

Environmental Governance
SYA 7933 (Sec. 1F48) / ANG 6930 (Sec. 1791) / LAS 6938 (Sec. 1G30)
Wednesday 11:45—2:30
Classroom Building Rm 230
Fall 2017

Professor Christine Overdevest
Department of Sociology
3113 Turlington Hall
Email: coverdev@soc.ufl.edu
Office Hours: Tuesday 10:30-1:30 or by appt

Professor Catherine Tucker
Department of Anthropology &
Ctr for Latin American Studies
Grinter Hall 309
Email: tuckerc@ufl.edu
Office Hours: Tuesday 1:00 – 3:00
or by appt

Environmental governance is the multi-disciplinary study of how formal and informal institutions, policies, rules, and practices shape environmental outcomes. It concerns contemporary challenges in designing rules and institutions for regulating human-environment relations. It raises questions about *who* makes environmental decisions; *how* they are made, and *how* political and economic power shapes environmental governance. It is concerned with normative questions such as how best to organize social actors and systems to promote good environmental or sustainable outcomes.

Environmental governance researchers investigate particular arrangements and/or address broader academic questions concerning the fitness to purpose/effectiveness, fairness, equity, legitimacy and accountability of different approaches. We evaluate leading environmental policy strategies, including traditional state regulation, market-based incentives, participatory and community-based approaches and regulation created by private actors—as well as cutting edge theoretical perspectives on de-growth, performativity, and building “diverse economies.” Increasingly, the interactions between different forms of regulation figure prominently in debates on governance. Empirical examples of governance arrangements from different parts of the world and different domains (climate change, forestry, fisheries, agriculture among others) highlight challenges and opportunities.

Objectives:

Students will:

- Describe and evaluate key trends in environmental governance
- Analyze and interpret the social and political forces associated with the emergence, institutionalization, and operation of competing approaches to environmental governance

- Compare and evaluate different theories and academic debates about environmental governance
- Contrast and appraise competing assumptions underlying different approaches to environmental governance.
- Explain the social and political outcomes and effectiveness of different approaches to environmental governance
- Demonstrate the capacity to pose and defend research questions related to environmental governance

Course Requirements

Grading

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 1. Seminar Paper. Due Monday, December 11 | 40% |
| 2. Weekly Assignments: Memos, Team Presentations, Class Debates & Discussion Participation | 40% |
| 3. Student Presentation | 20% |

Seminar Paper

The paper should explore a specific challenge for environmental governance. There are several approaches to a good seminar paper for this class:

1. Write an empirical paper. You may choose to do web and document research on a specific state or non-state governance initiative (such as fair trade, a forest certification scheme), analyzing it alone or in comparison with another initiative. You may analyze its emergence, effectiveness, relationship to public authority, or other issues raised in class. 15-20 pps.
 - a. If you write an empirical paper, consider submitting to *Society and Natural Resources* as an “Practice Based Knowledge” (PBK) article (5000 word limit): According to the journal, “the rationale for focusing on PBK is due to its key role in the emergence of hybrid governance institutions across state, market, and civil society, understanding the complexity of dynamic socioecological systems, recognizing the challenges of multiple knowledge systems and context-specific practices, embracing the power of informal institutions and civic science, and engaging debates on the growing prevalence of market-oriented conservation. The goal is to provide a dedicated space within the published, peer-reviewed literature for scholars, government officials, nonprofit managers, and engaged citizens to share experiences informed by practical action. Relevant and timely practice-based insights may improve understanding and management of social and ecological processes and systems, while also offering the potential to contribute to theory.”

2. Write a case study analysis that develops a detailed assessment of a specific environmental governance challenge and possible options for policy and/or practice, which could include an analysis of extant policy processes and outcomes. 15-20 pages.
 - a. If you write an empirical paper, consider submitting a shorter but publishable policy review or analysis for *Society and Natural Resources* According to *Society and Natural Resources*: “Policy Reviews examine current or proposed policies associated with natural resource management. These articles can raise questions of policy, propose alternate action, or critique current or proposed policy.” (5,000 word limit).
3. You may also apply concepts and readings in the course to your own research interests, exploring how they influence the development of your research thesis. 15-20 pages.
4. Finally, you may write a theoretical synthesis and critique of different approaches to governance. 15-20 pages.

NOTE: Groups of two or three students may propose to collaborate on a paper for publication.

Grading Criteria for Papers (adapted from the syllabi of Professor Aili Mari Tripp):

1. Well defined statement of your thesis. A thesis supplies a specific subject and a clear direction for your paper. A thesis must: a) contain an arguable point; b) control the entire argument; c) provide a structure for your argument.
2. Serious Engagement of Alternative Arguments. As appropriate, do you seriously consider arguments other than those you make? Do you address evidence that does not support your position? Draw from sources not read in class?
3. Clarity of Presentation. Are your ideas clearly expressed? Is your paper focused or does it wander? Can a reader easily identify your main points? Are the ideas presented elaborated sufficiently? Are there sign-posts to guide the reader? Are terms defined?
4. Organization. Is the paper organized effectively? Is the sequence of points made logical and clear? Does each paragraph have a central idea that a reader can easily identify?
5. Grammar, Spelling, Citations, Format. Is the copy clean and relatively free from grammatical errors? Have you cited ideas and facts drawn from published sources?

Papers due – 12/011/2017. (Submit to Canvas, double spaced)

Weekly Assignments: Memos, Team Presentations, and Class Debates

Each week we will have an activity to engage with the readings and topics – either a memo, a team presentation, or a class debate. Memos are due by 5 pm on the day before class and should be submitted to Canvas. The memos are meant to help you engage and reflect on basic arguments of each reading and define key concepts in enough detail so that you could use them as study guides for prelims and/or for material to support your seminar paper. Team presentations require your team to read an article or two beyond the required readings and verbally and/or using visual aids or videos present the key ideas to the class as well as engage the class in a critical discussion of the text. Class debates will divide the class into designated supporters and critics of a key argument made in the readings. We will provide a focus question for the debates. For each weekly assignment, students will be evaluated based on the quality of presentations and their individual contribution to the team project.

Paper Presentations

On November 28 or December 5, students in groups or individually will present their seminar papers. Drafts of their papers must be circulated no later than 6 pm on Sunday, November 27 and December 4, respectively. Students will take 15 minutes to present, followed by discussion. Each class participant should attempt to improve the papers presented by offering helpful critiques.

Class Schedule

Note: Adjustments may be made to the schedule and content if advantageous for learning

Preamble: Introduction to Environmental Governance

Week One – Aug. 23 Class and Participant Introduction—

Broadly introduce philosophical contexts and instructors' intellectual foundations.

Dryzek, Chapter 1. "Making Sense of Earth's Politics: A Discourse Approach." pp. 1-22 only in *Politics of the Earth*, Oxford University Press.

Dryzek's book evaluates the actors and storylines underlying three ideal type approaches to environmental governance: administrative rationalism (state-based approaches), economic rationalism (market-based approaches), and democratic pragmatist (participatory approaches).

Part I – Cutting Edge Thinking in the Area of Environmental Governance

***Week Two – Aug 30 Degrowth and Designs for a New Society-Environment Relation
(Additional readings may be added)***

Paulson, S. 2017. Degrowth: Culture, Power, and Change. *Journal of Political Ecology* 24:425-448.

Week Three – Sep 6 Performativity Theory and the Diverse Economies Research Programme

Gibson-Graham, J.K. 2008. “Diverse Economies: Performative Practices for ‘Other Worlds’.” *Progress in Human Geography* pp. 1–20.

Gritzas, Giorgos and Karolos Iosif Kavoulakos. 2015. “Diverse Economies and Alternative Spaces: An Overview of Approaches and Practices.” *European Urban and Regional Studies*. 2015:1-15.

Law, J. and Urry, J. 2004. “Enacting the Social.” *Economy and Society*, 33 (3), pp.390-410.

Holm, Peter. 2007. “Which Way is Up on Callon?” In *Do Economists Make Markets?* (Eds) MacKenzie, Donald, Fabian Muniesa and Lucia Siu. Pp. 235-243.

Blok, Anders. 2011. “Clash of the eco-sciences: carbon marketization, environmental NGOs and performativity as politics,” *Economy and Society*, 40:3, 451-476, DOI: 10.1080/03085147.2011.574422

Supplemental/Background reading:

MacKenzie, Donald, Muniesa, Fabian and Lucia Siu (eds) . 2007. *Do Economists Make Markets? On the Performativity of Economics*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2007.

Callon M., Lascoumes P., Barthe Y., 2009, *Acting in an Uncertain World. An Essay on Technical Democracy*, MIT Press.

Memo: Please write a memo where you define the “diverse economies” research programme and the performativity perspective as environmental governance perspectives, including your best analysis of their key analytical strengths and weaknesses. Come to class with discussion questions.

Week Four – Sept 13 Performance and Public Measures: A Performative/DeGrowth Governance Mechanism?

Espeland W. and M. Sauder. 2007. “Rankings and Reactivity: How Public Measures Recreate Social Worlds.” *American Journal of Sociology*. 113(1): 1–40

Continuing a theme from last week, Espeland and Sauder develop a theoretical view of a particular performative practice -- the power of public measures – to enact new social worlds.

Overdeest, Christine. 2010. “Comparing Forest Certification Schemes: The Case of Ratcheting Standards in the Forest Sector.” Special Issue on Law and Legitimacy in Transnational Governance. *Socio-Economic Review*. 8(1):47-76.

Similarly, this articles seeks to demonstrate the importance of public measures in recreating social worlds.

Fung, Archon and Dara O’Rourke. 2000. “Reinventing Environmental Regulation From the Grassroots Up: Explaining and Expanding the Success of the Toxics Release Inventory.” *Environmental Management*. 25(2):115-127.

Unlike economic accounts of measures and measurements, which focus on information’s effect on reputation and self-interest, F&O argue that the effectiveness of performance information is dependent on how it is used to mobilize a variety of societal actors in a particular field to put social pressure on targeted actors.

Part II – Intellectual Background, History and Evolution of Environmental Governance

Week Five –Sept 20. Post WWII Approaches to Environmental Governance: Administrative Rationalism and Economic Rationalism

Jodi L. Short, 2012. “The Paranoid Style in Regulatory Reform.” *Georgetown Law Review*. pp.1-65 (focus on p. 1-7, p 22- 63)

It is important in the study of environmental governance to understand critiques of different approaches to governance. Short overviews the major critiques of state regulation emerging from the post-war economic literature, including characterizations of the “costly state,” the “captured state,” the “cognitively impaired state,” and the “coercive state.” Short argues that one of these views legitimize the growth of self-regulation in the 1980s and 1990s.

Memo, option 1: *What is the appropriate role of the state in environmental governance? In your memo, defend two of the four critiques and deconstruct two others. Submit your memo by Sunday at 5 pm. Come to class prepared to discuss/debate the appropriate role for the state in environmental regulation.*

Brohe, Arnaud, Eyre, Nick, and Nicholas Howarth. 2009. Chapter 2. "Emissions Trading: A New Tool for Environmental Management." In *Carbon Markets: An International Business Guide*. London: Earthscan.

Memo, option 2: Write a summary and critique of emissions trading as an environmental governance mechanism.

Supplemental Readings:

Joel Mintz. 2005. "Has Industry Captured the EPA?: Appraising Marver Bernstein's Captive Agency Theory After Fifty Years," 17 *Fordham Environmental Law Review*. Pp.1-37.

REGBLOG (University of Penn Law School) recently ran a series on regulatory capture. Check out various articles here: <http://www.regblog.org/2016/06/13/rooting-out-regulatory-capture/>

Week Six –Sep27 Introducing Participatory and Civil-Society Approaches: Commons Theory, Common-Pool Resources and Common Property

This discussion will review types of goods, especially common-pool resources, and circumstances in which common-pool resources may be most effectively managed by community-based management. We will also examine illustrative case studies that show the challenges and variability of community-based management regimes in different contexts.

Memo Option 1 (3 pages, double-spaced): Read the McKean and Cox articles and one of the case study readings. Analyze how the case study applies concepts of common-pool resources/community governance, and then consider how an administrative rationalist or economic rationalist approach would have addressed the case.

Memo Option 2 (3 pages, double-spaced): Read the McKean and Cox, and two of the case study readings. Analyze how the case studies reveal the utility of common-pool resources/commons theory. Consider why this approach is particularly suited (or not) to the circumstances of the case study, and briefly address whether any other of the theoretical approaches covered thus far would have added valuable insight.

McKean, M. 2001. Common Property: What Is It, What Is It Good for, and What Makes It Work? In *People and Forests: Communities, Institutions, Governance*. Eds. C. C. Gibson, M. McKean and E. Ostrom, eds. Pp. 27-55. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

McKean's chapter provides a clear explanation for the difference between common-pool goods and property rights, and why common property (i.e., community-based resource management) can be economically and environmentally efficient and sustainable in certain contexts. One key point is that a good presents inherent qualities, while property is a human creation imposed upon goods. Common property is accurately described as joint private ownership.

Cox, Michael, Gwen Arnold, and Sergio Villamayor Tomás. 2010. "A Review of Design Principles for Community-based Natural Resource Management." *Ecology and Society* 15(4):38.

Cox et al. analyze the findings of numerous case studies that have assessed Ostrom's design principles for long-enduring communal management of common-pool resources, and suggests some modifications while showing ample evidence supporting the principles.

Case Study Readings:

These articles offer a range of empirical findings on community-based resource management as well as explanations for contexts in which groups may prefer private ownership over communal ownership.

Baur, I., Liechti, K. & Binder, C.R. 2014. Why do individuals behave differently in commons dilemmas? The case of alpine farmers using common property pastures in Grindelwald, Switzerland. *International Journal of the Commons*. 8(2), pp.657–685. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.18352/ijc.469>

Epstein, Graham, Mateja Nenadovic, and André Boustany. 2014. "Into the deep blue sea: Commons theory and international governance of Atlantic Bluefin.

Mwangi, Esther. 2007. "The Puzzle of Group Ranch Subdivision in Kenya's Maasailand." *Development and Change* 38(5):889-910.

Netting, Robert McC. 1976. "What Alpine Peasants Have in Common: Observations on Communal Tenure in a Swiss Village." *Human Ecology* 4(2):135-46.

Week Seven – Oct 4 Exploring Complexities, Contradictions, and Multi-level Challenges for Community-Based Natural Resource Management

This class will assess the complications of understanding “community” and how various factors within and across levels of governance can pose challenges for community-based natural resource management.

Agrawal, A., and C Gibson. 1999. "Enchantment and Disenchantment: The Role of Community in Natural Resource Conservation." *World Development* 27:629-49.

Berkes, Fikret. 2007. "Community-based conservation in a globalized world." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 104(39):15188-93.

Possible addition to show intersection with degrowth and commons governance:

Lockyer, J. 2017. Community, commons, and degrowth at Dancing Rabbit Ecovillage. *Journal of Political Ecology* 24:519-542

Team Presentation: Teams of 4 students will draw on Agrawal & Gibson (1999), Berkes (2007), and at least two of the four readings below to develop a summary sheet (bullets are fine) that briefly identifies aspects of community-based environmental governance as follows: (1) three potential internal challenges or contradictions that may face communities, (2) three potential multi-level/external challenges to community success in environmental governance, (3) three examples (drawn from the readings) of how communities have dealt successfully *or not* with internal and/or external challenges, and (4) one question for discussion.

Dell’Angelo, Jampel, Paul F. McCord, Elizabeth Baldwin, Michael E. Cox, Drew Gower, Kelly Caylor, and Tom P. Evans. 2014. "Multilevel Governance of Irrigation Systems and Adaptation to Climate Change in Kenya." in *The Global Water System in the Anthropocene: Challenges for Science and Governance*, Anik Bhaduri, Janos Bogardi, Jan Leentvaar, and Sina Marx, eds. Pp. 323-41. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Gatzweiler, Franz W. 2005. Institutionalising Biodiversity Conservation – The Case of Ethiopian Coffee Forests. *Conservation and Society* 3(1):201-223.

Parlee, Brenda, and Fikret Berkes. 2006. "Indigenous Knowledge of Ecological Variability and Commons Management: A Case Study on Berry Harvesting from Northern Canada." *Human Ecology* 34(4):515-28.

Tucker, Catherine M. 2004. "Community Institutions and Forest Management in Mexico’s Monarch Butterfly Reserve." *Society and Natural Resources* 17:569-87.

Week Eight – Oct 11 – From Joint Management to Decentralization and Co-Production of Knowledge

Larson, A. M., D. Barry, and G. R. Dahal. 2010. "New Rights for Forest-Based Communities? Understanding Processes of Forest Tenure Reform." *International Forestry Review* 12(1):78-96.

This study examines the impacts of forest tenure reform, particularly approaches of devolution and decentralization of forest rights, to further community rights to manage forest resources.

Reid, R. S., D. Nkedianye, M. Y. Said, D. Kaelo, M. Neselle, O. Makui, L. Onetu, S. Kiruswa, N. Ole Kamuaro, P. Kristjanson, J. Ogutu, S. B. BurnSilver, M. J. Goldman, R. B. Boone, K. A. Galvin, N. M. Dickson, and W. C. Clark. 2016. "Evolution of models to support community and policy action with science: Balancing pastoral livelihoods and wildlife conservation in savannas of East Africa." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113(17):4579-84.

Reid et al. report on a long-term project working that developed a continuous engagement model with pastoral communities to create hybrid local-scientific knowledge relevant for conservation planning and policy. The project aimed to transcend power inequities that typically exist between researchers, community members, and policy makers.

Readings for Team Presentation: Teams of 4 students review and come to class prepared to present one of the following case studies. Teams must prepare a written brief of 1-2 pages to share with the class that (1) summarizes the article's argument, (2) identifies and discusses key critical strengths and (3) weaknesses of the argument and (4) sets up questions for discussion.

Behera, Bhagirath. 2009. "Explaining the performance of state-community joint forest management in India." *Ecological Economics* 69(1):177-85.

Nagendra, Harini, Birendra Karna, and Mukundu Karmacharya. 2005. "Examining Institutional Change: Social Conflict in Nepal's Leasehold Forestry Programme." *Conservation and Society* 3(1):72-91

Van Laerhoven, Frank. 2014. "When is Participatory Local Environmental Governance Likely to Emerge? A study of collective action in participatory environmental councils in Brazil." *Environmental Policy and Governance*. Wiley Online Library DOI: 10.1002/eet.1646.

Wright, Glenn Daniel, Krister Andersson, Clark C. Gibson, and Tom P. Evans. 2015. "What incentivizes local forest conservation efforts? Evidence from Bolivia." *International Journal of the Commons* 9(1):322-46.

Week Nine – Oct 18 Systematic Approaches to Institutional Analysis: The Institutional Analysis and Development (IAD) and Socio-ecological Systems (SES) Frameworks

Ostrom, Elinor. 2011. Background on the Institutional Analysis and Development Framework. *Policy Studies Journal* 39(1):7-27.

This article provides a brief summary of the background and purpose of the IAD Framework, which provided the foundation for the eventual development of the Social-Ecological Systems (SES) Framework.

Ostrom, E. 2009. A General Framework for Analyzing Sustainability of Social-Ecological Systems. *Science* 325: 419-522.

The SES Framework has been adopted by a number of researchers as a tool for systematically assessing the strengths, weaknesses, and functionality /sustainability of SESs, especially at local and regional scales.

Additional Readings:

Frey, Ulrich J., and Michael Cox. 2015. Building a diagnostic ontology of social-ecological systems. *International Journal of the Commons* 9(2):595-618. URL: <https://www.thecommonsjournal.org/articles/10.18352/ijc.505/#>

Leslie, H., X. Basurto, M. Nendovic, K. Cavanaugh, J. J. Cota-Nieto, B. Erisman, E. Finkbeiner, G. Hinojosa-Arango, M. Moreno-Sriniketh, S. Reddy, A. Sánchez-Rodríguez, K. Siegel, J. J. Ulibarria-Valenzuela, A. Hudson Weaver, O. Aburto-Oropeza. 2015. Operationalizing the social-ecological systems framework to assess sustainability. *PNAS* 112(19):5979-5984.

Nagendra, Harini, and Elinor Ostrom. 2014 "Applying the Social-Ecological System Framework to the Diagnosis of Urban Lake Commons in Bangalore, India." *Ecology and Society* 2014: 19.

Young, Oran. 2010 Institutional Dynamics: Resilience, vulnerability and adaptation in environmental and resource regimes. *Global Environmental Change* 20:378-385.

Memo: Drawing on the two readings by Ostrom and at least two of the “Additional Readings,” please write a 2-3 page memo on the IAD and SES Frameworks that discusses the contributions, challenges, and potential drawbacks of using these frameworks. Include at least one question for discussion (underline your discussion question). Use the McGinnis as a reference to check the correct definitions for applying the frameworks.

Highly Recommended as a Background Reference:

McGinnis, M. 2011. An Introduction to IAD Framework and the Language of the Ostrom Workshop: A Simple Guide to a Complex Framework. *Policy Studies Journal* 39(1):169-183.

McGinnis provides definitions of concepts that are foundational for the IAD Framework and institutional analysis, as well as a brief overview of the IAD Framework. McGinnis reveals the care that the Ostrom Workshop has given to constructing a common language. Many of the terms have a range of meanings in scholarly and public use. The Ostrom Workshop endeavored to bring consistency and clarity to important foundational terms through precise definitions, which are often narrower than often found in general use.

Week Ten – Oct 25 Civil Society Regulation via Environmental Certification

Meidinger, Errol. 2003. “Forest Certification as a Global Civil Society Regulatory Institution.” In: *Social and Political Dimensions of Forest Certification*. Pp. 265-289. Forstbuch: Nordrhein-Westfalen, Germany.

Background reading on one of the first civil society regulatory institutions: the Forest Stewardship Council. Meidinger develops the notion that these are more than “market-based” regulatory devices as is evidenced in their deliberative standard setting forums, power balancing among interest groups.

Steering Committee of the State-of-Knowledge Assessment of Standards and Certification. 2012. *Toward sustainability: The roles and limitations of certification*. Washington, DC: RESOLVE, Inc. Read the Executive Summary pp. ES1-ES18.

Consensus review of the state of play by the actors themselves. The Steering Committee is a group of certified firms, standard setting organizations and academics.

Tim Bartley and Shawna N. Smith 2010. “Communities of Practice as Cause and Consequence of Transnational Governance.” The Evolution of Social and Environmental Certification.” Pp. 347-374 in *Transnational Communities: Shaping Global Economic Governance*, edited by Marie-Laure Djelic and Sigrid Quack.

Graeme Auld, Stefan Renckens, and Benjamin Cashore, 2015 “Transnational Private Governance between the Logics of Empowerment and Control” *Regulation and Governance* 9(2): 108-124

Levy, David, Juliane Reinecke and Stephan Manning. 2016. “The Political Dynamics of Sustainable Coffee: Contested Value Regimes and the Transformation of Sustainability.” *Journal of Management Studies*. 53:3 (364-401)

Week Eleven – Nov 1 Commodity Chain Governance

Gereffi, Gary. 1994. "The Organization of Buyer-Driven Global Commodity Chains: How U.S. Retailers Shape Overseas Production Networks." Pp. 95-122 in *Commodity Chains and Global Capitalism*, edited by G. Gereffi and M. Korzeniewicz. Westport CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.

A classic statement on how supply chains (aka commodity chains, value chains) are becoming important pathways of power, an analysis where the power within different kinds of chains lies and how that is changing under conditions of globalization.

Sabel, Charles O'Rourke, Dara and Archon Fung. 2001. *Ratcheting Labor Standards: Regulation for Continuous Improvement in the Global Workplace*. Boston: Beacon Press

A counter-statement on how global supply chains become important locations of governance (and targets of activists) under globalization.

Readings for Team Presentation: Teams of 4 students come to class prepared to present one of the following readings. Teams must prepare a written brief which (1) summarizes the article's argument, (2) identifies and discusses key critical strengths and (3) weaknesses of the argument and (4) sets up questions for discussion. Schurman, Rachel. 2004. "Fighting Frankenfoods: Industry Structures and the Efficacy of the Anti-Biotech Movement in Western Europe." *Social Problems* 51: 243-268.

Bartley, Tim and Curtis Child. 2014. "Shaming the Corporation: The Social Production of Targets and the Anti-Sweatshop Movement." *American Sociological Review* 79(4):653-679

More on power and vulnerabilities in supply chains in the Schurman and Bartley and Child's articles.

Taylor, P. 2005. "In the Market But Not of It: Fair Trade Coffee and Forest Stewardship Council Certification as Market-Based Social Change." *World Development* 33:129-147.

A comparative case study of conventional and certified markets for coffee and forest products by through commodity chain analysis and social embeddedness theory.

O'Rourke, Dara. "The Science of Sustainable Supply Chains." *Science*. 344(6188):1124-1127.

On technology and supply chains.

Week Twelve – Nov 8 Synthesis and Moving Forward ??

This class gives us the chance to consider ideas and issues that emerge during the course, which merit discussion. Reading suggestions are welcome to add to the discussion.

Agrawal, Arun, and Maria Carmen Lemos. 2007. "A Greener Revolution in the Making? Environmental Governance in the 21st Century." *Environment* 49(5):36-45.

Boas, Ingrid, Frank Biermann, and Norichika Kanie. 2016. "Cross-sectoral strategies in global sustainability governance: towards a nexus approach." *International Environmental Agreements* 16:449-64.

Keohane, Robert O. and David G. Victor. 2010. The Regime Complex for Climate Change. The Harvard Project on International Climate Agreements Discussion Paper 10-33. January 2010.

An article that develops the concept of a “regime complex” and the conditions under which they may be a desired governance mechanism.

Week Thirteen - Nov 15 Open Week (Theme to be decided in conjunction with class interests)

-Regime Complexes?

-Scale?

-Regulatory Triangle – Regulatory Intermediaries (related to certification literature)?

Week Fourteen – Nov 29 Student Presentations

Week Fifteenth – Dec 5 Student Presentations

<i>Final Paper Due December 11</i>

University Policies and Services:

Academic Honesty: On all work submitted for credit by students at the University of Florida, the following pledge is either required or implied: “On my honor, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid in doing this assignment.”

Accommodation for students with disabilities: Students requesting classroom accommodation must first register with the Dean of Students Office. The Dean of Students Office will provide documentation to the student who must then provide this documentation to the Instructor when requesting accommodation.

UF Counseling Services: Resources are available on-campus for students having personal problems or lacking a clear career and academic goals which interfere with their academic performance. These resources include:

1. University Counseling Center, 301 Peabody Hall, 392-1575, personal and career counseling;
2. Student Mental Health, Student Health Care Center, 392-1171, personal counseling;
3. Sexual Assault Recovery Services (SARS), Student Health Care Center, 392-1161, sexual counseling;
4. Career Resource Center, Reitz Union, 392-1601, career development assistance and counseling.