DIIS WORKING PAPER 2018: 10

ANALYSING CLIMATE FINANCE COORDINATION

Erik Lundsgaarde, Adam Moe Fejerskov and Jakob Skovgaard

Erik Lundsgaarde

Senior Researcher
erlu@diis.dk

Adam Moe Fejerskov

Researcher
admo@diis.dk

Jakob Skovgaard

Associate Professor and Researcher
jakob.skovgaard@svet.lu.se

Acknowledgements

This working paper was written as part of the research project *Share or Spare? Explaining the Nature and Determinants of Climate Finance Coordination*, for which funding from the Swedish Research Council is gratefully acknowledged. The author(s) thank Kevin M. Adams, Kendra Dupuy, Adis Dzebo and Mikkel Funder for helpful comments on a draft of this working paper. Comments to the authors are welcome.

DIIS Working Papers are work in progress by DIIS researchers and partners. They may include documentation which is not necessarily published elsewhere. DIIS Working Papers are published under the responsibility of the author alone. DIIS Working Papers should not be quoted without the express permission of the author.

DIIS WORKING PAPER 2018: 10

DIIS · Danish Institute for International Studies
Østbanegade 117, DK-2100 Copenhagen, Denmark
Tel: +45 32 69 87 87
E-mail: diis@diis.dk
www.diis.dk
ISBN 97887-7605-934-7 (pdf)
DIIS publications can be downloaded free of charge from www.diis.dk

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ANALYSING CLIMATE FINANCE COORDINATION

INTRODUCTION

As climate finance flows increase in importance, attention to how to use resources directed to climate change mitigation and adaptation in developing countries effectively is also growing. One important dimension of climate finance effectiveness is more effective coordination of resources provided by different actors and distributed through diverse channels at multiple governance levels. This paper builds on the discussion in Lundsgaarde, Dupuy and Persson (2018), which outlines the context for coordination challenges in the climate finance arena, by presenting analytical guideposts for explaining the nature and determinants of climate finance coordination practices.

The foundation for this paper is a review of theoretical entry points for studying coordination that identifies key explanations for the pursuit of coordination as well as for its limited reach. This discussion draws on research fields dealing with global environmental governance, aid management and organizational analysis. In reviewing key lines of discussion in these literatures, the paper emphasizes where the three fields overlap in their conceptualization of coordination and highlights their complementary character in explaining coordination outcomes. The paper then outlines explanatory factors for coordination that reflect common themes identified in the literature review to provide a basis for further empirical work on climate finance coordination.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON COORDINATION

Coordination occurs at multiple governance levels that possess unique characteristics while sharing central traits with others. This paper focuses on three specific contexts for actor interaction – the international, the national and the organizational levels – and the factors that enable, constrain and shape coordination choices within them. The analysis of coordination in these contexts takes a theoretical point of departure in three sets of literature: global environmental governance, aid management, and organizational studies, while acknowledging that insights from a wider body of work may be relevant in explaining coordination choices. Scholars working within these fields have developed explanations for coordination that encompass a range of perspectives including cost–benefit and normative logics, which cut across rationalist, functionalist, constructivist and sociological lenses. In the following we provide an overview of the landscape of perspectives while gradually zooming in on explanatory guideposts with the most theoretical salience for this project.

Coordination at the International Level: Management, Orchestration and Institutional Fragmentation

As Lundsgaarde, Dupuy and Persson (2018) highlight, climate finance coordination challenges exist at multiple governance levels, including at the global level, where the coordination of multilateral funds is an issue, and at the national level, where international finance streams interact with national financial management systems. Alternative theoretical approaches to examining coordination may thus use different contexts for coordination as their reference point.

In the field of environmental governance, global-level dynamics provide an important foundation for understanding coordination challenges. International environmental problems such as climate change and climate finance are increasingly governed by sets of institutions with different memberships, norms, principles and decision-making procedures. This state of affairs is often referred to as (i) 'fragmentation' (Biermann et al. 2009; Zelli & van Asselt 2013), (ii) 'complexity' (Keohane & Victor 2011), or (iii) 'polycentric governance' (Jordan et al. 2015; Ostrom 2010). The literature on international institutions has shifted from focusing on single institutions to increasingly studying the interaction or interplay between institutions (Gehring & Oberthür 2009; Oberthür & Stokke 2011), as well as on the fragmentation and coupling of institutions into institutional complexes or 'regime complexes' (Biermann et al. 2009; Raustiala & Victor 2004; Stokke 2001; Zelli 2011; see Zelli & van Asselt 2013, p. 5, for the distinction between institutional interaction and institutional complexity). Whereas some climate governance researchers argue that the fragmented state of global environmental governance is largely negative due to its focus on how coherent responses to climate change are impaired (Biermann et al. 2009), others see it in a more positive light as providing opportunities for testing different solutions and tailoring them to national circumstances (Keohane & Victor 2011; Ostrom 1990; Rayner 2010). Importantly, given the original focus on intergovernmental institutions, this literature treats states as the primary actors, except for those scholars who explicitly focus on private and international organization actors.

Biermann et al. (2009) distinguish between three kinds of fragmentation that reflect variations in *institutional integration*, *norm conflicts* and *actor constellations*. Institutional integration concerns how the different international institutions addressing a given issue relate to one another in terms of mandates and decision-making. Norm conflicts concern the relationship between the core norms across institutions. Finally, the emphasis on actor constellations highlights the degree to which different actors, mainly states, support the same institutions within the governance architecture. According to Biermann et al. (2009), variations in these factors can lead to fragmentation having a (i) synergistic (one core institution supported by all relevant state actors, integration of norms and institutions), (ii) cooperative (looser integration of norms and institutions yet no conflict) or (iii) conflictive (largely unrelated institutions, conflicting norms) quality. The kind of fragmentation that is at play in relation to a specific issue has consequences for how effectively the issue is addressed. Biermann et al. (2009) argue that the more conflictive the fragmentation is, the less effective the global governance arrangement.

In the climate finance arena, the governance architecture is undisputedly characterized by institutional fragmentation (Gomez-Echeverri 2013; Pickering et al. 2017; Pickering et al. 2015a). A range of new institutions governing or delivering climate finance have emerged alongside existing institutions from the development finance institutional complex. The climate finance institutional complex includes multilateral funds (e.g. the Green Climate Fund, GCF) and the Global Environmental Facility, GEF, multilateral development banks, bilateral aid agencies and funds, national climate change trust funds in recipient countries, and new multilateral monitoring bodies (e.g. the Standing Committee on Finance of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, UNFCCC, among others). Regarding fragmentation in terms of actor constellations, the different institutions often vary in their membership. United Nations (UN) organizations have universal membership, for example, while others are restricted to industrialized countries (e.g. the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, OECD), or include a different balance of regional stakeholders (the regional development banks). The involvement of private actors adds another type of stakeholder engagement and hence another dimension of fragmentation (Pauw 2017; Stadelmann et al. 2013). Finally, when it comes to normative fragmentation in the climate finance complex, different norms have been promoted. Developing countries favour equity-oriented norms such as historical responsibility and 'common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities' (Skovgaard 2017), while industrialized countries prefer norms of efficiency and effectiveness (Pittel & Rübbelke 2013; Stadelmann et al. 2014).

These conceptualizations of the climate governance landscape as fragmented have stimulated calls for coordination from academics and practitioners (Betsill et al. 2015; Zelli & van Asselt 2013). In a tightly integrated institutional complex with one institution at the centre, supported by all actors and with no norm conflicts, coordination among institutions is of little relevance. However, in a fragmented system such as the one addressing climate finance, it does make a difference whether the overlap between institutions is managed or not, with coordination constituting one kind of management (Zelli et al. forthcoming) The literature on coordination generally focuses on the coordination between institutions, including public as well as private and public–private institutions addressing various aspects of climate change.

The literature on institutional interaction or interplay focuses on how institutions inevitably interact within the climate institutional complex, yet such interaction is often conceived to be unintentional and as characterized by institutions acting without mutual adjustment of their actions (Eberlein et al. 2014; Oberthür 2016; Oberthür & Stokke 2011; Stokke 2001). A subfield within this literature, the literature on *interplay management,* focuses on interaction that is deliberately managed and in which the actors involved reflect upon the interaction of institutions (Oberthür 2016; Oberthür & Stokke 2011). However, interplay management does not necessarily involve coordination, but often takes place solely within one institution (ibid).

Whereas the interplay management literature focuses mainly on managing relations between inter-governmental institutions, a related literature on *orchestration* mainly focuses on relations between transnational and hybrid institutions (Abbott 2012, 2014; Abbott & Snidal 2010; Chan et al. 2015; Hale & Roger 2014). According to Abbott, Genschel, Snidal and Zangl (2015), orchestration by intergovernmental organizations (IGOs, the focus of their research) consists of the IGO enlisting and supporting intermediary actors to address target actors in pursuit of its governance goals. The UNFCCC secretariat's enlisting of non-state initiatives through its Non-State Actor Zone for Climate Action or NAZCA portal is an example of orchestration (Chan et al. 2015). Thus, orchestration constitutes a sub-type of governance that is distinguished from other kinds of coordination by being indirect – operating through intermediaries – and soft, because the orchestrator lacks control over the intermediaries (Abbott et al. 2015). Importantly, orchestration often involves setting up structures intended to shape the actions of the intermediaries, structures that, inter alia, can be used for coordination, for example the NAZCA portal. Orchestration – as well as other kinds of international and domestic coordination – can be informal or formal, and institutionalised to greater or lesser degrees. Orchestration also constitutes a kind of coordination that is distinguished by being unequal (the orchestrator orchestrates other actors) rather than being mutually agreed between actors.

Factors enabling and constraining coordination

The literature on international institutions rarely operates with coordination as its main focus. However, it is possible to pinpoint various factors that the literature identifies as enabling or constraining coordination. First, as research on orchestration outlines, actions taken by the UNFCCC (or in the case of climate finance also the World Bank) may facilitate coordination among international and transnational institutions as well as among states (see e.g. Abbott 2014). Such output can, for example, take the shape of UNFCCC decisions to manage fragmentation through setting up structures for coordinating activities through the Green Climate Fund (GCF), or efforts to standardize climate finance reporting through the Standing Committee on Finance (Pickering et al. 2017). On the other hand, UNFCCC output on climate finance – as well as on other issues more generally – has often been criticized for having little effect, and certainly still leaves considerable discretion for actors regarding whether they want to coordinate or not.

The self-interest of actors is often identified as a key factor that may enable or constrain coordination (see Keohane 1989 for a similar argument regarding international regimes in general). Keohane and Victor (2016) argue that the depth of coordination depends inter alia on the size of the joint gains that actors (in this case states) will receive from coordination. Starting from similar assumptions about actors' self-interested motives, Gehring and Faude (2014) argue that actors will engage in forum shopping, leading institutions to specialise in different areas and create a functional division of labour in the long term. Importantly, Gehring and Faude also point to the importance of power in such divisions of labour: the content of the division of labour depends on the constellation of (state) interests and the distribution of power, and changes to the distribution of power are likely to challenge established divisions of labour. Self-interest does not rule out a role for knowledge. Abbott (2014, p. 84) points to the role of entrepreneurs, 'providing information, demonstration effects and learning opportunities that reveal the benefits of institutional coordination and collaboration'. Thus, although actors may be interest-driven, their knowledge of the world is neither given nor fixed.

While idea- and norm-oriented factors have received less attention than purely interest-based factors in the literature on coordination between institutions, they have received more attention when it comes to enabling coordination between states. Haas (1992) argues that epistemic communities based within international institutions can shape coordination by creating a shared understanding of a policy problem and how to address it among policy experts from the various countries. Epistemic communities can also involve experts from international organizations, a subset of international institutions. Whereas Haas focused on cognitive interaction, i.e. how to understand and address an issue, interaction can also be normative, i.e. regarding the norms upheld by one institution (Stokke 2001; Gehring & Oberthür 2009).

Coordination at the National Level: Lessons from Aid Management

As in the field of global environmental governance, the concept of fragmentation has informed the understanding of the nature of coordination challenges in the context of aid management. As Schulpen, Loman and Kinsbergen (2011) suggest, a fragmented aid landscape reflects several dynamics. It is understood to be driven in part by an ever-expanding list of aid providers, including states beyond the membership of the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD, and private actors. Decisions by diverse actors to distribute aid widely contribute to the multitude of initiatives and projects that overlap in mandate but are separately administered. The main arenas for coordination discussed in the aid management literature relate to how actors interact at the country level and how donors make decisions at headquarters that take the priorities of other actors into consideration.

Within the aid management literature, rationalist approaches have played an important role in framing the need for coordination and explaining shortcomings in coordination practice. Aid coordination is generally advanced as a means of increasing effectiveness by lowering the transaction costs of finance delivery, streamlining administrative structures and procedures, reducing project duplication (wastage), better aligning donor and recipient priorities, and allowing smaller actors in particular to reap larger returns from their inputs (Bigsten & Tengstam 2015; Bourguignon & Platteau 2015). The cost–benefit rationale explains development finance coordination as a matter of efficiency, that is, as a means for optimally distributing resources among competing uses (Buse & Walt 1996; Bigsten 2006). Reducing transaction costs was a key motivation behind the formulation of the aid effectiveness principles, which emphasize the desired leadership role of developing countries in coordinating externally-financed activities (OECD 2008; Lundsgaarde & Keijzer 2018).

Although a key emphasis of the effectiveness agenda is on reducing the burden on partner country administrations and it therefore focuses on coordination undertaken at the country level, benefits from coordination were expected to accrue on both sides of the development cooperation relationship. An improved division of labour enabling donors to focus on areas where they contribute added value represents one possible advantage to funders (Delputte & Orbie 2014).

Determinants of coordination practice

In spite of the advantages associated with increased coordination, the aid management literature outlines numerous explanations for limited coordination that help to account for uneven progress in the implementation of this dimension of the aid effectiveness agenda. In this respect, the discussion of coordination tends to focus on obstacles to, rather than enablers of, coordinated action.

A first explanation for limited coordination consistent with a rationalist approach is that coordination can itself create transaction costs that may negate efficiency gains. Funders and recipients must establish formal coordination mechanisms in the form of standardized procedures and frameworks to enable actors to clearly divide tasks, roles, and responsibilities, to establish expectations, to create consultative processes, and to enforce coordination agreements. Sufficient resources must be dedicated to coordination instruments both initially and over time, both to harmonize their systems initially and to sustain participation. Coordination also requires sufficient numbers of competent staff dedicated to carrying out coordination tasks, as well as senior management staff that can push coordination processes forward (Linn 2009). Furthermore, the need for coordination across multiple governance scales may undermine the value of coordination, such as when donor-level structures, in seeking to foster coordination, perversely create additional administrative burdens on recipient governments (Barakat 2009; Gulrajani 2014).

Second, the desire to maintain autonomy is linked to the interests that varied actors pursue through cooperation relationships. Thus, limited coordination may reflect an underlying divergence of preferences among the many actors populating the aid arena. A large literature dealing with donor motives for aid allocation highlights that decisions on where to direct funding are based on a variety of considerations reflecting economic and political interests of the donor country as well as the characteristics of partner countries. This literature suggests that the underlying logic for individual donors' in-country activities can vary. The presumed interest of donors to deliver aid effectively can be understood as just one of numerous interests pursued in development cooperation relationships alongside a variety of other goals. As Olivié & Pérez (2016) reveal in an analysis of aid coordination in Morocco, interests on both sides of the aid relationship can serve as barriers to coordination. Partner governments may have an interest in maintaining diversity among funders and therefore display reluctance in advancing coordination efforts, for example.

The multiplicity of interests at work in development cooperation are in part a reflection of the diverse actors that influence decision-making in this field. Even when the focus of an analysis is restricted to a particular donor-partner country dyad, numerous governmental actors can be involved in international cooperation, increasing the potential for the introduction of diverse interests in a cooperation relationship. As Pickering et al. (2015a) indicate with respect to climate finance, finance ministries, environment ministries and development ministries are among the actors involved in formulating priorities on the funder side. The differences in the views of environment ministries that have greater experience with mitigation efforts and development ministries that consider adaptation to be closely related to an existing development mandate, can influence the balance of priorities in climate finance portfolios. On the recipient side, a key source of interest conflicts relates to the line ministries that stand to lose control of funding due to consolidated approaches and the central aid coordinating entities (often a finance ministry) that may have greater leeway to influence funding priorities in a more strongly coordinated aid management context (Leiderer 2015; Winckler Andersen & Therkildsen 2007).

Third, limited coordination can relate to its perceived consequences for the bargaining power of donors and recipients, or to power relations among donors. While coordination can lead to alignment of donor and recipient priorities, this likely depends on how actors are brought into a coordination process and how participants perceive their ownership over the process. A funder's decision to coordinate may involve strategic considerations related to retaining or relinquishing control or bargaining power. Even with the advent of an ownership agenda implying a transfer of initiative and management responsibilities to partner governments, donor interests in maintaining control continued to be expressed through heavy involvement in the preparation of development strategies, the use of conditionalities, and close monitoring of partner efforts (Fraser & Whitfield 2009). Increased policy dialogue accompanying a transition to pooled funding approaches could, in this respect, be interpreted as a mechanism to ensure that funder interests are protected (Winckler Andersen & Therkildsen 2007). Continuing donor participation in such dialogue processes even when the transition to pooled funding should enable a withdrawal provides an example of donor reluctance to cede control over how resources are used at country level. Power relations can shape not only the bargaining dynamics between donors and recipients but also coordination prospects among the donors. The presence of a strong lead donor can increase the potential for more coordinated action, however large donors may also obstruct coordination efforts (Olivié & Pérez 2016).

A fourth explanation for limited coordination focuses on the incentives of various participants involved in aid efforts to coordinate with other actors. As Gibson, Andersson, Ostrom and Shivakumar (2005) illustrate through a case study of the Swedish aid administration, aid management involves a long delivery chain in which various actors are involved. Throughout this delivery chain, actors may face different rewards or sanctions for their actions in promoting more effective development cooperation. As one example, Gibson et al. (2005) suggest that while the Swedish development agency Sida's working environment offered positive incentives promoting a culture of learning, the organization did not use an individual's record of success or failure with development projects as a criterion for career advancement. In the context of a more general assessment of donor coordination efforts, Aldasoro, Nunnenkamp and Thiele (2010) indicate that poor incentives for aid administrators to coordinate can relate to pressure to demonstrate project visibility and pressure to withhold project information from other funders in order to associate themselves with the most interesting projects. These studies thus highlight barriers to coordination located within development organizations.

A final explanation for coordination practice consistent with a rationalist approach is that the extent of coordination can reflect the capacities of partner governments. In a study of the implementation of the aid effectiveness agenda in the health and education sectors in Zambia, Leiderer (2015) indicates that although Zambia on the surface had all of the needed elements in place for execution of the aid effectiveness agenda, analytical capacity within governmental coordination units was weak and they were therefore limited in the types of information on donor activities they could collect and process. The other side of the capacity issue is that a lack of donor coordination can contribute to lowering the capacity of partner governments to manage aid. As Wrighton & Overton (2012) illustrate in the case of the small-island state of Tuvalu, the persistent multiplicity of partners pursuing specific interests can prove especially challenging in light of the development effectiveness agenda's goal to foster greater participation of partner country governments in dialogue processes.

This overview of explanations for coordination practice in the aid management literature highlights that the extent of coordination can relate to a combination of factors that may reinforce one another. For example, the interests of donors or recipients may be linked to the power or autonomy both sides wish to retain within a given partnership. Many studies in this literature point to a gap between the commitment to international principles and the country-level implementation of the principles. While funders may share numerous common interests that are associated with their acceptance of international agreements to advance development concerns and respect effectiveness principles, these are evidently not the only interests that shape their development cooperation practices. This points to the relevance of examining when an interest in coordination as a means for promoting more effective cooperation outcomes outweighs other interests present in cooperation relationships.

Within the aid management literature, the context for coordination has generally been defined in terms of an interface between OECD donors and partner countries. However, a diversifying actor landscape is drawing increasing attention to a wider scope for coordination challenges in aid delivery. New actors such as emerging powers and global vertical funds (Schulpen et al. 2011; Leiderer 2015) have grown in importance over the last decade in parallel with the existing system. At the same time, there is growing interest in the contribution of private sector actors to development efforts, expanding the scope of coordination challenges beyond a government-to-government setting.

Organization-level Perspectives on Coordination

Finally, organizational theory situates coordination challenges within the confines of individual organizations or in interactions between organizations, providing a micro-level scope for analysis in contrast to the broad literatures discussed above. Coordination has long been a central subject in organization theory. It is often seen as an organizational activity that 'emerges in contexts where interdependent actors need to align their different contributions to achieve a common objective' (Gkeredakis 2014). Early organizational thought on coordination mainly revolved around notions of improper organizing, leading researchers to concentrate on theories of organizational design (e.g. Thompson 1967) from a perspective identifying formal organizational structure as the main barrier to effectively coordinated organizing. The challenge was thus to match formal coordination mechanisms such as rules, plans or hierarchies with levels of interdependence among actors needing to align their activities (Gkeredavkis 2014). Likewise, interorganizational research has traditionally focused on formal mechanisms or properties of organizational networks (Grandori & Soda 1995; Swan & Scarbrough 2005), with an understanding of coordination as predominantly being information and knowledge exchange, shaped by exercises of organizational planning.

Okhuysen and Bechky (2009) identify five types of mechanism that encapsulate how emergent practices assist in coordination. From this perspective, there is no sharp distinction between coordination practices and coordination enablers.

Plans and rules are purposive and indispensable elements of organizing as they establish relationships and serve as preparation for task completion. They help define responsibilities for tasks, allocate resources, and reflect the working agreements among actors defining how actors orient themselves.

Objects and representation serve instrumental, symbolic and aesthetic purposes in coordination and may convey both technical and social information and mobilize action as a result. They enable direct information-sharing, provide a structure for activities and can facilitate learning across groups and build shared understandings of common goals.

Roles represent specific social and organizational positions and therefore also expected behaviour and action over time, yet they can change over time or from situation to situation. They help structure interactions but may also exacerbate both formal and informal differences between actors. Some roles may even be given responsibility for coordination and function as interorganizational actors, connecting disparate groups as active brokers and translators rather than as information sharers.

Routines are patterns of behaviour, initially seen as mechanical properties that were stable and hard to change, yet now conceived to be more complex, with social meaning and interaction embedded in them. Though perhaps taking place in cycles, such as monthly or annual donor meetings, the forms of and objectives of meetings may change. As re-occurring efforts, they are key in reproducing and sustaining coordination efforts.

Finally, *proximity* denotes the relative distance between individuals, groups and organizations, often shaping both the form and frequency of interaction and communication. In contexts spanning great distances, such as in the global climate finance landscape in which organizations may be spread across the world, visibility and performative dynamics are important for maintaining meaningful interaction and trust.

The organizational literature has gradually shifted from a structural focus on coordination mechanisms towards modes of coordinating, i.e. what people do to coordinate *in situ*. Thus, coordination is increasingly conceptualized as a dynamic activity or emergent process, always in the making (Kellogg et al. 2006). Actors approach coordination in a situated manner in response to specific challenges and opportunities as they arise, often through formal and informal processes of knowledge sharing and communication (Okhuysen & Bechky 2009; Bechky 2006; Gkeredakis 2014). Coordination remains an ongoing accomplishment, and formal mechanisms may help facilitate it, but their presence does not guarantee it, underlining the perspective of coordination as interaction between actors. Over time, organizational research has stressed the substantial discrepancy between the formal descriptions of work in rules, procedures and agreements, and the informality of everyday organizational life with its practices and routines (Pentland & Feldman 2008).

For some, this change of analytical and empirical focus reflects a turn within coordination studies in Organization Theory that increasingly emphasizes organizational processes and social practices of coordinating (Jarzabkowski et al. 2012). A key insight is that coordination mechanisms should not be viewed as management decisions made prior to coordination processes, but rather that these are constituted through coordinating. As such, interdependencies are not given but rather evolve and are renegotiated and reframed over time (Kellogg et al. 2006).

Coordination mechanisms are not stable entities that freeze actors into specific roles and expectations from which they cannot escape. More often than through formal mechanisms, coordination is accomplished through the repetition of patterns of interaction that form routine procedures and rules that are socially produced and reproduced through interaction (Jarzabkowski et al. 2012). These perspectives point to the inadequacy of explanations of formal structure and design alone to both explicate and ensure coordination. As such, the analytical balance remains to understand how everyday practices of coordination intersect with, strengthen, or even undermine, formal coordination mechanisms.

Coordination rests on a set of different organizing principles that in turn shape and are reproduced through coordinating practices. Some argue that coordination depends on the three fundamental conditions of accountability, predictability and shared understanding (Okhuysen & Bechky 2009). Accountability makes responsibilities visible by attributing specific tasks to specific organizational members, who are then held accountable for their work. It may be created by both formal structures and by informal means such as emergent dialogue or interaction. As such, it may be produced in situations without necessarily being a given from the outset of a process. Predictability reflects actors' expectations about what will happen at what times, by whom it will be done and how. Only through predictability may actors be able to understand their place in the larger whole and understand what they need to do to fulfil the actions for which they are accountable. Finally, common understanding shapes coordination by referring to degrees of shared perspectives on objectives and goals.

Aside from the strong individual-level organizing principles and conditions discussed above, others have focused on the cognitive problems that individuals face when trying to coordinate with others. For example, some individuals may have inadequate lay theories of organizing and exhibit a fundamental neglect for coordination when designing organizational processes or participating in them (Heath & Staudenmayer 2000).

Seeing formal mechanisms and institutional structures for coordination as being in dialogue with the actors involved raises questions about how actors within organizations are shaped by institutional rules, structures or orders as they engage in coordination activities. It also suggests how these actors can 'break free' if the logic of their organization privileges fragmentation and competition rather than coordination. To address this duality and the constitutive nature of agency and structure, conventions theory explores how actors cope with a plurality of interdependencies (i.e. coordination issues) through conventions (Boltanski & Thévenot 2006). Conventions theory highlights the dynamic ways through which actors engaged in local coordination situations may tap into larger-scale integration processes. As an example, Gkeredakis (2014) shows how actors working on specific tasks are able to elevate their narratives from the local tasks and reflect upon and draw associations to larger-scale efforts of coordination. This pragmatic versatility is relevant for the context of climate finance coordination and programmatic implementation in which actors juggle the tangible conditions and challenges of local projects while being embedded in wider global systems of interaction and coordination. Their temporal orientations and versatility form relevant objects of study as they may move between short-term programme documents and imaginings of the productive impact of an effective climate finance regime.

CONCEPTUALIZING COORDINATION

Coordination is a commonly used term to describe various forms of interaction among actors such as states, organizations or individuals in different governance settings. The term may be so widely used that its definition is taken for granted. This section identifies commonalities and differences across the three theoretical perspectives to provide a working definition of coordination.

A general distinction between the theoretical perspectives reviewed is that they vary in their focus on specific settings in which coordination problems can emerge. The literature on global environmental governance highlights coordination possibilities and difficulties among states and international institutions in relation to transnational policy objectives. In the literatures on institutional interplay or orchestration, coordination occurs in a context of persistent autonomy of the actors involved. Coordination points to the growing consistency of action among actors. In this context, it may thus be distinguished from integrated action or the delegation of responsibility to other actors.

Within the aid management literature, there is a particular emphasis on a restricted setting for coordination, namely the country level. Coordination is generally understood as a means to achieve the objective of delivering aid more effectively. It requires collaboration among multiple agents and is defined through a description of practices reflecting varying degrees of cooperation. Coordination practices fall along a spectrum ranging from information-sharing to collective implementation (Orbie et al. 2017). Other distinctions can relate to the timing of activities (for example, whether coordination informs decision-making or takes place after the conclusion of activities to inform future engagement) or the level of action at which coordination takes place, ranging from policy formulation, to programming, to implementation (Orbie et al. 2017). In the field of aid management, the coordination term is commonly associated with the concept of harmonization. Harmonization is similarly defined with respect to certain practices, particularly the development of common procedures for planning, implementing and monitoring aid, and undertaking actions to improve complementarity with other actors through a division of labour (OECD 2008).

The definition of coordination presented in the organizational studies literature shares an emphasis on the persistence of actor autonomy and alignment around common goals (see Gkeredakis 2014). One distinction with the definition presented in the other literatures is that there is greater attention to coordination as a collection of practices and as a continuous process with a predictable quality based on the existence of shared understandings among actors involved. As the discussion above indicates, this literature presents varied perspectives on coordination, suggesting that it may either reflect an extension of rules or the assignment of responsibilities, or be a more informal response to specific challenges.

In line with core elements of the different theoretical entry points outlined above, coordination can thus be conceived as a practice or a process that actors engage in to facilitate the achievement of goals shared with other actors (Lundsgaarde et al.

2018). Thus, coordination can be considered either as a discrete action or as an ongoing and dynamic pattern of interaction. It is understood as a cooperative act that implies a shared commitment to certain objectives among the actors involved. The emphasis on shared goals underlines that coordination has an intentional quality, but the identification of the common objectives of involved actors may not be straightforward, as actors pursue multiple goals simultaneously. Coordination can vary in scope and form. By emphasizing the preservation of actor autonomy, this characterization of coordination implies that avoiding overlap and increasing the consistency of actions that different actors carry out reflects a central coordination objective.

In light of the many possible emphases in examining the drivers, substance and consequences of coordination practices, a focus on coordination within defined settings, among particular actors, and with respect to specific goals is needed to guide specific research outputs. The general definition of coordination presented in this section provides an umbrella for a variety of phenomena, including decision-making among climate finance providers about where to allocate resources for climate mitigation and adaptation, the development of standardized accreditation procedures for climate fund recipients, and the harmonization of reporting frameworks for funding recipients.

EXPLANATORY FACTORS FOR COORDINATION

This section draws together the theoretical entry points in the literatures outlined above to identify the common themes in explaining coordination practice that can guide the analysis of climate finance coordination. This discussion outlines six general variables extracted from the literature review (preferences, power, normative and cognitive structures, formal institutional settings, temporal developments and entrepreneurship). Importantly, these factors are not mutually exclusive, but may interact in various ways. These factors shape not only the presence of coordination itself, but also the content of the coordination, including how the coordination takes place and which objectives and principles guide coordination.

Constellation of Actor Preferences

As should be clear from the discussion of the factors identified, particularly by the international fragmentation and aid management literatures, actors and the objectives they pursue constitute important explanations of coordination (Keohane & Victor 2016; Bigsten & Tengstam 2015; Bourguignon & Platteau 2015). Importantly, the actors in question include states, bureaucratic entities within the state (ministries, agencies, local offices and other units of agencies and ministries), international organization bureaucracies, and individuals (Gibson et al. 2005). In this context, a relevant actor is defined by its ability to participate in the coordination of climate finance and by a distinct set of preferences. We use the term preferences to refer to the objectives that actors pursue, which do not necessarily involve material gain.

While much of the literature on the role of norms and interests argues that there is a clear-cut distinction between norms and interests in influencing actor behaviour, in practice this distinction is often more difficult to establish precisely. For instance, a preference for financing adaptation may be driven by a combination of a normative commitment to the principle of historical responsibility and by utility-maximization through acting as a side-payment in negotiations and avoiding climate induced migration (Rübbelke 2011). Consequently, we use the broader term preferences rather than interests. However, preferences can be distinguished based on how altruistic or utility-maximising they are. Different preferences on the altruistic end of spectrum include poverty reduction, historical responsibility for climate change and gender equality, whereas the more utility-maximizing preferences include maximizing economic gains for state bureaucracies or for domestic business, military security and limiting migration. A preference for the provision of (global, regional or national) public goods may be more or less altruistic, depending on the priority given to the utility of others compared to oneself.

Actor preferences may align in different ways; ranging from similar and complementary to conflicting. Preferences may be diverse without necessarily being conflicting, e.g. one donor's preference for gender mainstreaming may be compatible with another donor's preference for rural development. Preference constellations concern not only thematic priorities, but also geographic allocation (between regions, countries and parts of a given country) and the channels through which climate finance is allocated (e.g. Multilateral Development Banks, UNFCCC funds, or bilaterally).

As the aid management and global governance literatures have pointed out, coordination may arise out of cost–benefit calculations, i.e. actors choosing to coordinate because it increases the fulfilment of their preferences compared to a situation in which they do not cooperate. This increase in preference obtainment can come from reduced transaction costs as well as from increased total bargaining power, particularly vis-à-vis recipients (Linn 2009; Fraser & Whitfield 2009). On the other hand, coordination may also decrease preference obtainment for actors in terms of diminished individual state bargaining power and in terms of individual actors or bureaucracies (e.g. ministries and agencies) relinquishing control within the decision-making process (Gibson et al. 2005; Aldasoro et al. 2010). All things being equal, the more similar preferences are, the easier coordination should be.

Power

Power trade-offs are at the heart of many political decisions, including the choice about whether to coordinate, as well as decisions about the extent of coordination. In the political science literature, different kinds of power have been identified (Barnett & Duvall 2005; Lukes 2005). Here we focus on interactional rather than constitutive kinds of power, be they direct – e.g. Dahl (1957): an actor holds power over another actor to the degree (s)he can get that actor to do something (s)he would not otherwise have done – or indirect – e.g. Bachrach & Baratz (1972): an actor can influence socially distant actors through institutions. Power may explain why coordination appears despite not making sense to actors in terms of cost–benefit calculations, shared worldviews or commitments to coordination (Benvenisti & Downs 2007; see also Zelli 2011). A powerful actor may impose coordination on others even when benefits from pursuing shared goals do not appear to outweigh the costs of doing so. For instance, a group of states with diverging preferences, which in case of an equal distribution of power would not have coordinated because their individual costs would outweigh the benefits, end up coordinating because one state can force them to do so by increasing the costs of not coordinating. Power may also influence the content of coordination, particularly which actors' preferences prevail in the coordination process. Powerful states may also be instrumental in setting up international institutions or regimes that reflect their interests (Krasner 1983) and thus more indirectly shape the coordination of climate finance through the formal institutional structures discussed below.

Furthermore, coordination can act as a way of enhancing the disciplining power of funders to shape recipients' behaviour given their material advantages. However, participating in cooperative arrangements entails that funders and recipients alike must give up some degree of control over financial allocations (Pickering et al 2015b). Coordination efforts among funders may push these funders away from a pursuit of narrow interests through funding streams or alignment of objectives, while recipients may lose influence vis-à-vis funders (Leiderer 2015; Bigsten &

Tengstam 2015; Buse 1999; Fuchs et al. 2013; Gibson et al. 2005). Finance fragmentation may thus become a purposeful strategy in coordinated instruments, as for instance when funders choose to support institutions with overlapping mandates to hedge political risks stemming from particular institutions (Zelli & van Asselt 2013).

In organizational theory, trust and power are two equally important principles and social mechanisms of organizing that shape coordination. Power is an important factor for coordination found in the social embeddedness of interorganizational relations.

Normative and Cognitive Structures

Climate finance coordination is not only the product of individual preferences and power constellations but is also shaped by the normative and cognitive structures of the social arenas in which multiple actors engage across different levels. These structures consist of ideas regarding how to understand a phenomenon and its causes and consequences, as well as normative ideas about the positive and negative sides of the phenomenon in light of 'what one ought to do' (Schmidt 2008, pp. 306–7). Whereas the preference constellation focuses on actors' autonomous calculations of costs and benefits in terms of obtaining their preferences, the normative and cognitive structures constitute an external influence on these preferences as well as on how actors pursue them, including which preferences and kinds of behaviour are considered legitimate and appropriate (March & Olsen 1989). The cognitive structures influence how actors perceive a situation including the casual consequences of actions such as coordination. In light of the uncertainty regarding the costs and benefits (in terms of preference maximization) of particular actions (Goldstein & Keohane 1993), ideas can play an important role in actors' choice to coordinate. The organizational literature also points to the importance of predictability and shared understanding for coordination (Okhuysen & Bechky 2009).

The normative structures can shape the degree to which actors perceive particular actions as appropriate and thus whether they will engage in them and how they will perceive of others engaging in them. For instance, the political legitimacy of a coordination instrument in the eyes of participants, the authority of the agency leading coordination, and the distribution of power within an instrument may determine actors' desire to join and remain in a coordination instrument (Regens 1988; Karlsson-Vinkhuyzen & McGee 2013). Besides the legitimacy of individual coordinating instruments or activities, positive views about the value of coordination in general – that it is 'a good thing to be doing' (Schermerhorn 1975, p. 848) – are likely to shape preferences of actors within organizations for participating in coordination instruments. So, too, will organizational culture, defined as the 'rules, rituals, and beliefs that are embedded in the organization (and its subunits) [and] that have important consequences for the way individuals who inhabit that organization make sense of the world' (Barnett & Finnemore 1999, p. 719). The development effectiveness agenda associated with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and follow-up agreements highlights the importance of donor coordination, and the UNFCCC also provides a set of principles and commitments (e.g. on the balance between adaptation and mitigation finance).

Yet, coordination may not only be influenced by ideas that deem coordination appropriate, but also by the degree to which the same ideas influence actors equally. For instance, the development effectiveness principles may matter not only in terms of promoting coordination, but also in terms of enhancing the legitimacy of norms that actors can converge around. All things being equal, a context characterized by uncontested normative and cognitive ideas (i.e. low degree of normative fragmentation, see Biermann et al. 2009) should be more conducive for coordination (Haas 1992). On the other hand, if the context is characterized by norm conflict or opposing causal beliefs (e.g. about the consequences of particular kinds of projects such as hydropower), actors are less likely to coordinate, or they may coordinate among actors that subscribe to the same cognitive and normative ideas.

Formal Institutional Structures

Formal institutional settings such as decision-making procedures, prior or higher-level commitments (e.g. UNFCCC Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions or National Adaptation Programmes of Action, the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness), and voting rules within international institutions may all influence coordination. These settings function as structures within which actors operate. On the international level, several reference frameworks and other measures for improving coordination exist. They include institutions such as the Standing Committee on Climate Finance and the Green Climate Fund that inter alia aim to improve coordination. However, even institutions set up to advance coordination may unintentionally make coordination more difficult if they promote competing or conflicting principles or involve different kinds of actors (e.g. development and environment ministries). On the domestic level, recipient or donor actors may set up formal institutions for discussing and coordinating development aid more generally as well as climate finance more specifically (Lundsgaarde et al. 2018). Such domestic level coordination often involves arrangements set up by the recipient government to facilitate coordination among domestic ministries and agencies as well as between international donors.

Yet, formal institutional structures do not need to explicitly address coordination to have an impact on the prospects for coordination. The formal institutional structures that determine which (international and domestic) actors are involved also matter, for instance by involving a range of agencies, initiatives and instruments and thus complicating the prospects for coordination (Lundsgaarde & Keijzer 2018).

We expect that the presence of formal institutional structures for coordination will improve the likelihood of coordination. Yet, we also expect the existence of multiple institutional structures supported by different actors (akin to what Biermann et al. [2009] refer to as conflictive institutional fragmentation) to lead to less overall coordination within a given system (the international level or the recipient country). In such a situation, there may be several focal points around which smaller sets of actors coordinate, but little coordination involving all actors. Hence, other factors may be important for the scope of the individual formal structures.

Temporality

Coordination is not merely an end state but is rather an iterative and evolving process of relationship building (Regens 1988). The dynamics of such a process alters the likelihood and character of coordination. Consequently, when studying the coordination of climate finance, one cannot just focus on actor preferences and power and the structures they operate within; it is also necessary to look at how specific dynamics have evolved over time. Explanations for coordination behaviour from organizational studies conceptualize coordination as an outgrowth of interaction and learning between actors over time. Among the contributions to the organizational studies literature, cost–benefit approaches emphasize the relational nature of actors in coordination instruments and how coordination can enhance information flows between participants about each other's preferences, interests, activities and opportunities. In environments that are characterized by high uncertainty, coordination processes can create continuous information flows that foster adaptive learning and enable mutual adjustment among participants (Regens 1988). Information flows enhance monitoring and reduce the information asymmetries that lead to wasted funds.

Yet coordination instruments must resolve a number of information asymmetries that can undermine coordination. Funders must be willing to share sensitive information amongst themselves, a challenge when they are heterogeneous in terms of size, preferences and time horizons, and when some funders may wish to preserve the leverage that information asymmetries grant them (Bigsten 2006; Bourguignon & Platteau 2015). Moreover, the entity charged with leading a coordination mechanism must be willing to share information widely rather than retain it, potentially threatening its authority (Linn 2009).

In climate finance, there may be many perceptions or logics of temporality. Annual budgets of multilateral funds have a specific logic to them as to where, how and when coordination may be necessary and possible, just as there are different temporal logics associated with specific projects (with multi-annual plans and benchmarks, mid-term reviews, annual budgets etc). These logics of temporality may be difficult to synchronize and may complicate coordination efforts, not only inter-organizationally with other exogeneous actors, but perhaps even within the same organizational system of headquarters, national offices and implementation partners. This makes it interesting to explore how organizational actors alter or construct their work trajectories to accommodate local circumstances or in response to other temporal logics at play higher up in the system and, vice versa, to what extent 'global planning' is shaped by local logics of temporality. The diversity of space may further shape coordination by setting up different boundaries of interaction. The headquarters of multilateral climate funds are bound to engage in different modes of coordination than national offices, for example. More than just shaping the modus of coordination, from virtual meetings to working lunches, these differences of space shape fundamental notions of trust, power and communication.

Developments over time may create path dependencies (Pierson 2004) shaping coordination through feedback loops. Actors that already coordinate may be more likely to coordinate in the future, due to already reduced transaction costs, better knowledge of their respective preferences, and established procedures and divisions of labour.

Agency and Entrepreneurship

Coordination processes and practices ultimately take place between actors – individuals – who engage in intra- or inter-organizational efforts. These efforts may occur under formalized rules or systems, just as they are shaped by institutional structures and logics, but they are ultimately driven by actors. Across disparate literatures, prevailing notions of entrepreneurs and 'antipreneurs' conceptualize how actors may engage in efforts to both push forward and shape organizational processes such as coordination but may also attempt to impede progress by setting up obstacles or hindering certain actions (see Bloomfield 2016). Whether conceptualized as policy (Kingdon 2003) or as institutional entrepreneurs (Maguire et al. 2004; Battilana et al. 2009; DiMaggio 1988), these are actors operating within bureaucracies – e.g. climate funds or aid agencies – who may induce and shape coordination in different ways. For instance, they may place coordination high on the decision-making agendas of funding agencies, or frame it in ways that resonate with existing cognitive and normative structures.

They may leverage resources to shape coordination processes, initiating divergent changes and actively participating in implementing these. Commonly, the forms of agency that these actors possess have been explored by relating them to either the properties of the actors or to their specific positions in a given field (Battilana et al. 2009). The former underlines the special abilities, characteristics and qualities of these actors that allow them to initiate forms of change. They are thus seen to form a distinct social type who may use their reflexivity to alter existing practices or initiate new ones. The latter is more focused on how a varied set of subject positions exists and that power and ability to incite change flows from these rather than only from the actors themselves. Different positions within bureaucracies thus grant actors access to resources and power, which in turn provide them with the capacity to ignite change. An obvious weakness of these 'entrepreneur' literatures is that they tend to overemphasize the agentic dimension of such actors, perhaps even to the point of these being portrayed as hyper-muscular entities detached from the institutional and organizational concerns that, in turn, are shaping them.

Drawing on Lawrence & Suddaby (2006) and others' work to introduce notions of institutional work, we may further broaden our attention from solely a focus on actors, towards their efforts though what could be conceptualized as 'coordination work'. That is, inspired by the practice turn in social theory (Schatzki et al. 2001), notions of coordination work redirect our attention towards the actions of the everyday lives of actors, rather than the actors themselves, exploring how these create, disrupt or shape coordination practices.

CONCLUSION

The discussion above points to many possible influences on the form and scope of climate finance coordination. A focused analysis of coordination dynamics within specific settings is needed to examine the relevance of the groups of explanatory factors listed and to gain a better understanding of the relationship between them. This requires restricting the research scope to particular levels of analysis, selected actors, and a limited number of coordination activities. A focus on specific arenas for coordination can facilitate the description of actor characteristics and preferences, power relations among actors, and normative and institutional frameworks that provide a starting point for explaining coordination outcomes. Because global climate finance decision-making cuts across levels of analysis and across sectors of activity, however, it is also clear that settings selected for focused study are not independent arenas. As a consequence, the interactions between global and country-level coordination of climate finance will inform the analysis of coordination in more restricted settings as the research project to which this paper contributes develops.

REFERENCES

Abbott, K.W. (2012) 'The transnational regime complex for climate change'. *Environment & Planning C: Government & Policy*, 30(4): 571–90. doi: 10.1068/c11127.

Abbott, K.W. (2014) 'Strengthening the transnational regime complex for climate change'. *Transnational Environmental Law*, 3(1): 57–88.

Abbott, K.W., Genschel, P., Snidal, D. & Zangl, B. (2015) *Orchestration: Global Governance Through Intermediaries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Abbott, K.W. & Snidal, D. (2010) 'International regulation without international government: Improving IO performance through orchestration'. *Review of International Organizations*, 5: 315–44.

Aldasoro, I., Nunnenkamp, P. & Thiele, R. (2010) 'Less aid proliferation and more donor coordination? The wide gap between words and deeds'. *Journal of International Development,* 22(7): 920–40.

Bachrach, P. & Baratz, M. (1972). *Power and Poverty: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Barakat, S. (2009) 'The failed promise of multi-donor trust funds: aid financing as an impediment to effective state-building in post-conflict contexts'. *Policy Studies,* 30(2): 107–26.

Barnett, M. & Duvall, R. (2005) 'Power in international politics'. *International Organization*, 59: 39–75.

Barnett, M. & Finnemore, M. (1999) 'The politics, power, and pathologies of international organizations'. *International Organization*, 53(4): 699–732.

Battilana J., Leca B., Boxenbaum E. (2009) 'How actors change institutions: toward a theory of institutional entrepreneurship'. *Academy of Management Annals* 3(1): 65–107.

Bechky, B.A. (2006) 'Gaffers, gofers, and grips: role-based coordination in temporary organizations'. *Organization Science*, 17(1), 3–21.

Benvenisti, E. & Downs, G.W. (2007) 'The empire's new clothes: political economy and the fragmentation of international law'. *Stan L. Rev.*, 60: 595.

Betsill, M., Dubash, N., Paterson, M., van Asselt, H., Vihma, A. & Harald, W. (2015) 'Building productive links between the UNFCCC and the broader global climate governance landscape'. *Global Environmental Politics*, 15(2): 1–10.

Biermann, F., Pattberg, P., van Asselt, H. & Zelli, F. (2009) 'The fragmentation of global governance architectures: a framework for analysis'. *Global Environmental Politics*, 9(4): 14–40. doi: 10.1162/glep.2009.9.4.14.

Bigsten, A. (2006) 'Donor coordination and the uses of aid'. *Working Papers in Economics number* 196. Göteborg University School of Business, Economics and Law.

Bigsten, A. & Tengstam, S. (2015) 'International coordination and the effectiveness of aid'. *World Development*, 69: 75–85.

Bloomfield, A. (2016) 'Norm antipreneurs and theorising resistance to normative change'. *Review of International Studies,* 42(2), pp. 310–33.

Boltanski, L. & Thévenot, L. (2006) *On Justification*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bourguignon, F. & Platteau, J.-P. (2015) 'The hard challenge of aid coordination'. *World Development*, 69: 86–97.

Buse, K. (1999) 'Keeping a tight grip on the reins: donor control over aid coordination and management in Bangladesh'. *Health Policy and Planning*, 14(3): 219–28.

Buse, K. & Walt G. (1996) 'Aid coordination for health sector reform: a conceptual framework for analysis and assessment'. *Health Policy*, 38: 173–87.

Chan, S., van Asselt, H., Hale, T., Abbott, K.W., Beisheim, M., Hoffmann, M., . . . Widerberg, O. (2015) 'Reinvigorating international climate policy: a comprehensive framework for effective nonstate action'. *Global Policy*, 6(4): 466–73.

Dahl, R. (1957) 'The concept of power'. *Behavioural Science*, 2(3): 201–15.

Delputte, S. & Orbie, J. (2014) 'The EU and donor coordination on the ground: perspectives from Tanzania and Zambia'. *European Journal of Development Research* 26(5): 676–91.

DiMaggio P. (1988) 'Interest and agency in institutional theory' in *Institutional Patterns and Organizations: Culture and Environment*, L.G. Zucker(ed.) Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Eberlein, B., Abbott, K. W., Black, J., Meidinger, E. & Wood, S. (2014) 'Transnational business governance interactions: conceptualization and framework for analysis'. *Regulation and Governance*, 8(1): 1–21. doi: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%291748-5991/issues.

Fraser, A. & Whitfield, L. (2009) 'Understanding contemporary aid relationships'. In *The Politics of Aid*, L. Whitfield (ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press, 74-107.

Fuchs, A., Nunnenkamp, P. & Öhler, H. (2013) 'Why donors of foreign aid do not coordinate: the role of competition for export markets and political support'. *Working Paper* No. 1825. Kiel Institute for the World Economy.

Gehring, T. & Faude, B. (2014) 'A theory of emerging order within institutional complexes: how competition among regulatory international institutions leads to institutional adaptation and division of labor'. *Review of International Organizations*, 9(4): 471–98. doi: https://link.springer.com/journal/volumesAndIssues/11558.

Gehring, T. & Oberthür, S. (2009) 'The causal mechanisms of interaction between international institutions'. *European Journal of International Relations*, 15(1): 125–56.

Gibson, C., Andersson, K., Ostrom, E. & Shivakumar, S. (2005) *The Samaritan's Dilemma: The Political Economy of Development Aid.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gkeredakis, E. (2014) 'The constitutive role of conventions in accomplishing coordination: insights from a complex contract award project'. *Organization Studies*, 35(10): 1473–1505.

Goldstein, J. & Keohane, R.O. (1993) *Ideas and Foreign Policy : Beliefs, Institutions, and Political Change*: Ithaca : Cornell University Press, 1993.

Gomez-Echeverri, L. (2013) 'The changing geopolitics of climate change finance'. *Climate Policy*, 13(5): 632–48.

Grandori, A. & Soda, G. (1995) 'Inter-firm networks: antecedents, mechanisms, and forms'. *Organization Studies*, 16 (2): 183–214.

Gulrajani, N. (2014) 'Organising for donor effectiveness: an analytical framework for improving aid effectiveness'. *Development Policy Review*, 32(1): 89–112.

Haas, P.M. (1992) 'Epistemic communities and international policy coordination: introduction'. *International Organization*, 46(1): 1–35. doi: http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayBackIssues?jid=INO.

Hale, T. & Roger, C. (2014) 'Orchestration and transnational climate governance'. *Review of International Organizations*, 9(1): 59–82. doi:

https://link.springer.com/journal/volumesAndIssues/11558.

Heath, C. & Staudenmayer, N. (2000) 'Coordination neglect: how lay theories of organizing complicate coordination in organizations'. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 22, 153–91.

Jarzabkowski, P.A., Lê, J.K. & Feldman, M.S. (2012) 'Toward a theory of coordinating: creating coordinating mechanisms in practice'. *Organization Science*, *23*: 907–27.

Jordan, A.J., Huitema, D., Hildén, M., van Asselt, H., Rayner, T. J., Schoenefeld, J. J. & Boasson, E.L. (2015) 'Emergence of polycentric climate governance and its future prospects'. *Nature Climate Change*, 5(11): 977–82. doi: 10.1038/nclimate2725.

Karlsson-Vinkhuyzen, S. I. & McGee, J. (2013) 'Legitimacy in an era of fragmentation: the case of global climate governance'. *Global Environmental Politics*, 13(3): 56–78.

Kellogg, K.C., Orlikowski, W.J. & Yates, J.A. (2006) 'Life in the trading zone: structuring coordination across boundaries in postbureaucratic organizations'. *Organization Science*, 17, 22–44.

Keohane, R.O. (1989) *International Institutions and State Power: Essays in International Relations Theory*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Keohane, R.O. & Victor, D.G. (2011) 'The regime complex for climate change'. *Perspectives on Politics*, 9(1): 7–23.

Keohane, R.O. & Victor, D.G. (2016) 'Cooperation and discord'. *Global Climate Policy*, 6: 570–75.

Kingdon, J.W. (2003) *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*: London: Longman.

Krasner, S.D. (1983) *International Regimes*: Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Lawrence, T.B. and R. Suddaby. (2006) 'Institutions and institutional work' In *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Studies*, S. Clegg, C. Hardy, T. Lawrence & W. North (eds), 215–54. London: Sage.

Leiderer, S. (2015) 'Donor coordination for effective policies?' *Journal of International Development*, 27: 1422–45.

Linn, J.F. (2009) 'Aid coordination on the ground: are joint country assistance strategies the answer?' *Working Paper* 10. The Wolfensohn Center for Development in the Global Economy and Development Program at the Brookings Institution.

Lukes, S. (2005) *Power: A Radical View* (2nd ed.) Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Lundsgaarde, E., Dupuy, K. & Persson, Å. (2018) 'Coordination challenges in climate finance'. *DIIS Working Paper* 2018: 3. Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies.

Lundsgaarde, E. & Keijzer, N. (2018) 'Development cooperation in a multilevel and multistakeholder setting: from planning towards enabling coordinated action?' *European Journal of Development Research*: 1–20.

Maguire, S. Hardy, C. & Lawrence, T. (2004) 'Institutional entrepreneurship in emerging fields: HIV/AIDS treatment and advocacy in Canada'. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(5): 657–79.

March, J. G. & Olsen, J. P. (1989) *Rediscovering Institutions : The Organizational Basis of Politics*: New York: Free Press.

Oberthür, S. (2016) 'Reflections on global climate politics post Paris: power, interests and polycentricity'. *International Spectator*, 51(4): 80–94. doi: 10.1080/03932729.2016.1242256.

Oberthür, S. & Stokke, O.S. (Eds.). (2011) *Managing Institutional Complexity: Regime Interplay and Global Environmental Change*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

OECD (2008) The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and Accra Agenda for Action. Paris: OECD.

Okhuysen, G.A. & Bechky, B.A. (2009) 'Coordination in organizations: an integrative perspective'. *Academy of Management Annals*, 3(1): 463–502.

Olivié, I. & Pérez, A. (2016) 'Why don't donor countries coordinate their aid? A case study of European donors in Morocco'. *Progress in Development Studies*, 16(1): 52–64.

Orbie, J., Delputte, S., Williams, Y., Steurs, L. & Verschaeve, J. (2017) *Improving European Coordination in Fragile States*. Brussels: Practioners' Network for European Development Cooperation.

Ostrom, E. (1990) *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*: Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Ostrom, E. (2010) 'Polycentric systems for coping with collective action and global environmental change'. *Global Environmental Change*, 20: 550–57. doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2010.07.004.

Pauw, W. (2017) 'Mobilising private adaptation finance: developed country perspectives'. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law & Economics*, 17(1): 55–71.

Pentland, B.T. & Feldman, M.S. (2008) 'Designing routines: on the folly of designing artifacts, while hoping for patterns of action'. *Information and Organisation* 18(4): 235–50.

Pickering, J., Betzold, C. & Skovgaard, J. (2017) Editorial, Special Issue: Managing Fragmentation and Complexity in the Emerging System of International Climate Finance,. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law & Economics*: 1–16.

Pickering, J., Skovgaard, J., Kim, S., Roberts, J. T., Rossati, D., Stadelmann, M. & Reich, H. (2015a) 'Acting on climate finance pledges: inter-agency dynamics and relationships with aid in contributor states'. *World Development*, 68: 149–62. doi: DOI 10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.10.033.

Pickering, J., Jotzo, F. & Wood, P. J. (2015b) 'Sharing the global climate finance effort fairly with limited coordination'. *Global Environmental Politics*, 15(4): 39–62.

Pierson, P. (2004) *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Pittel, K. & Rübbelke, D. (2013) 'International climate finance and its influence on fairness and policy'. *World Economy*, 36(4): 419–36. doi: 10.1111/twec.12029.

Raustiala, K. & Victor, D. (2004) 'The regime complex for plant genetic resources'. *International Organization*, 58(2): 277–309.

Rayner, S. (2010) 'How to eat an elephant: a bottom-up approach to climate policy'. *Climate Policy*, 10(6): 615–21.

Regens, J.L. (1988) 'Institutional coordination of program action: a conceptual analysis'. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 11(2): 135–54.

Rübbelke, D.T.G. (2011) 'International support of climate change policies in developing countries: strategic, moral and fairness aspects'. *Ecological Economics*, 70(8): 1470–80. doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2011.03.007.

Schatzki, T.R., Knorr-Cetina, K. & von Signy, E. (2001) *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*. London: Routledge.

Schermerhorn, J.R. (1975) 'Determinants of interorganizational cooperation'. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 18(4): 846–56.

Schmidt, V.A. (2008) 'Discursive institutionalism: the explanatory power of ideas and discourse'. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11: 303–26. doi: 10.1146/annurev.polisci.11.060606.135342.

Schulpen, L., Loman, B. & Kinsbergen, S. (2011) 'Worse than expected? A comparative analysis of donor proliferation and aid fragmentation'. *Public Administration and Development*, 31: 321–39.

Skovgaard, J. (2017) 'Limiting costs or correcting market failures? Finance ministries and frame alignment in UN climate finance negotiations'. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law & Economics*, 17(1): 89–106. doi: 10.1007/s10784-016-9348-3.

Stadelmann, M., Michaelowa, A. & Roberts, J. T. (2013) 'Difficulties in accounting for private finance in international climate policy'. *Climate Policy*, 13(6): 718–37. doi: 10.1080/14693062.2013.791146.

Stadelmann, M., Persson, Å., Ratajczak-Juszko, I. & Michaelowa, A. (2014) 'Equity and cost-effectiveness of multilateral adaptation finance: are they friends or foes?' *International Environmental Agreements-Politics Law and Economics*, 14(2): 101–20. doi: 10.1007/s10784-013-9206-5.

Stokke, O.S. (2001) *The Interplay of International Regimes: Putting Effectiveness Theory to Work*. *FNI Report* 14/2001. Lysaker: The Fritjof Nansen Institute.

Swan, J. & Scarbrough, H. (2005). 'The politics of networked innovation'. *Human Relations*, 58(7): 913–43.

Thompson, P. (1967). *Organizations in Action*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Winckler Andersen, O. & Therkildsen, O. (2007) 'Harmonisation and alignment: the double-edged swords of budget support and decentralized aid administration'. *DIIS Working Paper* No. 2007/04. Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies.

Wrighton, N. & Overton, J. (2012) 'Coping with participation in small states: the case of aid in Tuvalu'. *Development in Practice*, 22(2): 244–55.

Zelli, F. (2011) 'The fragmentation of the global climate governance architecture'. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: *Climate Change*, 2(2): 255–70.

Zelli, F. & van Asselt, H. (2013) 'The institutional fragmentation of global environmental governance: causes, consequences, and responses'. *Global Environmental Politics*, 13(3): 1–13.

Zelli, F., Nasiritousi, N., Sanderink, L., Skovgaard, J. & Bäckstrand, K. (eds.) (2019 fc). *Governing the Climate–Energy Nexus: Institutional Complexity and Its Challenges to Effectiveness and Legitimacy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.