linked to trade – for example,

⁸<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/68280/sheri-fink-and-rebecca-rabinowitz/the-uns-battle-with-ncds?page=2>

through trade agreements that favour the interests of powerful industrial countries over less powerful developing countries.⁹

With health conferences growing increasingly political in nature, the regular result is outcomes based on political compromises. These in turn are often criticized by civil society and social movements as falling short of concrete positive action to advance health worldwide. The above-mentioned 2011 Rio conference is another case in point. Its final outcome document, the Rio Declaration, triggered ‘frustration over the declaration process and content ran high’, as Loewenson (2011) narrates. In fact, ‘no less than three alternative declarations were also circulated on the final day, one from the People’s Health Movement, a global civil society movement (Peoples Health Movement, 2011), one from the Latin American Association of Social Medicine (2011), and one from the International Federation of Medical Students’ Associations (2011) (Loewenson, 2011).

This growing political awareness of health at the global level can also be seen in the UN General Assembly. In January 2009, the main deliberative, policy-making and representative organ of the United Nations adopted Resolution 63/33 on Global Health and Foreign Policy (UN General Assembly A/RES/63/33, 2009).¹⁰ The resolution urges member states to ‘consider health issues in the formulation of foreign policy’ and thereby raises the profile of health radically (Fidler, 2009; Council of Foreign Relations, 2010). This development at the highest UN level, whose affirmation is reiterated through the annual adoption of subsequent UN resolutions on global health and foreign policy, represents a seminal shift: health has been recognized as being of an increasingly high-politics character at the global level, and already permeates several areas of global governance. As indicative as such resolutions are of the increased recognition of the global health/ foreign policy relationship, the mere existence of political comments on NCDs, the Rio Declaration or UN resolutions does not automatically integrate global health into foreign policy-making.

⁹ See, for example, the speech of Professor David Sanders he gave on the closing day of the World Conference on Social Determinants of Health:

<http://cmdss2011.org/site/opinioes/we-should-stand-up-for-the-poor-people-that-are-paying-for-the-crisis-of-capitalism/>

¹⁰ The UN Resolution 63/33 on Health and Foreign Policy was followed by the UN resolutions 64/108 and 65/27 of the year 2010. While the first Resolution 63/33 had been rather procedural in nature, primarily recognizing the relationship of global health and foreign policy, the two more recent resolutions are more substantive in that they call for action steps to be undertaken in order to ensure long-term global health outcomes. Having the UN Member States agreeing by consensus on such a historical resolution is more than remarkable, especially because the official document does not focus – as it used to in the past (e.g. UN resolutions on malaria, sickle cell anemia) – on specific health problems, but rather highlights the holistic, global character of health and its intimacy with the countries’ foreign policies. UN General Assembly. (2009). General Assembly Adopts 28 Drafts Texts on Fourth Committee’s Recommendation. Retrieved 12.12.2010, from <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2009/ga10902.doc.htm>

Although numerous articles and books have been published on global health and foreign policy in recent years (Kickbusch, 2003, 2009; Feldbaum et al., 2010), the first report of the Initiative notes that there have been few attempts at empirically analysing the cross-sectoral interaction of health issues and its relation to foreign policy and global governance. Such studies could show how the relation between non-communicable diseases and trade unfolds in reality, and the kinds of decisions involved in this interaction. There is equally a need to build knowledge across health issues of governance challenges and experiences of state and non-state actors who seek to manage interlinkages (Eggen/Sending, 2012). In an exploratory attempt to document accumulated knowledge on cross-sectoral interlinkages, we now turn to the three selected global issues and their integration into various foreign policy spheres.

4 Learning lessons from cross-sectoral governance challenges

a) The integration of environment into global trade governance

The global issue of environment is tightly linked with today's globalization dynamics and undoubtedly represents a cross-sectoral challenge. Such cross-sectoral challenges offer possibilities for issue linkage and mainstreaming, and the case of the environment and global trade governance seemed especially pertinent. The essential environmental challenge for the world is to curb environmental damage, which is often the result of the increased scale of global economic activity. 'International trade constitutes a growing portion of that growing scale, making it increasingly important as a driver of environmental change. As economic globalization proceeds and the global nature of many environmental problems become more evident, there is bound to be friction between the multilateral systems of law and policy governing both.'¹¹ Without doubt, environment and trade have much to lose as well as much to win from each other, as Messerlin (2010) notes.

In the scholarly literature, the trade/environment discourse has tended to focus on the various forms of interplay these two policy areas can take. There is little discussion of issue linkage as a potential concept for bridging trade/environment dynamics, whereas a sizable literature can be found on regime complexity (See Raustiala/Victor, 2004; Alter/Meunier, 2009) and issue interplay.¹² Often at the core of such concepts is the attempt to illustrate and analyze how environmental regulation and international competitiveness may involve conflicts but also opportunities (Neary, 2006). The answer to tackling such complexities is found in 'overlap management', and has come to the fore at the World Trade Organization, which offers a range of institutional mechanisms for dis-

¹¹ <http://www.iisd.org/trade/handbook/default.htm>

¹² 'The problem of interplay concerns interactions between and among regimes created to address specific issues, such as climate and trade that belong to separate issue areas. Gehring (2011)

cussing the trade/environment interface. These include the Committee on Trade and Environment, as well as the committees and councils which administer agreements that can be relevant to environmental regimes including those on Technical Barriers to Trade, Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures, Subsidies and Countervailing Measures, Trade in Services and Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (Stokke, 2004). And yet, the WTO's 'dispute settlement system has remained the most visible and contentious site of trade–environment overlap management' (Sikina, 2010:57). Approaching the issue through the lens of environmental policy-making, observers have contended that the WTO undermines the effectiveness of multilateral environmental agreements, with no equally powerful World Environmental Organization in existence (Gehring/Faude, 2010). As a result, 'rather than working with environmental organization partners to negotiate solutions in specific areas of overlapping concern, the WTO is figuring out, internally, how it understands its relationship to, and interaction with, environmental issues' (Sikina, 2010:56). This situation is aggravated, as Oberthür and Stokke (2011) argue, by the circumstance that institutional complexes where environmental issues overlap with organizations, like the WTO, often suffer a status-quo bias: 'More often than not, ensuring appropriate environmental protection requires change rather than preserving the status quo' (Oberthür/Gehring, 2011:333).

In their recent work on managing the institutional complexity between trade and the environment, Oberthür and Stokke (2011) conclude: 'surprisingly little is known about the extent to which, how and with what effect relevant actors or groups of actors have dealt with and improved institutional interaction and its effects. More empirical research into existing interplay management efforts and their performance over time may help in advancing our knowledge about the most promising strategies and the conditions for their successful implementation' (Oberthür/Stokke, 2011:51). Oberthür and Gehring note (2011:336), 'knowledge is needed on the question under which actors choose to pursue problem-solving interplay management aiming to enhance global environmental governance as opposed to strategic interplay management to advance their own agendas'.

Notwithstanding the above-mentioned research gaps, let us turn to the two selected environmental sub-fields of climate change, and biodiversity. Here an analytical body of knowledge exists that may offer insights as to how these global issues have been integrated into the foreign-policy sphere of trade.

Climate change and its integration into global trade governance

Climate change has become a highly political issue at the global level in recent decades. The relevant literature points to two explanations: On the one hand, it appears that this increased attention to climate change in a broader socio-economic and political context has been a product of issue

linkage with other environmental problems that were more salient at the time climate change emerged as a global issue.¹³ On the other hand, the salience of climate change has also been traced back to the political structure within which the policy issue was sought to be effectively confronted. In the words of Young (2002:119f), ‘the decision to create a negotiating committee for climate change reporting directly to the UNGA signalled both that the North–South dimensions of the (climate change) problem would figure prominently in regime creation and that climate change would become a matter of ‘high’ politics rather than one regarded as suitable for largely scientific or exclusively environmental consideration’.

As noted, we see mainstreaming as a potential strategy that works along the horizontal dimension, across various global governance spheres. However, it also became clear that the mainstreaming strategy in the context of climate change represents a showcase example of how mainstreaming has usually been treated. In the literature on climate change, mainstreaming is explicitly regarded as a top–down, vertical approach used to place climate change adaptation mechanisms within development planning and cooperation (Kok/Coninck, 2007). Mainstreaming is thus applied as a strategy through which national agencies can effectively integrate policies aimed at mitigating climate change and thereby ‘adapting’ to its potential impacts.¹⁴ While literature exists that discusses mainstreaming practices at the national level and compares the levels of advancement in terms of turning policies and programmes conducive to climate change adaptation, mainstreaming does not seem to have received equal consideration as regards the global level.

Let us now turn to the strategy of issue linkage. Most of what has been written about climate change and issue linkage does not document empirical cases where issue linkage has occurred, but rather advocates using issue linkage as a strategy for further advancing the global regime on climate change. This is the case for more recent literature (Kemfert, 2004; Van Asselt/Gupta/Biermann, 2005; Buchner/Carraro, 2006), but also for the literature produced on the creation of the Kyoto Protocol (Lipschutz/Peck, 2010:191). Moreover, it would appear that no study has yet been published on issue linkage dynamics within the UNFCCC, even though this framework was initiated through discussions as early as 1995. The policy issue of climate change has tended to be embedded in debates over environmental regulation and international competitiveness, creating

¹³ According to UNEP, ‘the rise of stratospheric ozone depletion to the political agenda forced a certain amount of political attention in at least some national and international arenas to the issue of climate change.’ United Nations Environment Programme (2011). Web page. <http://new.unep.org/IEACP/iea/training/manual/module3/1061.aspx>. This helped climate change to appear on the global policy-making agendas and has since become significantly more political in character than other environmental issues, such as the rise of stratospheric ozone depletion due to the close issue overlaps between climate change and trade and energy.

¹⁴ As an integration method, it has been vividly discussed in climate change discussions, notably at the more recent Conference of the Parties (COPs) at the international level, as well as within some development funding agencies at the national level. Huq/ Reid (2004).

a considerable potential for issue linkage at the interface of environment and trade (Neary, 2006:96). Indeed, several studies offer suggestions on how to link climate change with trade (Barrett, 1995; Conconi/Perroni, 2000; Whalley, 1991). What most of these have in common is that their linkage suggestions are intended to advance the climate change regime. Similar intentions are offered through contributions that discuss the issue linkage of climate change with research and development incentives (Carraro/Buchner, 2004; Hovi/Skodvin, 2008).¹⁵ Despite these insightful writings, remarkably little has been published in form of written accounts of issue linkage that has in fact occurred and is analyzed empirically.¹⁶ However, although their linkage has become apparent – not least through cross-sectoral issues, such as subsidies, standards and labels, and free allocation of emissions allowances – ‘any attempt to address the numerous interlinkages between trade and climate in the context of an eventual framework for an integrated, comprehensive climate regime, continues to end in rancour’ (Meléndez-Ortiz/Jegou, 2011).

Even though little has been documented on issue linkages at the interface of climate change and trade, such linkages have indeed occurred. Looking at the Kyoto Protocol, we believe that the ‘flexibility mechanisms’ stipulated there represent one form of issue linkage between climate change and trade, as they foresee the creation of markets for greenhouse gas emission reductions through project-based emissions crediting or emissions trading. While Hübler and Keller (2009) note that the Clean Development Mechanism, the most-discussed flexibility arrangement in the Kyoto Protocol, represents a case of issue linkage between climate change and trade, they do not elaborate more explicitly on this. The Clean Development Mechanism aims at enhancing co-operation among industrialized and developing countries in order to achieve sustainable development and reduce emissions. It is based on the principle of trading emission reduction offsets, created in the style of a typical trade agreement (Streck, 2004).

Biodiversity and its integration into global trade governance

We now turn to biodiversity.¹⁷ This issue and its overlaps through the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) with global trade governance clearly illustrate the challenges that arise with overlapping issue areas or regime complexities, as Rosendal (2006) and Raustiala/Victor (2004) have discussed. The elements that together constitute the biodiversity sphere are undisputed, so as such they do not generate significant controversy. The political conflict around biodiversity has emerged only

¹⁵ For climate change and issue linkage with cooperation on research and development, see: Kemfert (2004); Carraro/Siniscalco (1997); Kemfert (2002); Buchner/Carraro/Cersosimo/Marchiori (2002).

¹⁶ For a similar conclusion, see: Conceição-Heldt, Eugénia da (2008).

¹⁷ Today’s standard definition posits that biodiversity is ‘the total sum of all the plants, animals, fungi and microorganisms on Earth, all of their genetic variations and phenotypic variation and all of the communities and ecosystems that they comprise.’ Raven (2009); Richerzhagen (2010).

as the result of countries becoming aware of the actual loss of biodiversity, entailing reductions in the size of natural areas and changes in ecosystem conditions.¹⁸

In the wake of biodiversity loss worldwide, a chasm has emerged between the developed and the developing countries, with different political, economic and natural interests at stake. This in turn has brought recognition of the growing need for political action, raising the global salience of biodiversity. This shift has been described as ‘a story (of genetic resources that) begins with the principle of a common heritage of mankind and ends with patents and national sovereignty’ (Rosendal, 2000:20). Scholars like Rosendal (2000; 2006) have noted the emergence of new biotechnologies able to carve out the maximum potential utility areas of genetic resources worldwide – potential that has resulted in unprecedented economic interests being linked to genetic resources. ‘One combined effect of these (...) trends has been a greatly enhanced interest in intellectual property rights and in access to genetic resources and associated technologies’ (Rosendal, 2006: 79). Indeed, ‘most of the world’s terrestrial species biodiversity is located in developing countries’ (Ibid.). While the developing countries are home to this natural treasure, it is the developed or industrialized countries that are the main users of biological resources (Ibid.). The developing world is thus confronted with a double burden. On the one hand, they face the ongoing loss of biodiversity, largely as the result of unintended side effects of the ‘human-induced destruction of habitats for the purpose of converting forest into agricultural land’ (Richerzhagen, 2010:14). On the other hand, most of the genetic resources extracted from developing countries are processed in industrialized countries, often without significant compensation to the resource-providing countries from the developing world. With these biodiversity access and benefits-sharing imbalances emerging, shifting perceptions arose as to the patentability of genetic resources. Historically, biological products or processes were originally excluded from patentability. However, this has changed significantly in recent decades, resulting in a deep conflict between the countries of the North and the South.

These North/South fault-lines became especially evident during the 1990s with the establishment of the most important legal agreement on biodiversity, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and its delicate regime overlaps, most notably with the WTO TRIPS Agreement; a conflictual situation that has provided grounds for issue linkage strategies and that has continued to challenge the preservation of biodiversity. A crucial element that distinguished the objectives of the CBD negotiations from the TRIPS consultations was ‘the early decision to include the issues of access to genetic resources on the CBD agenda, which established the link to domesticated biological resources and emphasized the need for equitable sharing of benefits’(Ibid.:97). In contrast, the main objective of the TRIPS negotiations involved the protection of intellectual property. There was strong advocacy during the

¹⁸ Biodiversity loss is synonym to a reduction in the size of natural areas and a change in ecosystem conditions. Martens/Rotmans/de Groot (2003).

TRIPS negotiations for the harmonization and strengthening of domestic patent legislation in all WTO member states and within all fields of technology, including biotechnology. This approach affected the policy areas that formed part of the biodiversity context, which suddenly faced the challenge of being subjected to the more immediate intellectual property issues of the TRIPS negotiations agenda. Biodiversity gained importance only later, when the issue became linked to raw materials and technological innovation (Ibid.).

The linkages between international property rights in biotechnology and access/benefit-sharing had been increasingly recognized internationally and therefore also became an intensively debated issue in the TRIPS negotiation context. However, this heightened awareness could not mitigate the fact that the two regimes have remained embedded in very different principles. As Rosendal (2000:144) notes: ‘The CBD builds on the principles that environmental concerns and equity should take precedence over economic concerns, while the WTO is based on the principles of trade liberalization’.

In this context of linking biodiversity to TRIPS, the important biodiversity element of access and benefit-sharing has been a central topic for issue linkage. The advocacy of intellectual property rights in the TRIPS context triggered concerns that led to strengthening the access and benefits-sharing issue in the negotiations leading up to the Convention on Biological Diversity. This move within the CBD context occurred because many countries, especially from the South, did not regard strengthened intellectual property rights and patent legislations as stipulated in the TRIPS Agreement as helpful to the objective of creating incentives for biodiversity conservation in the South. The fact that access and benefit-sharing of biodiversity was affected by the TRIPS Agreement negotiation certainly did not help to promote biodiversity conservation. After all, the TRIPS Agreement was established to strengthen and harmonize intellectual property rights in all fields of technology, including biotechnology, and is thus fundamentally different from the objectives of the CBD. Strengthened intellectual property rights and patent legislation were not deemed helpful for fostering incentives for biodiversity conservation in the South. This created a major impetus for the developing countries to push for access- and benefit-sharing rights in the CBD negotiations as a counterweight to the TRIPS regulations, not least given the significant discrepancy of the two regimes and their objectives. ‘Whereas the CBD does not embody legal and economic enforcement mechanisms, patents and intellectual property rights in general are legally enforceable under the WTO-dispute settlement procedure’ (Rosendal, 2006: 92). This elementary institutional strength of TRIPS has trickled down to the national level, so that ‘most developed countries have complied with the TRIPS obligation of a strengthened patent system, but have not established legislation for access and benefits sharing with the CBD’ (Ibid.:94). In other words, the hard power of the TRIPS Agreement has trumped the rather soft power of the CBD. On the other hand, this conflicting relationship of CBD and TRIPS on

biodiversity has been recognized by the WTO and the CBD, as well as other third institutions, and efforts have now been initiated to mitigate the conflict and increase synergies (Ibid.).

Despite such mitigation efforts, the example above shows how the interaction of various issue areas can harm the implementation of the respective global issue, especially when issue linkage occurs across institutions with different principles and powers. So far, it is hard to see positive results coming from all efforts to conserve biodiversity worldwide, and many authors have focused on this deplorable situation. The common denominator of such criticism is guided by the reality that biodiversity is still declining. Mace et al. (2010) contend that biodiversity loss is not only continuing but in fact accelerating, ‘largely because the major drivers of biodiversity loss persist, often at increasing intensity’.

Interaction between the issue areas of biodiversity and trade may well have been influenced by prior strategic moves. Several authors have commented on the nature of the political forum within which the biodiversity negotiations took place. As Rosendal (2001) has argued, ‘choosing the UN forum to advocate an environmental agenda could (already) be seen as a strategic move on the part of the North. The UN Conference on Environment and Development was clearly the best forum in which to achieve some kind of environmental concessions from the South, whereas the WTO may still be used strategically by the North to maintain its economic interests’. Raustiala and Victor (2004) expect actors to attempt to select that particular policy-making forum that has the highest potential to serve their interests. There is yet another potential pitfall in analyzing issue- and regime crossovers that occurred in the context of biodiversity: overlooking those documented cases where deliberate attempts to connect the one issue are with the other were not successful. There is documentation of the actions of some countries – like India, which openly opposed further strengthening and harmonization of domestic patent legislation through the WTO/TRIPS regime as this would have undermined incentives to protect and conserve genetic resources in the South, and in a broader sense reduce the incentives for biodiversity conservation. It could be argued that India was one of the first countries to advocate the primacy of the CBD over TRIPS Article 27.3(b), which was most relevant for the efficiency of the CBD (Sell, 2002).¹⁹ India’s move can be regarded as one more proof of the emerging realization that the two regimes – the CBD and TRIPS – affected the management of genetic resources differently. This circumstance also seemed to have played a role in the only contribution we found that explicitly discusses the use of issue linkage in the context of biodiversity and its connection with trade. Raustiala and Victor (2004:299) recall the divide between developing and developed countries and how the latter sought to link the IP agenda to issue of biodiversity:

¹⁹ Sell further said that The CBD, unlike TRIPS, recognizes the rights of indigenous cultures to preserve their knowledge and resources (Article 8j) and that ‘it stresses that biological resources are sovereign resources of states whereas TRIPS enforces private property rights over them.’

Created under the auspices of the UN Environment Programme, the negotiations that lead to the CBD originally centered on conservation—a key issue for many industrialized countries and a logical focus for the environment ministries that dominated the UN Environment Programme. The UN Environment Programme like FAO was an open forum with low barriers to entry. Thus developing countries found it relatively easy to graft their (intellectual property) IP agenda onto the CBD Negotiations. What they were unable to achieve in other fora — notably TRIPs — developing countries tried to gain through linkages to biodiversity. The result was two diverging and distinct sets of rules, with the CBD rules on IP — mostly related to benefit-sharing — partly undercutting those in TRIPs. This divergence in substantive rules occurred despite the fact that the CBD and the WTO have broadly the same membership. The two institutions offered two distinct fora, with different bureaucratic representation, leading to different expressions of state interests and issue linkages. One institution, dominated by environment ministries and also open to participation by nongovernmental organizations, was attractive to those who wanted sovereign property rights and mandated redistribution of the benefits of PGR (plant genetic resources): hence the adoption of the language and discourse of ‘protecting’ raw PGR and preserving biodiversity. The other institution, populated by finance and trade ministers and largely inaccessible to nongovernmental organizations, has focused much more narrowly on property rights as an economic spur to innovation. Environmental ministries have launched a free-wheeling discussion on redistribution of wealth and property rights within the CBD.

The interplay between the TRIPs and CBD negotiations also generated aspects that came to influence the standing of the Convention on Biological Diversity in a positive way. For example, the fact that biodiversity-related aspects (like biotechnology, genetic resources and access and benefit-sharing) were linked to the negotiation agendas has arguably contributed to the growing legitimacy of the CBD objectives (Ibid.). We have also made an observation with regard to the rather general potential of biodiversity for issue linkage. Several authors have mentioned that the CBD was too ambitious in that it enumerated too many objectives without prioritizing clearly. Also noted has been the lack of attention to mainstreaming biodiversity across domestic policy sectors, which hampers the stimulation of national and regional implementation of biodiversity objectives (Chandra/Idrisova, 2011).

Summing up on the interplay between the environment and trade, and more specifically on climate change and biodiversity and their interfaces with the global governance sphere of trade, we can recapitulate the following. Firstly, the significance of power hierarchies among and between institutions must not be *underestimated* – for institutions embedded in one specific sphere of governance, but particularly when two different policy areas become interconnected. As shown above, the general policy-making interplay between the environment and trade has

often gravitated towards the institutional asymmetry existing in the two policy areas. Whereas the trade governance sphere is greatly influenced by the WTO, the policy sphere of the environment has no similarly influential regulatory organization. As a result, environmental issues, once overlapping with the trade governance sphere, are often subject to trade dynamics and vested interests. The case of biodiversity and its interaction with trade issues exhibits a similar pattern, where the hard power of the TRIPS Agreement has trumped the less powerful CBD stipulations. It is hard to imagine how these tendencies can have positive effects on the realization of the respective environmental goals.

b) The emergence of migration²⁰ in global security governance

Here we focus one type of migration type: humanitarian migration, which is based on the concept that individuals should be permitted entry to a receiving country because refusal could endanger their lives or well-being.²¹ This category includes both refugees and asylum seekers. The Global Commission on International Migration, launched by the UN Secretary-General and several governments in 2003, concluded in their comprehensive final report that the global governance sphere of migration is characterized by a proliferation of international institutions and global initiatives (GCIM, 2005:72). As a result, the ‘responsibility for the legal, normative and human rights dimensions of international migration is rather diffused with the UN system’, as well within the broader global migration environment (Ibid.:63). This situation, it can be argued, is also the result of the situation that the UN does not have one distinct specialized agency for dealing comprehensively with the global issue of migration. Moreover the most recently established intergovernmental institution set up to deal with migration issues, the IOM, operates outside the UN system.²²

²⁰ According to the United Nations, a migrant is defined as ‘as someone entering a country for twelve months or longer’. Adamson (2006)

²¹ Today, nation-states are increasingly confronted with the challenge of determining the factors according to which a migrant can be granted or refused entry. See Adamson (2006:170). Especially the policy issue of non-voluntary migration that migration has seen an upsurge of interest worldwide, perhaps due to globalization and securitization dynamics. Graham (2000). It has been held that the terrorist attacks on 9/11 in the USA have had a considerable impact on how migration has been perceived since. Adamson (2006). See also: Ibrahim (2005); Betts (2009).

²² www.ilo.int. In past decades, various actors have been actively involved at the interface of migration and security, shaping how migration is perceived and handled at the global level. This article focuses only on selected institutions considered to have been significant actors in shaping the migration–security nexus. For example, some studies have concluded that the migration–security relationship should be seen as a consequence of changes within in the UN Security Council. ‘Although the UN has traditionally remained tied within a state-centric framework and refuses to interfere in the domestic matters of individual countries, today the organization is increasingly involved in rectifying gross violations of human rights in the international system.’ Barnett (2002). This seminal change also represents the general UN shift away from state security towards human security and catalyzed critical new approaches to address the global challenge of migration.

Turning to the case of the UNHCR, the only migration-related UN body (Betts, 2009), we find that issue linkage has only been (attempted to be) established between humanitarian migration and security. Betts (2009) distinguishes between tactical and substantive issue linkage; it has been particularly the latter that has been applied to the refugee regime, especially the self-conception and role of the UNHCR to ‘create, change, or highlight the ideational, institutional, or material relationships between issue areas’ (Betts, 2009b:39f, 45). The UNHCR has come under growing pressure to re-position itself as a key authority in global migration governance, because a growing number of public and private actors have begun establishing themselves in the field of migration issues. This challenging situation for UNHCR has been further complicated by the circumstance that ‘Northern states increasingly prevented refugees’ access to their territories, while Southern states received inadequate support for the refugees they hosted’ (Betts, 2009a:56). UNHCR’s strategic response to these two new situations consisted of the Convention Plus initiative launched in 2003, which sought to provide a ‘more systematic and structured approach to finding lasting solutions to refugee situations, especially protracted refugee situations, through more effective means of inter-state cooperation and burden-sharing.’²³

The Convention Plus initiative (2003–2005) attempted to create a normative framework for burden-sharing that could then be applied to overcome specific long-standing refugee situations in the South. Ultimately, the initiative was characterized by North–South polarization and failed. The basis of the project was to persuade both the North and South to agree to a set of differentiated but complementary commitments. Northern states were to make financial and resettlement commitments; in return, Southern states were to commit to enhance their refugee protection capacity and make local integration and self-sufficiency available to refugees. The initiative was explicitly premised on issue linkage in two ways: (1) it attempted to connect these two broad commitments together by making one conditional on the other, and (2) it appealed to the North and South to fulfil these commitments on the basis of their wider interests. UNHCR appealed to Northern states on the basis of their security and migration concerns, arguing that burden-sharing and addressing protracted refugee situations could serve as a means of achieving wider goals. UNHCR appealed to Southern states to commit to enhancing refugees’ access to protection as a means of attracting development assistance that could simultaneously benefit the local population. Unfortunately, the UNHCR attempt to appeal to the interests of the states in other issue areas was not perceived as credible by the states. This is because there was little structural basis on which to connect refugee protection to migration and development. The North–South impasse therefore prevailed, and the initiative did not lead to an agreement on a normative framework for burden-sharing (Betts, 2009b:50).

²³ <http://www.unhcr.org/428deac22.html>

The example above has been described as a clear attempt of substantive issue linkage, although not successful. Even though, the UNHCR did not succeed in linking migration to other issues areas, the case sheds light on the distinct role international institutions could (and sometimes do) play in the attempts to trigger substantive issue linkages among and between various policy fields. The new strategy was intended to complement the existing legal body of the UNHCR, most notably the 1951 Convention, which had proven inadequate for dealing with new global complexities in an increasingly imbalanced world. The Convention Plus Initiative attempted to ‘facilitate a “grand bargain” on the allocation of responsibility for refugee protection, whereby Northern states could meet their interest in limiting irregular migration through contributing to refugee protection in the South. The initiative thereby attempted to use issue linkage to connect Northern states’ interests in migration to refugee protection’ (Betts, 2009a:56). In other words, issue linkage was used as a strategy by the UN agency to connect the selected interests of developed countries on more popular migration topics to as yet less popular issues also related to migration. Clearly, the UNHCR used issue linkage as a strategy to ‘channel states’ wider concerns with migration and security into a commitment to refugee protection’ (Ibid.:57). By doing so, the UNHCR tried to re-gain its grounds of authority in an ever-crowded landscape of institutions dealing with migration, which had affected state strategies in increasingly bypassing UNHCR through engagement with alternative international forums, ‘to limit the arrival of asylum seekers onto their territory, thereby escaping their obligations under the 1951 Convention’ (Ibid.).

Summing up the case of the migration–security nexus, let us recall the most pertinent parameters that affect the politics of global migration. They may have the potential to indicate why – despite our expectations – remarkably little issue linkage on their relationship has been documented in the relevant literature. Important here is the fact that the policy field of migration is characterized by a considerable fragmentation of actors, also within the UN family – thus, the policy environment is characterized by the absence of capacity to ‘formulate and implement effective migration policies’ (GCIM, 2005:2). The incentives to engage in issue linkage seem to be particularly low for states. This may be a result of the absence of a ‘formal global governance system for international migration, involving the establishment of new international legal instruments or agencies’ (Ibid). As the general literature on issue linkage tends to locate state engagement in issue linkage in negotiation contexts, one could expect an increasing use of issue linkage by countries, if more international regulation was established around migration issues. Moreover, many governments still do not perceive the global issue of migration as a high-priority issue in international politics. Although several UN resolutions mention migration in connection with security,²⁴ the potential of linking

²⁴ Some of the first migration-related resolutions were issued in 1999, including resolutions A/RES/54/138 on ‘violence against women migrant workers’, A/RES/54/166 on ‘protection of migrants’, as well as A/RES/54/212 on ‘migration and development’. None of the documents even mention security as such. Complementary to these 1999 resolutions, there exists a resolution submitted by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (A/RES/54/146), which mentions security in a broader

these two important issue areas does not seem to have been utilized to any great extent. Future research will need to look for evidence in the security environment and how security actors have in fact engaged in issue linkage around migration issues.

c) The emergence of gender from global development governance

Discussions around gender started in the 1970s, with the general objective of transforming politics. Until then, the issue had at best played ‘a marginal role in international governance. The gender term had been largely limited to a little-invoked reference in the 1948 UN Declaration, which reaffirmed the equal rights of women and men, and an occasional reference to women in the context of the UN’s support for economic and social development’ (Hafner-Burton/Pollack, 2002:347). An increasing number of gender advocates organized themselves in order to overcome the continuous production of gendered structures, for example by ensuring changes of gendered structures, which they regarded as central for addressing the root causes of gender inequality (Rao/Kelleher, 2005:59). Many of these movements were organized in transnational networks that ‘served as conduits not only of information about differing policy models and initiatives but also (...) of knowledge concerning alternative political strategies and how they may be applied to further promote policy change’ (True/Mintrom, 2001:28). Also important was the role played by internal advocates within global governance institutions, who often worked closely together with external advocacy groups (True, 2003; Razavi/Miller, 1995). Through the establishment of a broad gender movement, activists sought to ‘increase the visibility of women and the importance of gender in the policies, programmes and projects of international development agencies’ (Hafner-Burton/Pollack, 2002:347).

Although more and more actors incorporated gender mainstreaming into their discourses, the concept remained contested – most notably as to how it could be implemented and put into practice (Walby, 2005:321). Even today, it is still often overlooked that ‘gender mainstreaming is not a goal in its own right, but a necessary mechanism for achieving gender equality through the objectives of other agendas’ (Booth/Bennett, 2002:441). Gender mainstreaming is the means to the end, which is the establishment

migration context, but only addresses personal security in the absence of the notion of state security. It was only until 2005, when, for the first time in UN history, a resolution addressed the important connection between migration and security. UN resolution A/RES/60/169 on the ‘protection of migrants’ emphasized ‘the global character of the migratory phenomenon, the importance of international, regional and bilateral cooperation and dialogue in this regard, as appropriate, and the need to protect the human rights of migrants, particularly at a time in which migration flows have increased in the globalized economy and take place in a context of new security concerns (...)’. <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N05/497/74/PDF/N0549774.pdf?OpenElement>.

While this reference has since then been reiterated in all subsequent UN resolutions on the topic ‘protection of migrants’ (2006: A/RES/61/165; 2007: A/RES/62/156; 2008 A/RES/63/184, and 2009: A/RES/64/166), it remains surprising why no further specific discussions were generated on the grounds of the migration–security nexus.

of gender equality. Gender mainstreaming is a strategy in itself, and its 'implementation calls for nothing short of the wholesale transformation of the institutions and processes of government' (Beveridge/ Nott/ Stephen, 2002:302). To reach this end, gender mainstreaming aims at reforming institutional processes, including the (re)organization, improvement, development and evaluation of policy processes (Council of Europe, 1998:12).

Charlesworth (2005) explains that the term 'gender mainstreaming' can be traced back to the UN Decade for Women, declared after the first UN-organized World Conference on Women held in Mexico in 1975. There, the discussion had emerged in response to increasing concerns about the effect of aid development policies on women. As the debate was thus grounded in a clear development context from the very start, it affected other concepts that had previously been relevant, like the approaches known as 'women in development' and 'gender and development'. The former term suddenly seemed inappropriate 'because it identified women as a special interest group within the development sphere needing particular accommodation'. When at first the term 'gender and development' emerged, it was seen as an advance over the former term 'because it drew attention to the impact of relations between women and men on development policies (with the) aim to change the practice of development to prevent inequality between women and men' (Charlesworth, 2005:2). Against these two concepts, gender mainstreaming was presented as a completely new strategy that 'reflected a strategic change in language and the globalization of that agenda to address gendered outcomes and promote institutional change in the "developed" world as well as the "developing" world' (True, 2003:370). Gender mainstreaming sought to broaden the concept of development to respond to women's lives, and was intended to address gender-relevant issues also outside of the sphere of development sphere (Charlesworth, 2005). It represented an important shift from pursuing specific policies on gender discrimination within the development context, to calling for the establishment of a general gender perspective in all public policies (Bustelo, 2003:383). This seminal shift did not come without externalities; many authors contend that gender mainstreaming has now become more political, not least because it politicizes traditional male and female roles (True/Mintrom, 200:31). Many UN bodies and agencies have now adopted a certain gender mainstreaming language, turning the issue into a salient topic at the global level (Charlesworth, 2005). Further, as True has noted, 'discourses of gender mainstreaming have now been extended to a whole range of global public policy issues, including not only economic development policies but also debates on international peace and security, "free" trade, human rights and democratization around the world' (True, 2003:371).

We soon realized that most of the literature consulted did not deal with the concept of gender per se, but with gender mainstreaming. The 'gender literature' turned out to be a gender mainstreaming literature. Moreover, gender mainstreaming was not the first gender-based concept that had been brought into policy-making discussions: it had, as noted above, been preceded by the concepts of 'women in development' (WID) and 'gender and development' (GAD). Even though gender mainstreaming succeeded

in bringing the topic to the attention of many different organizations and forums, the strategy has been met with several well-founded criticisms. First and foremost, it has been argued that the upsurge in gender mainstreaming has been too quick, resulting in a situation where no specific institution feels exclusively responsible for the issue. A negative side-effect is that no ‘authority (can) determine which efforts to adopt (gender) mainstreaming policies are “true” as opposed to sham or misguided’ (Beveridge/Nott/Stephen, 2002:300). The rapid ascendancy of gender mainstreaming is seen as the reason why many observers are still unclear about how gender is supposed to be understood (Eveline/Bacchi, 2005:497). Potential misunderstandings of the term may further be attributed to the fact that ‘gender mainstreaming’ as a term is not easily translated into other languages (Charlesworth, 2005:299). Other scholars have warned that ‘there might be the danger of talking about gender mainstreaming without implementing it’ (Council of Europe, 1998:14; Verloo, 2002).

Together, these shortcomings entail consequences for the implementation of gender mainstreaming and effectively achieving gender equality. It is not clear whether the use of gender mainstreaming as a strategy has improved the situation of women worldwide, triggering greater equality between men and women (Bacchi/Eveline, 2010:42). Many scholars contend that gender mainstreaming does not appear to have had much impact, and that appropriate tools for measuring the impacts have often been lacking (Charlesworth, 2005; Hafner-Burton/Pollack, 2002). Drawing from all these insights, it appears that the formerly external, or independent, strategy of mainstreaming was internalized into the concept of gender to provide a more political package. This approach seems to have failed in generating tangible improvements towards greater gender equality. In addition, it could be argued that the failure of gender mainstreaming has also derogated the quality of mainstreaming as a strategy, which should be seen independently from specific gender issues. ‘Gender’ and ‘mainstreaming’ may have become too tightly intertwined. This is detrimental to mainstreaming as a generic strategy, which may work horizontally in integrating one global issue into a global governance area traditionally seen as less akin to it. The mixed policy-level experience of gender mainstreaming may thus contribute to explain why mainstreaming as a general strategy is rarely discussed in relation to other issues.

5 Comparing lessons learned – insights for how to advance health as part of foreign policy

The starting point for this study is that efforts to place an issue higher on the global political agenda and to call for cross-sectoral integration, does not automatically resolve the question of *how* this is to be done. Nor is this a straightforward task how foreign policy-makers can utilize global governance areas to advance the broad range of concerns that fall under the issue *global health*. This comparison across global issues has shown

that considerable resources, time and energy go into making sense of and attempting to manage the interaction of issues and policies on the global level. It is no longer sufficient to address the major societal challenges from a sectoral division of labour and with a short-term perspective, when the challenges themselves are interacting and interconnected as well as long-term in their impact (Kickbusch, 2011). This final section suggests some policy lessons for governmental actors on how to advance health as part of foreign policy. We draw these recommendations from the key observations emerging from our exploration of how the environment (climate change and biodiversity), migration and gender as global issues stand in interaction with other governance sectors. We conclude by indicating specific areas for further research on the health/foreign policy nexus.

Policy lesson 1: Build capacity to manage complex governance structures

Without doubt, the global policy environment is marked by the growing density of institutions and initiatives. Policy-makers will increasingly need to ‘consider the existence of several institutions co-governing an issue area’ (Oberthür/Gehring, 2011:49). Such an environment bears a high potential for conflicts, whereas issue linkage in particular offers a way of overcoming conflictual political situations. We can expect issue linkage or mainstreaming and other forms of integration attempts to become increasingly relevant for states in times where global public policy-making is steadily driven by multipolar forces. Building capacity to manage complex governance structures has also been termed ‘interplay management’, which ‘refers to conscious efforts by any relevant actor or group of actors, in whatever form or forum, to address and improve institutional interaction and its effects (Ibid.:6). We need more interplay management in global health and foreign policy which can seek ‘to enhance synergy and mitigate disruption among the relevant institutions involved’ (Ibid.). Yet, here we must bear in mind that such strategies do not always necessarily lead to positive outcomes for the global issue. Careful assessments must be undertaken as to where the use of issue linkage or mainstreaming can support the commitment to global health.

In talking about interplay management across governance sectors, we are also calling for greater capacity to operate effectively in complex, interdependent networks of organizations and systems across the public, private and non-profit sectors to co-produce public value, and to be able to measure the value produced in new ways that allow us to evaluate whether our societies are moving towards greater well-being (World Economic Forum, 2011; Kickbusch, 2011). Thus far, it has mainly been states that could influence the level of importance of a health issue at the global level. We believe that now, in the second decade of the 21st century, there are various factors that similarly affect whether or not a global health issue will receive global attention and trigger concrete policy. It has become increasingly apparent that most global health issues cannot be resolved by states alone. Nor can they be solved entirely in joint efforts with NGOs, international organizations, or public-private partnerships. Global health issues today increasingly require the active

involvement of global private industries, because they increasingly impact on parts of the nature of the global health problem. By the same token, we believe that the power of global private industries also plays a role in influencing how salient a global health issue becomes at the global level. Foreign policy-making is not solely a matter of managing complex global issues; equally important is managing the landscape of other groups and actors, which, in addition to states, impact on global issues.

Policy lesson 2: New policy concepts require new strategies to help generate concrete action

Today the trend is headed away from the traditional concept of global health governance towards recognition of the concept of governance for global health. This embraces all levels and spheres of governance (and all the actors engaged) and their impact on health at the global level.²⁵ ‘Governance for global health’ is significantly different from ‘global health governance’, because it requires a completely new way of thinking as regards the responsibility of all relevant stakeholders, public and private actors alike, to work towards global health objectives. Governance for global health means taking responsibility for all determinants of health in innovative ways. ‘Many of the major determinants of health inequalities lie outside the health sector and therefore require non-health sector policies to (coordinate) them’ as they positively/negatively impact on health (Townsend/ Davidson/Whithead, 1992; Whitehead-/Diderichsen, et al. 2000; Bambra et al., 2005).²⁶

The Oslo 2007 Ministerial Declaration on Global Health and Foreign Policy mentioned ‘governance for health’, but without further specifying the term – merely noting that ‘governance for health is an aspect of deepening global democracy within regional and global institutions’ (Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Brazil, France, et al., 2007). The most recent UN resolution on Global Health and Foreign Policy acknowledges for the first time the increasing importance of governance for global health,²⁷ stating that ‘it requires the discussion of the role of the state and

²⁵ Both ‘global governance for health’ and ‘governance for global health’ indicate that a cross-sectoral governance approach is needed to advance health objectives. Both concepts relocate global health in a more holistic governance realm (whether by looking only at the global level as the latter concept does, or by implying the local, national, regional *and* global spheres, as with the first concept).

²⁶ See also Buse/Lee (2005); Dogson/Lee/Drager (2002) Lee/Dogson (2000); Kickbusch (2011).

²⁷ The three consecutive UN Resolutions of the General Assembly on ‘Global Health and Foreign Policy’ reveal an interesting evolving pattern as regards the growing attention to ‘governance. The first resolution on the subject, A/RES/63/33, did not all at mention the term ‘governance’; about a year later, the succeeding resolution, A/RES/64/108 referred to ‘governance’ once, but only in a general context.²⁷ In 2010, the third and most recent UN resolution, A/RES/65/95 mentioned the term ‘governance’ four times, out of which the resolution refers to ‘governance for global health’. UN General Assembly (2009). 63/33 Global health and foreign policy. A/RES/63/33. UN. New York; UN General Assembly (2010). 64/108 Global health and foreign policy. A/RES/64/108. UN. New York; UN; and General Assembly (2010). 65/95 Global Health and Foreign Policy. A/RES/65/95. UN. New York

other stakeholders in improving the coordination, coherence and effectiveness' (UNGA A/RES/65/95, 2010). In doing so, the resolution reflects the increasing recognition worldwide that a broader approach towards governance for health is needed to promote joint action within the health and non-health sectors, on the part of public and private actors and the general public, in a common cause.

New concepts often require strategies that can help to generate concrete action. With 'governance for global health', strategies must be formulated that foster enhanced coordination across sectors and actors. How to capture the interest and commitment of such diverse but undoubtedly relevant stakeholders? This brings us back to one of the initial research questions: under what conditions can strategies to integrate health into other areas of governance contribute to the advancement of health objectives worldwide?

An innovative form of cross-sector coordination could be established through the creation of *shared value*. This, as Porter and Kramer explain, is 'not philanthropy but self-interested behaviour to create economic value by creating societal value' (Porter/Kramer, 2011:77). Shared value is not social responsibility, philanthropy, or even sustainability, but a new way to achieve economic success. The concept of shared value can be defined as policies and operating practices that enhance the competitiveness of a company while simultaneously advancing the economic and social conditions in the communities in which it operates. Shared value creation focuses on identifying and expanding the connections between societal and economic progress. The concept rests on the premise that both economic and social progress must be addressed by using value principles. Organizations and government entities often see success solely in terms of the benefits achieved or the money expended. For governance for global health, a shared value approach would 'encompass consensus-building around substantive principles and distribution procedures, accurate measures of effectiveness, changes in attitudes and norms and open deliberations to resolve problems' (Porter/Kramer, 2011:67p). It would entail raising awareness among stakeholders in the various fields of global governance who might not have connected their work philosophies and actual practices with objectives related to global health. Looking into such potential forms of realizing an impact-oriented integration of health into foreign policy may give helpful ideas for what kind of strategies are needed in taking governance for global health as the conceptual base.

Research observation 1: Different actors in the global arena utilize strategies of mainstreaming and issue linkage differently

The literature on climate change and biodiversity indicates that states use issue linkage to reach agreements. It is often utilized in diplomatic circles characterized by a North/South divide, as the environmental examples of climate change and biodiversity, but also migration showed. Issue linkage emerges as a strategic attempt to overcome divergent interests or fault-

lines between (groups of) countries by tailoring differentiated but complementary commitments to a shared responsibility.

Moreover, we have seen that states seem to have rather low incentives to use issue linkage outside of governmental negotiations. Take the case of migration, for instance: This policy field characterized by considerable fragmentation of actors, also within the UN family. From this institutional disorder it follows that the policy environment has a general lack of capacity to ‘formulate and implement effective migration policies’ (GCIM, 2005:2). In particular, incentives for states to engage in issue linkage seem low when there is no ‘formal global governance system for international migration, involving the establishment of new international legal instruments or agencies’ (Ibid.).

But it is not only countries that can and do play a role in linking issues. In the case of biodiversity, it was the CBD Secretariat that has been ‘actively pursuing linkages with regimes that focus primarily on issues other than biodiversity, but whose activities are directly relevant to biodiversity concerns’ (Long, 2011).²⁸ In this way, international institutions can play a triggering role in situations where the issue linkage of certain policy issues may appear initially less salient to countries’ perceptions.

International organizations also employ the strategy of issue linkage, for example in seeking to reposition them in a changing, complex governance landscape by forging new links between issue areas. This was the case with migration and the UNHCR, as the UN agency that attempted issue linkage as a strategy to ‘channel states’ wider concerns with migration and security into a commitment to refugee protection’ (Betts, 2010). Although the UNHCR did not succeed, this case sheds light on the role international institutions may play in triggering substantive issue linkages between policy fields. Issue linkage is not necessarily practiced in order to link an entire policy field to a selected area of foreign policy: it may focus on a very specific sub-issue, as shown through the example of humanitarian migration or access and benefit-sharing in the case of biodiversity.

Finally, let us briefly turn to another actor that did *not* feature in the publications we consulted: non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

²⁸ The CBD has established such a partnership with the FAO for implementation of its agricultural biodiversity work programme, but also works with the UNFCCC, as well as with the Desertification Convention (plus the Ramsar Convention) through the Joint Liaison Group for the Rio Conventions to Promote Cooperation. The CBD is active in promoting issue linkages, and Long (2011) believes that no other international environment but the CBD identifies and promotes biodiversity preservation in such a comprehensive and pro-active way. According to Long, ‘this results from the conception of the CBD as a framework convention for biodiversity protection and from the actions of CBD officials in aligning their efforts with those of other biodiversity-focused regimes. Other important linkages that have occurred around biodiversity include the Conference of Parties (COP) of the CBD, which has recognized the value of linkages with institutions beyond the environmental area, such as the WHO and WTO.

Why there is apparently no literature on the role of NGOs in relation to the use of issue linkage and mainstreaming? Do these actors use such strategies at all? And if so, how different is their practice and the outputs/outcomes? Future research should include such questions.

Research observation 2: Strategies work differently to address horizontal versus vertical interplay

Horizontal interplay ('different sectors of policy-making relevant to a specific topic') is distinct from vertical interplay ('different levels of policy-making') (Karlsson-Vinkhuyzen/Kok, 2011:285). Cross-sectoral coherence is necessary with the horizontal dimension, which entails cross-sectoral collaboration across international organizations and other stakeholders at the global level. Issue linkage seems to be discussed mainly along the horizontal dimension – note that Young (2002: 111) refers to this specific focus of issue linkage as a 'horizontal interplay', which must be regarded as a result of the density of institutional arrangements. The literature suggests that attempts have been made to link trade as a governance realm horizontally with various global issues (e.g. climate change or access and benefit-sharing aspects of biodiversity), whereas the field of development assistance seems to offer examples of vertical mainstreaming, as seen in the cases of climate change and gender.

Mainstreaming as a strategy has mostly found its way into literature as a vertical dimension. In the climate change literature, mainstreaming is explicitly regarded as a top-down, vertical approach used to emplace climate change mechanisms in development planning and cooperation (Kok/Coninck, 2007). Some scholars have discussed vertical mainstreaming in an environmental context (Persson/Klein, 2009). While there are some studies that discuss mainstreaming practices at the national level and compare levels of achievement in terms of shifting policies and programmes conducive to climate change adaptation, mainstreaming does not seem to have been equally considered at the global level. We believe that mainstreaming can also be useful for practice at the global level – across countries, international organizations, secretariats and relevant initiatives.

We do not yet know and understand everything about issue linkage, a shortcoming that might become increasingly challenging as interactions become more complex and thus allow for a possible rise of issue linkage in the future (Betts, 2011:87). Furthermore, over the past three decades, global policy-making has increasingly generated issue linkages among the numerous policy issues that governments, as well as all other public and private stakeholders must contend with.

Research observation 3: How do we assess the high-politics vs. low-politics character of a global issue?

We have argued that the two main global issues in focus in this report have been selected on the basis of characteristics similar to global health. For one thing, environmental issues such as climate change and bio-

diversity, but also migration and gender have traditionally been considered as rather low-politics issues and have seen a recent significant upsurge of attention in foreign policy-making. The documentation we consulted, however, does not reinforce this assumption. We found that both climate change and biodiversity were subjected to trade dynamics and interests. This gives rise to the question of whether such environmental issues can in fact be considered as high-politics issues, since they at least seem to be less powerful than one of the undisputed high-politics issues: trade. The trade governance realm has paid increasing attention to climate change and biodiversity (or more specifically: its access and benefits-sharing elements), but it appears that this attention has been warranted much more because of the interlinkages with trade than because of their basic objectives like mitigating climate change or halting the loss of biodiversity. By the same token, we should critically assess the localization of global health along the low-politics vs. high-politics spectrum. Has global health really become a high-politics issue? And if so, is it considered a high-politics issue because of its objectives – or because of its close interlinkages with more traditional high-politics areas like security and trade?

Issue linkage and mainstreaming can easily become goals in their own right, with the focus on agenda-setting in order to propel an issue onto the global political agenda becoming an end more than a means. There is room for further investigating the conditions under which the rise of issues on the global political agenda leads to improved outcomes. Such knowledge should inform how global health issues are to be integrated into various areas of foreign policy, particularly if the main objective is to achieve better health worldwide.

Future research lesson 1: How can foreign policy areas open up to global health?

The explorative comparison across issue areas shows that the mere use of issue linkage or mainstreaming in connection with a global issue does not necessarily result in greater global relevance. This finding has direct implications for our initial research question. We realized that the question – how can global health be made integral to foreign policy realms and global governance processes associated with these? – might not necessarily illuminate all possible approaches available to the global community. In fact, the general expectation of achieving greater salience for global health across global governance areas might prove misleading, as it is driven by the underlying puzzle what global health actors can do to lift their issues into non-health areas of global governance. Instead, it might be better to consider asking how foreign policy areas can open up to such global issues. This complementary research question would also help to ensure the assessment of multi-directional integration processes of global health, as explained by Karlsson-Vinkhuyzen & Kok (2011:288). Multi-directional approaches to global health and foreign policy require more knowledge on how stakeholders in other governance areas are aware of incorporating health into their decision-making processes. How

are foreign policy and global governance areas already dealing with global health, and under what conditions do they make it possible to take health increasingly into account? Finally, we may ask whether there exist specific types of mechanisms or policy incentives that can trigger foreign policy and global governance sectors to open up to global health issues.

Future research lesson 2: Lack of knowledge on policy implementation, outcomes and impact

We have noted the need for more knowledge on the effects and outcomes of cross-sectoral interlinkages and attempts to manage it. Across the three areas under review, there exists literature that documents policy output, but apparently little documentation of policy implementation, the outcomes and impacts that occur as the result of integrating an issue into various fields of governance. The documentation consulted for this report reveals the need to measure implementation and impact of connections between international policies and health. This brings us back to one of the initial key questions, showing that more in-depth research is required to find answers to the challenge of how to develop analytical frameworks for assessing the impact of foreign policy domains on conditions for people's health.

Little is known about what the most promising strategies for issue linkage and their successful implementation may be; and this lack of knowledge is a problem with all the global issues highlighted in this report. Issue linkage or mainstreaming as such does not necessarily advance the objectives of the policy issue that is sought to be connected with a selected area of foreign policy. In fact, issue linkage or mainstreaming can even obstruct implementation, especially if issue linkage occurs across institutions that work with different principles and different forms of hard and soft powers. Moreover, in the case of gender mainstreaming, we have noted that many authors contend that gender mainstreaming does not appear to have led to considerable impact, and that appropriate tools for measuring the impacts are still lacking (Charlesworth, 2005; Hafner-Burton/Pollack, 2002). Today it is not clear whether the use of gender mainstreaming as a strategy has improved the situation of women and triggered greater gender equality worldwide (Bacchi/Eveline, 2010:42). Even though two issues are linked at the policy level (which many would see as a positive output), that does not mean that it helps the issue in question (often referred to in the literature as 'outcome' or 'impact'). Nor does it mean that linking a global issue to another global governance area will prove advantageous for the objectives of the global issue.

We have asked how strategies unfold differently across issues areas, and what this means for how strategies of interplay management should be used, and under what conditions, to help move global health objectives forward – and we have seen that little is known about how to address this challenge. Remarkably little has been published in form of written accounts of the issue linkage that has occurred, accompanied by empirical analysis.²⁹ As yet, we simply do not know how states have successfully

²⁹ For a similar conclusion, see Conceição-Heldt (2008).

employed issue linkage or mainstreaming as strategies. A possible explanation might be that these strategies have been practiced within the field of diplomacy, and – due to their sensitive nature – have rarely been exposed in the literature. We have noted that the potential of issue linkage to reach agreements is similarly expected within the research community. Studies that deal with climate change and issue linkage have tended not to focus on empirical cases of actual issue linkage, but instead advocate the use of issue linkage as a strategy for advancing the global regime on climate change. Similar intentions are offered in studies that discuss the issue linkage of climate change with research and development incentives (Carraro/Siniscalco, 1997; Buchner/Carraro/Cersosimo/Marchiori, 2002). Indeed, we find a significant number of studies offering suggestions on how to link climate change with trade (Barrett, 1995; Conconi/Perroni, 2000; Whalley, 1991). This observation is similar to one of the key observations found in the first report of our Research Initiative. Eggen and Sending (2012) conclude that the bulk of the global health and foreign policy literature is ‘framed around questions like “how to...”, trying to point out pathways to more successful integration of health in foreign policy. There is of course no necessary contradiction between such a policy focus and high academic quality, but it should be noted as a distinct feature of this literature’.

We should also note that experience and knowledge are emerging across global issues on the management of global institutional complexities (Oberthür/ Gehring, 2011). These approaches may be able to shed more light on how global health can be meaningfully integrated into foreign policy spheres in highly complex and overlapping governance environments. Further in-depth research on global health and foreign policy is needed to inform policy-makers how to manage the current and future governance challenges that are increasingly becoming cross-sectoral in character.

6 Bibliography

- Aggarwal, V (ed.) (2000). *Institutional Designs for a Complex World*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press
- Alter, Karen J. and Meunier, Sophie (2009). The politics of international regime complexity, *Perspectives on Politics*, 7: 13–24
- Adamson, Fiona (2006). Crossing borders: International migration and national security,; *International Security*, 31(1): 165–199
- Andresen, Steinar, Skodvin, Tora, Underdal, Arild and Wettestad, Jørgen (2000). *Science and Politics in International Environmental Regimes*. Manchester: Manchester University Press
- Axelrod, Regina S., Van Deever, Stacy D. and Vig, Norman J. (2011). Introduction: Governing the international environment, pp. 1–23 in R.S. Axelrod, S.D. Van Deever and D.L. Downie (eds), *The Global Environment*. 3rd ed. Washington DC: CQPress
- Bacchi, Carol and Eveline Joan (2010). Mainstreaming and neoliberalism: A contested relationship, pp. 39–60 in C. Bacchi and J. Eveline (eds), *Mainstreaming politics: Gendering practices and feminist theory*. Adelaide: University of Adelaide Press
- Bambra, Clare, Fox, Debbie, and Alex Scott-Samuel Fox (2005). Towards a politics of health, *Health Promotion International*, 20(2): 187–193
- Barnett, Jon, Adger, W. Neil (2007). Climate change, human security and violent conflict, *Political Geography*, 26 (6): 639–655
- Barnett, Jon (2003). Security and climate change, *Global Environmental Change*, 13(1): 7–17
- Barnett, Laura (2002). Global governance and the evolution of the international refugee regime, *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 14: 238–62
- Barrett, Scott (1995). *The Strategy of Joint Implementation in the Framework Convention on Climate Change*. UNCTAD/GID/10, Geneva
- Barrett, Scott, 1997. Towards a theory of international cooperation, in C. Carraro (ed.), *New Directions in the Economic Theory of the Environment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Betts, Alexander (2011). Substantive issue-linkage and the politics of organization, pp. 85–99 in C. Bjola and M. Kornprobst (eds), *Arguing Global Governance: Agency, Lifeworld, and Shared Reasoning*. New York: Routledge
- Betts, Alexander (2010). The Refugee Regime Complex, *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 29(1):12-37
- Betts, Alexander (2009a). Institutional proliferation and the global refugee regime, *Perspectives on Politics*, 7(1): 53–58
- Betts, Alexander (2009b). *Protection by Persuasion*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press
- Betts, Alexander (2009c). *Forced Migration and Global Politics*. Chichester: Blackwell
- Beveridge, Fiona, S. Nott, and K. Stephen (2002). Mainstreaming: a case for optimism and cynicism, *Feminist Legal Studies* 10(3): 299–311
- Bohringer, Christoph, Finus, Michael, and Vogt, Carsten (2002). *Controlling Global Warming: Perspectives from Economics, Game Theory and Public*

- Choice* (New Horizons in Environmental Economics). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar
- Booth, Christine and Bennett, Cinnamon (2002) Gender mainstreaming in the European Union: towards a new conception and practice of equal opportunities?, *European Journal of Women's Studies* 9(4): 430–446
- Bourbeau, Philippe (2011). *The Securitization of Migration: A Study of Movement and Order*. Abingdon: Routledge
- Buchner, Barbara and Carraro, Carlo (2006). US, China and the economics of climate negotiations, *International Environmental Agreements*, 6: 63–89
- Buchner, Barbara and Dall'Olio, Silvia (2005). Russia and the Kyoto Protocol: the long road to ratification, *Transition Studies Review*, 12(2): 349–382
- Buchner, Barbara, Carraro, Carlo, Cersosimo, Igor and Marchiori, Carmen (2002). *Back to Kyoto? US Participation and the Linkage between R&D and Climate Cooperation*, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan
- Buse, K. and Lee, K. (2005) *Business and Global Health Governance*. Discussion Paper no 5, Key issues in health governance project. London: London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. Geneva: WHO
- Bustelo, Maria (2003) Evaluation of gender mainstreaming: ideas from a meta-evaluation study, *Evaluation Journal* 9(4): 383–403
- Carraro, Carlo and Buchner, Barbara (2004). *Issue Linkage and Climate Regimes*. <http://www.esri.go.jp/jp/prj-rc/kankyoku/kankyoku14/04feem.pdf> Accessed 30.11.2011
- Carraro C. and Siniscalco, D. (1997). R&D cooperation and the stability of international environmental agreements, in C. Carraro (ed.), *International Environmental Negotiations: Strategic Policy Issues*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar
- Chandra, A. and Idrisova, A. (2011). Convention on Biological Diversity: a review of national challenges and opportunities for implementation, *Biodiversity and Conservation*, DOI: 10.1007/s10531-011-0141-x
- Charlesworth, Hillary (2005) Not waving but drowning: gender mainstreaming and human rights in the United Nations, *Harvard Human Rights Journal*, 18: 1–18
- Conceição-Heldt, Eugénia da (2008). Assessing the impact of issue linkage in the Common Fisheries Policy; *International Negotiation*, 13: 285–300
- Conconi, P. and Perroni, C. (2002). Issue linkage and issue tie-in in multilateral negotiations, *Journal of International Economics*, 57: 423–447
- Commission on Global Governance for Health (2011). Web page. <https://www.med.uio.no/helsam/english/research/global-governance-health/about/> Accessed on 28.11.2011
- Convention on Biological Diversity (2011). Web page. List of Parties. <http://www.cbd.int/convention/parties/list/> Accessed on 30.11.2011
- Council of Europe. (1998). *Conceptual Framework, Methodology and Presentation of Good Practices*. Final report of activities of the group of specialists on mainstreaming. Strasbourg: Council of Europe
- Council of Foreign Relations (2010). The Global Health Regime, *Global Governance Monitor*, available at: http://www.cfr.org/publication/22763/global_health_regime.html?breadcrumb=%2Fpublication%2Fby_type%2Fbackgrounder# Accessed on 19.11.2011

- Dodds, Felix and Sherman, Richard (2009). A multilateral system for climate and energy security: what roles for existing institutions? pp. 152–169 in F. Dodds, A. Higham and R. Sherman, *Climate Change and Energy Insecurity*. London: Earthscan
- Dogson, R., Lee, K. and Drager, N. (2002) *Global Health Governance: A conceptual overview*. Discussion paper no. 1, Key issues in health governance project. London: London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. Geneva: WHO
- Eggen, Øyvind and Sending, Ole Jacob (2012). *Recent Contributions to Research on Health and Foreign Policy*. First Report of the International Research Initiative on Global Health and Foreign Policy. Oslo: Norwegian Institute of International Affairs
- Eveline, J. and Bacchi, C. (2005). What are we mainstreaming when we mainstream gender? *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 7(4): 496–512
- Feldbaum, H., K. Lee, et al. (2010). Global health and foreign policy, *Epidemiologic Reviews* 27: 1–11
- Fidler, D. P. (2009). Health in foreign policy: an analytical overview, *Canada Foreign Policy* 15(3): 11–29
- Fidler, D. P. (2005). Health as foreign policy: between principle and power, *Whitehead Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations*, 6(2): 179–194
- GCIM. (2005). *Migration in an Interconnected World: New Directions for Action*. Geneva: Global Commission on International Migration
- Gehring, Thomas and Faude, Benjamin (2010). *Division of Labor within Institutional Complexes and the Evolution of Interlocking Structures of International Governance: The Complex of Trade and the Environment*. Available at: <http://stockholm.sgir.eu/uploads/Gehring-Faude-Division-of-Labour-within-Institutional%20Complexes.pdf>; accessed on 22.12.2011
- Graham, David T. (2000). The People Paradox. Human movements and human security in a globalizing world; in: Graham, David T. and Poku, Nana. *Migration, Globalisation, and Human Security*. London and New York: Routledge
- Haas, Ernst B. 1990. *When Knowledge is Power: Three Models of Change in International Organizations*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Hafner-Burton, Emilie and Mark A. Pollack (2002). Gender Mainstreaming in Global Governance, *European Journal of International Relations*, 8(3): 339–373
- Haines, A. Kovats, R.S., Campbell-Lendrum, D., Corvalan, C. (2006). Climate change and human health: Impacts, vulnerability and public health, *Public Health*, 120: 585–596
- Hartmann, Betsy (2010). Rethinking Climate Refugees and Climate Conflict: Rhetoric, Reality and the Politics of Policy Discourse, *Journal of International Development*, 22: 233–246
- Hovi, John, Skodvin, Tora (2008). Which Way to U.S. Climate Cooperation? Issue Linkage versus a U.S.-Based Agreement, *Review of Policy Research*, 25(2): 129–148
- Hübner, Michael, Keller, Andreas (2009). *Energy Savings via FDI? Empirical Evidence from Developing Countries*; Kiel: Kiel Institute for the World Economy; available at: <http://www.ifw-members.ifw-kiel.de/publications/energy-savings-via-fdi-empirical-evidence-from-developing-countries-1/energy-savings-via-fdi-empirical-evidence-from-developing-countries> Accessed on 19.11.2011

- Huntington, Hillard G., Brown, Stephen P.A. (2004). Energy security and global climate change mitigation, *Energy Policy*, 32(6): 715–718
- Huq, S. and Reid, H. (2004). Mainstreaming adaptation in development, *IDS Bulletin*, 35(3): 15–21
- Ibrahim, M. (2005). The securitization of migration: A racial discourse, *International Migration*, 43(5): 163–187
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2011). Web page. http://www.ipcc.ch/organization/organization_history.shtml Accessed on 30.11.2011
- International Federation of Medical Students' Associations (IFMSA) (2011) Medical students' perspective on the Rio Declaration, Mimeo, Rio de Janeiro <http://ifmsa.wordpress.com/2011/10/21/medical-studentsperspective-to-the-rio-statement-on-the-social-determinants-of-health/>
- International Labour Organization (2011). Web page. www.ilo.int Accessed on 30.11.2011
- Jeffries, Michael J. (2006). *Biodiversity and conservation*. 2nd ed. London : Routledge
- Kardam, Nuket (1991). *Bringing Women In: Women's Issues in International Development Programs*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers
- Karlsson-Vinkhuyzen, S. I. and M. Kok (2011). Interplay Management in the Climate, Energy and Development Nexus; in: Oberthür, S. and O. Schram Stokke (Eds.). *Managing Institutional Complexity: Regime Interplay and Global Environmental Change: State of the Art and Perspectives*. Cambridge: MIT Press, pp. 285–312
- Kemfert, Claudia (2004). Climate coalitions and international trade: assessment of cooperation incentives by issue linkage, *Energy Policy*, 32:455–465
- Keohane, Robert O. (1984). *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press
- Kickbusch, I. (2011). *Governance for health in the 21st century: a study conducted for the WHO Regional Office for Europe*. Copenhagen: World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe
- Kickbusch, I. (2009). Moving Global Health Governance Forward; in: *Making Sense of Global Health Governance: A policy perspective*. K. Buse, W. Hein and N. Drager. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 320–339
- Kickbusch, I. (2003). Global Health Governance: some new theoretical considerations on the new political space; in: *Globalization and Health*. K. Lee. London, Palgrave, pp. 192–203
- Kok, M.T.J., Coninck, H.C. de (2007) Widening the scope of policies to address climate change: Directions for mainstreaming, *Environmental Science and Policy*, 10: 587–599
- Latinamerican Association of Social Medicine (ALAMES) (2011) Debate and action about the Social Determinants of Health, Rio de Janeiro October 21 www.alames.org
- Lee, K. Dogson, R. (2000) Globalization and Cholera: Implications for global governance. *Global Governance*, Vol.6: 213–236
- Lipschutz, Ronnie D. and Felicia Allegra Peck (2010). Climate change, globalization, and carbonization; in: Bryan S. Turner (ed.). *The Routledge*

- International Handbook of Globalization Studies*; Milton Park: Routledge, ch. 10, pp. 182–204
- Loewenson, Rene (2011). Clarity and Contradiction at the World Conference on Social Determinants of Health, *Global Health Diplomacy Monitor*, 2(5): 8.11; available at: <http://www.ghd-net.org/sites/default/files/Health%20Diplomacy%20Monitor%20Volume%202%20Issue%205.pdf>
- Long, Andrew (2011). Developing Linkages to Preserve Biodiversity, in: *21st Yearbook of International Environmental Law*
- Lovejoy, Thomas E. (1980). Changes in Biological Diversity; in: Barney, G.O. (ed.). *The Global 2000 Report to the President, 2 (The Technical Report)*. Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Mace, Georgina M, Cramer Wolfgang, Díaz, Sandra (2010). Biodiversity Targets after 2010. Current Opinion in *Environmental Sustainability*, 2 (1–2): 1–6
- Martens P, Rotmans J, de Groot D. (2003). Biodiversity: luxury or necessity? *Global Environmental Change*, 13: 75–81
- Messlerin, Patrick A. (2010). *Climate change and trade policy From mutual destruction to mutual support*. Working Paper (April). Paris: Groupe d'Économie Mondiale, Sciences Po
- Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Brazil, France, et al. (2007). Oslo Ministerial Declaration –global health: a pressing foreign policy issue of our time, *The Lancet*, 369 (9570): 1373–1378
- Møgedal, S. and B. L. Alveberg (2010). Can Foreign Policy Make a Difference to Health? in: *PLoS Med* 7(5): e1000274
- Murphy, Deborah, Drexhage, John, Brown, Oli, Cosbey, Aaron, Tarasofsky, Richard, Darkin, Beverley (2009). Climate Change and Danish Foreign Policy; in: Harris, Paul G. (ed.). *Climate Change and Foreign Policy*. London: Routledge, ch.7, pp. 101–116
- Najam, Adil (2011). The View from the South: Developing Countries in Global Environmental Politics; in: Axelrod, Regina S, Van Deever, Stacy D. and Downie, David Leonard. *The Global Environment*. 3rd ed. Washington DC: CQPress, ch. 12, pp. 239–258
- Neary, Peter J. (2006). International Trade and the Environment: Theoretical and Policy Linkages, *Environmental & Resource Economics*, 33: 95–118
- Norse, E.A., McManus, R.E. (1980). *Ecology and Living Resources Biological Diversity, Environmental Quality 1980: Eleventh Annual Report of the Council on Environmental Quality*. Washington DC: Council on Environmental Quality
- Oberthür and Stokke (2011), and Sebastian, Gehring, Thomas (eds.) (2006). *Institutional Interaction in Global Environmental Governance: Synergy and Conflict among International and EU Policies*. Cambridge; Mass: MIT Press
- Oberthür, Sebastian, Gehring, Thomas (2011). Institutional Interaction: Ten Year of Scholarly Development; in: Oberthür, S. and O. Schram Stokke (Eds.). *Managing Institutional Complexity: Regime Interplay and Global Environmental Change: State of the Art and Perspectives*. Cambridge: MIT Press, pp. 25–58
- Oberthür, Sebastian, Gehring, Thomas (2011). Conclusions. Decentralized Interplay Management in an Evolving Interinstitutional Order; in: Oberthür, S. and O. Schram Stokke (Eds.). *Managing Institutional Complexity: Regime Interplay and Global Environmental Change: State of the Art and Perspectives*. Cambridge: MIT Press, pp. 313–341

- Oppermann, Kai, de Vries, Catherine E. (2011). Analyzing issue salience in international politics; in: Oppermann, Kai, de Vries, Catherine E. (eds.). *Issue Salience in International Politics*, London: Routledge, ch.1, pp. 3–19
- Orbinski, J. (2007). Global Health, Social Movements, and Governance; in: *Governing Global Health: Challenge, Response, and Innovation*. A. Cooper, J. Kirton and T. Schrecker. Aldershot, Ashgate, pp. 29–40
- Peoples Health Movement (2011) Protecting the right to health through action on the Social Determinants of Health. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, available at: www.phm.org
- Persson, Åsa, Klein Richard J.T. (2009). Mainstreaming Adaptation to Climate Change in Official Development Assistance, in: Harris, Paul G. (ed.). *Climate Change and Foreign Policy*. London: Routledge, ch.11, pp. 162–177
- Porter, M. E. and M. R. Kramer (2011). Creating Shared Value, *Harvard Business Review* (January/February), pp.62–77
- Rao, Aruna and Kelleher, David (2005). Is there Life After Gender Mainstreaming? *Gender and Development*, 13(2):57–69
- Raustiala K, Victor DG. (2004). The regime complex for plant genetic resources; in *International Organization*, 58(2): 277–309
- Raven, Peter. The Epic of Evolution and the Problem of Biodiversity Loss, in: McManis, Charles R. (ed.) 2009. *Biodiversity and the law: intellectual property, biotechnology and traditional knowledge*. London: Earthscan, ch.2, pp.27–34
- Razavi, Shahar and Carol Miller (1995). Gender Mainstreaming: A Study of Efforts by the UNDP, the World Bank and the ILO to Institutionalize Gender Issues. Geneva: *United Nations Research Institute for Social Development Occasional Paper No. 4*
- Richerzhagen, Carmen (2010). *Protecting Biological Diversity*. New York: Routledge
- Rosendal, GK. (2006). The Convention on Biological Diversity: Tensions with the WTO TRIPS Agreement over Access to Genetic Resources and the Sharing of Benefits. In Oberthür, Sebastian, Thomas Gehring (eds). *Institutional Interaction in Global Environmental Governance – Synergy and Conflict among International and EU Policies*. Cambridge (MA), MIT Press, pp. 79–103
- Rosendal GK. 2001. Impacts of overlapping international regimes: the case of biodiversity. *Global Governance*, 7(1): 95–117
- Rosendal GK. (2000). *The Convention on Biological Diversity and Developing Countries*. Dordrecht: Kluwer
- Sanders, David (2011). We should stand up for the poor people that are paying for the crisis of capitalism. Speech given at the World Conference on Social Determinants of Health, Rio de Janeiro, 19–21 October. Available at: <http://cmdss2011.org/site/opinioes/we-should-stand-up-for-the-poor-people-that-are-paying-for-the-crisis-of-capitalism/> Accessed on 30.11.2011
- Saunier, Richard E. and Meganck, Richard A. (2009). Global Environmental Governance Essay; in: Saunier, Richard E. and Meganck, Richard A. *Dictionary and Introduction to Global Environmental Governance*; 2nd ed. London: Earthscan
- Schmidhuber, Josef, Tubiello, Francesco N. (2007). Global food security under climate change, *PNAS*, 104(50): 19703–19708

- Scholar Google (2011). Web page. www.scholar.google.com Accessed on 21.11.2011
- Sell, Susan K. (2002). Private Power, Public Law: The Globalization of Intellectual Property Rights. *Cambridge Studies in International Relations*: 88. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Shaffer, Brenda (2009). *Energy Politics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press
- Streck, Charlotte (2004). New Partnerships in Global Environmental Policy: The Clean Development Mechanism, *Journal of Environment & Development*, 13(3): 295–322
- The Report of the Commission on Global Governance (1995). *Our Global Neighbourhood*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Townsend, P., Davidson, N. and Whithead, M. (eds) (1992). *The Black Report and the Health Divide: Inequalities in Health*. London: Penguin.
- True, Jacqui (2003). Mainstreaming Gender in Global Public Policy, *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 5(3): 368–396
- True, J. and Mintrom, M. (2001). Transnational networks and policy diffusion: The case of gender mainstreaming, *International Studies Quarterly*, 45: 27–57
- United Nations Environment Programme (2011). Web page. <http://new.unep.org/IEACP/iea/training/manual/module3/1061.aspx> Accessed on 30.11.2011
- United Nations Framework Convention (2011). Web page. Kyoto Protocol. http://unfccc.int/kyoto_protocol/items/2830.php Accessed on 30.11.2011
- United Nations Framework Convention (2011). Web page. Full Text of the Convention. http://unfccc.int/essential_background/convention/background/items/2536.php Accessed on 30.11.2011
- UN General Assembly (2010). *A/RES/65/95 Global Health and Foreign Policy*. New York: UN
- UN General Assembly (2010). *A/RES/64/108 Global health and foreign policy*. New York: UN
- UN General Assembly (2009). *A/RES/63/33. Global health and foreign policy*. New York: UN
- UN General Assembly. (2009). General Assembly Adopts 28 Drafts Texts on Fourth Committee's Recommendation. <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2009/ga10902.doc.htm> Accessed on 12.12.2010
- UN General Assembly (2009). *A/RES/64/166. Protection of Migrants*. New York: UN
- UN General Assembly (2008). *A/RES/63/184. Protection of Migrants*. New York: UN
- UN General Assembly (2007). *A/RES/62/156. Protection of Migrants*. New York: UN
- UN General Assembly (2006). *A/RES/60/169. Protection of Migrants*. New York: UN
- UN General Assembly (2006). *A/RES/61/165. Protection of Migrants*. New York: UN

- UN General Assembly (2000). *A/RES/54/212. Migration and Development*. New York: UN
- UN General Assembly (2000). *A/RES/54/166. Protection of Migrants*. New York: UN
- UN General Assembly (2000). *A/RES/54/146. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees*. New York: UN
- UN General Assembly (1999). *A/RES/54/138. Violence against women migrant workers*. New York: UN
- UN General Assembly (1988). *A/RES/43/53. Protection of global climate for present and future generations of mankind*. New York: UN
- United Nations University (2011). Web page. International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources (ITPGRFA). http://www.unutki.org/default.php?doc_id=54
Accessed on 22.11.2011
- Van Asselt, H.J.M., Gupta, J., Biermann, F. (2005). Advancing the climate agenda: exploiting material and institutional linkages to develop a menu of policy options. *RECIEL*, 14 (3): 255–264
- Verloo, M. 2002. *The development of gender mainstreaming as a political concept for Europe*. Paper presented at the Conference on Gender Learning, Leipzig, 6–8 September
- Young, Oran (2002). Horizontal Interplay: The Politics of Institutional Linkage; in: *The Institutional Direction of Global Change: Fit, Interplay and Scale*, edited by Oran Young, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 111–138
- Walby, Sylvia (2005) Gender Mainstreaming: Productive Tensions in theory and Practice, Social Politics. *International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, Vol.12 (3): 321–343
- Web of Knowledge (2011). Web page. <http://www.webofknowledge.com/>
Accessed on 21.11.2011
- Weiss; Thomas G. (2000). Governance, Good Governance and Global Governance: Conceptual and Actual Challenges, *Third World Quarterly*, 21(5): 795–814
- Whalley, J. (1991). The interface between environmental and trade policies, *The Economic Journal*, Vol.101:180–189
- Whitehead, M., F. Diderichsen, et al. (2000). Researching the impact of public policy on inequalities in health. *Understanding Health Inequalities*. H. Graham. Buckingham: Open University Press
- Williams, M. (1993), Re-articulating the Third World Coalition: The Role of the Environmental Agenda, *Third World Quarterly*, 14(1): 7–29
- Wlezien, Christopher (2005). On the salience of political issues: The problem with ‘most important problem’, *Electoral Studies*, 24: 555–579
- World Economic Forum (2011). *Global Risks 6th Edition*. Risk Response Network. Geneva: World Economic Forum
- WTO–UNEP (2009). *Trade and Climate Change. A report by the United Nations Environment Programme and the World Trade Organization*; Geneva: WTO Publications; available at: http://www.wto.org/english/res_e/booksp_e/trade_climate_change_e.pdf,
accessed on 22.12.2011

The Fridtjof Nansen Institute is a non-profit, independent research institute focusing on international environmental, energy, and resource management. The institute has a multi-disciplinary approach, with main emphasis on political science, economics, and international law. It collaborates extensively with other research institutions in Norway and abroad.



**FRIDTJOF NANSENS INSTITUTT
FRIDTJOF NANSEN INSTITUTE**

**Fridtjof Nansens vei 17, P.O. Box 326, NO-1326 Lysaker, Norway
Phone: (47) 67 11 19 00 – Fax: (47) 67 11 19 10 – E-mail: post@fni.no
Website: www.fni.no**