D1.1 Dataset on global governance regimes, tools and approaches - Codebook

WP1 - Mapping and measuring global governance

Appendix - Codebook

TRIGGER Deliverable 1.1:

Dataset on global governance regimes, tools and approaches

Data Filename: TRIGGER_D1.1_GlobalGovernance_Dataset

This document describes the TRIGGER Deliverable 1.1: 'Dataset on global governance regimes, tools and approaches'.

For users, please cite the dataset as:

Umbach, Gaby (2021): Dataset on global governance regimes, tools and approaches, TRIGGER project, European University Institute, Florence.

1. Introduction

The (global) governance concept grasps the effects of globalisation and regionalisation on the emergence of post-national constellations (Zangl and Zürn 2003) in contemporary global politics which root in the extension of political problem horizons, regulatory impact and participatory approaches beyond national political systems (Peters 2002:3; Rosenboim 2019; Zumbansen 2012). Such decoupling of politics from national contexts results in denationalised political problem-solving that is no longer territorially bound and that defines political space functionally (Knodt 2004). The extension and redefinition of political space beyond the nation state that follows from this denationalisation make an increasing variety of transnational governance structures essential means of problem-solving within expanded regulatory horizons. With its focus on these structural and procedural realities of polycentric politics (Peterson 2003:18), the governance concept in its global perspective describes essential features of multilevel political interrelations in transnational governance arrangements, i.e., key aspects of global governance.

Global governance is a multidimensional phenomenon of transnational political and institutional practice. It has become a key reference point for the management of transnational and global interactions in a multipolar international political system, in which public authority and political sovereignty are dispersed across political levels and entities. Because of such dispersion, modes of global governance are complex and multifaceted expressions of regulatory demand and practice within transnational politics. They manifest structures, exercise and outcomes of political power and public authority in multi-actor international decision-making constellations. In their most integrated and integrative forms, they could be understood as the closest the international community gets to participatory and accountable collective action at global level.

The central assumptions of the global governance perspective gained traction with the collapse of the bipolar international system that led to the emergence of a multilateral, multipolar global order in which a superior sovereign level is missing. As economic catch-up spurred by globalisation gained pace, the rise of emerging powers redistributed and diffused global power within the international system in which also non-state actors gained ground (Yeo 2020:15). Therefore, global governance also embraces transnational neopluralism of multi-stakeholder interaction, public-private cooperation, private authority, and social movements within a global system of formal and informal institutions of transnational rule setting, resulting in a differentiated, fragmented and multimodal global governance architecture (Long, 2015; Pankakoski and Vihma, 2017).

Global governance, moreover, entails normative interpretations that frame political interventions to balance outcomes of globalisation (Finkelstein, 1995; Fukuyama, 2013; Grindle, 2007; Pierre and Peters, 2005). Based on this normative function, global governance institutions define common global rules, ethics, norms, values, paradigms, standards. With these features, global

governance has become a key means and place to frame and control globalised political and social norm-setting and interactions that otherwise remain potentially unregulated as they are out of reach for nation state control (Weiss, 2000; Doornbos, 2001; Murphy, 2000).

Not only related to this normative function, the contestation of global governance and the renationalisation of politics is a trend witnessed around the world. This trend jeopardises existing global political institutions, rules and standards that govern challenges of planetary scale and the EU's role within them. It points at issues of rendering the benefits of the complex, yet essential network of global governance structures visible to underline its contribution to the organisation of world affairs. Fragmentation and new forms of protectionism followed from such contestation and erosion of existing global regimes (Fermont 2020:12).

Focusing on oftentimes far-reaching aspects of global politics, institutions and modes of global governance require thorough analysis in order to identify their benefits and potential. To properly assess global governance solutions, their focus and role in global politics need to be analysed and evaluated (Giebler 2012). It is through such assessment that the understanding of their contribution to collective action at global level helps frame the leeway for EU actorness to influence the rules-based delivery of global public goods. Global governance regimes, tools and approaches provide the international environment in which the EU engages in. They affect the EU's potential to influence global politics, form opportunity structures and represent constraints that frame the EU's capacity to act. At the same time, the EU's engagement shapes global governance, establishing a feedback loop between institutions of global governance and EU actorness to influence global politics. In this multidirectional perspective, global governance creates the ecosystem for EU actorness to unfold and provides the backdrop, target and momentum for the EU to act globally. Stocktaking of the features of global governance is therefore an entry point into the analysis of the EU's role in global governance.

This demand is the starting point for the present dataset that informs TRIGGER's Deep Dive analyses. Its aim is to map global governance practices and modes in the areas of interest to TRIGGER's Deep Dive assessments of global governance structures, regimes, tools and approaches in four distinct areas (climate change; data protection; development policy and relations with Africa; Sustainable Development Goals). The dataset focusses on these thematic areas and is tailored to inform TRIGGER's analysis. Therefore, the research on the EU's involvement in global governance arrangements within the single policy areas has its starting point within it.

As the dataset informs the Deep Dive analyses that ultimately lead to the Atlas of Global Governance Regulation and Europe's Actorness (AGGREGATOR), it is sensitive to the different forms of global governance regimes, tools and approaches and maps different types of organisations. The dataset applies a broad perspective to the institutional ecosystems in which

the EU operates internationally within the four areas. It is open to future data collection related to further areas to extend TRIGGER's research on EU actorness to other policy fields.

2. Existing datasets

While the measurement of global governance itself is still in its conceptualisation phase (see TRIGGER Dataset on Measuring Governance Performance as a Global Governance Instrument), information on various institutional aspects and entities of global governance has been collected in several independent datasets. The academic community has produced different datasets on international authority, international organisations and regional integration organisations, the latter mainly focussing on regional economic organizations. Apart from the original producers' copyright permission, a merger of these datasets of different methodological approaches and intellectual copyright holders into one integrated SQL database would require a consolidated effort and independent budget supporting the extension of timelines, harmonisation of metadata and interlinkage of individual entries by common identifiers to ensure comparability of entries across datasets. Such a consolidated endeavour was not the aim of the dataset, which targets to inform TRIGGER's Deep Dive related policy-oriented research rather than bringing together existing datasets on international organizations and global governance institutions in a harmonized way.

With the aim of supporting TRIGGER research in mind, the dataset seeks to provide fit-for-purpose information on the state of global governance regimes, tools and approaches, particularly in the four TRIGGER's Deep Dive policy areas. Therefore, apart from data on institutional arrangements, also their engagement in the relevant policy areas is listed to provide an insight into the multilevel governance environment in which the EU operate in when dealing transnationally with climate change; data protection; development policy and relations with Africa; and the Sustainable Development Goals. Related to its data collection a key challenge and additional aim of the dataset is to present the information contained in the dataset in a way that is useful and useable also for non-data scientists and researchers engaged in TRIGGER's qualitative research on the global governance environment in the four selected areas. This explains potential variation in aggregate data representation as compared to existing datasets in the area, such as related to full coding or text entries.

One frequently analysed area of global governance are international organisations. In terms of data collection, the Yearbook of International Organizations by the Union of International Associations (UIA)[1] provides information on about 42,000 active international organisations and about 74,000 international organisations in total. The dataset covers both inter-governmental

---

[1] Union of International Associations (UIA) (various years): Yearbook of International Organizations, online open access version.

organisations (IGOs) and international non-governmental organisations (INGOs). The benefit of the dataset is the overview of international organisations by *inter alia* subject area; history; organizational type and structure; members and headquarter location. For the dataset's data collection it is a useful source to control variables related to organisational characteristics and development; political economy; and geopolitics for those international organisations selected for integration. Individual re-control was yet required for some information as they were not yet updated in the original dataset.

Also focussing on international organisations, the Intergovernmental Organizations dataset of the Correlates of War project[2] provides information on the status of state membership of 534 international governmental organisations from 1816 to 2014 (1816-1965: 5-year intervals; 1966-2014: annual data). It distinguishes between economic, security, and multi-issue inter-governmental organisations and contains information on IGOs that have at least three nation-states as members. The dataset does not contain data for IGOs that also have non-state members. The dataset offers three different data display options: IGO-year, country-year, individual country memberships into joint dyadic memberships in each IGO. A particular benefit of the dataset is the listing of state members of IGOs and the quality of membership per year from 1966 to 2014. For the data collection, as part of the Diplometrics dataset (see below), this feature served as the starting point for data collection that is completed for the missing years for the organisations that will be integrated in AGGREGATOR.

The Formal Intergovernmental Organizations (FIGO) project[3] by Volgy, Fausett, Grant and Rodgers collects data for formal inter-governmental organisations with three or more state members that have ongoing decision-making and oversight by states, organisational autonomy and a bureaucratic organisation. The dataset covers the years 1975, 1989, 2004 as three reference points in time and provides data on state membership in FIGOs. Adding the denominator 'opportunity', the datasets also adds information on FIGOs a state was capable of joining. The benefit of the FIGO dataset is the information of membership in formal inter-governmental organisations. It was yet not directly accessible; therefore, the merged and extended Diplometrics dataset (see below) provided indirect access to FIGO data.

The 2016 Diplometrics - Intergovernmental Organization Data Set merges, updates, and extends the 2004 CoW and 2008 FIGO datasets.[4] The dataset combines the CoW list of 244 IGOs with 46 additional IGOs from the FIGO dataset and add further IGOs, resulting in a sample of 409 IGOs. The time period covered by the dataset is 1816 to 2014. Additionally, an 'IGO aims' part of

[2] Pevehouse, J.C.W., Nordstron, T., McManus, R.W. and Spencer Jamison, A. 2020. "Tracking Organizations in the World: The Correlates of War IGO Version 3.0 datasets", Journal of Peace Research 57:3, 492- 503; original datatset: Wallace, Michael, and J. David Singer. 1970. "International Governmental Organization in the Global System, 1815-1964." International Organization 24: 239-87.
[3] Volgy, T., Fausett, E., Grant, K., & Rodgers, S. 2008. Identifying Formal Intergovernmental Organizations. *Journal of Peace Research, 45*(6), 837-850. Retrieved August 4, 2021, http://www.jstor.org/stable/27640772.
[4] Moyer, J. D., Bohl, D. K., Camp, H., & Turner, S. Frederick S. Pardee Center for International Futures. (2016). *Diplometrics: Intergovernmental Organization* [Data file], http://pardee.du.edu/diplometrics.

the dataset provides a list of seven policy areas including 40 sub-areas. The benefit of the dataset is the information provided on membership in IGOs over time until 2014. Moreover, the 'IGO aims' identify overarching policy areas some of which are relevant for the TRIGGER Deep Dive analyses (id 610. Climate change; id. 240. Development; id 640. Sustainability). For the dataset's data collection, this list served as an identifier for potentially Deep Dive relevant IGOs. The dataset also served as a source for the membership dimension until 2014 of relevant IGOs selected. Additional years and policy areas are added for integration in AGGREGATOR.

Dealing with decision-making in international organizations, Hooghe, Marks, Lenz, Bezuijen, Ceka, and Derderyan focus their Measure of International Authority Dataset (MIA)[5] on variables that proxy delegation and pooling in international authority, more precisely in 76 international organisations. Moreover, data for additional 31 international organisations is available, but unpublished. The dataset contains data on aggregate delegation and pooling variables (by decision area and stage). It disaggregates delegation and pooling into variables that describe the structure and composition of international organisations' bodies and their role in decision-making at five decision stages across six decision areas. Data aggregation produces annual measures, scaled 0 to 1. In terms of policy scope, 25 so-called policy categories describe the policy portfolio of international organisations and changes in it over time. The measure of an IO's policy scope is annual. The policy scope distinguishes between core and flanking policies and by doing so is more differentiated than e.g. the Correlates of War (CoW) dataset on international organisations (see above). The MIA coding scheme offers a detailed description of the dataset entries and variables. Apart from its information on organisational and decision-making patterns, one of the benefits of the dataset is that it provides information on the policy scope of international organisations. For the data collection, the dataset's variables on organisational and decision-making patterns serve as a source of background information and control. The MIA dataset does yet not offer specific information on climate change, data protection, development policy and relations to Africa and the Sustainable Development Goals under its policy scope variables as it defines the policy areas more broadly.

Focusing on regional integration, the 2013 Regional Economic Organizations (REO) dataset[6] assembled by Haftel contains information on economic activities and institutional structure of 28 REOs over three decades. Data points for REOs differ; where available they start in 1982 and range to 2007, covering 5-year intervals. REOs established after 1982 contain fewer observations. The dataset covers variables *inter alia* on trade share; implemented scope; regional concentration of power; regime type; members; independence of REOs' bureaucracies; dispute settlement mechanisms (DSM); and economic development. In publications based on the

---

[5] Hooghe, L., Marks, G., Lenz, T., Bezuijen, J., Ceka, B. and Derderyan, S. (2017). Measuring International Authority. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
[6] Haftel, Yoram Z. 2013. "Commerce and Institutions: Trade, Scope, and the Design of Regional Economic Organizations". *The Review of International Organizations* 8 (3): 389-414.

dataset, the author analyses the mandates and economic issues addressed by the REOs as well as links between commerce, economic scope, and regional institutions. The benefit of the dataset is the information provided on REOs for the period from 1982 to 2007. For research on the dataset, it served as a general information source for regional economic integration communities selected. As the dataset goes beyond economic integration in its regional dimension, additional data were collected.

In the same area, the Regional Governance dataset[7] by Goertz and Powers focusses on regional economic institutions and collects the legally binding treaties of these institutions. It includes 35 multilateral, multi-issue regional organisations that have at least one legally binding treaty and span from 1946 to 2005. The treaties are coded on various dimensions and the treaty text is available for many dataset entries. The benefit of the dataset is the accessibility of the legal texts that was yet no focus of the dataset's data collection at this point. For future updates of the dataset, these variables can yet be integrated to inform additional treaty related variables.

The Comparative Regional Organizations Project (CROP) by Jetschke, Theiner, Marggraf and Münch is a database project that collects, codes, and analyses treaties of international regional organisations (RO). It focusses on institutional design characteristics of over 75 regional organisations and on 280 contractual documents as well as over 300 agreement items. Organisations are defined as RO by the project if they are multilateral organisations with a multipurpose scope; hold regular meetings; have established rules of decision-making; and were established by at least two contiguous states that define their membership on a regional basis, i.e. regionally defined membership.[8] The project focusses on similarities and differences among ROs induced by diffusion and analyses in how far processes of diffusion between ROs determine their institutional design. It covers the period from 1945 to 2015 and includes ROs at continental, transcontinental and international level. It provides information on RO agreements, that is on ROs' treaty amendments; timespan between founding treaty and first amendment; organisational aims according to the treaties; norms, principles, and values referenced in the treaties; areas of competences; and RO organs. The benefit of the project is that it offers a more inclusive definition of RO than other datasets as it also includes ROs that e.g. initially did not have a permanent secretariat or are small in membership. For the research on the dataset, it serves as a general information source for the regional integration dimension. For future updates of the dataset, the extension and integration of the timeline of treaty development per organisation can be envisaged for all dataset entries. For the other variables, the website presents data visualisations only in regionally/institutionally aggregated or score form with no original dataset being publicly accessible.

---

[7] Goertz, Gary; Powers, Kathy. 2019. "Regional governance: the evolution of a new institutional form". Qualitative Data Repository. https://doi.org/10.5064/F6UHXBNH: Goertz, Gary; Powers, Kathy. 2014. "Regional governance: the evolution of a new institutional form", WZB Discussion Paper No. SP IV 2014-106, WZB Berlin Social Science Center, Berlin.
[8] http://lehrstuhlib.uni-goettingen.de/crop/data.html.

The TRANSACCESS dataset of Sommerer, Tallberg, and Squatrito presents data on the depth, range, permanence and codification of access of transnational NGOs, civil society organisations, and multinational corporations to 298 bodies of 50 IGOs. Its time period ranges from 1950 to 2010[9]. The dataset accounts for the above-mentioned transnational neopluralism of multi-stakeholder interaction within global governance. It enables the analysis of more participatory forms of global governance over time, issue areas, and world regions, which is the benefit of this dataset. For the dataset's data collection, the selection of inter-governmental organisations as the key reference point (see below) did yet not cover this focus for the first round of data collection as the dataset serves to support the analysis of the EU's actorness in global governance, focussing strongly on institutional, procedural and structural questions and aspects. The dataset however served as a control source for international organisations selected for integration in the dataset, if analysed by TRANSACCESS. For future updates of the dataset, the transnational NGO dimension will receive attention.

The Regional Organizations' Competencies (ROCO) datasets (I - IV) by Panke and Starkmann[10] provide information for 76 regional organisations (ROs) from 1945 to 2015. ROs are defined as institutions (with primary rules, headquarters or secretariat), in which at least three states cooperate with each other on various issues. Membership roots (among others) in geographic criteria. Datasets ROCO I (main treaties; treaty changes) and II (main treaties; treaty changes; additional primary law sources for ASEAN, AU, EAC and ECOWAS) contain data related to policy competencies, so-called 'policy mandates', referring to specific policy issues (as defined by the ROs' primary law status document). The two datasets contain information on eleven policy areas (agriculture; development; economy and trade; energy; environment; finance; good governance; health; migration; security and defence; technology, infrastructure and science), none of which exactly matches the TRIGGER Deep Dive areas. Under each policy area, different policy competences are grouped, that in part overlap with TRIGGER Deep Dive areas. Dataset ROCO III provides information of state membership in the 76 selected ROs. ROCO IV includes information on the 76 ROs. The benefits of the databases are the overview of policy competences of ROs and the decision-making modes. For the dataset's data collection, ROCO I to IV serve to confirm geographical variables and membership over time. For future updates of the dataset, variables on decision-making and policy competences can receive attention.

The Vitality of International Organizations dataset by Gray proposes to measure institutional vitality. It provides aggregate data for different levels of institutional vitality ('Life'; 'Zombie'; 'Death' as per definition of the author) of 68 international organisations focussing on economic integration,

[9] Sommerer, Thomas; Tallberg, Jonas; Squatrito, Theresa. 2015. "Transnational Access to International Organizations 1950-2010", https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/DDE1HE; Sommerer, Thomas; Tallberg, Jonas. 2017. Transnational Access to International Organizations 1950–2010: A New Data Set, *International Studies Perspectives*, 18(3): 247–266, https://doi.org/10.1093/isp/ekv022.
[10] Panke, Diana; Starkmann, Anna. 2019. "Regional Organizations' Competencies (ROCO)", https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/UBXZHC.

i.e. regional economic organisations.[11] The time span for entries varies according to organisations. The earliest data relate to the year 1948 and the latest to 2013. The dataset contains coded variables such as for the level and goals of proposed integration; bureaucratic autonomy; member similarity; IO transparency and security mandate. While reference is made to Haftel 2012; Genna 2002; CoW; UIA YIO; the US State Department's listing of hardship pay for specific cities; and other sources for the coding, no comprehensive coding description could be found for all variables. Based on the dataset, Gray develops a theory of organisational vitality by largely looking at input and throughput variables (trade potential and violent conflict between members; attractiveness of headquarter position and hiring of staff; policy initiative autonomy; operating budgets; quality of bureaucracy; number of meetings). Output and outcome variables are less represented, because according to the author "classifying organizations as living ones has less to do with their performance and more to do with their actual operating capacity" (Gray 2013:8). A certain degree of goal attainment, that is the production of "any output relevant to their organization's mission" (Gray 2018:6) is yet mentioned among the output variables considered. In the specific case of regional economic organisations, the dataset highlights the relevance of trade levels between members calculated based on gravity model predictions. Following from the analysis, a measure of vitality of international economic organisations is proposed. The level of vitality is measured according to an institution's headquarters'/secretariat's ability "to attract and retain talented staff (as proxied by hardship compensation associated with the secretariat's location) as well as to autonomously enact policy [. Both] are associated with whether organizations truly stay active, or whether they simply endure or die off" (Gray 2013:2). The author explains the level of vitality of an organisation as the result of the combined effects of staffing and bureaucratic autonomy, because of the (geo-)political fact that "in the context where no feasible gains from trade can be realized, the geographic pull of the location of the headquarters and the autonomy of the secretariat can explain whether a given REO stays alive or effectively dead" (Gray 2013:3). The US State Department's hardship pay rates associated to headquarter locations and flights to these locations serve as proxies for an organisations' ability to attract high-quality staff, assuming that locations in less well-off developing countries attract qualified staff to a lesser degree. Based on these assumptions, the author suggests that approximately 52 percent of the 68 IOs analysed are 'alive', around 10 percent 'dead' and about 38 percent 'zombie' at some point of their existence during the time from 1948 to 2013 (see Gray 2018), calculated on an annual basis for each REO as opposed to an overall composite assessment of the IO's development over time. The present dataset cannot test whether Gray's assumptions and assessment reflect the institutional reality and capacity of the regional economic organisations analysed; whether other regionally embedded proxies, a stronger focus on output and outcome variable or other geopolitical and/or cultural variables affect the performance of individual

---

[11] For coding details see Gray, Julia. 2013. Life, Death, or Zombie? The Vitality of International Organizations. Draft paper; Gray, Julia. 2018. *Life, Death, or Zombie? The Vitality of International Organizations*, dataset; see also Gray, Julia. 2018. Life, Death, or Zombie? The Vitality of International Organizations, *International Studies Quarterly*, 62(1): 1–13.

international organisations in a similar way and/or produce different results. It can also not replicate the assessment for all its own entries. Therefore, the integration of vitality variables into the dataset was accompanied by the necessary prudence. In terms of Gray's concern about the vitality of international organisations, it is argued that the EU's actorness in global governance in the four selected TRIGGER Deep Dive areas seem less dependent on international organisations secretariats'/headquarters' geographic attractiveness or autonomy to initiate policies, but rather on specific actor/negotiation constellations in global governance arrangements. Yet, in order to use the potential explanative benefit of these vitality variables, the 'life' (at least one annual meeting at internal level; some kind of progress towards stated mandate), 'zombie' (semi-regular operations; continue to operate without any progress toward mandate; few gains from trade; fall short of ambitions) and 'death' (no meetings; no visible level of activity; no progress towards goals; missing funding) variables were added to the dataset for IOs that were part of Gray's dataset to indicate at potential concerns about their function and performance (for variable definitions see Gray 2018:3).

3. Methodology

3.1 Data Sources

Based on the above assessment of existing datasets on international organisations of different quality, the dataset extends the data collection in a fit-for-purpose and policy-relevant way to support also the qualitative research of non-data scientists within TRIGGER. This means that it provides information related to TRIGGER's four Deep Dive areas in a way that is useful for researcher engaged in qualitative research on the global governance environment in the four selected areas.

For TRIGGER's Deep Dive analyses, global governance regimes, tools and approaches constitute the international political-institutional environment in which the EU's actorness and role unfold. The data collection related to global governance within TRIGGER was therefore designed in a fit-for-purpose way to contribute to the Deep Dive analyses, meaning that it was targeted to inform the project's Deep Dives analyses on EU actorness in particular policy areas. Thus, and as mentioned above, data collected for the dataset focussed on the four policy areas analysed in the Deep Dives, that is on climate change; data protection; development policy and relations with Africa; Sustainable Development Goals.

Against this thematic backdrop and in light of the conceptual complexity of global governance within the TRIGGER Deep Dives, the dataset focusses on the development of an inventory of global governance institutions, organisations, regimes, tools and approaches in the respective thematic areas. To provide for a broad inclusive approach, the data collection started from the

2016 Diplometrics Data Set that merged, updated, and extended the 2004 CoW and 2008 FIGO datasets. This choice was based on the assumption that IGOs represent most relevant global governance arenas for the EU to engage in, even though this introduces a certain institutional quality bias into the dataset. The 409 IGOs included in the Diplometrics sample where controlled for their policy relevance for TRIGGER's Deep Dive research. This was done by analysing the entries' policy-related activities and institutional set up. Moreover, only non-dead IGOs were selected for integration. This research step added the required fit-for-purpose dimensions of active and policy-relevant institutions, the latter not being visible to the required extend in the existing datasets. Together with the integration of further policy-relevant entries not covered by the existing datasets, this research step resulted in the present dataset sample of 294 entries. Furthermore, the dataset includes reference to the Diplometrics membership timelines (variable ID15) that will be used in an updated version for data visualisations in TRIGGER AGREGGATOR. The Diplometrics dataset also served as a control source for variable ID12 (Year of establishment).

The Yearbook of International Organizations served as a source to control for the dataset's variables ID4 (Geographic scope) and ID5 (Continental reach). Both variables disaggregate the Yearbook's Type of Organisation I (specifically types A, B, C, D, G, and T) for a more intuitive use in the Deep Dive analysis by non-data scientists. Moreover, the Yearbook's Type of Organisation II informed the dataset's variable ID20 (Institutional quality). Furthermore, the Yearbook served as a source and control option for variables ID12 (Year of establishment); ID18 (Legal basis) and ID22 (Focus).

Finally, in terms of external sources, whenever information was available for the dataset's entries, the Vitality of International Organizations dataset was used as a source for variable ID 27 (Vitality of International Organisations 2013) to indicate at the quality of performance of the institution in 2013 or the latest year available in the original dataset. As mentioned above, the dataset cannot test the validity of the original dataset's assessment. However, in order to use the additional explanative benefit of these analytical variables, the 'zombie', 'death' and 'life' variables were added to the dataset for the IOs that were also part of the original dataset to indicate at potential concerns about their functionality in the past.

As a result of the research and data collection conducted, the dataset maps existing global governance practices and modes relevant for climate change, data protection, development policy and relations with Africa and the Sustainable Development Goals. It takes stock of the diversity of instruments, regimes, processes and partnerships applied and the evolution of the global governance environment over time. It consists of 294 governance arrangements on three main levels: global, intercontinental, and regional integration and contains 73 global, 108 intercontinental, and 113 regional institutions/arrangements.

The dataset contains variables, obtained from the extraction and (re-)coding of variables from existing datasets on international organisations as well as from qualitative information on the characteristics of global governance regimes, tools and approaches from original websites and official documents, capturing different institutional dimensions. The focus of the dataset, and hence its unit of analysis is on individual global governance arrangements, predominantly IGOs. The dataset includes information on global governance regimes, tools and approaches, drawing on a number of original and data sources. For the related research and data collection, the following sources were reference points and sources:

- Comparative Regional Organizations Project
- Diplometrics - Intergovernmental Organization Data Set
- Harvard Dataverse
- Intergovernmental Organizations dataset of the Correlates of War project
- OECD International Regulatory Co-operation: The Role of International Organisations in Fostering Better Rules of Globalisation
- Measure of International Authority Dataset
- Regional Governance dataset
- Regional Organizations' Competencies (ROCO) datasets
- The World Factbook
- Vitality of International Organizations
- WorldStatesmen
- Yearbook of International Organizations

3.2 Variables and Coding

The dataset contains 28 variables to allow for in-depth analysis of the institutional quality, geo-political, political economy and development dimension of global governance in the given policy areas:

1. **Code—ID:** Dataset numerical identifier of the institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach.
2. **Full Name:** The full name of the institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach.
3. **Abbreviation:** The abbreviation of the institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach.
4. **Geographic scope:** The institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach covers all continents or specific continents/regions.
5. **Continental reach:** The institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach covers specific continents/regions.
6. **Continental reach - All continents:** The institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach covers all continents.
7. **Continental reach - Africa:** The institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach covers Africa.
8. **Continental reach - Americas:** The institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach covers the Americas.

9. **Continental reach - Asia:** The institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach covers Asia.
10. **Continental reach - Europe:** The institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach covers Europe.
11. **Continental reach - Oceania:** The institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach covers Oceania.
12. **Year of establishment:** Official year of adoption/entry into force.
13. **Seat:** Geographic location of the headquarters/secretariat.
14. **Number of official members:** The number of official members, excluding observer and affiliate status.
15. **Membership timeline in DIPLOMETRICS:** Availability of full membership timelines in the DIPLOMETRICS dataset for the period until 2016.
16. **Type of members:** Type of members of the institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach.
17. **Formal requirements for membership:** As defined on the website and/or accompanying documentations.
18. **Legal basis:** Legal document on which the institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach is based.
19. **Institutional quality:** The details on the institutional/organisational quality.
20. **Organisational structure:** The management and administrative structure is centralised, regionally or nationally decentralised, a combination of central and de-centralised structures.
21. **Focus:** Brief description of the regime's, tool's and approach's thematic/policy focus.
22. **Climate Change:** Relevant activities/units related to climate change.
23. **Data Protection:** Relevant activities/units related to data protection.
24. **Development Policy and Relations with Africa:** Relevant activities/units related to development policy and relations to Africa/African countries.
25. **Sustainable Development Goals:** Relevant activities/units related to Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals.
26. **Vitality of International Organisations 2013:** Description of the vitality of International Organisations according to Julia Gray (2013/2018).
27. **Source:** Link to the official website.
28. **TRIGGER Area:** Identifier for the TRIGGER Deep Dive analysis.

The data was collected and coded in two steps: First, the above mentioned existing datasets were analysed for integration and integrated as indicated. Second, the below coding scheme was the basis for the manual coding of the data. It determined which information was relevant for the data collection and is applied to describe the data. Based on the completed data collection, i.e. the final list of entries, the coding (see 'Coding description') took place. Given this two-step approach, the deliverable started with a pre-defined list of variables, which was then amended and coded manually.

Table 1: Coding Scheme

ID	Name	Definition	Coding Description	Comment
1	**Code-- ID**	Dataset numerical identifier of the institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach.	Absolute value/figure	
2	**Full Name**	The full name of the institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach.	Name	
3	**Abbreviation**	The abbreviation of the institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach.	Abbreviation	
4	**Geographic scope**	The institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach covers all continents or specific continents/regions.	1: Global 2: Regional 3: Intercontinental	Specification of Type of organisation I (A, B, C, D, G, T), Union of International Associations (UIA) (various years); Yearbook of International Organizations, online open access version.
5	**Continental reach**	The institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach covers specific continents/regions. In case it is global in reach (Geographic scope = 1), it is coded accordingly.	0: All continents 1: Africa 2: Americas 3: Asia 4: Europe 5: Oceania	Specification of Type of organisation I (A, B, C, D, G, T), Union of International Associations (UIA) (various years); Yearbook of International Organizations, online open access version. The designation of continents follows the UN standard geographic regions classification (M49 code).
6	**Continental reach: All continents**	The institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach covers all continents.	0: No 1: Yes	The designation of continents follows the UN standard geographic regions classification (M49 code).
7	**Continental reach: Africa**	The institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach covers Africa.	0: No 1: Yes	The designation of continents follows the UN standard geographic regions classification (M49 code).
8	**Continental reach: Americas**	The institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach covers the Americas.	0: No 1: Yes	The designation of continents follows the UN standard geographic regions classification (M49 code).
9	**Continental reach: Asia**	The institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach covers Asia.	0: No 1: Yes	The designation of continents follows the UN standard geographic regions classification (M49 code).
10	**Continental reach: Europe**	The institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach covers Europe.	0: No 1: Yes	The designation of continents follows the UN standard geographic regions classification (M49 code).
11	**Continental reach: Oceania**	The institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach covers Oceania.	0: No 1: Yes	The designation of continents follows the UN standard geographic

ID	Name	Definition	Coding Description	Comment
				regions classification (M49 code).
12	**Year of establishment**	Official year of adoption/entry into force.	Absolute value/figure	Sources: Official websites; Moyer, J. D., Bohl, D. K., Camp, H., & Turner, S. Frederick S. Pardee Center for International Futures. (2016). Diplometrics: Intergovernmental Organization [Data file], http://pardee.du.edu/diplometrics; Union of International Associations (UIA) (various years); Yearbook of International Organizations, online open access version.
13	**Seat**	Geographic location of the headquarters/secretariat.	1: Africa 2: Americas 3: Asia 4: Europe 5: Oceania	The designation of continents follows the UN standard geographic regions classification (M49 code).
14	**Number of official members**	The number of official members, excluding observer and affiliate status.	1: up to 25 2: 26 to 50 3: 51 to 75 4: 76 – 100 5: 101-125 6: 126-150 7: 151-175 8: 176-200 9: 201 and more	As listed in official website.
15	**Membership timeline in DIPLOMETRICS**	Availability of full membership timelines in the DIPLOMETRICS dataset for the period until 2016.	0: No 1: Yes	Data available until 2014 (updated until latest accession for integration in AGGREGATOR). Sources: Moyer, J. D., Bohl, D. K., Camp, H., & Turner, S. Frederick S. Pardee Center for International Futures. (2016). Diplometrics: Intergovernmental Organization [Data file], http://pardee.du.edu/diplometrics.
16	**Type of members**	Type of members of the institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach.	Description given by the institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach	
17	**Formal requirements for membership**	As defined on the website and/or accompanying documentations.	Information given by the institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach	
18	**Legal basis**	Legal document on which the institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach is based.	1: Constitution 2: Treaty 3: Statute 4: Charter	Sources: Official websites; Yearbook of International

ID	Name	Definition	Coding Description	Comment
			5: Agreement 6: Declaration 7: Constitutive Act 8: Convention 9: Other	Organizations, online open access version.
20	**Institutional Quality**	The details on the institutional/organisational quality.	1: Inter-governmental Organisation (IGO)/inter-governmental 2: Non-governmental Organisation (NGO)/non-governmental 3: International Financial Institution (IFI) 4: Private company 5: Forum/Network/ Conference 6: Other	Sources: Websites; Specification of Type of organisation II, Union of International Associations (UIA) (various years): Yearbook of International Organizations, online open access version.
21	**Organisational structure**	The management and administrative structure is centralised, regionally or nationally decentralised, a combination of central and de-centralised structures.	1: Centralised 2: Regionally decentralised 3: Nationally decentralised 4: Combination	Source: Websites.
22	**Focus**	Brief description of the regime's, tool's and approach's thematic/policy focus.	Information given by the institution, organisation, regime, tool, approach	Sources: Websites; Union of International Associations (UIA) (various years): Yearbook of International Organizations, online open access version.
23	**Climate Change**	Relevant activities/units related to climate change.	0: No 1: Yes	As mentioned in official website/documents.
24	**Data Protection**	Relevant activities/units related to data protection.	0: No 1: Yes	As mentioned in official website/documents.
25	**Development Policy and Relations with Africa**	Relevant activities/units related to development policy and relations to Africa/African countries.	0: No 1: Yes	As mentioned in official website/documents.
26	**Sustainable Development Goals**	Relevant activities/units related to Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals.	0: No 1: Yes	As mentioned in official website/documents.

ID	Name	Definition	Coding Description	Comment
27	**Vitality of International Organisations 2013**	Description of the vitality of International Organisations according to Julia Gray (2013/2018).	1: Death (no meetings; no visible level of activity; no progress towards goals; missing funding) 2: Zombie (semi-regular opera-tions: continue to operate without any progress toward mandate; few gains from trade; fall short of ambitions); NA: not part of Gray sample 3: Life (at least one annual meeting at internal level; some kind of progress towards stated mandate)	The dataset cannot test whether the dataset's assessment of the vitality of international organizations reflects the institutional reality and capacity of the regional economic organiza-tions analysed. However, in order to use the additional explanative benefit of these analytical variables, the 'zombie', 'death' and 'life' variables were added to the dataset for the IGOs that were also integrated in the original dataset to indicate at potential concerns about their functionality in 2013. For these variables, the respective latest available year is taken from Gray 2018. Source: Gray, Julia. 2018. Life, Death, or Zombie? The Vitality of International Organizations, dataset; Gray, Julia. 2013. Life, Death, or Zombie? The Vitality of International Organizations. Draft paper; see also Gray, Julia. 2018. Life, Death, or Zombie? The Vitality of International Organizations, International Studies Quarterly, 62(1): 1–13.
28	**Source**	Link to the official website.	Link	
29	**TRIGGER Area**	Identifier for the TRIGGER Deep Dive analysis (relevant for project-internal research purposes).	1: Climate Change 2: Development Policy and Relations with Africa 3: Data Protection 4: Sustainable Development Goals	

The design and methodology of the dataset allows for the integration of further variables on institutional quality and policy-related information during future research and updates. The further extension of the dataset beyond the TRIGGER scope is envisaged to make it a living dataset and research resource in the future and to extend the 'cartography' for TRIGGER's AGGREGATOR Atlas of Global Governance REGulation and Europe's AcTORness beyond the project's lifetime.

4. Literature

Institutional websites, documents and sources as indicated through links.

Biermann, F., Pattberg, P. Van Asselt, H. and Zelli, F. 2009. The Fragmentation of Global Governance Architectures: A Framework for Analysis. Global Environmental Politics 9(4): 14–40.

Doornbos, M. 2001. 'Good Governance': The Rise and Decline of a Policy Metaphor? Journal of Development Studies 37(6): 93–108.

Fermont, M. 2020: The WTO has never been more relevant – or more at risk of collapse, in Rethinking Global Governance, Friends of Europe, Discussion Paper, Winter 2020, pp. 11-13.

Finkelstein, L.S. 1995. What Is Global Governance? Global governance: 367–372.

Fukuyama, F. 2013. What Is Governance? Governance 26(3): 347–68.

Giebler, H. 2012. Bringing Methodology (Back). in Some Remarks on Contemporary Democracy Measurements. European Political Science 11(4): 509–518.

Gray, J. 2018. Life, Death, or Zombie? The Vitality of International Organizations, International Studies Quarterly, 62(1): 1–13, https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqx086\

Gray, J. 2018. Life, Death, or Zombie? The Vitality of International Organizations, dataset; s

Gray, J. 2013. Life, Death, or Zombie? The Vitality of International Organizations. Draft paper.

Grindle, M.S. 2007. Good Enough Governance Revisited. Development policy review 25(5): 533–574.

Goertz, G. and Powers, K. 2019. "Regional governance: the evolution of a new institutional form". Qualitative Data Repository. https://doi.org/10.5064/F6UHXBNH: Goertz, Gary; Powers, Kathy. 2014. "Regional governance: the evolution of a new institutional form", WZB Discussion Paper No. SP IV 2014-106, WZB Berlin Social Science Center, Berlin.

Haftel, Y.Z. 2013. "Commerce and Institutions: Trade, Scope, and the Design of Regional Economic Organizations". The Review of International Organizations 8 (3): 389-414.

Hooghe, L., Marks, G., Lenz, T., Bezuijen, J., Ceka, B. and Derderyan, S. (2017). Measuring International Authority. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Knodt, M. 2004. International Embeddedness of European Multi-Level Governance. Journal of European Public Policy 11(4): 701–719.

Long, A. 2015. Global Integrationist Multimodality: Global Environmental Governance and Fourth Generation Environmental Law. J. Envtl. & Sustainability L. 21: 169.

Moyer, J. D., Bohl, D. K., Camp, H., and Turner, S. 2016. Diplometrics: Intergovernmental Organization [Data file], Frederick S. Pardee Center for International Futures, http://pardee.du.edu/diplometrics.

Murphy, C.N. 2000. Global Governance: Poorly Done and Poorly Understood. International Affairs 76(4): 789–804.

Pankakoski, T. and Vihma, A. 2017. Fragmentation in International Law and Global Governance: A Conceptual Inquiry. Contributions to the History of Concepts 12(1): 22–48.

Panke, D. and Starkmann, A. 2019. "Regional Organizations' Competencies (ROCO)", https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/UBXZHC.

Peters, G.B. 2002. Governance: A Garbage Can Perspective. Institute for Advanced Studies. Working paper. Vienna. http://aei.pitt.edu/347/.

Peterson, J. 2003. Policy Networks. Institute for Advanced Studies. Working paper. Vienna. http://aei.pitt.edu/764/.

Pevehouse, J.C.W., Nordstron, T., McManus, R.W. and Spencer Jamison, A. 2020. "Tracking Organizations in the World: The Correlates of War IGO Version 3.0 datasets", Journal of Peace Research 57(3): 492- 503; original datatset: Wallace, Michael, and J. David Singer. 1970. "International Governmental Organization in the Global System, 1815-1964." International Organization 24: 239-87.

Pierre, J. and Peters, G.B. 2005. Governing Complex Societies: Trajectories and Scenarios. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Rosenboim, O. 2019. State, power and global order. International Relations, 33(2), 229–245.

Sommerer, Th., and Tallberg, J. 2017. Transnational Access to International Organizations 1950–2010: A New Data Set, International Studies Perspectives, 18(3): 247–266, https://doi.org/10.1093/isp/ekv022.

Sommerer, Th. and Tallberg, J. 2017. Transnational Access to International Organizations 1950–2010: A New Data Set, International Studies Perspectives, 18(3): 247–266, https://doi.org/10.1093/isp/ekv022.

Sommerer, Th., Tallberg, J., and Squatrito, T. 2015. "Transnational Access to International Organizations 1950-2010", https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/DDE1HE;

Organizations 1950-2010", https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/DDE1HE;

Union of International Associations (UIA) (various years): Yearbook of International Organizations, online open access version.

Volgy, T., Fausett, E., Grant, K., & Rodgers, S. 2008. Identifying Formal Intergovernmental Organizations. Journal of Peace Research, 45(6): 837-850.

Weiss, Th. G. 2000. Governance, Good Governance and Global Governance: Conceptual and Actual Challenges. Third world quarterly 21(5): 795–814.

Yeo, L.H. 2020. Regions are the future of global governance: how the EU and ASEAN can lead the way, in Rethinking Global Governance, Friends of Europe, Discussion Paper, Winter 2020, 15–17.

Volgy, T., Fausett, E., Grant, K., and Rodgers, S. 2008. Identifying Formal Intergovernmental Organizations. Journal of Peace Research, 45(6): 837-850. http://www.jstor.org/stable/27640772.

Zangl, B. and Zürn, M.. 2003. Frieden und Krieg: Sicherheit in der nationalen und postnationalen Konstellation. Suhrkamp.

Zumbansen, P. 2012. Governance: An Interdisciplinary Perspective, in The Oxford Handbook of Governance, ed. David Levi-Faur. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 84–96.

trigger

Trends In Global Governance
and Europe's Role

CEPS Centre for European Policy Studies

Fraunhofer
ISI

spi
Sociedade Portuguesa de Inovação

Innovation for sustainability
isinnova

EPFL

ETLA

European University Institute

Freie Universität Berlin

TUM
Technische Universität München

POLITECNICO
MILANO 1863

ESIDG

EMAE
EURO-MEDITERRANEAN
ECONOMISTS ASSOCIATION

**INSTITUTION EURASIAN INSTITUTE
OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**