

IMES DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

Is New Governance the Ideal Architecture for Global Financial Regulation?

Annelise Riles

Discussion Paper No. 2013-E-1

IMES

INSTITUTE FOR MONETARY AND ECONOMIC STUDIES

BANK OF JAPAN

2-1-1 NIHONBASHI-HONGOKUCHO

CHUO-KU, TOKYO 103-8660

JAPAN

You can download this and other papers at the IMES Web site:

<http://www.imes.boj.or.jp>

Do not reprint or reproduce without permission.

NOTE: IMES Discussion Paper Series is circulated in order to stimulate discussion and comments. Views expressed in Discussion Paper Series are those of authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Bank of Japan or the Institute for Monetary and Economic Studies.

Is New Governance the Ideal Architecture for Global Financial Regulation?

Annelise Riles *

Abstract

A central challenge for international financial regulatory systems today is how to manage the impact of Global Systemically Important Financial Institutions (G-SIFIs) on the global economy, given the interconnected and pluralistic nature of regulatory regimes. This article focuses on the Financial Stability Board (FSB), and proposes a new research agenda regarding the FSB's emerging regulatory forms. In particular, it examines the regulatory architecture of New Governance (NG), a variety of approaches that are supposed to be more reflexive, collaborative, and experimental than traditional forms of governance. A preliminary conclusion is that NG tools may be effective in resolving *some* kinds of problems in a pluralistic regulatory order, but they are unlikely to be suitable to *all* problems. As such, this article proposes that analyses of the precise conditions in which NG mechanisms may or may not be effective are necessary. It concludes with some recommendations for improving the NG model.

Keywords: International Financial Regulation; Global Systemically Important Financial Institutions; Financial Stability Board; Regulatory Reform; New Governance; Regulatory Pluralism

JEL classification: K23, K33

* Jack G. Clarke Professor of Far East Legal Studies, Cornell Law School (E-mail: ar254@cornell.edu)

This paper was prepared in part while the author was a visiting scholar at the Institute for Monetary and Economic Studies, Bank of Japan. The author would like to thank the Institute for hosting me during the course of this research and Minoru Aosaki, Michael Dorf, Cristie Ford, Mikari Kashima, Naoko Shindo and Hirotaka Hideshima, for their very helpful comments and criticisms. Chika Watanabe provided excellent research assistance. Views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official views of the Bank of Japan.

Table of Contents

Part I: Introduction	1
Part II: The FSB approach to global financial architecture	7
A. The Challenge of G-SIFIs as a problem of international legal coordination	8
Option 1: Break up the G-SIFIs	8
Option 2: Government liquidation or nationalization in conditions of crisis	9
Option 3: Preparedness.....	10
The Corollary: Coordination among Regulators	12
B. The limits of harmonization as a coordination technique	13
C. Three key elements of FSB methodology	18
Standard-setting.....	19
Peer Review.....	20
Supervisory Colleges	24
D. Conclusion to Part II	26
Part III: The New Governance Approach	26
A. What is New Governance?	27
Valuing diversity and pluralism.....	28
A pragmatic approach to conflict between state and market.....	29
Institutional Roots in EU Comitology	30
Regulation by information	33
B. Addressing the democracy deficit	36
C. Conclusion to Part III	37
Part IV: New Governance in Practice: A Critical Appraisal	38
A. Lessons Learned from NG in financial regulation prior to 2008	39
B. Practical Shortcomings in the Application of New Governance by the FSB	42
Limited Participation.....	42
Limited Public-Private Coordination.....	43
Standards Slide into Rules.....	44
Pluralism Slides into Harmonization.....	46
Problems with the Sociological Approach	47
Learning Slides into Surveillance	48
Audit Culture.....	50
Part V: Conclusion	52
A. Possible Avenues for Reform	54
A more inclusive process	54
Better procedural regulation of NG processes.....	57
More narrowly tailored assessment tools	59
Greater resources for monitoring and deliberation activities	59
B. Recommendation: Mount a cross-disciplinary, cross-jurisdictional research project aimed at evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the FSB experience with New Governance methodologies to date and at identifying the conditions under which those methodologies are successful and those in which they require supplementation with other methods.	60

Part I: Introduction

The central transnational regulatory challenge of the moment is how to monitor and manage large cross-border institutions that can jeopardize the health of the entire global economy. So-called Global Systemically Important Financial Institutions (G-SIFIs) are cross-border institutions that are so large or interconnected with other financial institutions that they are potentially too big to fail (TBTF). Equally importantly, such institutions are subject to multiple, overlapping, and even sometimes conflicting, legal regimes.

From a legal point of view, the challenge G-SIFIs pose to global financial regulation is the problem of the interdependence of regulatory regimes in a global system that is inherently pluralistic in nature. The threat of regulatory arbitrage that underlies much of the push for the harmonization of financial regulation—the threat of a race to the bottom among jurisdictions—is plausible only if legal regimes are sufficiently fungible and interconnected on the one hand, and yet sufficiently different in regulatory substance or approach on the other, that in some circumstances they can become viable alternatives from market participants' point of view. Conversely, where markets are interconnected, one approach to regulatory oversight in one jurisdiction produces externalities in other regulatory regimes.

This article takes stock of the way the international financial regulatory system is now tackling this challenge as exemplified by the initiatives of one of the prime organs of global financial regulation today, the Financial Stability Board (FSB) (See Griffith-Jones, Helleiner & Woods 2010). The G20 launched the FSB as its technocratic arm of policy creation and implementation in 2009,¹ transforming an earlier G7 institution, the Financial Stability Forum, into a more robust organization

¹ G 20 London Summit, 2 April 2009, "Declaration on Strengthening the Financial System"

with increased membership, increased institutional capacity (increased permanent secretariat staff, standing committees) and a broadened mandate to take a more macro-prudential focus on G-SIFIs in particular.²

Article 1 of the FSB's charter emphasizes its core functions and methodologies-
-coordination, standard-setting, implementation of global standards, and
identification and assessment of cross-border financial risks:

The Financial Stability Board (FSB) is established to coordinate at the international level the work of national financial authorities and international standard setting bodies (SSBs) in order to develop and promote the implementation of effective regulatory, supervisory and other financial sector policies. In collaboration with the international financial institutions, the FSB will address vulnerabilities affecting financial systems in the interest of global financial stability (Financial Stability Board 2009a).

One cannot but be impressed with the sheer volume of initiatives the FSB has undertaken since its relaunching in 2009, and by the remarkable leadership, energy and acumen behind these. In this article I take the FSB as a target of critical analysis precisely because the FSB represents arguably the state of the art in international

² Structurally, the FSB consists of a plenary of representatives of regulators, central banks and finance ministries in member jurisdictions and international organizations, which makes decisions by consensus, including approving peer review reports and choosing new members; a steering committee; a secretariat; and three standing committees, one of which (the standing committee for standards implementation) is responsible for conducting peer reviews (described further below). Agreements are negotiated in individual committees through the circulation of draft text usually first produced by the secretariat.

Member jurisdictions are allowed one, two or three voting participants depending on "the size of the national economy, financial market activity and national financial stability arrangements of the corresponding Member jurisdiction." FSB Charter Art. 10. At present there are 24 member jurisdictions plus the Bank for International Settlements, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS), the Committee on the Global Financial System (CGFS), the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB), the International Association of Insurance Supervisors (IAIS), the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) and the Committee on Payment and Settlement Systems (CPSS) (FSB Charter Appendix A).

financial governance: it is an experimental, purposeful and energetic institution that deploys the most innovative international financial regulation methodology today.

The FSB's approach, like that of most domestic and international regulators, is to tackle discrete and pressing problems through tailored policy initiatives--for example, determining which banks should be designated as G-SIFIs, drafting rules on executive compensation, or deciding how much and what kind of capital such banks should be required to set aside. These are important and complex questions that leave little time for an "eagle's eye view" of all of this activity taken as a whole. And yet, built into the structure of the Basel Accords and of the numerous activities of the FSB, there nevertheless is an inchoate but distinct ambition that this activity will ultimately add up to a larger global financial governance project, something more than the sum of the parts.

Thus, it is important to carefully consider the sum of all these parts, to reflect on where this broad flurry of activity is leading, and to evaluate whether the implied target of these activities is sufficient to prevent or abate financial crises to come. The question of regulatory *form*--of the nature, strengths and weaknesses of the emerging global financial architecture--remains surprisingly under-examined both by academics and by policy-makers. For example, to date, the FSB has never clearly articulated, let alone defended, its model of regulatory form--what I will call the New Governance (NG) architecture.

To date, the academic literature has also not done a sufficient job of providing leadership in addressing these larger questions. Academic experts in financial regulation, perhaps because they are so closely engaged in conversation with policy-makers, have tended to approach problems in international financial governance at a more granular, policy-by-policy level, without regard for the larger architecture.

These experts have focused on pointing out the strengths or shortcomings of particular policy initiatives and have assumed that international coordination will take care of itself.³ In many cases, academics implicitly accept and even build off of the FSB model seemingly without noticing the choice, or discussing its implications (e.g. Romano 2012). If one reads this literature as a whole for what it might tell us about the larger questions addressed in this article, however, these specific inquiries into discrete policy initiatives raise questions about the NG architecture.

From another disciplinary perspective, there are those working on international law and governance, principally in non-financial law fields such as international labor law, international environmental law, and public international law, who applaud the emerging structure of global financial regulation (Miyano 2008)--largely because that structure has been borrowed (possibly without sufficient reflection) from innovations in many of the public law fields in which they work. These proponents, however, generally lack extensive expertise in financial law, and thus their analyses of the specifics of the global financial regulatory architecture remain thin. And yet the comparison with other legal fields is not entirely misplaced: the entanglement of regulatory systems is a problem that global financial regulation shares with a host of other major international regulatory areas, from environmental regulation, to counter-terrorism, and many more. This challenge has been extensively discussed in the public international law literature (Twining 2003).

We know that regulatory architecture--that the form regulation takes--rules versus standards, hard law versus soft law, penalties versus rewards, *ex ante* versus *ex post* regulation, administrative, judicial or legislative rule-making-- impacts upon

³ Gordon and Mayer for example argue for the harmonization of regulation that impacts on systemic risks such as capital requirements, bail-ins, etc., without discussing the mechanism by which harmonization should take place (Gordon and Mayer 2011).

the efficacy of regulatory initiatives, the legitimacy of regulation, and its distributive effects. For example self-regulation is a regulatory architecture that was once taken for granted by many as the best way of achieving certain regulatory objectives, and yet it is widely acknowledged today that self-regulation has clear limitations. Indeed, the understanding that regulatory architecture matters is precisely the premise of NG initiatives (described in Part III): for its proponents, NG offers a more effective and just regulatory form for achieving the same substantive policy goals that one might pursue through either so-called “command and control” regulation or self-regulation.

This article merely aims to initiate a debate and propose a research agenda regarding the emerging form of the architecture of international financial governance. It does so by bringing together what is known in other legal and social scientific fields about the particular regulatory technologies deployed the FSB. The aim of this article is not to propose an alternative architecture, but rather to lay the groundwork for thinking through the alternatives by suggesting how we might approach a more careful diagnosis of the potential problems with the now taken-for-granted approach.

Although this article is not the place for a full exposition of my own views on possible alternatives, I ask the reader to put aside for a moment one assumption that often stands in the way of a full consideration of the current predicament. It is often taken for granted, implicitly or explicitly, that the current system is the only plausible alternative to an older form of international legal governance sometimes disparaged as “command and control” regulation. This older view is, to some extent rightly, seen as outmoded, impractical, and ill-suited to current regulatory challenges.⁴

However it is sometimes then assumed that any criticism of the current approach to

⁴ Law professor Jodi Short has argued that many criticisms of command and control regulation in the US may stem more from a general American anxiety about state power and coercive government than from an objective evaluation of past policies (Short 2012: 637, 642, 681).

regulation is also an implicit argument for a return to command and control, or conversely, that a criticism of command and control regulation is in itself an argument for NG regulation, as if there can only be two possibilities—new governance or command and control. A more rational and illuminating approach might consider the strengths and weaknesses of the NG approach on its own terms. Only once we evaluate the efficacy of the current model can we determine whether it is indeed the best possible option and how it might be reformed.

The analysis proceeds as follows. In Part II, I describe the pervading understanding of “the problem” of G-SIFIs at successive layers of complexity, and I then describe what kind of practical policy response to this problem is entailed in the regulatory approach of the FSB. In Part III, I analyze the problems and solutions outlined in Part II from the standpoint of the body of regulatory theory that most directly corresponds to (and has most directly influenced) this approach. This body of regulatory theory--the so-called New Governance (NG) literature--claims developments in global financial governance as a prime example of its applications, and has indirectly influenced the architecture of global financial governance via models borrowed from initiatives in Europe such as the European Union (EU)'s ‘Open Method of Co-Ordination’ (OMC) and efforts in the US to establish models of reflexive administrative law such as the US National Environmental Policy Act.

In Part IV, I evaluate NG as implemented by the FSB as an architecture of international financial governance. Experts in financial regulation both in the academy and in government who have focused on the effects of particular NG initiatives prior to and since the financial crisis are far less enthusiastic than proponents of NG about its practical prospects for success in this area. Indeed, much of the initiative for current transnational rule-making derives from concerns

about the potential pitfalls or limitations of pre-financial crisis NG-style initiatives as applied prior to 2008 in the US and in Europe to the relationship between regulators and financial market participants. And yet ironically, at the very moment at which the FSB is busy creating rules and procedures to supplement the failures of pre-2008 domestic regulation that, in many North Atlantic countries, was inspired in important parts by the NG model, the FSB is itself applying much of the same regulatory architecture, with little critical evaluation, to the relationship between international and domestic regulators--as a tool of international regulatory coordination. To make matters worse, in the process of transposing NG into a tool of international regulatory coordination, some of the most innovative aspects of NG seem to have been lost, diluted or disregarded in practice.

As described in the conclusion (Part V), a preliminary hypothesis emerges from this analysis: NG mechanisms may be effective in resolving *some* kinds of problems caused by the interrelationship of legal regimes in a pluralistic regulatory order, but they are unlikely to be suitable to *all* problems. This in turn suggests an agenda for future research: detailed study of the precise conditions in which new governance tools may or may not be effective in international financial governance is sorely needed.

Part II: The FSB approach to global financial architecture

This Part describes the G-SIFI problem and the FSB's response as a problem of transnational regulation. The first section summarizes the practical challenges G-SIFIs pose as a variation on a quite standard problem in international law and institutions--a problem of coordination in pluralistic conditions. The second section

describes what is most innovative and deserving of analytical attention about the FSB's approach to this problem.

A. The Challenge of G-SIFIs as a problem of international legal coordination

As mentioned at the outset, the challenge of G-SIFIs is that they are difficult to understand and to control from the vantage point of any singular jurisdiction, and yet their failure can have serious consequences for multiple jurisdictions and for the global economy as a whole. The Liikanen report commissioned by the European Union to provide a blueprint for future EU directives on banking regulation defines them as “those institutions whose distress or disorderly failure would cause significant disruption to the wider financial system and economic activity, due to their size, complexity, systemic interconnectedness or lack of good substitutes that can readily take over their activities” (Liikanen et. al. 2012: 38).

The regulation of G-SIFIs is therefore an inherently transnational problem that demands both practical coordination among regulators and an understanding of how national and international regulatory regimes interact. The proposed responses to the risks posed by G-SIFIs can be divided into the operationally desirable but politically unpalatable on the one hand and the more politically feasible but more difficult to operationalize on the other.

Option 1: Break up the G-SIFIs

If certain financial institutions are too systemically important and complex to fail, then the most logical proposal is to break them up into smaller entities.

Prominent academic commentators, including Joseph Stiglitz and Simon Johnson, and even some prominent market participants such as former Citigroup CEO John Reed and former Citigroup Chairman and CEO Sanford Weill have

questioned whether the increasingly large size of financial conglomerates contributes to wider economic welfare to a degree that is proportionate to the externalities they impose on the global economy. Legal scholars, likewise, have proposed that existing anti-trust law might be used to break up some of these conglomerates (Reich 2010). As the de Larosière report outlining the EU position on financial regulation explains,

Given their size and the structural function they have for the financial system as a whole, [SIFIs] are, to some extent, "too big to manage" and "too big to fail" – which means that they can expose the rest of society to major costs and are subject to acute moral hazard; in some instances, these institutions can even be "too big to save", for example when they are head-quartered in a relatively small country or when the organisation of a rescue package is simply too complex to implement (de Larosière 2009: 62).

However, most policy-makers believe that this approach is for the moment unfeasible due to the opposition of powerful financial institutions (Krugman 2010). As the de Larosière report makes clear:

However, although this may be desirable in instances of excessive market dominance under anti-trust law, it is unlikely that large financial institutions will be broken up into component parts (de Larosière 2009: 62).

Option 2: Government liquidation or nationalization in conditions of crisis

If the failure of a G-SIFI spreads risk throughout the financial system and imposes costs on taxpayers, another logical proposal would be to give regulators the authority to nationalize or liquidate banks whose capital ratio falls below a certain level (Butler 2009). However, again, many observers believe this is politically unfeasible at least in the US due to the public's distaste for government ownership of private assets (Blinder 2009) and regulators' fear that liquidation is an admission to regulatory failure (Coffee 2011: 839).

Option 3: Preparedness

The dominant approach, therefore, has been to focus on drafting firm-specific plans for a more orderly resolution of institutions that pose general systemic or “macroprudential” risks (Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation 2011). This is the approach embodied in the American Dodd-Frank legislation (Dodd Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection 2010)⁵ as well as in the focus on identifying G-SIFIs and requiring that they hold up to an additional 2.5% of capital in reserve, in addition to the amount enshrined in the Basel III accords and implemented in recent framework documents promulgated by the FSB (Basel Committee on Banking Supervision 2011). The new FSB standard on resolution promulgated in October 2011 for example emphasizes “mandatory resolvability assessment and a recovery and resolution plan for each global SIFI,”⁶ as well as “a cross-border cooperation agreement between relevant authorities” (Draghi 2011).

The centerpiece of this approach is the imposition of additional capital requirements on G-SIFIs both to guard against and ultimately insulate taxpayers from bearing the cost of resolution (Dash 2011).⁷ Other proposals include mandating that financial institutions create “living wills” that purport to define how they would be resolved at times of crisis--an approach now enshrined in US regulations (Enrich 2010)--and shifting the burden of loss to bond holders by mandating that certain categories of bonds stipulate that they will convert to ordinary shares when a bank’s capitalization drops to a certain level (so-called CoCos or bail-

⁵ It is the basis of Title I, Section 165 of Dodd Frank that directs the Federal Reserve to apply prudential standards to systemically important bank and non-bank financial institutions (Romano & Verstein 2011: 48, comments of Tom Baxter, General Council of Federal Reserve Bank of NY).

⁶ 28 G-SIFIs have been designated as of November 2012.

⁷ Basel III imposes “requirements for globally systemically important banks to hold additional common equity capital above the Basel III minimum standards, rising from 1% to 2.5% of risk-weighted assets commensurate with the systemic impact of their failure, to be fully phased in by 2019” (Draghi 2011).

in debt) (Hart et al. 2010). There are also proposals to impose additional taxes on G-SIFIs to create a fund that would cover resolution costs or to ask other financial institutions to cover the cost of the bailout of one of their peers after a crisis has occurred (Singh 2011).

However, problems remain with all these efforts to prepare for the next failure of a G-SIFI. First, many question whether the preparations are enough. Lehman itself, for example, probably would not have been required to post the additional capital requirements demanded of G-SIFIs under the current regime (Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation 2011). CoCos raise a host of problems, from how to price such instruments to whether they are open to legal challenge to their possible contagion effects at times of crisis (Pazarbasioglu, Ceylan et al. 2011). More generally, planning for the future is difficult and the experience of past crises is not always a good guide. Living wills, for example, are unlikely to bear much resemblance to actual crisis conditions and hence are somewhat academic exercises (Gilani 2011).⁸ As Black points out, “the solution of an orderly liquidation process for global financial conglomerates is untested, and many doubt whether it will work to prevent future financial crises” (Black 2010: 267). Goodhart and Dimitrios likewise conclude in their Mayekawa Lecture held in 2011 that: “The experience of the failure of Lehman Brothers was so appalling that most governments thereafter

⁸ The living will project exemplifies a response to the threat of future crisis social scientists have observed in many other arena, from environmental to security to medical risks. The approach is to prepare what scholars term “fantasy documents” concerning preparedness that outline procedures which in all likelihood bear little resemblance to what would need to be done or would actually be done at the moment of crisis. Social scientists have argued that the true function of such documents is to generate public confidence in the present, rather than to mitigate disaster in the future, and also to create a project that necessitates cooperation and hence gives the parties an opportunity to work together and build relationships (Clarke 1999).

decided that liquidation of a SIFI could not be tolerated” (Goodhart & Tsomocos 2011: 63).

The Corollary: Coordination among Regulators

The backstop to this preparedness approach therefore is better coordination among regulators with the hope that it will lead to greater degrees of trust and better coordination at a moment of future crisis. This focus on building channels for coordination and information-sharing responds directly to the failures of coordination between US and UK regulators at the time of the Lehman crisis. Yet commentators and policy-makers alike have decried inadequate levels of information-sharing regarding G-SIFIs among national regulators (Corcoran 2011: Brummer 2011).

In particular, the failure of a G-SIFI creates potential conflicts of interest between a G-SIFI’s home jurisdiction and the host jurisdictions in which the G-SIFI does business. In a situation of G-SIFI failure, by definition there are not sufficient assets to cover the G-SIFI’s liabilities globally and regulators and courts are often tempted to favor their own nationals over other creditors. If the home jurisdiction’s courts or regulators can assert control over the G-SIFI’s assets worldwide, then they may use available assets to compensate their own national creditors first. Conversely, if a host jurisdiction can, through its courts or by administrative regulation, assert legal jurisdiction over the G-SIFI’s assets located within its territory then the host jurisdiction’s courts or regulators may use these assets to compensate creditors located within the jurisdiction first. Because home and host regulators anticipate such behavior at moments of the failure of a G-SIFI they may be reticent to share information for fear of creating tactical advantages for regulators on the other side.

Hence the problem of coordination between so-called home and host regulators is a central focus of the FSB (Basel Committee on Banking Supervision 2006). The stated task of the FSB is to “significantly step up cooperation amongst authorities to prepare feasible and credible G-SIFI resolution plans” (Draghi 2011).

B. The limits of harmonization as a coordination technique

In order to understand why NG emerges as an appealing regulatory architecture for the FSB as it addresses coordination problems among regulators, it is necessary to understand what NG innovates against--international harmonization. Up to this point, most attempts at financial regulatory coordination have emphasized a more classical international legal solution to coordination: harmonized rules agreed upon at the inter-state level and translated into substantially similar national laws by domestic legislatures or enforced by domestic regulators. The legal mechanism of choice for regulatory coordination of this kind has been the inter-state agreement. These agreements have traditionally been negotiated among national financial regulators of G20 nations⁹ through the Basel Committee (Basel Committee on Banking Supervision 2010b) and then sanctioned by heads of state at G20 meetings¹⁰. But they are intended to be global in scope--to apply to G20 nations as well as non-G20 nations (Helleiner 2010). The aim is for the content of these agreements to supersede conflicting national law through implementing legislation or changes in regulatory practice in each country (Helleiner 2010).

Why did this kind of formal harmonization traditionally seem like a necessary form of coordination? As domestic regulators in jurisdictions such as the US pursued

⁹ Prior to 2009, such agreements were negotiated among the so-called G-10 nations only.

¹⁰ In the past these proposals were approved at G7 meetings.

domestic reforms, they confronted a steady drumbeat of threats that markets would respond to additional regulatory burdens by moving business to jurisdictions that do not have heightened regulatory requirements (Gonzalez & Schipke 2011). National regulators responded to this threat of regulatory arbitrage and of a so-called “race to the bottom” by attempting to ensure that other jurisdictions had roughly the same regulatory burdens as their own (Eubanks 2010). One concern for the national regulator at the international level has been to ensure that domestic regulatory reform does not lead to a decrease in the size of one’s domestic financial industry. Thus, international harmonization of regulatory standards has traditionally been seen as the necessary corollary of domestic regulatory reform.

In other words, one emblem of this early stage of international financial governance is that national regulators act on the international plane with a quite nationalist view of their interests: other nations’ markets are of concern primarily insofar as they pose financial risks to the domestic market or they become of a potential source of competition to the domestic market because of lower regulatory standards. Yet the implication of this nationalist orientation, ironically, is that it becomes necessary to push for global harmonization and standardization over national diversity in regulatory approaches, that is, to favor harmonization rather than pluralism as a modality of international legal architecture.

In practice, harmonization as an architectural model leads to numerous problems. First, harmonization typically takes the form of substantive *rules*, such as capital adequacy requirements for systemically important financial institutions. One practical reason for the emphasis on harmonizing rules at the Basel Committee and the FSB is that rules are relatively easy to identify, describe, and produce compared to regulatory standards or practices. Yet harmonized rules mean little if

the degree of supervision concerning adherence to those rules varies widely from one jurisdiction to another. As Pan argues, rule-making does not in itself translate into better regulatory supervision:

International law scholars who analyze the performance of transgovernmental networks should distinguish between rulemaking and standards setting, on the one hand, and supervision, on the other. This distinction is important because one of the main achievements of transgovernmental networks has been to drive convergence and harmonization of national rules and standards in the areas of banking, securities, and insurance. Basel I and Basel II, for example, are successful instances where a transgovernmental network has been able to produce a broadly accepted set of regulatory standards. The recent financial crisis, however, demonstrated that the real need for regulatory action is in the area of supervision (Pan 2010: 264-265).

Likewise, Dickson the Superintendent of Financial Institutions of Canada has argued that current reforms give too much attention to rule-making and not nearly enough attention to the process of supervision itself:

If we take the view that supervisory judgment has failed time and again, and that we should therefore rely far more on rules than on supervisors going forward, we may create a system with even more risk, as rules often have unintended consequences which can take quite some time to see. As well, our record in getting rules right is not stellar. Stricter rules, like substantially higher capital requirements, can create a false sense of security; an institution will never have enough capital if there are material flaws in its risk management practices. That is why supervision matters (Dickson 2010: 624).

A related problem with harmonization as an international governance structure is a pervasive lack of support from domestic politicians, banks, the public, and even regulators in many jurisdictions for rule-making at the international level. Global agreements require domestic support for implementation but in many jurisdictions, domestic constituencies, from legislators to market participants, have proven profoundly skeptical of newly harmonized rules (Tarullo 2008). The consequence is

often the practical impossibility of full compliance with internationally harmonized rules.

Likewise, the lack of will for coordination among regulators themselves--the sense of national competition that often pervades the sense of the common good--also impedes harmonization efforts. Unwillingness on the part of national regulators to adhere to internationally harmonized standards is likely to be even stronger in cases of emerging markets not represented at the FSB or the G20.

For all these reasons, even many of the proponents of international legal harmonization agree that full or substantial harmonization of regulatory standards in the short to medium term is most likely impossible. Yet many commentators and policy makers go further to argue that even if it were achievable, harmonization is the wrong objective--that it is not desirable in the first place.

First, different jurisdictions face different conditions and different problems. For example as Jeffrey Gordon commented in April 2011 at a round-table discussion on Dodd-Frank held at Yale Law School, the US focus on the liquidation of G-SIFIs reflects options available to US regulators given the size of the US economy and of the Treasury relative to the size of failing financial institutions that may not be available to other countries. For other countries, the focus rather must be on preventing the failure of institutions that are “too big to save” through higher capital adequacy requirements and bail-ins.¹¹

Equally importantly, where systemic risk is created by “herd mentalities” in which market participants pursue common strategies, different regulatory

¹¹ Of course, individual jurisdictions are free to adopt higher capital requirements than those stipulated by Basel III and some are taking steps to do so. As the Vickers Report comments, however, jurisdictions that do so risk putting themselves at a disadvantage due to regulatory arbitrage (Independent Commission on Banking 2011: 9)

approaches may act as a stop-gap against contagion by incentivizing different business models (Smits 2010; Low 2010). As Sato, former Commissioner of Japan's Financial Services Agency explained in an op-ed in the Financial Times in 2009, "A global community adopting a uniform platform is vulnerable to a virus, as we have witnessed during the current financial pandemic. Capital adequacy regulations should be designed to foster diversity in business models, demanding the right level of capital for the business type of the bank in question" (Sato 2009; see also Riles 2011). As Gordon and Mayer write of the crisis of 2008, "[O]ne saving grace in the crisis was that most countries in the world had not adopted state of the art, "most advanced" regulatory and governance practices " (Gordon & Mayer 2011: 1).

On these points, policy-makers and academics interested in international financial regulation would most likely benefit from more active engagement with state of the art international regulatory theory more generally. The inability of regulators to deliver on promises made in international forums in the face of domestic pressure from legislators or market participants is a well-documented problem in international law and institutions (Ezirgiannidou 2009). Competition among national representatives and the lack of will for coordination among regulators--the sense of national competition that often pervades the sense of the common good--is also a problem that repeats itself in numerous international regulatory fields. These problems have been addressed in different ways and with varying degrees of success at different periods in international legal history--from state-to-state agreements to the construction of international institutions, to the development of customary international law (Krisch & Kingsbury 2006). Moreover, an extensive literature on global legal pluralism now demonstrates that legal pluralism is a given

condition of transnational legality that cannot ever be entirely eliminated. In fact, this literature demonstrates that pluralism has numerous advantages, and hence must be incorporated into transnational legal governance (Michaels 2009, Berman 2009, Teubner 1997, Trachtman & Radaelli 2009). Hence the challenges posed by global harmonization initiatives in international financial regulation are not unique to this field. I turn now to the question of how the FSB confronts these challenges.

C. Three key elements of FSB methodology

The FSB has acquired credibility as a site for coordinating financial regulatory standards and for creating soft law mechanisms to ensure compliance. However the FSB's formal legal authorities are extremely limited. Article 2 of the FSB charter grants the FSB the authority only to "assess vulnerabilities affecting the global financial system," to "promote coordination and information exchange," "monitor and advise on market developments," and "advise and monitor on best practice in meeting regulatory standards." As if to make the point absolutely clear, Article 16, the final article of the charter, states that "This Charter is not intended to create any legal rights or obligations" (Financial Stability Board 2009a).¹²

So with these limited powers, how does the FSB tackle a coordination problem that the standard international legal tools have proven incapable of resolving? The FSB's approach is innovative. It aims to address, on the one hand, the interrelated quality of domestic regulatory systems, and on the other hand, the political difficulties associated with achieving and implementing international consensus on harmonized rules (Moschella 2010) through a new set of institutional tools borrowed directly from

¹² The de Larosière report goes further and calls for reforming the FSB into a more robust institution that would more closely resemble the IMF (See also Arner & Taylor 2011).

recent institutional innovations in the EU (Radaelli and Meuwese 2009) and the US. Three principal kinds of initiatives deserve attention: standard setting projects, peer-review, and cross-border, firm-specific coordination.

Standard-setting

In theory at least, the FSB circumvents some of the problems of harmonization initiatives as embodied in standard international legal frameworks by emphasizing broad standards, “best practices,” or “rules of thumb” for regulators rather than hard and specific rules.^{13, 14} Standards--what some commentators have referred to as the FSB’s “soft law approach” (Arner & Taylor 2009: 7) in order to contrast this architecture with rules and regulations-- are seen as preferable tools of global financial regulation because they allow for pluralism—for differences in national strategy and emphasis—within a framework of certain common baselines and shared regulatory values. Standards are also viewed as more flexible than rules and hence more able to accommodate future problems that may not be foreseen at the moment of rule-drafting. This focus on standards over rules is not unique to the FSB. The June 2004 Basel II Accords were already largely principle-based agreements.¹⁵

Yet in practice these standards seem to shade into a regime that takes on more and more of the trappings of traditional international legal rules and norms (Karmel &

¹³ The FSB charter refers five times to the purpose of FSB as to develop or implement “standards” but makes no reference at all to “rules” or “regulations” (Financial Stability Board 2009a).

¹⁴ Some people involved in the work of the FSB do not take the view that the FSB distinguishes between “standards” and “rules” and that it adopts a standard-setting approach rather than a rule-making approach.

¹⁵ After establishing specific principles regarding requirements for capital reserves, which local regulators like the US Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) formally integrated into national programs like the Consolidated Supervised Entities (CSE) Program, Basel II left the details of risk assessment to the individual institutions themselves (Ford 2010a). On the wider relationship between rules and standards in regulatory practice see Kennedy 1976; Schauer 2004–2005.

Kelly 2008). In the area of G-SIFIs, for example, the FSB in October 2011 promulgated what then Chairman Mario Draghi ambiguously described in his letter to the G20 prior to the Cannes summit as “A new international standard - [on the resolution of financial institutions] as a point of reference for consistent reform of national resolution regimes.” In this slippery language, a mere standard or “point of reference” also becomes something more than that, the basis for “consistent reform” and “a new international standard.”

Peer Review

The FSB moves beyond earlier institutions however with its focus on peer review. Peer review is a soft law technique for implementing harmonized regulatory standards. Countries report on their progress in implementing particular standards, and these reports are in turn evaluated by a committee of peers. The peer review technique was borrowed directly from recent institutional innovations in the EU where, as the name suggests, it was modeled on the academic practices for evaluating scholarship.¹⁶ The secretariat engages those who fail to comply in a “confidential dialogue” that can ultimately lead to public “naming and shaming” (Walter 2010). An FSB “scoreboard” on its website “tracks progress across the full range of reforms” (Draghi 2011: 3). Redacted versions of peer review results are published on the FSB website. Beyond this, there are no clear penalties for failure to

¹⁶ The peer review process itself was first developed in the mid-17th century when the Royal Society of London began to circulate potential journal articles among experts in the relevant field for comments on a piece’s suitability and worth (Klug 1999). By the 20th century the practice had become widespread across academic disciplines, as publishers found that a group of independent experts with similar knowledge could provide the best judgment of a work’s merit in a rapidly changing field, and further, were most helpful in improving the quality of a paper through comments and feedback. Like academic journals that made a practice of delegating authority to a community of practicing peers, within the realm of financial regulation, the peer review technique has been used to re-imagine accountability outside the box of static compliance to authoritative rules.

participate in the peer review process or comply with international regulatory standards.

Peer reviews are of two types: “country peer reviews” focusing on one individual country’s success in implementing standards, to which countries agree to submit as a condition of their membership in the FSB, and “thematic peer reviews” focusing on one particular problem or regulatory initiative across different countries.¹⁷ The FSB describes the procedure as follows:

FSB peer reviews will be based on reports drafted by small teams composed of experts from FSB member jurisdictions and international bodies, supported by the FSB Secretariat. The substantive review by peers will take place in the Standing Committee on Standards Implementation. The final responsibility for approving FSB peer reviews lies with the Plenary, as the decision-making body of the FSB. In keeping with the FSB’s commitment to lead by example, peer review reports will be published, along with any commentary provided by the reviewed jurisdictions for inclusion. Following publication of the report, jurisdictions’ implementation of agreed actions will be monitored by the FSB and, if implementation lags, peer pressure may be applied (Financial Stability Board 2010).

The FSB’s own official objectives for peer review span a number of analytically disparate purposes, from the rather benign goal of information exchange, to the more interventionist goal of evaluating FSB members’ adherence to their commitments, to norm building (what the FSB terms “fostering a race to the top,”) to evaluating and rethinking the content of international regulatory standards and approaches themselves. The last of these is important to the peer review ideal: as NG proponents Sabel and Zeitlin explain, the peer review process creates a kind of accountability that “anticipates the transformation of rules in use” (Sabel & Zeitlin 2008). In the future, the FSB promises even “more intense monitoring in priority

¹⁷ For an example of a recently completed national peer review, see Financial Stability Board 2012b. For an example of a recently completed thematic review, see Financial Stability Board 2011a.

areas: the Basel capital and liquidity framework; OTC derivatives market reforms; compensation practices; G-SIFI policy measures; resolution frameworks; and shadow banking” (Draghi 2011: 3).

FSB peer reviews are largely paper reviews in which a committee of 4-9 representatives of member jurisdictions and international organizations appointed by the FSB Standing Committee on Standards Implementation reviews member states’ responses to a questionnaire, supplemented by other documentation such as the results of prior peer reviews or other academic or legal materials the committee may request or procure. The FSB handbook on peer review also anticipates that peer review committees would provide the public with an opportunity to comment on the review process through their website (Financial Stability Board 2012a).

The committee then drafts a report of approximately 15 pages and submits this to the Standing Committee on Standards Implementation where it is discussed (and representatives of the country under review are given an opportunity to respond). Ultimately the report is submitted to the FSB Plenary for approval and then is posted on the FSB website. An FSB diagram of this process somewhat romantically portrays an amorphous entity it terms the “public at large” as the ultimate judge and arbiter of national regulatory compliance¹⁸.

¹⁸ As Cristie Ford (personal comment) points out, the diagram bears an ironic resemblance to Ayres and Braithwaite’s “enforcement pyramid” (Ayres & Braithwaite 2002: 35-38). The resemblance is ironic because Ayres and Braithwaite’s pyramid is intended to point out that informal sanctions are effective only in the shadow of more formal penalties for non-compliance.




Figure 1 Structure of Information Flows for G20 Reporting (Financial Stability Board 2011c: 5)

In sum, peer review as practiced by the FSB is a governance regime that carries only a possible reputational sanction. What defines this particular implementation of peer review as a mode of governance therefore is not so much the sanction as the regularized practice of periodic and extensive self-evaluation and reporting requirements. On this front, the FSB has instituted a busy schedule of self-reporting requirements whereby national regulators must complete questionnaires concerning their regulatory activities and their compliance with international standards.

For example a questionnaire developed for a thematic review on risk governance contains approximately 50 detailed questions, to be answered by already busy national regulators in just over one month. The questionnaire is posted on the website but responses are not made public. Although the questions are framed as merely for information gathering purposes, many assume a clear normative framework and set of policy preferences, and the survey prompts national

regulators into a kind of self-evaluation according to those policy preferences. For example, question 1.1 reads,

Please describe your jurisdiction's overall approach to assessing firms' risk governance frameworks (e.g. legislation, regulation or supervisory guidance)? Please provide links to relevant documents. Has your jurisdiction evaluated whether such guidance is consistent with the BCBS or OECD principles on corporate governance or other recommendations provided by the industry? (Financial Stability Board 2012d: 3).

The message is clear. Member states should be evaluating themselves according to international standards. Regulators completing this survey may find it rather embarrassing to have to answer any part of this question in the negative. Moreover, "risk governance" is defined quite specifically in the questions to include the internal institutional structures in place within private firms for monitoring and managing risk, such as the competence and authority of risk management departments and the authority of boards, and also the regulatory practices for monitoring these structures. Regulators completing this survey may also find it quite uncomfortable to have to admit to their global peers that financial institutions in their jurisdiction do not have exactly this kind of organizational structure for managing risk. Hence the peer review process of answering these questions also encourages regulators to set up similar levels of review among the market participants they regulate.

Supervisory Colleges

A third architectural innovation worthy of mention is the so-called "supervisory colleges" aimed at the cross-border regulation of individual financial institutions and in particular the coordination of home and host regulators. Again, the model for this initiative was a similar experiment of the same name conducted by regulators in the EU (de Larosière 2009: 61). The goal is to

enhance information exchange and cooperation between

supervisors to support the effective supervision of international banking groups. Colleges should enhance the mutual trust and appreciation of needs and responsibilities on which supervisory relationships are built. (Basel Committee on Banking Supervision 2010a: 2) .

What is new here, from the standpoint of international law, is that regulation is not generally applicable to all, but rather is specific to a particular non-state actor: regulators convene to develop specific protocols for information sharing concerning a specific financial institution. Rules, procedures, and information-sharing across borders are being developed tailored to, and applicable only to, one particular target of regulation. For example, a supervisory college concerning Citibank would assemble regulators¹⁹ in each jurisdiction with intimate knowledge of and authority over Citibank in their jurisdiction and develop protocols for information sharing in times of crisis, build relationships among individual regulators, and devise regulatory policies, procedures and strategies tailored to Citibank's particular situation. In the environmental or security context, in contrast, one does not create environmental regulations that apply to only one polluter, or security laws that apply to only one terrorist organization (even if, in practice, general rules are often created in response to a specific case). Thus the model dispenses with the traditional formal model of regulation in favor of something more pragmatic, and it also recognizes that regulation is conducted by real people-- and that personal relationships among regulators is as significant a source of regulatory stability and strength as, for example, sanctions against governments for failure to share information might be.

¹⁹ Ford describes the regulatory advantages of enforcement teams that are ad hoc, specific to the context of a firm, and flexible to the needs of the job. (Ford 2005: 819–821.)

D. Conclusion to Part II

In sum, the FSB responds to the challenges of an interrelated but plural global regulatory environment with some new tools and approaches borrowed largely from the European experience in coordinating among diverse regulatory authorities within the EU. These tools and approaches are not particularly legal in nature--indeed, the FSB has minimal formal legal authority over its members. They are rather pragmatic and problem-oriented. And they are sociologically and institutionally grounded: they emphasize relationships, reputations, and the gradual evolution of norms and standards through repeat encounters.

Part III: The New Governance Approach

Although the FSB initiatives described in the previous section eschew traditional legal approaches, therefore, they draw powerfully on one popular body of regulatory theory known as New Governance (NG). As described in this section, NG theories of the government's role in coordinating optimal regulatory outcomes developed first in the context of domestic regulatory problems as a new way of thinking about the continuing role of the state in the context of free market challenges to all forms of regulation, but they were later picked up as a tool for inter-state coordination among disparate regulators and regulatory regimes in the EU in regulatory contexts other than finance such as labor and environmental standards.²⁰ These initiatives received enthusiastic academic attention as innovative and novel approaches to age-old problems concerning the lack of enforceability and hence

²⁰ Other strands of NG techniques were developed in the US in a variety of policy areas including environmental protection, health care, public school reform, and public housing (Karkkainen 2004:474-475).

“soft law” character of international law. From there, European regulators with personal experience of this model imported these methods into the FSB and other emerging nodes of contemporary global financial governance.

For NG theorists, the implicit but pervasive application of their theory by the FSB and related institutions has naturally been a source of enthusiasm and pride. In Part IV, I will evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of NG as a mode of global financial governance. However, because most financial regulators and experts in financial law are not very familiar with the NG debates that lie beneath the surface of current initiatives in their field, this part first lays out the key elements of the NG approach to regulation, its theoretical origins, and its distinctive characteristics.

A. What is New Governance?

The term New Governance captures a variety of regulatory approaches that emphasize a shift away from traditional so-called “command-and-control” regulation towards more reflexive, collaborative, and experimental forms of governance. Instead of mandating certain behavior through regulations and directives, NG regulates through “a continuous dynamic process governed by the relevant stakeholders” (Bingham 2010: 300). Here, the task of government is to *coordinate* and *facilitate* collective information-sharing and learning:

[N]ew governance regulation, unlike command and control regulation, is regulation based on an iterative process between private party experience and a regulator that serves variously as clearinghouse, catalyst, monitor, prod, and coordinator” (Ford 2010a: 445).

As De Burca and Scott explain in the introduction to their collection of essays on NG in the EU and the US,

The concept of new governance is by no means a settled one. It is a construct which has been developed to

explain a range of processes and practices that have a normative dimension but do not operate primarily or at all through the formal mechanism of traditional command-and-control type legal institutions. The language of governance rather than government in itself signals a shift away from the monopoly of traditional politico-legal institutions, and implies either the involvement of actors other than classically governmental actors, or indeed the absence of any traditional framework of government, as is the case in the European Union and in any transnational context. In a practical sense, the concept of new governance results from a sharing of experience by practitioners and scholars across a wide variety of policy domains which are quite diverse and disparate in institutional and political terms, and in terms of the concrete problem to be addressed. Yet in each case, the common features which have been identified involve a shift in emphasis away from command-and-control in favor of 'regulatory' approaches which are less rigid, less prescriptive, less committed to uniform outcomes, and less hierarchical in nature (De Burca & Scott 2006: 2).

While the term has been applied to a broad range of processes and practices, according to Ford, there are three related convictions that underlie most NG strategies implemented in the EU and US: 1) an emphasis on 'learning by doing' that includes structured learning processes that pull experience into the creation of regulation in self-reflexive ways; 2) a recognition of the necessity for regulatory revisability, as documented in practices like notice-and-comment rules which allow quick decisions by relevant actors; and finally, 3) humility about the fact that regulators cannot know more about everyday operations than the practitioners themselves (Ford 2010a).

Valuing diversity and pluralism

One classic element of the NG approach to regulation is to set broad targets and allow regulated entities to reach those targets in their own ways. As De Burca and Scott explain,

the idea of new or experimental governance approaches places considerable emphasis upon the accommodation

and promotion of diversity, on the importance of provisionality and revisability--in terms of both problem definition and anticipated solutions--and on the goal of policy learning. New governance processes generally encourage or involve the participation of affected actors (stakeholders) rather than merely representative actors, and emphasize transparency (openness as a means to information-sharing and learning), as well as ongoing evaluation and review. Rather than operating through a hierarchical structure of governmental authority, the 'centre' (of a network, a regime, or other governance arrangement) may be changed with facilitating the emergence of the governance infrastructure, and with ensuring coordination or exchange as between constituent parts. A further characteristic often present in new governance processes is the voluntary or non-binding nature of the norms. (De Burca & Scott 2006: 3)

A pragmatic approach to conflict between state and market

Another key value of the NG approach is its emphasis on experimentation and collaboration. The experimental and collaborative approach has its links to American management studies, accounting techniques, theories of pedagogy and even ethical, cultural and religious norms, as well as to the American tradition of philosophical pragmatism (Simon 2004). However, in the US, the more concrete impetus for this new approach to regulation lies in the search by center-left academics and policy-makers in local, state and national government, for a pragmatic response to market-based critiques of the legitimacy of state regulation. On this point, the NG argument is that markets cannot always be counted on to produce the kind of efficient and welfare-maximizing coordination that neoliberals imagined would emerge through the institution of price:

Optimal coordination will not always emerge, however, as if led "by an invisible hand." Even in settings where coordination is essential, it may fail to materialize, may emerge in a form that could have been improved upon, or may not be amenable to displacement despite the world changing around it. There consequently may be a role for regulation in encouraging, fostering, and facilitating

efficient coordination (notes omitted) (Ahdieh 2010: 581).

Yet on the other hand, NG is not a call for a return to state control: it takes seriously neoliberal critiques of the inefficiencies and injustices of state “command and control” and therefore seeks a “third way” between free markets on the one hand and state regulation on the other. As Wilkinson explains,

Attempting to escape from the sterility of many traditional social scientific dichotomies - state versus market, regulation versus deregulation, democracy versus expert, and technocratic governance, and so on - experimentalism draws on our potential for reconstructing and reimagining governance - both locally, and in a variety of national, transnational, supranational, and international settings - according to the generic value of self-government. (Wilkinson 2010: 676).

Ford puts it most powerfully:

The challenge, then, is to imagine an alternative within which regulatory design is not always a drag on human capacity and imagination, in the way that old style non-reflexive command-and-control regulation can be, and yet that puts sufficient brakes on risk-blind hubris, socially detrimental self-aggrandizement, and predictable human flaws in decision-making and information processing (Ford 2010a: 447).

What this excursion into the political origins of the NG concept highlights is that the architecture now used by the FSB to coordinate among national regulators was developed first to address a problem in relations between *state* regulators --federal, state or municipal government--and *private* parties that were the target of regulation. Thus, as with the EU Open Method of Coordination the deployment of NG techniques by the FSB stretches those techniques further to address the state-state relations--relations between national regulators, mediated by an international organization, and the compliance of national governments with international law.

Institutional Roots in EU Comitology

In the late 1990s this approach was adapted by EU bureaucrats into a technocratic process for consensus-building among national regulators in particular

regulatory areas known as the Open Method of Coordination (OMC) peer-review process :

Regulation in this model begins with councils or networks of EU officials and member states that set framework goals, timetables, and metrics for gauging and comparing performance. National ministries and regulators then have the discretion to advance these goals and translate guidelines into local practice as they see fit. But they are obliged to report their performance on those metrics, to participate in peer reviews that compare how member state methods perform, and to periodically revise goals, metrics, and procedures in light of those comparisons. Again, the emphasis is to abandon fixed rules and bureaucratic enforcement in favor of local experimentation and deliberative processes that expose new possibilities and foster interactions in which states learn from, discipline, and set a continually corrected baseline for one another....(Schneiberg & Bartley 2008: 49).

The OMC originated with the European Employment Strategy as defined in the Amsterdam Treaty of 1997. The initial motivation behind the OMC was the need for EU legislators to address unemployment issues in a way that accounted for national diversity in technological and industrial expertise (Trubek & Mosher 2003: 46-49). Under the OMC policy guidelines EU member states set short and long-term goals, as well as specific quantitative and qualitative indicators or benchmarks to guide the process. These broad guidelines are then translated into national and regional policies, and periodically monitored through a peer review process organized around forms of mutual learning (Eberlein & Kerwer 2004: 123). Unlike more traditional governance models, the point of the OMC was not to create a single common framework, but rather to encourage experiential sharing among EU member states and to establish best practices across diverse national contexts.

By avoiding strict regulatory requirements, and instead making space for experiments that are adjusted to local situations, the OMC has allowed the EU to encourage policy improvement while also fostering principle-based convergence.

There is now evidence that by using targets and the peer review process, EU member states have begun to gain a better understanding about how to combat some cross-border problems such as unemployment (Trubek & Mosher 2003: 46-49). Since 1997 the OCM guidelines have been applied to tackle a broad range of regulatory issues in the EU, and hence in effect have replaced the traditional one-size fits-all central policy as the regulatory approach of choice at the EU level.

In theory at least, NG as applied by the EU represents a substantial innovation over traditional approaches to international law and institutions, as it is a practical response to the political difficulties in creating binding rules at the international level.²¹ Its focus on consensus,²² reflexivity and discourse draws on work in international relations theory on the effect of “epistemic communities” of global actors on norm-creation²³ while its emphasis on effectuating learning across public and private divides within a particular sectoral or regulatory area evokes Anne-Marie Slaughter’s work in international relations on “the disaggregated state” and the

²¹ In the US similar efforts have since been used to grapple with a federal system that governs policies across fifty states. Examples of the NG model in the US include among others, the Green Building Council’s LEED standard, a voluntary certification process that has helped standardize the metrics of sustainability while also reducing the ecological footprint of new construction; educational initiatives like the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), which creates nation-wide goals and then allows states to develop localized methods for assessing school performance; and in public-housing reforms like Chicago’s HOPE VI act which replaced top-down legislation with partnerships between planners and the actual communities in need of housing projects. As De Burca argues, these standards-based reforms represent pragmatic, participatory, and information-centric strategies that are designed to enlist states, private entities, NGOs and other social actors in an ongoing dialogue (De Burca 2010). NG, then, aims to reshape both the means and ends of legislation.

²² The emphasis on consensus is particularly prevalent in the European versions of NG. The American versions emphasize deliberation first and consensus second (Cristie Ford, personal comment).

²³ For Slaughter, the Basel process is a good example of the workings of such “epistemic communities” (Slaughter 2005: 42).

displacement of traditional states with transnational issue networks in the “new world order.”²⁴

Regulation by information

One central NG technique that is particularly prevalent in the emerging global financial governance regime is so-called “regulation by information.”²⁵ The FSB’s “scoreboard” on its website, for example, regulates by publicly ranking jurisdictions and regulators according to the FSB’s standards for compliance.

Regulation by information deploys certain standards or “indicators”²⁶ to publicly rank or comparatively evaluate countries’ performance with respect to a predetermined global standard. This is regulation by information because although some indicators are used as bases for awarding benefits or penalties, “[t]he majority of prominent indicators appear to operate in global governance in even more diffuse

²⁴ “[New Governance] rejects an image of law that is state-centered, unified, and hierarchical, underpinned by ‘the rule of law’ that protects individual rights, strictly separates political and legal powers and enforces a chain of governmental command through formal court-centered processes. It promotes instead an image of law that is decentered, fragmented, and heterarchical...”(Wilkinson 2010: 673-674).

As De Burca and Scott point out, there is considerable division of scholarly opinion about the impact of new governance on traditional legal institutions, and about the normative desirability of new governance tools. Some view new governance as taking power and capacity away from legal institutions (De Burca & Scott 2006: 5), while for others “Law and new governance are posited as mutually interdependent and mutually sustaining. They potentially play off one another’s strengths and mitigate one other’s [sic] weaknesses” (De Burca & Scott 2006: 6).

²⁵ “Regulation by information refers to an array of experiments with disclosure, rating/ranking systems, and certification or labeling initiatives. Such schemes rely on the release and dissemination of information to discipline firms and stimulate enforcement by consumers, investors, or advocacy organizations” (Schneiberg & Bartley 2008: 43).

²⁶ “An indicator is a named collection of rank-ordered data that purports to represent the past or projected performance of different units. The data are generated through a process that simplifies raw data about a complex social phenomenon. The data, in this simplified and processed form, are capable of being used to compare particular units of analysis (such as countries or institutions or corporations), synchronically or over time, and to evaluate their performance by reference to one or more standards” (Davis et. al. 2011: 5).

ways than this, by influencing professional, public and political opinion to craft new approaches or take different policy orientations” (Davis et. al. 2011: 20).

Because they are perceived as technical rather than political, indicators have an aura of objectivity about them. But as Davis et. al. suggest with respect to World Bank indicators,

A particular feature of global governance indicators is the way they tacitly embody theories about both the appropriate standards against which to measure societies (or institutions) and the appropriate ways in which to measure compliance with those standards. ...Those theories are generated through dynamic collective processes that differ in significant ways from other political processes. ...Consequently, using any given indicator in global governance involves tacitly accepting both a very particular set of claims about the standards against which societies or institutions ought to be evaluated and a particular process for generating those claims (Davis et. al. 2011: 4).

And yet from NG proponents’ point of view, this is very much the value of regulation by information: it turns highly politicized questions, about which it is difficult to reach global consensus, into seemingly technical problems to be delegated to experts. It trades the highly politicized processes of international negotiation for a depoliticized practice of mutual auditing in which the FSB, as a technocratic institution, borrows the characteristics and processes of the auditor: “independence from the matter being audited; technical work in the form of evidence gathering and the examination of documentation; the expression of a view based on this evidence; a clearly defined object of the audit process” (Power 1997: 8).

It is important to appreciate once again that this approach to global financial governance is far more sociological in its orientation than legal. NG addresses age-old challenges of public and national law—challenges such as how to generate legitimacy for international rules and organizations, how to generate effective solutions to cross-border problems, and how to ensure that the international

agreements are enforceable—largely by exerting social pressure on regulators. These sociological tools recognize that within the relatively circumscribed club-like expert community of regulators engaged in international financial governance activities, the club can bring considerable informal pressure to bear on any one of its own members to come into compliance with international standards.²⁷ As Brummer points out, these pressures are experienced as quite real by many national regulators: “A regulator’s record of compliance with international standards can affect its reputation, and with it, its ability to create coalitions and alliances in the future” (Brummer 2012: 116).

What is valuable about this approach is its recognition of the role of ideas, expertise, communities of experts, in producing international law (Riles 2000; Riles 2011)--dimensions that are traditionally ignored in international legal theory. This recognition is exemplified in the FSB supervisory colleges, which assume that communities of experts can be their own basis of compliance.

One further advantage of this approach from the FSB’s point of view is that it shifts much of the task of monitoring and promoting compliance onto the representatives of regulated entities themselves--onto domestic regulators in the case of the FSB. With the dramatic expansion of peer review, domestic regulators spend increasingly large amounts of time evaluating their performance relative to

²⁷ As Schneiberg and Bartley emphasize, however, NG theorists insist that NG is more than sociological coercion through shaming: it also requires some harder enforcement tools

including the use of comparison and penalty defaults to destabilize established understandings, the fostering of common cognitive frameworks to discipline interest-based bargaining, and the leveraging of higher-order processes by specific (usually domestically based) actors. Furthermore, [NG techniques] feed into (and reflexively evaluate) conventional legislation by nation-states, further blurring lines between soft and hard law processes (Schneiberg & Bartley 2008: 49).

international standards, collecting and processing data about their performance, and communicating to real or perceived international audiences about their activities (Merry 2011: S88). Over time, this activity is designed to have an impact on regulators' behavior, identity, and world-view. As Dunn writes in her study of an EU standards-based regulatory project, "[t]his transforms audited managers as acting subjects: they now have strong incentives to constantly monitor and discipline themselves in order to ensure that the EU's production objectives are met" (Dunn 2005: 185).

B. Addressing the democracy deficit

The standards for evaluating or ranking jurisdictions are often produced by "expert committees," and hence in the NG approach, non-elected technocrats yield considerable implicit power through such instruments. As such NG is open to standard domestic criticisms of international organizations as undemocratic and unaccountable to domestic constituencies.

But for NG proponents, one great promise of the approach is its contribution to the challenges of creating legitimacy and accountability for international institutions directed by non-elected experts. Sabel and Simon write in "Accountability without Sovereignty" that peer review actually provides *better* popular accountability than the traditional formal "principal-agent" model of democratic accountability (in which elected "agents" are accountable through elections to the public as "principal") because the deliberative process entailed in peer review –what they term "dynamic accountability"--actually entails a more substantive and meaningful form of accountability than formal electoral accountability.

Peer review imposes on implementing 'agents' the obligation to justify the exercise of discretion they have

been granted by framework-making 'principals' in the light of pooled comparable experience. In peer review, the actors at all levels learn from and correct each other, thus undermining the hierarchical distinction between principals and agents and creating a form of dynamic accountability--accountability that anticipates the transformation of rules in use. ...To put it differently, what dynamic accountability achieves is a method of controlling and checking the ability of participators to discern or distinguish the right course of action when such control cannot be hard wired into the rules of hierarchy. Within the context of the EU, multiple 'agents' or the various administrative authorities responsible for implementing EU law in their respective jurisdictions can be expected to drift from the original intentions of the principal authority. However, with the peer review process, the respective administrative authorities are pushed to explain their decisions, including how specific decisions impact other agents. In this way, the peer review process opens accountability to possibilities that may have been initially overlooked by the principal (Sabel & Simon: 400).²⁸

C. Conclusion to Part III

In sum, many of the core values of NG, such as fostering regulatory pluralism, mutual learning, and principled-based self-regulation rather than command and control regulation, are clearly admirable and innovative. In theory at least, NG represents a substantial innovation over traditional approaches to international law and institutions because it recognizes and addresses the political difficulties with creating binding rules at the international level.

And yet the observations of experts in financial regulation concerning some applications of these approaches, together with social scientific and legal studies of the outcomes of NG approaches in other areas of international regulation suggest

²⁸ For a skeptical analysis of these claims that peer review produces deliberation and that deliberation translates into accountability, see Shapiro 2004.

that the reality of NG may be somewhat different from the theory. In the next section, we explore these studies, and their implications for the FSB, in more detail.

Part IV: New Governance in Practice: A Critical Appraisal

The previous Part described important recent architectural innovations in international financial governance. And yet, what are we to make of the following fact: despite all the framework agreements, all the peer review documents, the supervisory college meetings and networking opportunities, many regulators privately confess to considerable skepticism about how much progress really has been made on cross-border coordination in the case of a failing G-SIFI since the Lehman crisis of 2008. The view of many regulators seems to be that if a systemically important financial institution were to fail today, the level of coordination would be relatively the same, or at best only slightly better, than at the time of the Lehman crisis.

This should, I believe, give us some pause. If these regulators are correct in their skepticism, then one might legitimately ask whether all this novel activity is really delivering enough added value to justify the tremendous time and expense involved. Why is there so little buy-in on the part of various domestic constituencies (Moschella 2010)--market participants, legislators, even domestic regulators--to this new approach to international governance? Does this suggest the need for any skepticism about the almost euphoric claims made on behalf of NG approaches? Surprisingly, to date, no serious empirical research on this subject has been undertaken in the area of global financial regulation. The intuitive appropriateness of the NG model has more or less been taken for granted by regulators focused more on the substantive details of the policy agenda.

In the absence of such research, this Part draws together what can be known about the strengths and weaknesses of the NG architecture in two ways. To begin with, NG methods were deployed in many sectors of *domestic* financial regulation prior to the crisis of 2008, and the weaknesses of these methods in the domestic context are widely appreciated. Indeed, it is the awareness of these weaknesses that spurs many efforts at more robust international financial regulation. And yet, remarkably, the same methods are now being redeployed on the terrain of transnational financial governance.

This time, the targets of regulation are not private firms, but domestic regulators in FSB member jurisdictions, and it is possible that this difference somehow eliminates the problems documented in the domestic context. On the other hand, it is also possible that this difference exacerbates the problems: a review of the implementation of NG by the FSB suggests a number of ways in which, in this new application, NG has actually lost some of its more innovative aspects. Secondly, I analyze the known aspects of the FSB governance structure. Where appropriate in this section, I draw analogies to available research on the application of NG techniques in other fields of transnational regulation. This analysis suggests both some potential weaknesses of NG as an architecture of international financial governance overall, and also some possible conditions for determining when the method might be most appropriate and effective and when it might not.

A. Lessons Learned from NG in financial regulation prior to 2008

Few NG experts claim any substantive knowledge of international financial regulation. The exception is Ford (Ford 2011; 2010b), whose work lies squarely at the intersection of both fields. Ford's survey of three recent examples of failure or

underperformance of NG-style financial regulation prior to the financial crisis, such as principle-based regulatory approaches to shadow-banking deployed by the SEC and the Basel II accords, gives us a more limited and pessimistic picture of how NG might be used in financial regulation. One example is regulators' past reliance on market participants' own risk management models to determine the nature and size of risks in the global economy. Although from a NG perspective this might have seemed like a wonderful collaborative approach to regulation, an approach that devolves authority to the market participants and enlists them in the project of governance, Ford concludes that "[r]egulatory faith in industry actors' competence, if not literally their bona fides, proved to have been misplaced to catastrophic effect" (Ford 2010a: 461).

From this and other examples, Ford finds a number of potential weaknesses in the NG approach, at least as it has been applied to date in real world financial regulatory contexts. First, information-based governance relies too heavily on regulated parties for information:

Information-based analysis and reason-giving (essential elements of new governance thinking) also seem to collapse in times of economic exuberance, when those involved are more willing to suspend disbelief. Market bubbles may also be times when regulators' budgets are under pressure, because problems are not at the forefront of peoples' minds. The duty to give reasons and explain is further hampered by extreme complexity of the sort that characterizes modern financial markets (Ford 2010a: 473).

In response, Ford argues "for a renewed appreciation of the amount of energy required to move people off their short-term incentives--an amount substantially greater than was put into the monitorship or principles-based regulatory initiatives" (Ford 2010a: 444)

the ways in which background conditions that are either subtle or taken for granted - including lack of diversity,

power imbalances, unequal access to information, and failures of transparency and accountability - have the potential to make reasonably designed regulatory initiatives ineffective, or worse. These are stories in which well-resourced actors were able to control loosely structured, fluid environments in their own interest, with minimal pushback from public-interested voices. In other words, they are situations in which our flawed humanity (tribal, short-sighted, self-interested but often irrational, and prone to satisficing) infiltrated regulatory models, reintroduced power relationships in indistinct but convincing ways, and arguably determined outcomes to a greater degree than did regulatory design (Ford 2010a: 448).

Second, the enthusiasm in the NG project for local experimentation assumes too quickly that industry representatives will make choices that are in the public interest:

In practical terms, the "local level" in new governance regulation cannot be a black box. Moreover, we cannot presume that public-regarding or long-term thinking will automatically be produced at this level. Without a considerable oversight mechanism that tests those groups' assumptions, those groups will develop suboptimal resolutions. For example, a local level comprised of self-interested bankers cannot be counted on to self-regulate effectively where no one is acting as an active, public-regarding counterweight in their interpretive community. What this means is that we should perhaps be wary of industry efforts toward "pre-emptive self-regulation." We should not assume that regulators will necessarily be able to adapt measures that were initially taken to pre-empt regulation into a more consequential project (Ford 2010a: 471).

Third, the NG emphasis on coordination, with its quite benign image of the differences among interested parties fails to fully take into account how powerful market participants may be, relative to regulators, both in terms of their influence over the political process and their ability to shape the dominant consensus about how markets should be regulated.

Regulation cannot be understood without reference to the broader social, political and institutional contexts that

contains it. Beyond pure regulatory design, the financial crisis makes clear that questions about the appropriate regulatory mix of strategies do not take place in isolation from questions of power and influence, which directly affect feasibility and effectiveness in practice (Ford 2011: 4).

B. Practical Shortcomings in the Application of New Governance by the FSB

Ford's research highlights potential concerns about the efficacy of NG as applied prior to the crisis of 2008 to public regulation of private market participants. And yet, just at the moment at which these failures are widely acknowledged, the same regulatory methods are being applied at the international level to coordination among national and international regulators. It is possible that what was less than fully successful at the national level, in the relationship among public and private actors, might succeed at the international level, in the relationship among various categories of public actors. But it seems counterintuitive to assume such success without further evaluation. Moreover, a review of the application of NG by the FSB suggests new challenges to regulatory success and ways in which some of the more innovative or hopeful dimensions of NG actually have been lost in the translation to international governance.

Limited Participation

NG posits an expanded community of stakeholders in which regulatory legitimacy is generated by including as many possible interested parties in the process of creating and implementing standards. But the FSB remains a closed membership organization that purports to make standards that apply to non-members as well as members. Some important emerging economies, including economies which are touted as possible relocation sites for global financial

institutions seeking to avoid North Atlantic regulatory burdens, do not participate in the FSB process. This poses a serious challenge to the FSB's legitimacy.²⁹ As Brummer puts it,

When an organization like the Basel Committee excludes a government (or many governments), it risks being viewed as an undemocratic or unrepresentative regime imposing its will on nonparticipating (and often democratic) governments. ...The very credibility of its standards may consequently be undermined because of the regulatory environment in which it was created, whatever its technocratic merits (Brummer 2012).

Likewise, the NG approach imagines collective governance in which all viewpoints are heard and coordinated. Yet in the FSB, although decisions are made by consensus, in practice some members have considerably more authority than others having more representatives in the plenary.³⁰ In the individual committees in which important policies are often debated and drafted, the representation of North Atlantic regulators on FSB and Basel committees--both as committee members and committee chairs--is still unduly large in relation to these economies' global market share.

Limited Public-Private Coordination

As described above, one of the central innovations of NG was its emphasis on new forms of collaboration between public and private actors that would go beyond the antagonistic relations between regulators and market participants posited by both free market and welfare state models of state-market relations. Yet so far, this collaborative approach has not been operationalized in the FSB process. This process has mainly engaged representatives of governments and international

²⁹ The FSB has sought to respond to this challenge by establishing regional "consultative groups" that hold ad-hoc discussions with non-member countries (Financial Stability Board 2012c).

³⁰ A list of the representatives of each country is available at <http://www.financialstabilityboard.org/about/plenary.pdf>.

bureaucracies, and private parties participate only through more attenuated opportunities for public comment.

This exclusion of private actors is unfortunate because it fails to recognize the practical authority of organizations like the International Swaps and Derivatives Association in constructing their own forms of international financial governance beyond the state (Riles 2011; Brummer 2012: 4; Teubner 1997). There are signs that the FSB recognizes this problem and plans to address it. Most recently, the FSB began reaching out more actively to private sector organizations and market participants.³¹ Yet such initiatives remain in the embryonic stage.

Standards Slide into Rules

Another innovative aspect of NG theory was its emphasis on governance through broad standards rather than rules. One advantage of standards, as we saw in Part III, is that they aim to encourage local experimentation and a plurality of approaches rather than hard and fast rules that demand compliance. Another advantage of standards over rules in financial governance in particular is that rules predominantly monitor and punish conduct *ex post*, in contrast to principles-based regulation, which is more *ex ante* in style. In practice, however, the FSB regime is increasingly rule-oriented rather than standards-oriented and this leads to a number of problems. Although it speaks in the language of standards, the FSB increasingly is creating what are functional rules.

³¹ For example, a “roundtable on risk disclosures by financial institutions [aimed] to encourage the private sector to jointly take forward development of principles and of leading practice disclosures that will be relevant and informative given current market conditions and risks.” The FSB plans to create a joint public-private task force on risk disclosure that will engage both with market participants and with other standard-setting national and international organizations “to develop principles for improved disclosures.” (Financial Stability Board 2012c)

One of the problems with rule-based governance--precisely the problem NG sought to address--is that rules can easily be diluted or ignored altogether at the national implementation phase and hence rules impose weighty compliance monitoring costs on regulators. For example Basel II was never implemented in the US at all and was only implemented in Europe just before the 2008 financial crisis. Despite the fiercely committal language in FSB reports and communiqués, the FSB lacks any formal power to hold member states to any of the agreements they have made at the international level. This fact has led one Chinese commentator to dismiss the organization as a "talking shop" (Ojo 2011).

As is well-documented in the context of the EU experience with NG techniques in the context of the OMC, another problem with rules is that they encourage private actors to "game" the system or develop other forms of resistance to the regime (Power 1997; Dunn 2005; Merry 2011: S90). This was also the global experience with capital adequacy standards under Basel II, where market participants devised all kinds of financial products and accounting methods to "game" the regulatory standards.

In theory, peer review is meant to address this problem of non-compliance. Yet in practice, peer-review also has its limits. First, participation in peer review is still largely voluntary in many practical respects. Although the FSB charter states that peer review is a requirement of membership, the FSB peer review handbook acknowledges that volunteers will be taken first and in practice to date country peer reviews have been limited to volunteers (Financial Stability Board 2012a):

Not only is peer review monitoring far from comprehensive, but the information generated through monitoring is often not shared with the broader international regulatory community or market participants. And even when information is shared, it often goes unused due to the complex format through which it is

disseminated. As a result, the risk-adjusted cost of defection can be low, increasing the likelihood of noncompliance when significant distributional tradeoffs arise (Brummer 2011: 263-64).³²

The problems the FSB is now encountering with peer review are replicated in the EU experience with OMC as well. According to the European Commission's own 2008 assessment of the impact of the OMC:

Delivery on the common objectives has been too slow or insufficient . . . there is a widespread consensus that the potential of the Social OMC remains largely unexploited, that a number of weaknesses should be corrected and that strategic reinforcement of the method would go some way towards improving delivery on the common objectives. The analysis points to a lack of political commitment and visibility and a need for better horizontal policy coordination and mainstreaming of social protection and social inclusion concerns in all relevant policy areas. (SEC(2008)2170: 2, quoted in Greer 2011: 196)

Pluralism Slides into Harmonization

A related innovation of the NG approach was its emphasis on regulatory pluralism rather than a demand for a single universal regulatory standard. Although

³² Brummer's review of the IMF's Financial Sector Assessment Program, which is more established and arguably more rigorous than the FSB's own peer review process, concludes that "despite its importance, the architecture supporting monitoring has historically been quite weak, even with regard to the primary monitoring system--FSAP." (Brummer 2012: 157). In particular, he identifies three key problems.

1. Participation is in practice less than compulsory and many countries do not in fact participate. This creates an "adverse selection problem" in which those countries which choose to participate are in practice those with the less serious regulatory problems (Brummer 2011: 159).

2. The information used in peer-review is provided by member states under review and hence is open to all kinds of bias, incompleteness, or error (Brummer 2011: 160). Note that the FSB is just beginning to attempt to address this problem in a small way by creating more uniform standards for data collection and reporting as concerns linkages among SIFIs in particular but this also requires mandating that private firms collect data in certain forms and certain kinds of data they may not have collected in the past (Financial Stability Board 2011b).

3. Results of peer review have not been made public enough (Brummer 2011: 161). This is arguably less of a problem in the case of the FSB which at least releases a redacted version of each peer review report on its website.

this ideal was also central to the FSB’s mandate and reflected in the language of “standard-setting” rather than “rule-making,” in practice the FSB is moving toward greater emphasis on securing compliance with harmonized rules and practices than the promotion of regulatory pluralism.³³ Consider, for example, the following official explanation of the new FSB standards on SIFIs that describes a harmonization project rather than a pluralistic project. According to then Chairman Draghi, the new standards were

designed to address gaps in legal frameworks and tools for effective intervention in failing systemic firms, including those that operate in multiple jurisdictions, and to remove impediments under existing national law to cross-border resolution. Their implementation will require legislative changes in many jurisdictions (Draghi 2011).

As one FSB report explains, likewise, peer reviews are now “focused on the implementation and effectiveness of international financial standards and of policies agreed upon within the FSB” (Financial Stability Board 2010: 3). This drift away from original commitments to pluralism and toward greater insistence on harmonization has been observed in the context of NG regulation in the EU also.³⁴

Problems with the Sociological Approach

One innovation of NG, as we saw, is its emphasis on sociological rather than legal tools for achieving outcomes. Yet some observers query whether, in the case of international financial regulation, a community of regulators who are collectively

³³ As Slaughter argues, harmonization goals are far more nationally suspect and hence to the extent that the FSB becomes what she terms a “harmonization network” it can expect greater degrees of domestic criticism (Slaughter 2005: 59).

³⁴ Dunn argues, for the context of EU food safety standards, that when coupled with NG “audit technologies” such as self-reporting mechanisms, this drift towards harmonized standards transforms has unintended detrimental effects on the internal character of local institutions, leading to pressures for jurisdictions to abandon differences and conform to a homogeneous model, that go far beyond the kinds of local change envisioned by traditional international legal harmonization projects or indeed the defensible objectives of regulatory policy (Dunn 2005).

committed to careful deliberation and individually susceptible to group pressure when they fail to meet international targets is in fact so easily achieved. Verdier points out that the fantasy of a community of cosmopolitan regulators is not borne out in practice: “national regulators are tied to domestic constituencies by incentives and accountability structures that are much stronger than their links to any “hypothetical global polity” (Verdier 2009: 115). Brummer argues that the NG model, with its happy image of a community of expert peers, ignores the fact that the dominant modality of interaction is not a “coordination problem,” in which regulators share the same basic preferences for regulatory standards,” but rather competition. “Regulators, in short, do not always share the same policy preferences. Some policy options will, for example, cost more for some countries than for others. Due to diversity in history, culture, and custom, countries have vastly different starting points as far as what kinds of regulations are already in place” (Brummer 2011: 269-270). Shapiro likewise argues that

There are a number of reasons to be agnostic if not atheistic about deliberation. Most fundamentally, there is little reason to believe that people with substantial, long-term, material interests in achieving a particular outcome are going to abandon those interests and their dedication to those outcomes as sweet reason emerges from the talk fest (Shapiro 2004: 350).

Learning Slides into Surveillance

And these limitations to deliberation lead to another problem. One of the greatest values of NG tools such as peer review is the opportunity they provide for comparison and learning.³⁵ Although proponents of NG promote peer review as a

³⁵ The opportunity for developing best practices by comparison to others is part of the underlying self-justification of NG. As noted by De Burca and Walker, NG “speaks to the close tracing of particular interests allowed by the timely adjustment of shifting preferences in local contexts of practice, the epistemic premium of continuously developing and refining best practice, the dignity and compliance-value of participation and negotiated settlement, and the

tool for reflexive learning, in practice peer review often slips into a tool of surveillance in which participants evaluate themselves and submit to evaluation according to how closely they conform to a given standard and there is relatively little opportunity to deliberate about the appropriateness of the standard in the first place. Although in theory NG supports a plurality of regulatory approaches, often it is used more to monitor and self-monitor according to a predetermined policy or institutional choice.

The FSB risk governance peer review questionnaire (FSB 2012d) provides a good example of this problem in practice. The questionnaire acknowledges that there is no clear international standard regarding proper procedures for risk governance and that the purpose of the review is to evolve toward consensus concerning a standard. Thus it would seem to be a natural vehicle for deliberation and consultation. And yet the specific questions posed to regulators presuppose an answer as to what the international standard for risk governance should be. For example, the questionnaire introduces the concept of a “risk committee” as a “a specialised Board committee responsible for advising the Board on the firm’s overall current and future risk appetite and strategy, and for overseeing senior management’s implementation of that strategy” --clearly one very particular possible institutional form of risk management among all possible forms. Rather than ask about other possible institutional forms or policy solutions that might serve similar functions in different jurisdictions, the questionnaire goes on to ask “do supervisory requirements or expectations exist concerning the role and responsibilities of the risk committee?” thus assuming that such committee should exist and should be supervised. In this way, the questionnaire becomes a tool of surveillance rather than

competitive dividend and diversity-respecting importance of the coexistence and coalition of differentiated frameworks of regulation.” (De Burca & Walker 2007: 536.)

a tool of deliberation, and a tool for promoting adherence to one specific regulatory response to risk as the new harmonized global standard rather than a tool for coordinating among pluralistic regimes.

When tools for learning become tools of surveillance, then the comparison conducted through peer review remains relatively superficial, and opportunities for learning are lost. Equally importantly, the unexamined common sense solutions found in jurisdictions that exercise larger influence at the FSB secretariat continue to dominate to the exclusion of other possibilities and at a cost to the international legitimacy of the organization as a whole. If Sabel and Simon claim that the deliberative dimension of NG is key to overcoming the democracy deficit in administrative law at the national and international level (Sabel & Simon 2006), then the converse is also true--a failure of deliberation and the transformation of NG instruments into tools of surveillance exacerbates the problems of democratic accountability many commentators see in a process by which a small group of non-elected experts hailing disproportionately from certain geographical areas make international rules for the rest of the world.

Audit Culture

Finally, although some Basel negotiators suggest that there are contexts in which NG tools can be effective means of learning and consensus-building--that is, that they can be used as opportunities to educate a wider audience of global regulators about the particular conditions of national markets, and also as opportunities to learn more about conditions of other markets that may impede regulatory harmonization--many regulators suggest a degree of frustration with the volume of paperwork produced by NG initiatives, and a concern that the time demands of these assignments do not produce sufficient practical rewards.

Given the sheer volume of new governance activity, this criticism needs to be taken seriously. In an era of seriously curtailed government budgets, time spent on peer review, on international meetings, and on information exchange is time that is not available for other regulatory initiatives. The FSB estimates that each member of a peer review committee should expect to spend the full-time equivalent of approximately six weeks on this work, and while the FSB (interestingly) does not estimate the time costs of such activity to the members under review, one can assume it is at least comparable. Furthermore, many of these reviews in turn make requests for information that place demands on market participants, and these demands have also mushroomed to the point at which risk management staff in some banks claim to spend almost half of their time responding to regulators' requests for information--often so that such information can in turn be passed on to international organizations.

Social scientists have begun to explore the real costs on institutional cultures of so-called "audit cultures" or "audit societies"--governance systems rooted principally in self-reporting strategies. These costs include lost labor resources devoted to wasted reporting efforts, but they also include other problems such as information overload, 'anxious preoccupation with how one is seen by others,' and an erosion of trust within institutions (Powers 1997; see also Shore 2008)--precisely the opposite of what the FSB seeks to achieve through NG strategies.

The reasons why such processes may begin to seem like "paperwork" rather than true exercises in deliberation relate once again to how these tools become standardized and institutionalized into fairly rigid models. When faced with a questionnaire that asks questions that do not fit the local context for example, there is little space within the form to explain why the question is not the right question to

be asking in the first place. This suggests that at a minimum more attention needs to be paid to designing a peer review and self-monitoring process that fosters meaningful dialogue and deliberation by making room for respondents to challenge the terms of the question or the assumptions behind the review itself.

Part V: Conclusion

The attention of policy makers, market participants, and many of their interlocutors in the academy has focused, naturally enough, on the details of particular policy initiatives of the moment without much regard for the wider sum of the regulatory parts. Yet individual policies take shape and come to be implemented within particular regulatory architectures.³⁶ The predominant architecture deployed by the FSB--the NG architecture—may have been chosen largely by default, and perhaps without sufficient critical analysis or empirical study. The summary of the history of the NG approach in Part III suggests that this lack of reflection is perhaps

³⁶ Pan argues that the fragility of the G20 “network” approach to financial governance should be apparent from the last financial crisis:

International law scholars frequently noted that the international financial architecture relied to a great extent on informal transgovernmental networks as opposed to formal international organizations or other treaty-based mechanisms. Thus, the international financial architecture appeared to provide convincing empirical support for such scholars' claims about the effectiveness of transgovernmental networks in promoting regulatory cooperation among states. In fact, the international financial architecture proved incapable of preventing or managing the causes and effects of the recent financial crisis. ...The failure of states to provide for an international legal regime capable of conducting prudential supervision of cross-border financial institutions proved to be one of the reasons why the international financial architecture was unable to prevent financial instability in the US from becoming a global financial crisis. (Pan 2010: 245-247).

due to the influence of Europeans and Americans on G20 reforms after the crisis of 2008 and culminating in the relaunching of the FSB. In Europe and in the US, NG techniques have generated considerable excitement in academic and policy circles from the late 1990s to the present.

However recent coordination challenges surrounding financial regulation in the EU that have surfaced in the past year, together with the weaknesses of the American collaborative approach to regulation demonstrated by the financial crisis of 2008, suggest that at a minimum this model should not be adopted without reflection. The aim of this article therefore has been to initiate a debate about the range of available approaches, and the strengths and weaknesses of each, in international financial regulation to be deployed by the FSB in particular as it addresses the challenges of G-SIFIs.

Although the NG model deployed by the FSB has solid theoretical foundations and much promise, in its application there are signs of potential pitfalls. This would suggest that regardless of how seductive NG is in theory, we should not assume that it is always the best approach to coordinating among interconnected but pluralistic regulatory regimes in the international financial system without further research into the precise conditions in which furthers goals of regulatory coordination while preserving diversity and promoting legitimacy, and those in which it does not.

Thus, a preliminary hypothesis for future research emerges from this analysis: NG mechanisms may be effective in resolving *some* kinds of problems caused by the interrelationship of legal regimes in a pluralistic regulatory order, but they are unlikely to be suitable to *all* problems. That is, at the very least, a robust international financial governance structure necessitates some other kinds of international legal arrangements alongside NG mechanisms. This hypothesis

merits empirical study, and also suggests the need for debate about the full range of possible legal alternatives for a global financial architecture. In short, the general validity of the NG model should not simply be accepted as an untested and unchallenged article of faith.

A. Possible Avenues for Reform

Although we lack sufficient information about current conditions to make firm recommendations, the research into uses of NG techniques in other international institutional contexts, together with lessons learned from the application of NG techniques by national regulators to domestic financial markets, does preliminarily suggest that a number of reforms of or limitations on NG mechanisms might improve their efficacy. These comparative insights provide us with initial hypotheses concerning which reforms or limitations on the NG model for the FSB might be worth pursuing. These include:

A more inclusive process

Why do market participants remain so skeptical of the relatively modest reform proposals embodied in Basel III? Why do domestic politicians in many countries fail to throw their support behind international regulatory initiatives? Perhaps more attention deserves to be paid to the form through which consensus about such reform initiatives as capital adequacy requirements for G-SIFIs is reached in the first place (Moschella 2010). Market participants point out that they have very few opportunities even to learn about negotiations at the FSB, let alone to participate in

them meaningfully, until after the agreement is complete.³⁷ While the FSB rule-making procedure allows for a public comment period, market participants argue that the process by which those comments are actually taken into account is opaque and that they have little sense of whether their comments have any impact on outcomes at all. The same is largely true of domestic legislators. Their involvement in the international consensus is often limited to approving or rejecting agreements negotiated by regulators after the fact. In particular, further comparative research needs to be conducted on the consequences of variations in national processes for participating in international regulatory coordination. Some countries, including the US make relatively greater room for the involvement of political branches, while the negotiation process in other countries allows for less political involvement. Likewise, some regulators obtain feedback from market participants through more formal notice and comment procedures while others have greater access to informal channels. It may be that such differences correlate with differing degrees of support for international regulation in different countries.

One of the lessons of recent innovations in international law and institutions is that bringing a wider range of actors into the negotiation process, while time consuming and messy, creates far greater success at the implementation stage. Those who participate in international negotiations are more committed to seeing the results of the negotiations bear fruit than those who do not have a chance to participate. One early example of the use of soft law techniques to create global consensus was the United Nations World Conference model, in which national delegations were expected to include representatives from a wide range of

³⁷ In Brummer's view, "the G-20 and the FSB have been relative laggards regarding accountability. Indeed, only the FSB has circulated consultative papers, and thus far has done so only rarely." (Brummer 2012: 198).

government and nongovernment organizations, and in which virtually any legitimate nongovernmental organization was allowed to participate as an observer to the process (Riles 2001). While such conferences were originally viewed as lesser forms of international law making than traditional closed door treaty-making negotiations among state representatives, in practice they have proven to be quite successful in generating broad and deep consensus for reform in individual nations on difficult social topics. These conferences serve important pedagogical and political functions, in addition to their legal function.

Of course it may not be possible to open up the financial regulatory process to this extent. Financial governance differs from governance areas such as the environment, safety standards labor rights, human rights, and even international trade in the sense that nongovernmental organizations are by and large industry organizations with budgets that dwarf those of national regulators, and with track records of favoring their own narrowly defined short-term interest at the expense of larger and longer-term interests. (Schwarcz and McDonnell 2010-2011: 1643–1644.) Many national regulators express a need for a space for discussion and coordination away from the political pressures they experience from market participants in which to construct rules that serve the wider social good. Regulators involved in the FSB rule-making process have concerns about the impact of openness on the ability to reach consensus, on how confidential information can be shared, and even on potential questions of sovereignty and national security of opening this process to a wider range of public and private actors (Jones 2010). From the point of view of many participants in G20 processes, the consensus-making process is complicated enough at the moment by the rapid increase in member states. Conversely, those civil society groups that do express an interest in financial regulation seem, from the

regulators' point of view, to engage in unhelpful populist bashing of financial institutions, thereby making it difficult to bring them into the expert discourse (Kelly 2011). While these are legitimate concerns, the exclusion of the full range of interested parties from the negotiations creates its own practical costs as well as challenges to the legitimacy of the consensus reached through NG methods (Nickel 2006).

There is also another reason to favor openness in the FSB process. As Ford points out, one of the lessons of the failures of NG techniques in financial regulation prior to the crisis of 2008 is that

the development of active contestation and deliberation within new governance structures cannot be presumed. It must be fostered, ensured, and protected. Reason-giving, problem identification, and careful problem-solving techniques tend to collapse when everyone's interests are aligned (Ford 2010a: 486).

This suggests that a broader and more diverse FSB membership perhaps could be a benefit rather than a burden to better governance by helping to preserve the plurality and diversity of views that is vital to the success of NG techniques. Ironically the premise of NG, that through such techniques, a broad base of stakeholders can and should be enrolled in decision-making processes, has been sidelined as NG has been translated into an international regulatory structure at the FSB.

Better procedural regulation of NG processes

We saw that although the ideals behind NG are often laudable, the implementation can stray far from those ideals. We also saw that NG processes impose substantial burdens on national regulators and on the private sector. Finally, we saw that there are increasing concerns about the legitimacy of the authority of a small group of technocrats at the FSB secretariat and of small unelected sub-

committees of the FSB plenary who are quickly becoming one of the most powerful agents of global financial regulation.

Concerns about similar processes in other international institutional contexts has led legal scholars to ask whether this explosion of law-making within international technocratic organizations should not be subject to greater procedural safeguards, just as the rule of law requires subjecting domestic administrative agencies to procedural safeguards. Kingsbury and his colleagues in the Global Administrative Law project at NYU law school have identified this “accountability deficit” as a primary target for international legal reform across numerous policy areas.³⁸

These safeguards could include, for example greater disclosure about the positions national representatives take at international meetings,³⁹ and more detailed rules concerning the process of agreement at meetings and the process of producing and evaluating peer review reports that would constrain bureaucrats’ discretion and provide greater opportunities for input from a wider range of participants, more detailed rules concerning standards of proof and evaluation in reaching conclusions, and opportunities for some higher or alternative level of appeal for review of FSB procedures. The FSB handbook on peer review takes a first step in this direction. It asserts that “FSB peer reviews will follow objective and transparent

³⁸ These developments lead us to define global administrative law as comprising the mechanisms, principles, practices, and supporting social understandings that promote or otherwise affect the accountability of global administrative bodies, in particular in ensuring they meet adequate standards of transparency, participation, reasoned decision, and legality, and by providing effective review of the rules and decisions they make (Krisch & Kingsbury 2006: 17).

³⁹ Slaughter argues that “public activists must seek to extend US domestic procedural guarantees to transgovernmental activity. ...In practice, this means requiring regulators seeking to develop US positions at harmonization talks ...to create a record of all their actions; this record would then be subject to notice-and-comment rule making, allowing all interested members of the public full input” (Slaughter 2005: 222-223).

procedures. The results of the peer review, including any assessments on which it is based, will be published to promote greater transparency by all member jurisdiction” (Financial Stability Board 2012a: 3). The procedures in the handbook remain quite general however.

More narrowly tailored assessment tools

Comparative research in other fields suggests that NG methods are most effective when the problem they seek to address is very narrowly tailored. In such cases, peer review can be more focused, and discussions in supervisory colleges can be more specific and meaningful. As Greer concludes in his survey of the EU experience with OMC in the health safety field,

In principle, this kind of more specific sectoral initiative can surmount the three obvious problems of the OMC in health: its broad system-level focus, the tendency for OMC work to concentrate in health ministries’ international rather than line divisions, and the ease with which comparative health indicators can always be discredited. By drawing on smaller networks with clearer preferences, more specific data concerns, greater lobby support, and professional engagement, it can create coordination and rulemaking where there were only informal shared ideas (Greer 2011: 198).

Greater resources for monitoring and deliberation activities

Finally, many of the problems associated with implementing NG ideals stem from lack of adequate resources. As Ford suggests, regarding national regulation,

principles-based regulation may be more "hands-off" in its approach to the procedural details, but this does not mean that it requires fewer regulatory resources. Principles-based regulation may actually require intensive interaction with firms, at least around certain issues or situations. It means having an adequate number of staff, and giving regulators the ability to obtain transparent and reliable information from and about industry. It requires that regulators have and use robust investigatory powers where necessary, conduct regular and adequate compliance audits, and possess the quantitative expertise and relevant experience to independently scrutinize information (Ford 2011; See also Ford 2010a).

Likewise, at the international level, the FSB would also need greater resources for monitoring and deliberation activities in order to implement principles-based regulatory regime.

B. Recommendation: Mount a cross-disciplinary, cross-jurisdictional research project aimed at evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the FSB experience with New Governance methodologies to date and at identifying the conditions under which those methodologies are successful and those in which they require supplementation with other methods.

What is needed now is a detailed study, based upon several case studies of particular specific regulatory or compliance initiatives, that would provide a detailed, empirical picture of how NG methodologies are currently being used both from the point of view of the FSB secretariat and committee structures and from the point of view of national bureaucracies and national interest groups in several representative jurisdictions. The focus should be on the micro-processes by which consensus over compliance is or is not reached. Research should seek to describe the governance process from various players' points of view, including bureaucrats, domestic legislatures, executive branch political leaders and market participants in order to consider how a device such as peer review might be effective in generating consensus with some constituencies but ineffective with others. The few studies we have suggest that the process of reaching consensus between peer review committees and regulated states is far more a complex process than the official procedures suggest and that there is some room for variation and contestation.⁴⁰

The emphasis should be on the relationship between these micro-processes and

⁴⁰ In his study of the work of expert committees at the IMF, Harper calls this relationship between international and national actors "paternalism without power" (Harper 2000: 45).

“issues of implementation, effectiveness, and local impact” across different jurisdictions with different market challenges and regulatory approaches. This requires a detailed objective picture of the social and institutional processes at work in regulatory technologies such as peer review, standards-making, and supervisory colleges. What is the experience of regulation by those who are subject to these processes and how does it shape their behavior? How do these practices alter or realign existing power dynamics in the market, and among nations? Under what precise conditions are such practices effective and when are they ineffective?

Since the very problem to be studied is the efficacy of questionnaire and committee-based information gathering processes, this study cannot rely entirely on such processes. Rather what is needed is a combination of observational and interview-based methods. On the basis of this empirical information it will be possible to determine when NG techniques are the ideal governance tools in international financial governance and when they should be supplemented with other kinds of governance tools.

References

Ahdieh, R. B. 2010. The Visible Hand: Coordination Functions of the Regulatory State. *Minnesota Law Review* 95: 578-649.

Arner, DW and M Taylor 2011. The Global Financial Crisis and the Financial Stability Board: Hardening the Soft Law of International Financial Regulation? Available at www.ssrn.com.

Ayres, Ian and John Braithwaite 1992. *Responsive Regulation: Transcending the Regulation Debate*. Oxford University Press.

Basel Committee on Banking Supervision 2011. Basel III: A Global Regulatory Framework for More Resilient Banks and Banking System (June 2011). Available at: <http://www.bis.org/publ/bcbs189.htm>

_____ 2010a. Good Practice Principles on Supervisory Colleges (October 2010). Available at <http://www.bis.org/publ/bcbs177.htm>.

_____ 2010b. Report and Recommendations of the Cross-Border Bank Resolution Group - Final Report (March 2010). Available at <http://www.bis.org/publ/bcbs169.htm>.

_____ 2006. Home host information sharing for effective Basel II implementation (June 2006). Available at <http://www.bis.org/publ/bcbs125.htm>.

Basel Committee on Banking Regulations and Supervisory Practices 1983. Principles for the supervision of banks' foreign establishments. Available at <http://www.bis.org/publ/bcbsc312.pdf>.

Berman, Paul Schiff 2009. The New Legal Pluralism. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 5(1): 225–242.

- Bingham, Lisa Blomgren 2010. The Next Generation of Administrative Law: Building the Legal Infrastructure for Collaborative Governance. *Wisconsin Law Review* 2010: 297-356.
- Black, Barbara 2010. The Globalization of Securities Regulation: Competition or Coordination? *University of Cincinnati Law Review* 79: 461-470.
- Blinder, Alan 2009. Nationalize? Hey, Not So Fast. *The New York Times* (March 7, 2009). Available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/03/08/business/08view.html>.
- Brummer, Chris 2012. *Soft Law and the Global Financial System*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 2011. How International Financial Law Works (and How It Doesn't). *Georgetown Law Journal* 99(2): 257-328.
- Butler, William 2009. Time To Take the Banks Into Full Public Ownership. *The Financial Times Blogs* (January 16, 2009). Available at <http://blogs.ft.com/maverecon/2009/01/time-to-take-the-banks-into-full-public-ownership/#axzz1uC088xLB>.
- Clarke, Lee 1999. *Mission Improbable. Using Fantasy Documents to Tame Disaster*. University Of Chicago Press.
- Coffee, John 2011. Systemic Risk After Dodd-Frank: Contingent Capital and the Need for Regulatory Strategies Beyond Oversight. *Columbia Law Review* 111: 795-847.
- Corcoran, Andrea 2011. Globalization Report Cards for Securities Regulators: National Enforcement of International Capital Market Standards for Information Sharing, Cooperation and the Prevention of Financial Crisis. *University of Cincinnati Law Review* 79: 651-696.

- Dash, Eric 2011. Higher Reserves Proposed for 'Too Big to Fail' Banks. *The New York Times* (June 25, 2011). Available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/26/business/26banks.html>.
- Davis, Kevin E., Benedict Kingsbury and Sally Engle Merry 2011. Indicators as a Technology of Global Governance. *IILJ Working Paper* 2010/2 Rev. Available at www.iilj.org.
- De Búrca, G. and Joanne Scott 2006. *Law and new governance in the EU and the US*. Oxford: Hart Publishing.
- De Búrca, G. and Neil Walker 2006–2007. Reconceiving Law and New Governance. *Columbia Journal of European Law* 13: 519-537.
- De Larosière, Jacques 2009. The High-Level Group on Financial Supervision in the EU (February 25, 2009). Available at [http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/finances/docs/de_Larosiere Larosiere_report_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/finances/docs/de_Larosiere_Larosiere_report_en.pdf).
- Dickson, Julie 2010. Too Focused on Rules: The Importance of Supervisory Oversight in Financial Regulation. Remarks of Julie Dickson. *Cardozo Journal of International and Comparative Law* 18: 623-631.
- Draghi, Mario 2011. FSB Letter to G20 Leaders on Progress of Financial Regulatory Reforms (October 31 2011). Available at http://www.financialstabilityboard.org/publications/r_111104ff.pdf.
- Dunn, Elizabeth C. 2005. Standards and Person-Making in East Central Europe. *In Global assemblages : technology, politics, and ethics as anthropological problems* (Aihwa Ong and Stephen J. Collier eds.) 173-193.
- Eberlein, Burkard and Dieter Kerwer 2004. New Governance in the European Union: A Theoretical Perspective. *JCMS* 42(1): 121-142.

- Enrich, David 2010. U.K. Eyes 'Living Wills' for Distressed Banks. *The Wall Street Journal* (May 20, 2010). Available at http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704691304575254442247140502.html?mod=rss_whats_news_us_business.
- Eubanks, Walter W. 2010. The Status of the Basel III Capital Adequacy Accord. *Congressional Research Service Report for Congress* (October 28, 2010). Available at <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41467.pdf>.
- Ezirgiannidou, S. 2009. The Climate Change Regime Post-Kyoto: Why Compliance is Important and How to Achieve it. *Global Environmental Politics* 9(4): 41-63.
- Fanto, J.A 2010. Financial Regulation Reform: Maintaining the Status Quo. *Brooklyn Journal of International Law* 35: 635-965.
- Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation 2011. The Orderly Liquidation of Lehman Brothers Holdings under the Dodd-Frank Act. *FDIC Quarterly* 5(2). Available at http://www.fdic.gov/bank/analytical/quarterly/2011_vol5_2/lehman.pdf.
- Financial Stability Board 2012a. Handbook for FSB Peer Reviews (December 19, 2012). Available at http://www.financialstabilityboard.org/publications/r_120201.pdf
- _____ 2012b. Peer Review of Canada (January 30 2012). Available at http://www.financialstabilityboard.org/publications/r_120130.pdf.
- _____ 2012c. . Press Release No. 25/2012. Available at http://www.financialstabilityboard.org/press/pr_120427a.pdf.
- _____ 2012d. SCSl Thematic Review on Risk Governance. Questionnaire for National Authorities (April 3, 2012). Available at http://www.financialstabilityboard.org/publications/r_120404.pdf.

_____ 2012e. Improving Financial Institution Risk Disclosures and Next Steps. Press Release No. 16/2012 (March 20, 2012).

_____ 2011a. Thematic Review Risk on Risk Disclosure Practices (March 18, 2011). Available at http://www.financialstabilityboard.org/publications/r_110318.pdf.

_____ 2011b. Understanding Financial Linkages: A Common Data Template for Global Systemically Important Banks (October 6, 2011). Available at http://www.financialstabilityboard.org/publications/r_111006.pdf.

_____ 2011c. A coordination framework for monitoring and reporting on the implementation of G20 financial reforms (October 18, 2011). Available at http://www.financialstabilityboard.org/publications/r_111017.pdf.

_____ 2010. FSB Framework for Strengthening Adherence to International Standards (January 9, 2010). Available at http://www.financialstabilityboard.org/publications/r_100109a.pdf.

_____ 2009a. Financial Stability Board Charter. Available at http://www.financialstabilityboard.org/publications/r_090925d.pdf.

_____ 2009b. Progress Since the Pittsburgh Summit in Implementing the G20. Recommendations for Strengthening Financial Stability. Report of the Financial Stability Board to G20 Finance Ministers and Governors (November 7, 2009). Available at http://www.financialstabilityboard.org/publications/r_091107a.pdf.

Ford, Cristie L. 2011. Macro and Micro Level Effects on Responsive Financial Regulation. Available at http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2008495.

_____ 2010a. New Governance in the Teeth of Human Frailty: Lessons from Financial Regulation. *Wisconsin Law Review* 2010: 441-487.

- _____. 2010b. Principles-Based Securities Regulation in the Wake of the Global Financial Crisis. *McGill Law Journal* 55:257-307.
- _____. 2005. Toward a New Model for Securities Law Enforcement. *Administrative Law Review* 57: 757–828.
- Gilani, Shah 2011. Living Wills for Banks Won't Kill Systemic Risk or Greed. *Forbes* (June 27, 2011). Available at <http://www.forbes.com/sites/shahgilani/2011/06/27/living-wills-for-banks-wont-kill-systemic-risk-or-greed/>.
- Gilad, Sharon 2010. It runs in the family: Meta-regulation and its siblings. *Regulation Governance* 4: 485-506.
- Gonzalez, Maria and Alfred Schipke 2011. Bankers on the Beach. *Finance and Development* 48(2): 42-45.
- Goodhart, Charles and Dimitrios Tsomocos 2011. Mayekawa Lecture: The Role of Default in Macroeconomics. *Monetary and Economic Studies* 29(2011): 49–72. Available at <http://ideas.repec.org/a/ime/imemes/v29y2011p49-72.html>.
- Gordon, Jeffrey and Colin Mayer 2011. Micro, Macro and International Design of Financial Regulation. Available at http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2047436.
- Greer, Scott L. 2011. The weakness of strong policies and the strength of weak policies: Law, experimentalist governance, and supporting coalitions in European Union health care policy. *Regulation Governance* 5(2): 187-203.
- Griffith-Jones, Stephany, Eric Helleiner and Ngaire Woods 2010. The Financial Stability Board: An Effective Fourth Pillar of Economic Growth? Special Report, Centre for International Governance Innovation (June 2010). Available at

<http://www.cigionline.org/publications/2010/6/financial-stability-board-effective-fourth-pillar-global-economic-governance>.

Haas, Peter 1992. Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination. *International Organization* 46(1): 1-35.

Harper, Richard 2000. The social organization of the IMF's mission work: an examination of international auditing. *In Audit cultures: anthropological studies in accountability, ethics, and the academy* (M. Strathern ed.): 21-54.

Hart, Oliver and Luigi Zingales. 2010. How To Make a Bank Raise Equity. *The Financial Times* (February 7, 2010). Available at <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/472719e6-140b-11df-8847-00144feab49a.html>.

Helleiner, Eric 2010. What Role for the New Financial Stability Board? The Politics of International Standards after the Crisis. *Global Policy* 1(3): 282-290.

Independent Commission on Banking 2011. Final Report [Vickers Report] (September 2011). Available online at www.ecgi.org/documents/icb_final_report_12sep2011.pdf (accessed December 12, 2012).

Karmel, RS and CR Kelly 2008. The Hardening of Soft Law in Securities Regulation. *Brooklyn Journal of International Law* 34: 883-951.

Karckainen, Bradley C. 2004. Reply. "New Governance" in Legal Thought and in the World: Some Splitting as Antidote to Overzealous Lumping. *Minnesota Law Review* 89:471-496.

Liikanen, et al. 2012. [High-Level Expert Group on Reforming the Structure of the EU Banking Sector](#) (October 2, 2012). Available at http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/bank/docs/high-level_expert_group/report_en.pdf (Accessed December 12, 2012).

- Jones, Huw 2010. Can this committee save the world from bankers? *Reuters News* (November 10, 2010). Available at <http://www.reuters.com/article/2010/11/10/us-g20-fsb-idUSTRE6A92I120101110>.
- Kelly, C.R. 2011. Financial Crisis and Civil Society. *Chicago Journal of International Law* 11:505-555.
- Kennedy, Duncan 1976. Form and Substance in Private Law Adjudication. *Harvard Law Review* 89:1685-1778.
- Klug, Aaron 1999. History of Peer Review. Royal Society of London Anniversary Day Address (November 30, 1999).
- Krisch, Nico and Benedict Kingsbury 2006. Introduction: Global Governance and Global Administrative Law in the International Legal Order. *European Journal of International Law* 17(1): 1-13.
- Krugman, Paul 2010. Financial Reform 101. *New York Times* (April 1, 2010). Available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/02/opinion/02krugman.html>.
- Lobel, Orly 2004. The Renew Deal: The Fall of Regulation and the Rise of Governance in Contemporary Legal Thought. *Minnesota Law Review* 89: 342-470.
- Low, Gary 2010. The (Ir)Relevance of Harmonization and Legal Diversity to European Contract Law: A Perspective from Psychology. *European Review of Private Law* 18: 285–305.
- McDonnell, Brett and Daniel Schwarcz 2010-2011. Regulatory Contrarians. *North Carolina Law Review* 89:1629-1682.
- Merry, S. E. 2011. Measuring the world indicators, human rights, and global governance. *Current Anthropology* 52: S83-S95.

- Michaels, Ralf 2009. Global Legal Pluralism. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 5(1): 243–262.
- Miyano, Hirokazu 2008. "Gurobaru gyosei hou' ron no toujou--sono haikai to igi [The Emergence of 'Global Administrative Law ' Approach-its Background and Problems]. In *Gurobaru gabanansu to Kokuren no shourai [Global governance and the future of the United Nations]* (Yozo Yokota and Hirokazu Miyano eds.): 323-338. Tokyo: Chuo University Press.
- Moschella, Manuela 2010. Back to the Drawing Board: The International Financial Architecture Exercise. *Review of International Political Economy* 17(1): 155-171.
- Nickel, Rainier 2006. Participatory Transnational Governance. In *Constitutionalism, Multi-Level Governance, and Social Regulation* (Christian Joerges and Ernst-Ulrich Petersmann, eds.): 1-41. Oxford: Hart Publishing.
- Ojo, M. 2011. Successfully Implementing Major Financial Stability Regulatory Reforms: The Risk Weighting Based Controversy (Basel v. Dodd Frank) and the Role of National Supervisors. Available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1870209>.
- Pan, E.J. 2010. Challenge of International Cooperation and Institutional Design in Financial Supervision: Beyond Transgovernmental Networks. *Chicago Journal of International Law* 11(1): 243-284.
- Pazarbasioglu, Ceyla et al. 2011. Contingent Capital: Economic Rationale and Design Features. International Monetary Fund: Monetary and Capital Markets Department. *IMF Staff Discussion Note SDN/11/01* (January 25, 2011). Available at <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/sdn/2011/sdn1101.pdf>.
- Power, Michael 1997. *The audit society: rituals of verification*. Oxford University Press.

- Radaelli, C.M. and A. Meuwese 2009. Better regulation in Europe: between public management and regulatory reform. *Public Administration* 87(3): 639-654.
- Romano, Roberta 2012. For Diversity in the International Regulation of Financial Institutions: Redesigning the Basel Architecture (August 10, 2012). Available at http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2127749.
- _____ 2010. . Available at http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1697348.
- Romano, Roberta and Andrew Verstein 2011. Assessing Dodd-Frank. *John M. Olin Center for Studies in Law, Economics, and Public Policy Research Paper* (August 11): 1–150.
- Reich, Robert 2010. Why Obama Must Take on Wall Street. *The Financial Times* (January 12, 2010). Available at <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/0666adfe-ffb6-11de-921f-00144feabdc0.html>.
- Riles, Annelise 2010. *Collateral Knowledge: Legal Reasoning in the Global Financial Markets*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____ 2000. *The network inside out*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Sabel, Charles H. and William Simon 2006. Epilogue: Accountability Without Sovereignty. In *Law and new governance in the EU and the US* (De Búrca, G., and Joanne Scott, eds.): 395-412. Oxford: Hart Publishing.
- Sato, Takafumi 2009. Tightening Capital Rules Could Increase Risk-Taking. *Financial Times* (June 30, 2009). Available at <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/f5d750b8-659d-11de-8e34-00144feabdc0.html#axzz1uCfBmYqk>.
- Schauer, Frederick 2004–2005. The Tyranny of Choice and Rulification of Standards. *Journal of Contemporary Legal Issues* 14: 803–814.

- Schneiberg, Marc and Tim Bartley 2008. Organizations, Regulation, and Economic Behavior: Regulatory Dynamics and Forms from the Nineteenth to Twenty-First Century. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 4(1): 31-61.
- Shapiro, Martin 2004. Deliberative, independent technocracy v. democratic politics: will the globe echo the E.U.? *Law and Contemporary Problems* 68: 341-356.
- Shore, Cris 2008. Audit culture and Illiberal governance. *Anthropological Theory* 8(3): 278-298.
- Short, Jodi L. 2012. The Paranoid Style in Regulatory Reform. *Hastings Law Journal* 63: 633-694.
- Simon, William H. 2004. Solving Problems vs. Claiming Rights: The Pragmatist Challenge to Legal Liberalism. *William and Mary Law Review* 46: 127-212.
- Singh, Manmohan 2011. Making OTC Derivatives Safe –A fresh Look. *International Monetary Fund Working Paper* (March 2011). Available at <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/cat/longres.aspx?sk=24726.0>.
- Skeel, David A. 2011. *The new financial deal: understanding the Dodd-Frank Act and its (unintended) consequences*. New York: Wiley Press.
- Slaughter, A. 2005. *A new world order*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Smits, Jan M. 2010. Full Harmonization of Consumer Law? A Critique of the Draft Directive on Consumer Rights (March 1, 2009). *European Review of Private Law* 18: 5-14.
- Strathern, M. 2000. *Audit cultures: anthropological studies in accountability, ethics, and the academy*. London: Routledge.
- Tarullo, Daniel K. 2008. *Banking on Basel: The Future of International Financial Regulation*. Washington, DC: Peterson Institute for International Economics.

- Teubner, Gunther 1997. *Global Law Without a State*. Aldershot: Dartmouth University Press.
- Trubek, D.M. Trubek, D.M. Trubek, D.M. *Governing Work and Welfare in a New Economy: European and American Experiments* (Zeitlin, J. and Trubek, D.M., eds.): 33-58. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Twining, William 2003. Review Essay: A Post-Westphalian Conception of Law. *Law and Society Review* 37: 199-258.
- Verdier, P.H. 2009. Transnational Regulatory Networks and Their Limits. *Yale Journal of International Law* 34: 113-172.
- Walter, Andrew 2010. Can the FSB Achieve Effective Surveillance of Systemically Important Countries? (Stephany Griffith-Jones, Eric Helleiner and Ngaire Woods, eds.): 32-35. Ontario: Centre for International Governance Innovation.
- Weil, Jonathan 2011. Too Big To Fail Ends with Wave of a Magic Wand. *Bloomberg* (June 16, 2011). Available at <http://mobile.bloomberg.com/news/2011-06-16/too-big-to-fail-ends-with-wave-of-a-magic-wand-jonathan-weil>.
- Whitall, Christopher 2010. Live and Let Die. *Risk* (September 2010): 106-108.
- Wilkinson, M 2010. Three conceptions of law: towards a jurisprudence of democratic experimentalism. *Wisconsin Law Review* 2010: 673-718.