

**Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript**

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

**Persistent WRAP URL:**

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/80577>

**How to cite:**

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

**Copyright and reuse:**

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

**Publisher's statement:**

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: [wrap@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:wrap@warwick.ac.uk).

**Diane Stone**

**‘Partners in Diplomacy:**

**Transnational Expert Communities and Global Policy Programmes’,**

**in Annabelle Littoz-Monet (Ed.)**

*The Politics of Expertise in International Organizations, Routledge, 2017*

## **Introduction**

### **The Expertise of Transnational Policy Communities**

Transnational Policy Communities

Transnational Transfers of Global Policy

Interpretative Communities

### **The World Bank and its Global and Regional Partnership Programs**

The Development Grant Facility

The Independent Evaluation Group

### **A Research Agenda in Lieu of a Conclusion**

## **Endnotes**

### **Appendix 1. DGF Finance Programs by Name**

Diane Stone is Centenary Professor in the Institute for Governance and Policy Analysis at University of Canberra and a Professor of Politics at the University of Warwick. Funding support was provided by the Horizon 2020 program: European Leadership in Cultural, Science and Innovation Diplomacy, Ref No: EU project 693799 – EL-CSID

## **Introduction**

Global policy partnerships and programs are proliferating. Even though these entities are relatively new and still evolving, and distinctive for their focus on a specific global policy challenge, they may be thought of as transnational bureaucracies. They go by diverse labels such as “Consultative Group” or “Affiliated Network” or “Global Forum.” As transnational bureaucracies, these global programs and partnerships are managed by a Secretariat of appointed officials, experts and other professionals (overseen by Boards composed of stakeholders such as the representatives of public and private donors, and international organization), that holds decision-making authority over financial allocations and which administers specialized functions for the delivery of public goods and services cross-nationally or the development of regulation or international standards. As a governance innovation, many are weakly institutionalized as policy networks but some have consolidated as permanent structures of governance. On the latter score, established in 1971 the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) is one of the oldest and most extensive of the Bank’s global programs. By contrast, at the other end of the spectrum of institutional longevity, The World Commission on Dams existed briefly from 1998 to 2001.

The World Bank via its Development Grant Facility (DGF) convened over 60 “global and regional partnership programs” (GRPPs) engaged in international standard setting to share expertise, promote compliance with Codes of Conduct and facilitate coordination in other areas of policy. In some respects, these programs and partnerships are the transnational equivalent of “agencification” which continues to be seen as a public sector reform process in many OECD countries over the past few decades.<sup>1</sup> Yet, these global programs also

combine elements of science diplomacy in the transnational transmission and translation of knowledge between public and private actors. The traditional notion of science diplomacy is “to build bridges between countries and to promote scientific cooperation as an essential element of foreign policy.”<sup>2</sup> However, the discussion in this chapter goes beyond this narrow understanding by expanding focus to capture a new dynamic where science diplomacy is also conducted through international organizations, global public-private partnerships and other informal global policy networks.

Also known as “multi-stakeholder initiatives” or “global funds,” these global programs are also sponsored by other international organizations, notably United Nations (UN) agencies and the European Union. However, this chapter focuses on the “global programs” of the World Bank that have been financed through DGF. From the turn of the century until 2015, the DGF was “the Bank’s mechanism to provide direct grant support for innovative Global Partnership Programs that are of high value to ... client countries but cannot be supported adequately through regular Bank country assistance operations or ... economic and sector work.”<sup>3</sup> A list of DGF programs is in Appendix 1.

Expertise is enrolled into World Bank activity in global policy initiatives as both a bureaucratic instrument of policy coordination, and as a tool of diplomacy and negotiation. From the Wolfensohn Presidency (1995-2005) onwards, the Bank engaged in reforms to shift from a policy monologue imposed on countries to a more dialogic approach of putting developing countries “in the driving seat.”<sup>4</sup> This dialogic approach is also symptomatic of the “new diplomacy.”<sup>5</sup> However, not only has diplomacy evolved to include relations between international organizations and national governments, collaboration with non-state

actors has become a “third layer of public diplomacy.”<sup>6</sup> The enrolment of expertise in transnational bureaucracies is evident in at least three senses.

First, the World Bank builds expertise and professional capacities internally as the so-called Knowledge Bank.<sup>7</sup> The Bank has its own large research department as well as other units producing applied studies such as by the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG). Other units of the Bank undertake research, while many members of staff hold doctorates (often in Economics or “development studies”) and contribute to the academy through adjunct professorial positions. The academic caliber of staff, and their publications has been well recognized and legitimated through peer review and evaluation.<sup>8</sup> In short, the Bank not only has significant expertise of its own; it also has a high capacity to absorb research and (social) scientific knowledge generated outside. Moreover, the Bank collaborates at an institutional level, as well as through individual members of staff, in multiple (social) scientific research projects.

Second, the World Bank is a convener, administrator and donor of GRPPs. Amongst dozens of other programs, these include bodies like the Global Health Research Forum, the Alliance for Responsible Fisheries and the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery. In some cases, the Bank takes a lead role in GRPPs, whereas in other circumstances it is just one partner alongside other official actors, private donors and philanthropic bodies, or the scientific community. As an “expert” and research partner in its own right, and combined with its professional competencies in establishing GRPP infrastructures, the Bank becomes an “intermediary” in the transfer of both knowledge and policy infrastructures not only between countries but also between global programs and other international organisations. In this regard, the Bank recognizes that “in addition to its financial and technical assistance

tools, it needs diplomacy skills to address the complexities...” of international conflicts and global policy problems.<sup>9</sup>

Third, scientific data, research reports and policy ideas are mutated and transformed by the transnational policy communities (TPCs) that emerge around GRPPs. TPCs are not simply composed of “international civil servants” working in the “secretariats” as professional experts.<sup>10</sup> They are complemented by a wider array of expert actors in TPCs – think tanks, university centers, professional associations and scientific institutes. The diversification of knowledge inputs into TPCs can cultivate a dynamic for social learning within a community. That is, processes of translation take place within the design of GRPPs even before policy is “imposed” on, or then also interpreted by and adopted, by client countries in further processes of “localization”. This constant interpretative and experimental process creates new transnational policy spaces of soft law and governance networks. In other words, TPCs become venues not only for the use of expertise produced by international organizations but also venues for the co-production of expert policy knowledge for utilization in GRPPs.

The core argument of this chapter is that expert knowledge is increasingly co-terminus with governance whereby experts in TPCs co-author and co-construct specific global policy institutions such as GRPPs. While these TPCs may reflect some “epistemic-like” characteristics, the concept of “interpretative community” is used here to reflect that the policy knowledge and capacities that are created are not only “epistemic” but also “social.” That is, TPCs not only engage in extensive networking to share scientific knowledge, but build their own bureaucratic expertise and capacities for making authoritative judgment. Taking this approach towards knowledge(s) that must be translated, helps undermine the

frequently encountered ontological separation between the scholar and the policy practitioner, between knowledge and power.

The research and intellectual interpretation that underpins conceptualization of “regional cooperation” or “global governance” is all too often treated as an expert ‘input from an “epistemic community” or a one-way transmission of ideas into decision-making. Instead, participants in TPCs engage in social learning, in addition to epistemic learning, that very often helps create a sense of policy identity at an elite level within the organizational cultures of GRPPs, or in international organizations or other transgovernmental venues.

This contribution to global governance is a “repeated cycle of interaction, interpretation and internalization”<sup>11</sup> conducted via intensive networking around shared professional experiences. Policy-making and knowledge making are seen as mutually constituted. This becomes manifest in practices such as “science diplomacy.”<sup>12</sup>

## **The Expertise of Transnational Policy Communities**

Rather than the term “international bureaucracies” that is used in the introduction of this collection, in its place, the more encompassing term “transnational policy communities” is employed in this chapter. As discussed below, this is an umbrella category that reflects the increasingly diverse range of policy actors involved in global governance and public diplomacy (which includes science diplomacy). In the following section, rather than address the content of the knowledge they produce, the discussion argues that TPCs have come to create global policy processes through the deployment of professional expertise, science diplomacy and the diffusion of ideas, standards, and policy practice.

TPCs are professional venues for learning and policy innovation. But there is also learning taking place within global programs and transnational networks. The network / global program / partnership modality developed by the DGF has been replicated as an organizational logic for global policy. Or as the IEG in the World Bank puts it: “In the absence of a global government that can collect taxes to provide global and regional public goods directly, partnership programs with shared governance arrangements have become the principal instrument for doing this.”<sup>13</sup> The partnership and global programs facilitate policy transfer and knowledge translation as a transnational policy process.

Even within international organizations, the meaning of “global policy” or “global programs” is opaque, indeterminate and shifting. As noted by the World Bank of its own initiatives, “the definitions of global programs and institutional partnerships are ambiguous at the operational level, as is the extent to which global programs are expected to focus on global public goods, as distinct from merit goods of high social value.”<sup>14</sup> Indeed, the operational distinction between programs and partnerships was not clear.<sup>15</sup>

This opaqueness in orientation of GRPPs is indicative of their experimental character. Nevertheless, the intention behind the World Bank’s DGF administration of GRPPs was to provide seed funding and institutional support for “cutting edge approaches” developed by coalitions or partners to development initiatives. Not only were they to be designed to raise funding and better utilize scarce resources but also to develop “best practices, research, capacity building, knowledge sharing, advocacy and other services.”<sup>16</sup> Either a victim of its own success, or symptomatic of the growing raft of global problems requiring global partnership responses, the DGF is now being phased out and its activities subsumed by the

Development Finance Vice Presidency in the Bank in order to leverage the resources, finances and skills across the entire World Bank Group.

Staff members of international organizations can have considerable autonomy in executing decisions. Public policy scholars have investigated the “black box” of bureaucracies to suggest that “international civil servants” are not merely agents acting on the directives of states but develop distinct agendas of their own.<sup>17</sup> Even so, there is also an analytic necessity to bring into the picture the unofficial transnational policy actors that partner with international organizations to convene new structures of policy coordination or public goods delivery. That is, those transnational policy actors who have been identified by different names of as “global managers”<sup>18</sup> or the “new diplomats.”<sup>19</sup>

### ***Transnational Policy Communities***

Three distinct types of policy actors are identifiable in TPCs: first, “international civil servant”; second, “internationalized public sector official” and third, “transnational policy professionals”. Each type functions with both governance expertise and technical expertise.

The first kind is the traditional “international civil servant”. These people are usually employed by an international organization to staff its secretariat and institute operations. The study of the influence of staff in international organization secretariats has however been “a peripheral research object” for scholars in International Relations and Public Administration.<sup>20</sup> The study of the secretariats and the staff of GRPPs and other types of transnational bureaucracy is even more peripheral. These individuals are not state delegates. The conventional paradigm of international civil service includes impartiality, objectivity, and international loyalty rather than national particularism.

The reality of international administration is more complex, where national interests continue to be pursued. Even so, international civil servants – such as those in the DGF and IEG of the World Bank – have considerable capacity to shape (or delay) policies because of their expertise, routines, and positions of power.<sup>21</sup> They have been cast as creators and administrators of knowledge where “managed interdependence learning” can bring about organizational change.<sup>22</sup> The relative lack of analysis of these actors, or a tendency to treat them as conforming to the conventional paradigm as dispassionate upholders of international objectives, combined with the lack of transparency of most international organizations, means that their roles as global policy shapers and implementers are rarely open to public scrutiny.

The second type of player in transnational policy communities is the “internationalized public sector official”. These are national bureaucrats and public sector officials regularly interacting with other national counterparts in what have been called “transnational executive networks” or alternatively “inter-governmental networks” or yet again “transgovernmental networks.”<sup>23</sup> In what can be sovereignty enhancing arrangements, the state is not disappearing but it is becoming disaggregated and penetrated by horizontal networks existing between “high level officials directly responsive to the national political process—the ministerial level—as well as between lower level national regulators.”<sup>24</sup> Often these officials are expert practitioners in their own professional field whether that be in international trade law, global health concerns, or cross-national integrated water management.<sup>25</sup>

The diversity and management challenges of transgovernmental networks are notable: they include legal networks of Attorney's General, the Food Safety Quadrilateral Group and the International Heads of Child Support Agency Meeting prevalent in the Anglo-sphere.<sup>26</sup>

Other networks include the High Level Group on Nonproliferation, the Rome/Lyons Group on Terrorism or the International Network on Environment Compliance and Enforcement.

These networks of judges, legislators, or regulators are intergovernmental in character, and state remains core to their operations. They are formally designated power holders and rule makers who derive their authority from their official positions within their nation-state.

Third is the emergence of "transnational policy professionals." This is a diverse community of consultants, foundation officers, scientific experts, think tankers, and NGO executives.

Their status as either public or private agents is not always clear-cut. Private consultants are contracted by public bodies, and private experts are co-opted into official advisory bodies.

Rather than acting individually, they are usually found in a network or professional association that is often in receipt of public support and/or patronage. They are external experts and advisors and their growing prevalence in governance is the reflective of the "technocratization of political life."<sup>27</sup>

Increasingly apparent in this third category are "science diplomats" who are not limited to the kinds of inter-state negotiations of the traditional diplomat from a Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Science diplomacy is usually linked to the foreign policy objectives of nation-states, but this phenomenon is also now linked to the efforts of scientific communities to improve international affairs. Diplomacy is no longer "necessarily coterminous with the system of states."<sup>28</sup> Some scientific groups seek to operate independently as civilian associations (such as PugWash which won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1995) and others work through their TPCs

in order to access and inform GRPPs, international organizations and other multi-lateral initiatives. The character of the science diplomat varies according to the policy problem or sector in which they are professionally engaged. Hence we see practices of environmental diplomacy around the Critical Ecosystem Fund, or medical diplomacy around the Stop TB Initiative or Roll Back Malaria. Science Diplomacy is thus a globalized form of evidence-based policy making. For instance, CGIAR engages in scientific research on agriculture and aquaculture not only to assist country development plans and policy but also to inform relations with bodies like the Food and Agriculture Organization, the OECD and other international bodies on matters such as achieving the Millennium (and Sustainable) Development Goals.

All three categories of actors interact in varying degree with each other to facilitate multilateral cooperation and the delivery of global public goods. Although the next section of the chapter dwells on the international civil servants located in the World Bank, they are nonetheless interdependent with actors in wider TPCs for implementation and monitoring of policy. Their roles cannot be fully understood without reference to the transnational policy professionals, science diplomats and public sector officials who are critical partners in GRPPs. Sometimes these individuals also move across categories in their career progression helping to consolidate but also blur the public-private boundaries of global programs.

### *Interpretative communities*

The empirical understanding of TPCs – composed of donor institutions, financial outlays, mechanisms such as GRPPs and individual actors such as civil servants and experts – needs to be complemented by a conceptual framework. Other chapters in this volume refer to the

epistemic community framework as a means to analyze the influence of experts. However, the epistemic community framework has its limits, and can be “over-determined.”<sup>29</sup> This can be the case with TPCs in general, and GRPPs in particular, as these bodies are not solely founded upon or driven by scientific expertise, research and data, or evidence even though the scientists and science diplomats in them may be publicly prominent.

The epistemic community framework tends to portray principled ideas and expert knowledge as a resource utilized by an agent. Power or change capabilities are seen to reside in the individual or institutional agent that advocates on behalf of stakeholder, corporate or international organization interests. By contrast, the interpretative community framework presupposes agents who create shared identities and common interests through instrumental actions and coalition building. This is not to negate the role of those actors or institutions that articulate the ideas. But representing TPCs and specific GRPPs as interpretative mechanisms in the global order provides a structural explanation of the power of ideas. Over time and through multiple discourses and venues, specific policy ideas or a slowly built scientific consensus become an organizing logic or coordinative policy paradigm.

An interpretative community indeed rests upon “professional interpreters.” Depending on the policy issue or problem focus of a given TPC this can include a mix of think tank directors, research fellows, legal experts as well as scientific and medical specialists. This analytical framework is a conceptual means through which to assess the power and type of influence specific to GRPPs as venues of expert or professional interpreters; that is, the “global managers” and “science diplomats” mentioned earlier.

“All professional interpreters ...are situated within an institutional context, and interpretative activity makes sense only in terms of the purposes of the enterprise in which the interpreter is participating. Furthermore, a given text is always encountered in

a situation or field of practice, and therefore can only be understood in light of the position it occupies in that enterprise. ... Thus, interpretation is constrained... by the “cultural assumptions within which both texts and contexts take shape for situated agents”. Meaning is produced neither by the text nor by the reader but by the interpretative community in which both are situated.”<sup>30</sup>

The texts of GRPPs are the meetings, publications, standards or bench-marks, and policy commentaries (such as briefs, speech writing) produced by the interpreters. The situations and ‘fields of practice’ are constituted through the policy community practices and networks where participants (donors, GRPP secretariats, think tanks and scientific institutes, consultants, expert advisors and other stakeholders to the TPC) articulate new meanings or revised understandings of global policy. For example, public goods theory developed in the Economics discipline has been reinvigorated into Global Public Goods policy paradigm.<sup>31</sup> It has been adopted as a legitimating discourse in the many partnership programs of international organizations.

The “interpretative communities” analytical frame emerges from a post-structuralist sensibility. Meaning-making is understood to have structural consequences in shaping or limiting the frame of reference for policy making or what is considered politically viable. Power and capacity for change comes from the idea itself irrespective of who or what articulates that discourse. This sets it in distinction from the epistemic community framework which portrays expert knowledge as a resource *utilized* by an agent.<sup>32</sup> The assumption of a universal and factual body of knowledge grounded in the natural world from which epistemic communities and other bodies of experts can draw from in order to devise directions for policy makers on “what to do next” is challenged by the interpretative community framework of knowledge as being contextually constructed, situational and

always bound up with particular practices and powers. Accordingly, the concern of this chapter is to address TPCs as an important *network mechanism* of “meaning-making” in which various experts and professionals articulate concepts and modalities of global policy delivery. The community has many institutional bases in its network, and it evolves over time through multiple discourses and changing venues. As both an idea, and an institutional venue, the GRPP template has become both an organizing logic and a policy co-ordination instrument.

In this “interpretative” perspective, the GRPP experts are not based in a separate or independent domain distinct from policy and politics feeding ideas in a one way transmission process to decision makers in international organizations, governments or donor bodies. Nor are TPCs merely hinged or fused onto political processes to legitimate inter-governmental cooperation. Instead, they are inextricably bound with such processes. This is not simply blurred lines between public-private actors that we see with the different types of bureaucrat or civil servant. It is more the case that expert knowledge is mutually constituted with governance whereby transnational experts co-author and create specific global policies. Indeed, the term “science diplomat” captures this fusion and integration.

## **The World Bank and its Global and Regional Partnership Programs**

Over the past two decades the World Bank has taken the lead in the development community as a convener of what it has variously identified as “global programs” or “global partnerships”. The IEG of the World Bank<sup>33</sup> defines “global and regional partnership programs” as having the following characteristics:

- The partners contribute and pool resources (financial, technical, staff, and reputational) toward achieving agreed-upon objectives over time.
- The activities of the program are global, regional, or multi-country (not single-country) in scope.
- The partners establish a new organization with a governance structure and management unit to deliver these activities.

Whilst the majority of the Bank’s global programs were initiated only since the mid-1990s, initial experimentation began earlier. The burst of activity since the millennium reflects, for the Bank, “the rapid pace of globalization, the sharply increased attention to global policy issues in the development community, and the Bank’s increased partnership orientation.”<sup>34</sup>

The Bank is currently involved in nearly 85 global and 35 regional programs—with another dozen usually under development.<sup>35</sup> Almost half the programs in which the Bank is involved are knowledge, advocacy, and standard-setting networks that are generating and disseminating knowledge about development in their sector. Of these, about 40 percent have management units (secretariats) located inside the Bank, about 35 percent in other international or partner organizations, and about 25 percent are freestanding independent legal entities.<sup>36</sup>

Depending on the program, the World Bank Group plays many different roles in GRPPs. It can be convener, financial contributor, trustee, member of the governing body, chair, host of the secretariat, administrative support and/or implementing agency.

### ***The Development Grant Facility***

“The DGF enables the Bank to participate with partners in funding GPPs that support the supply of critical global public goods.”<sup>37</sup> This is a considerable challenge given that the DGF was a relatively small entity within the World Bank. Located in what was once known as the Concessional Finance and Global Partnerships Vice Presidency, now known as Development Finance, these programs now sit alongside the Trust Funds and other financial instruments supporting partnerships.

DGF’s role has been to help to fund global and regional initiatives that cannot be supported adequately through the regular country assistance operations of the World Bank. It strongly supports external partnerships; DGF funds are meant to be put to work outside the Bank by an external agency. Partners are multilateral and bilateral foundations, or the private sector, NGOs or universities. However, most DGF funds are executed by existing leading development institutions (e.g. WHO, SIDA, IFAD, UNESCO, or OECD) or by newly created institutions to coordinate program work (e.g. the Consultative Group to Assist the Poor, the Global Forum for Health Research, or the International AIDS Vaccine Initiative).

The objectives of the DGF funding mechanism were to “encourage innovation through provision of seed money and support” as well as “catalyze partnerships through convening and building coalitions, and raising funds.”<sup>38</sup> In addition, this funding instrument is a means for the Bank to broaden its financial services on offer in the market. Another outcome of this funding mechanism is the effect of blending Bank personnel into on-going professional relationships within TPCs.

A visit to the web-site of the Bank’s Trust Funds and Partnerships unit would give the reader the impression that partnership programs are financial instruments. Indeed they are; but they

can also be viewed as “knowledge networks” and nodes in the networks of issue specific TPCs. Through the Trust Funds the Bank provides finance and financial management services for GRPPs. However, the experts and advisors within a TPC provide the scientific and social capital as well as the human resources to implement and administer the GRPPs that “are focused on the provision of global public goods” such as “responses to climate change, and food security.”<sup>39</sup> Each policy domain requires scientific and social scientific knowledge and expertise to interpret the causes and consequences of pandemics, climate change and food insecurity. For instance, as a world-wide network of scientific laboratories, CGIAR is noted for its high-level research in its early years concentrating on breeding better staple food crops, expanding later to cover natural resource management, food production, and ecoregions.<sup>40</sup>

Clearly, specialized financial expertise and detailed bureaucratic knowledge of the internal architectures of, and funding flows between, international organisations, programs and donors is also required. The skills of the science diplomat become an increasingly valuable attribute in GRPPs given the dependence of these programs on multiple sources of funding and often the need to explain complex scientific data and theories to diverse political audiences and the educated lay public.

### ***The Independent Evaluation Group—IEG***

At the turn of the millennium, the experimentation with different kinds of networks and partnerships across vastly different policy fields began generating questions and concerns within the World Bank about the governance and management of GRPPs. This concern took shape in reviews and alongside assessments and learning about successes and failures that could be translated into guidelines for best practices in the design and development of

global and regional partnerships.<sup>41</sup> The IEG has become increasingly central to the World Bank's oversight of global programs.

The evaluations by IEG have been essential learning tools for the Bank and its partners. The purpose of the IEG is “to provide an objective assessment of the results of the Bank Group's work” and of relevance in a policy transfer frame of analysis, “to identify and disseminate lessons learned from experience.”<sup>42</sup> IEG reviews DGF programs but the Bank's involvement in global or regional programs extends well beyond DGF. IEG has responsibility for providing evaluations of nearly 120 global programs it has identified with Bank involvement. The three main purposes of these reviews of GRPPs are (a) to help improve the relevance and the effectiveness of the programs being reviewed, (b) to identify and disseminate lessons of broader application to other programs, and (c) to contribute to the development of standards, guidelines, and good practices for evaluating GRPPs.

Despite the name, IEG is part of the World Bank, not independent of it, and the majority of the Group's staff are seconded from within the Bank and to a large extent bound by the Bank's operational principles. They come from diverse research backgrounds. Instead of an epistemic character, IEG staff “focus more on professionalism and best practices rather than the real substance of their knowledge.”<sup>43</sup> Nevertheless, through its evaluations and professional overview, IEG plays an important “meaning-making” role by developing the symbols, language and policy narrative about GRPPs.

The IEG's *Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs* (2007) is indicative of the diffusion of standards and principles between the World Bank and its GRPP partners, where the OECD Development Assessment Committee's Network on

Development Evaluation is a vehicle and a convening point of the TPC to disperse norms and educate participants of standards and generate consensus and common perspective.

Emerging from a consultative process with partners, the *Sourcebook* is a document that has synthesized, applied, and elaborated existing evaluation principles and standards as a guide and a tool for the governing bodies and management units of GRPPs. Given the World Bank's dominance in convening and managing GRPPs, the standards and criteria developed by IEG, by default, are quickly embedded among professional groups as a result of the Bank and its partners disseminating this material. The evaluations and interpretations of GRPPs by IEG has a structuring, or path dependency effect, on subsequent developments.

## **A Research Agenda in Lieu of a Conclusion**

Through experimentation in DGF with global and regional partnership programs, the World Bank has developed transnational expertise on two fronts: First, it is an expert and financial “interlocutor” in the transfer of knowledge and policies from the Bank to external constituencies. Second, the Bank has become expert in the construction and management of global and regional partnership programs. These GRPPs overlap outside the Bank and into other international organizations (as a consequence of funding interdependencies) but also overlap into TPCs of a more diverse array of public and private organizations and actors.

TPCs provide the intermediary managerial role that provides coordination across functional and geographical boundaries by making knowledge sources available, connecting the parties to the transfer of standards and policy tools, and generating opportunities for knowledge exchange. These intermediaries act as “ambidextrous ties” connecting formal and informal knowledge search and transfer mechanisms.<sup>44</sup> But with what effectiveness, efficiency and

accountability remain open to further examination. Likewise, further sets of questions relate to the representativeness and accountability of GRRPs and their reliance on external experts.<sup>45</sup> Due to high density of experts, technical advisors and scientists in GRRPs, the flip-side to the positive connotations of these partnerships fuelling science diplomacy, international research collaboration or knowledge sharing is that GRRPs may well form mini technocracies.

Finally, the above discussion on the global and regional policy programs of the DGF has taken a vantage point from one unit in an international organization that has taken a leading role in convening such ventures. Doing so imposes a sense of order on the vast variety of global programs – a tidiness that does not exist in reality. A different starting point with other partners in global public-private partnerships would focus on the diverse undertakings by business or global philanthropists<sup>46</sup> that present a more unruly, fragmented and disordered picture of the range of global partnership programs. Yet, all these initiatives incorporate expertise in some measure to define the cause-and-effect relations that create and potentially solve global problems, to guide policy action and to establish the mechanisms and social practices of cooperation and coordination between international organizations and their partners and stakeholders in transnational policy communities.

---

<sup>1</sup> Tom Christensen and Per Lægreid, “Agencification and regulatory reforms,” in *Autonomy and regulation. Coping with agencies in the modern state*, ed. Tom Christensen and Per Lægreid (Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, Mass.: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2006)

<sup>2</sup> American Academy for the Advancement of Science, *Center for Science Diplomacy*, Accessed 21<sup>st</sup> April 2016, <http://www.aaas.org/program/center-science-diplomacy>

<sup>3</sup> World Bank, *Development Grant Facility Financed Programs*,

---

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/PROJECTS/EXTFININSTRUMENTS/EXTTRUSTFUNDSANDGRANTS/EXTDGF/0,,contentMDK:20588735~menuPK:64161792~pagePK:64161825~piPK:64161011~theSitePK:458461,00.html>

<sup>4</sup> Diane Stone and Christopher Wright, eds., *The World Bank and governance: a decade of reform and reaction*, (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2006)

<sup>5</sup> Jan Melissen, *Beyond the new public diplomacy* (The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations, 2011)

<sup>6</sup> Geoffrey Cowan and Amelia Arsenault, “Moving from monologue to dialogue to collaboration: The three layers of public diplomacy,” *The annals of the American academy of political and social science* 616, no. 1 (2008): 10-30.

<sup>7</sup> Stone and Wright, eds., *The World Bank and governance: a decade of reform and reaction*

<sup>8</sup> Abhijit Banerjee, Angus Deaton, Nora Lustig, Ken Rogoff, and Edward Hsu, *An Evaluation of World Bank Research: 1998-2005* (Washington, DC: World Bank Publications, 2006)

<sup>9</sup> Syed Kirmani and J-M Guy, eds., *Fostering riparian cooperation in international river basins: The World Bank at its best in development diplomacy* (Washington, DC: World Bank Publications, 1997)

<sup>10</sup> Ole Jacob Sending, “The International Civil Servant,” *International Political Sociology* 8, no. 3 (2014): 338-340.

<sup>11</sup> Iain Johnstone, “The power of interpretative communities,” in Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall, eds., *Power in Global Governance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005): 185-204.

<sup>12</sup> Lloyd Davis and Robert Patman, eds., *Science Diplomacy: New Day or False Dawn*, (New York: World Scientific, 2015); Birte Fähnrich, “Science diplomacy: Investigating the perspective of scholars on politics–science collaboration in international affairs,” *Public Understanding of Science* 0963662515616552 (December 2015).

<sup>13</sup> World Bank, *Global and Regional Partnership Programs*, Accessed 21<sup>st</sup> April 2016, <https://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/evaluations/global-and-regional-partnership-programs>.

<sup>14</sup> Operations Evaluation Department, *The World Bank’s Approach to Global Programs: An Independent Evaluation Phase 1 Report*, (Washington, DC: World Bank Document), 1 August 2002: x.

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid: 3

<sup>16</sup> World Bank, *Development Grant Facility Objectives and Eligibility Criteria*,

<sup>17</sup> Yi-Chong Xu and Patrick Weller, "To Be, but not to Be Seen: Exploring the Impact of International Civil Servants," *Public administration* 86, no. 1 (2008): 35-51.

<sup>18</sup> Patriotta, Gerardo, Anna Castellano, and Mike Wright. "Coordinating knowledge transfer: Global managers as higher-level intermediaries." *Journal of World Business* 48, no. 4 (2013): 515-526.

<sup>19</sup> John Kelley, "The new diplomacy: Evolution of a revolution," *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 21, no. 2 (2010): 286-305.

<sup>20</sup> Frank Biermann and Bernd Siebenhüner, eds., *Managers of Global change: the Influence of International Environmental Bureaucracies*, (Boston: MIT Press, 2009), 1.

<sup>21</sup> Xu and Weller, "To Be, but not to Be Seen: Exploring the Impact of International Civil Servants," 35-51.

<sup>22</sup> Ernst B. Haas, *Where Knowledge is Power: Three Models of Change in International Organizations*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990)

<sup>23</sup> Timothy Legrand, "Transgovernmental policy networks in the Anglosphere," *Public Administration* 93, no. 4 (2015): 973-991.

<sup>24</sup> Anne Marie Slaughter, *A New World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 19

<sup>25</sup> Kirmani and Guy, *Fostering riparian cooperation in international river basins: The World Bank at its best in development diplomacy*

<sup>26</sup> Legrand, "Transgovernmental policy networks in the Anglosphere," 973-991.

<sup>27</sup> Jarle Trondal, Zuzanna Murdoch and Benny Geys, "Representative bureaucracy and the role of expertise in politics," *Politics and Governance* 3, no. 1 (2015): 27.

<sup>28</sup> Kelley, "The new diplomacy: Evolution of a revolution," *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 21, no. 2 (2010): 289.

<sup>29</sup> Mai'a Cross, "The limits of epistemic communities: EU security agencies," *Politics and Governance* 3, no. 1 (2015): 92.

---

<sup>30</sup> Johnstone, “The power of interpretative communities,” 189.

<sup>31</sup> Inge Kaul, Paolo Conceição, Katell Le Goulven and Ronald U. Mendoza, *Providing global public goods: managing globalization* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)

<sup>32</sup> Cross, “The limits of epistemic communities: EU security agencies,”; Diane Stone, *Knowledge Actors and Transnational Governance* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013)

<sup>33</sup> Independent Evaluation Group, *Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs: Indicative Principles and Standards*, (Washington, DC: IEG-World Bank, 2007), xvi

<sup>34</sup> World Bank, *Global Monitoring Report: Policies and Actions for Achieving the Millennium Development Goals and Related Outcomes*, (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2004), 201

<sup>35</sup> Independent Evaluation Group, *The World Banks Involvement in global and Regional Programs* (Washington, D.C.: IEG-World Bank, 2011), xvii

<sup>36</sup> Independent Evaluation Group, *The World Banks Involvement in global and Regional Programs*, xviii

<sup>37</sup> World Bank, *Development Grant Facility Financed Programs*

<sup>38</sup> DGF Objectives and Eligibility Criteria. Accessed 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2016:

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/PROJECTS/EXTFININSTRUMENTS/EXTTRUSTFUNDSANDGRANTS/EXTDGF/0,,contentMDK:20571902~menuPK:64161795~pagePK:64161825~piPK:64161011~theSitePK:458461,00.html>

<sup>39</sup> World Bank, *What are Financial Intermediary Funds*,

<http://fiftrustee.worldbank.org/Pages/FIFSOversview.aspx>

<sup>40</sup> For a full outline of CGIAR research and its sixteen Research Programs – ranging from gene banks, agroforestry, or aquatic agricultural systems—across fifteen Research centres (including, *inter alia*, the International Potato Center and Bioversity International), see <http://www.cgiar.org/our-strategy/cgiar-research-programs/>

<sup>41</sup> Independent Evaluation Group, *The World Banks Involvement in global and Regional Programs*

<sup>42</sup> Independent Evaluation Group: Accessed 21<sup>st</sup> April 2016

---

<http://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/content/ieg/en/home.html>

<sup>43</sup> Cross, “The limits of epistemic communities: EU security agencies,” 97

<sup>44</sup> Patriotta, Gerardo, Anna Castellano, and Mike Wright. "Coordinating knowledge transfer: Global managers as higher-level intermediaries." *Journal of World Business* 48, no. 4 (2013): 515-526.

<sup>45</sup> Trondal, Murdoch and Geys, “Representative bureaucracy and the role of expertise in politics”

<sup>46</sup> Michael Moran, *Private Foundations and Development Partnerships: American Philanthropy and Global Development Agendas* (London and New York: Routledge, 2013).

## **Appendix 1. DGF Finance Programs by Name**

1. Affiliated Network for Social Accountability - Africa
2. Affiliated Network for Social Accountability - EAP
3. Affiliated Network on Soc. Accountability and Gov. in SA and the G.P.F
4. Africa Agriculture Water Investment Partnership
5. African Program for Onchocerciasis Control
6. Alliance for Responsible Fisheries
7. Cities Alliance
8. City Indicators Facility
9. Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research
10. Consultative Group to Assist the Poor
11. Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund
12. Development of Education in Africa
13. Gender Innovation Fund
14. Global Development Network
15. Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery
16. Global Financial Management Partnership
17. Global Forest Partnership - Phase II
18. Global Forum for Health Research
19. Global Gov. and Strengthening Dev. Country Voice
20. Global Governance and Strengthening Dev. Country Voice - G-24 Secretariat
21. Global PPP and Multi-Donor TF for Youth Investment
22. Global Partnership for Disability and Development
23. Good Governance: Community Mobilization to Combat Corruption
24. Institutional Development Fund

25. LAC MIC Gov. and Public Mngt Partnership Facility
26. Mobilizing Resource Stewardship: Communities, Conservation and Markets
27. Nelson Mandela Institution
28. Partnership for African Capacity Building
29. Partnership for Child Development
30. Partnership for Environmental Assessment in Africa
31. Population and Reproductive Health Capacity Building Program
32. Public Expenditure Management and Peer Assisted Learning
33. Research and Development in Human Reproduction
34. Research and Training in Tropical Diseases
35. Roll Back Malaria
36. Roma Education Fund
37. Small States Network for Economic Development
38. Statistical Capacity Building – MAPS
39. Statistical Capacity Building – PES
40. Stop TB Initiative
41. Strengthening Bank's Support to the Arab World
42. Subnational Development Technical Assistance Program
43. Support to Agricultural Value Chain Development & Diversification
44. Sustainable Advancement of Gender Equality and Empowerment
45. Trade Data for Low Income Countries
46. Trade Standards Practitioners Network
47. UNAIDS and Regional Initiative