## Good Governance

# International Organizations and Global Governance Agenda: SDGs as a Paragon

**Felix Chidozie[1], Oluwatobi O. Aje[2]**

**Abstract:** International organizations are predominantly innovative capacity-building measures for the conduct of bilateral and multilateral diplomacy in an increasingly complex and symbiotically interdependent global community. Thus, international organizations are important actors in international relations for the conduct and operations of global governance. However, international organizations have in recent time suffered crises of legitimacy and effectiveness due in part to the current global wave of nationalistic aspirations accentuated by forces of globalization. To this end, the paper situates these new forms of populism within the precinct of globalization theory supported heavily by secondary sources of data. Using the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), an initiative of the United Nations as a model, anchored on content analysis and review the paper argues that the global transformative agenda for people, planet and prosperity could become the most effective vehicle for promoting global governance agenda. It concludes that the twin tyrannies of poverty and war, which fundamentally dominate the objectives of international organizations and by implication, global governance agenda, can be defeated on a more measurable scale under the SDGs. It canvasses that all the global stakeholders both in public and private sectors must intensify their collaborative partnership in order to meet the vision 2030 target in the SDGs' agenda.

**Keywords:** international organizations; global governance; globalization; sustainable development goals; united nations

## 1. Introduction

Although the international society (system) has become a global village, it has remained largely a primitively organized political community. The international

[1] PhD, Department of Political Science and International Relations, College of Leadership Development Studies, Covenant University, Nigeria, Address: Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria, Tel.: +2348033815520, Corresponding author: felix.chidozie@covenantuniversity.edu.ng.
[2] Department of Political Science and International Relations, College of Leadership Development Studies, Covenant University, Nigeria, Address: Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria, Tel.: +2348069436996, E-mail: ajeoluwatobi@gmail.com.

community which is sustained by bilateral and multilateral diplomatic relations has always been decentralized, characterized, as it is, by a diffused power structure (Akindele, 2000:35). Thus, International organizations and institutions are innovative, capacity-building measures for the conduct of diplomacy in an increasingly complex and symbiotically interdependent global community that began to emerge in the second half of the nineteenth century (Akindele, 2000, p. 36). Therefore, international organizations are important actors in international relations for the conduct and operations of global governance.

An international organization can be defined as formal, continuous structure established by agreement between members (government and/or non-government) from two or more sovereign states with the aim of pursuing the common interest of the membership (Archer, 2001, p. 33). It can be deduced from this broad definition of international organizations that an international organization operates in a world of states; It operates where there are contacts among the states; It is birthed where there is recognition of certain problems that are common to all the states; and there must be a consensus by the states to come together to organize and solve the identified common problems together (Adeniran, 1982, p. 85). To be sure, these common problems usually transcend the capacities, resources and borders of individual sovereign states (Novotny, 2007).

Hence, Weiss (2013) describes global governance as collective efforts to identify, understand, or address worldwide problems that go beyond the capacities of individual states to solve. It is the capacity within the international system to provide government-like services and public goods in the absence of a world government. Thus, global governance is the combination of informal and formal values, rules, norms, procedures, practices, policies, and organizations of various types that often provides a surprising and desirable degree of global order, stability, and predictability (Weiss, 2013, p. 32). It can be submitted that global governance captures a gamut of interdependent relations in the absence of any overarching political authority; 'neither can it be equated with world government' (Mishra, 2013, p. 624).

However, Contemporary governance is multi-layered. It includes important local, sub-state, regional, supra-state, and trans-world operations alongside and intertwined with national arrangements. It has increasingly worked through private and public instruments. In this situation, regulatory authority has become considerably more decentralized and diffuse (Scholte, 2004, p. 426). It is in this

regard that international organizations provide veritable vehicles for the execution of global governance agenda. Consequently, global governance has come under increasing threat following the global rise in nationalist agenda accentuated by new forms of globalization. To this end, scholars are beginning to probe the effectiveness and legitimacy crises of prominent international organizations especially the United Nations and European Union as reliable instruments of global governance (Novotny, 2007; Goldin and Vogel, 2010; Mishra, 2013; Graham, 2015; Report of the Commission on Global Security, Justice and Governance, 2015; Jang et al, 2016). According to Armstrong and Gilson (2011), the crisis in global governance as they affect international organizations has been premised on two domains in extant literature – effectiveness and legitimacy. They define effectiveness as the capacity to achieve a set of objectives without undue disruption and legitimacy as a broad degree of acceptance by those directly affected by governance. On these two scores, it is evident that contemporary governance is lacking.

It is against this backdrop that the paper proposes the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and 169 targets, an initiative of the UN, representing a plan of action for people, planet and prosperity as a veritable and viable alternative to the traditional objectives of international organizations. SDGs seek to build on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and complete what these did not achieve. It involves all countries and all stakeholders from both public and private sectors, acting in collaborative partnership. It resolves to free the human race from the tyranny of poverty and want and to heal and secure the planet. It is a global transformative agenda with a measurable vision of 2030 (UN, 2017).

## 1.1. Method and Structure

Secondary sources of data such as relevant books, journals, periodicals, occasional paper series, reviews and internet sources were adopted to accomplish the work. The paper is divided into five thematic sections. Section one introduces the work. Section two presents the theoretical and conceptual discourse of globalization, international organizations and global governance. Section three is the critical analyses of emerging issues and crisis of global governance in the 21st century. Section four presents the SDGs as valid and veritable antidote to the crisis of global governance agenda. Section five concludes the work and proffer recommendations.

## 2. Theoretical and Conceptual Discourse

### 2.1. Globalization

The concept of globalization, has become a cliché in the lexicon of the social sciences, cutting across variegated aspects of human endeavour (political-economic and socio-cultural among others). The multidimensional nature of the concept, partly accounts for the struggles over its meanings, its effects, its origins and its impact that have played out in a variety of ways among scholars, government officials, observers and global citizens (Schirato & Webb, 2003). Since in a way, everyone is affected either negatively or positevely by the currents of globalization, it thus appears that everyone is crucial in the framing of its meaning, its discourse and its practicies (Schirato and Webb, 2003). Hence, Dicken describes the concept as one of the most used, and yet one of the most misused and often confused terms in the current world (Dicken, 2007, p. 3).

Recognizing that there is 'no straightforward or widely accepted definition of the term, either in general use or in academic writings' (Schirato & Webb, 2003, p. 2), it is pivotal to breifly  examine various definitions of globalization and then identify key elements and characteristics common to the various conceptions.

Giddens asserts that globalization represents the 'intensification of world social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events ocurring miles away and vise versa' (Giddens, 1990, p. 64). In this view, globalization shrinks and unites the world into a complex system with unbreakable nerve strands that connect the sub-systems together. In essence, national happenings become tide to the international system and, variegated issues, gains and challenges on one end joinlty have connections and implications for the entire system through the connections offered by the nerve strands.

The definition espoused by Giddens is in tandem with that of Albrow who defines globalization as 'all those processes by which the peoples of the world are incorporated into a single world society, global society' (Albrow, 1990, p. 9). Similarly, the World Bank conceives of globalization as the worldwide circulation of not only 'goods, services and capital but also of information, ideas and people' (World Bank, 2000, p. 3). The definition presumes that contemporary realities allows for free movement of both human and non-human resources across national boundaries. Products produced in one part of the world are moved for usage in the

other end; information and ideas are shared on a global level; and labour are outsourced internationally in a manner unfathomable before now.

Owing to the all embracing tendencies of the concept of globalization, scholars such as Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, and J Perraton (1999) as well as Dicken (2007) advance that the concept of globalization is holistic and applicable to every facet of human endeavour. Dicken for example posits that an understanding of the gimmick of globalization can be best attained when examined as a multidimensional phenomenon, (Dicken, 2007). While Held et. al (1992) emphasised the ubiquitous and multidimensional nature of globalization when they described globalization as 'the widening, deepening and speeding up of worldwide interconnectedness in all aspects of contemporary social life, from the cultural to the criminal, financial to the spiritual'. These set of scholars rejects tying globalization to a single aspect of human endeavor- economic, political, social or cultural.

In contrast, scholars such as Castells (1996) and Mattelart (2000) stress the place of the economy in framing a definition for globalization. Castells opines that essentially, globalization represents a universal 'economy with the capacity to work as a unit in real time on a planetary scale' (Castells, 1996, p. 2). While Mattelart's argues that the foundation for modern globalization was first nurtured in the economic realm of human endeavour. He contends that 'globalization originated in the sphere of financial transactions, where it has shattered the boundaries of national systems. Formerly regulated and partitioned, financial markets are now integrated into a totally fluid global market through generalized connections in real time' (Mattelart, 2000, p. 76). Interpreting Mattelart argument, Schirato and Webb reiterates that, contemporary globalism is 'predicated -if not entirely dependent- upon this new phenomenon of capital flows, and the technology which makes it possible' (Schirato & Webb 2003, p. 13). Hence, the advancement in information and communication technology is a major vehicle driving globalization (World Bank, 2000).

Finally, it is pertinent to note that in all of the definitions advanced by scholars – increased integration, interpenetration, and interconnectedness of the globe are recurring themes in the descriptions and explanations of globalization. Resultant of the interconnections and interpenetration, events at one part resonate at another end. Consequently, issues of 'trade, terrorism, clash of cultures, migration, off-shoring banking, foreign direct investment, Avian flu and SARS, global warming, the importation of foreign invasive species that gain ecological advantages over

native species [among others] … are just the tip of an iceberg labelled globalization' (Sobel, 2009, p. 1).

## 2.2. Global Governance

The complexities and realities of globalization have made it inexorable for national problems to be inextricable from global problems, it has created 'losers as well as winners; and it entails risk as well as opportunities' (Weiss 2013). Weiss explains that the consequent interdependency of globalization, the proliferation of non-states actors, and the recasting of the concept of world government are the integral elements behind the emergence of global governance discourse among policy wonks and academic walls. This is quite logical because the cross-border flow of information, ideas, finance, investments and people; the growing importance of non-state actors and the need to adequately regulate the activities of these various elements in the absence of a world government requires a tacit form of control which, in a way, is embodied in the concept of global governance. A lack of sufficient and efficient global governance is thus bound to expose the weaknesses and problems inherent in the globalization process. "But the problem lies not in globalization but in the "deficiencies of its governance" (Weiss, 2013, p. 13).

According to the Commission on Global Affairs, (1995, p. 2) governance is the 'sum of the many ways individuals and institutions, public and private, manage their common affairs. It is a continuing process through which conflicting or diverse interests may be accommodated and co-operative actions may be taken'. For Weiss, governance represents the 'range of formal and informal values, rules, norms, practices, and organizations that provide better order than if we relied purely upon formal regulations and structures' (Weiss, 2013, p. 31).

When amplified towards the management of the global complex, global governance features a fine interplay between, the States, profit organizations, non-profit organizations, inter-governmental organizations, non-governmental organizations and the individuals who appears to be concerned for 'human rights, equity, democracy, meeting basic material needs, environmental protection, demilitarization' (Wilkinson, 2005, p. 27) among others. This suggests that the whole burden of global governance is not borne by the governments alone. Although, governments remain the key public institutions for the construction of positive solutions towards global problems, they represent just a part of the wide-ranging picture of global governance (Wilkinson, 2005; Rosenau, 2005).

Rosenau recognised this fact when he conceived global governance as the 'systems of rule at all levels of human activity-from the family to the international organization- in which the pursuit of goals through the exercise of control has transnational repercussions' (Rosenau, 2005, p. 45). It suggests that global governance is goal driven and solution orientated. This perhaps resonates with Weiss definition which conceives global governance as the 'collective efforts to identify, understand, or address worldwide problems that go beyond the capacities of individual states to solve' (Weiss, 2013, p. 32). In doing this, effective global governance must reflect particles of efficient decisions and suggestions from local, national and regional circles; it must be able to draw from the multiplicity of people and institutions across various levels (Wilkinson, 2005).

Therefore, it is safe to conclude that there is no lone way, form or structures to the actualization of global governance; rather, it encompasses a multifaceted and dynamic process of interactive decision-making across all levels that constantly evolves and responds to the changing circumstances and challenges of the global system (Wilkinson, 2005). It is sufficiently different from global government in that, formal and informal actors and institutions are well integrated (Weiss, 2013; Rosenau, 2005; Wilkinson, 2005; Karns, Mingst, & Stiles, 2015).

## 2.3.    International Organization

Diehl posits that a clear way of understanding international organizations is to classify them based on their scope and membership potentials. International organizations could be designed to focus on, or solve a particular problem. In other words, they operate based on their area of concern. While some possess specific goals and objectives, others possess universal goals and objectives. World Health Organisation, Food and Agriculture Organization fall within the category of the former while the United Nations for example falls within the latter. They could also be designed based on the possibilities of its membership. While some possess universal membership, others possess limited and targeted membership. For example, while the United Nations offers universal membership, most regional international organisations offer limited or region-specific membership (Diehl, 2005). However, the definition that views international organizations as basically inter-governmental in nature, populates extant literature.

Defined in general terms, international organization represents formal, structure established by agreement between members from two or more sovereign states, either profit or non-profit oriented, government or non-government with the aim of pursuing the common interest of the membership (Archer, 2001).

Although many actors are involved in the process of global governance, in the absence of world government, international (especially inter-governmental) organization are among the visible actors with enormous clout in steering the vehicle of the international system (Karns, Mingst, & Stiles, 2015). International organization provides the coordinated mechanisms to manage the complex dynamics of international relations, 'IGOs and INGOs manage conflicts; they monitor and protect human rights; they promote development and trade; and they work to avert environmental collapse' (Weiss, 2013, p. 36).

Barkin (2006), comprehends International organizations as essentially intergovernmental in nature. Accordingly, 'Intergovernmental organizations, as opposed to nongovernmental organizations (NGOs)… are organizations that are created by agreement among states rather than by private individuals. These NGOs and transnational corporations (TNCs) are integral parts of the international political system, but they are not IOs' (Barkin, 2006, p. 1). Here, Barkin limited the scope of international organization to include international groups jointly set up by government of more than one nation to facilitate cooperation among member states and for the benefit of each member states. Similarly, Ian Hurd reiterates Barkin's position when he argues that the foundation of international organizations is set in motion as a result of the promises states make to each other - via 'an inter-state treaty that sets out the authority of the organization and the obligations of its members' (Hurd, 2011, p. vii). Hurd emphasises the place of legal construct and legal obligation as guiding principles framing all international organizations.

Though many actors are involved in the process of global governance, in the absence of world government, international (especially inter-governmental) organizations are among the visible actors with enormous clout in steering the vehicle of the international system (Karns, Mingst, & Stiles, 2015). International organizations provide the coordinated mechanisms to manage the complex dynamics of international relations, 'IGOs and INGOs manage conflicts; they monitor and protect human rights; they promote development and trade; and they work to avert environmental collapse' (Weiss, 2013, p. 36).

Although set up by the state, international organizations often demand compliance from the state in various means, overt and covert. They remain important actors in contemporary international politics as they simultaneously limit and enhance state sovereignty. Even when states act contrary to the stipulated rules of the organization, they still cannot ignore its tentacles. States often offer justification for acting contrary to the organization's decision, with the hope that they can be cleansed from sanctions list. This reveals how seriously government takes international organizations (Hurd, 2011)

The seriousness credited to international organizations is inevitable as they represent collective ambition for equality, peace and sustainable development. Inefficient as they may seem, they represent the ideal form of coordinated efforts for managing challenges and problems without passport. This resonates with one of Klabbers' view that historically, international organizations are often conceptualized as 'entities with a single task: the management of common problems' (Klabbers, 2005). It can be deduced that international organization is birthed where there is recognition of certain problems that are common to all the states; and there must be a consensus by the states to come together to organize and collectively solve the identified problems (Adeniran, 1982, p. 85). Fulfilling this primordial responsibility remains one of the greatest challenges facing international organizations, in view of the complexities of contemporary global governance.

## 3. Emerging Issues and Crisis of Global Governance Agenda in the 21st Century

Global governance which underscores the collective management of common problems at the international level is at a critical juncture. Although global governance institutions have recorded relatively many successes since they were developed after the Second World War, the growing number of issues on the international agenda, and their complexity, is outpacing the ability of international organizations and national governments to cope (Mishra, 2013). Reinforcing the above is the fact that global governance is a product of neo-liberal paradigm shifts in international political and economic relations. Thus, the privileging of capital and market mechanisms over state authority has created governance gaps that have encouraged actors from private and civil society sectors to assume authoritative roles previously considered the purview of the state (Jang, et al, 2016). These

complexities resulting from contemporary international realities are among the issues that define the current challenges of global governance.

More specifically, Mishra (2013, p. 622) argued that at the beginning of the 21st century, threats such as ethnic conflicts, infectious diseases, and terrorism as well as a new generation of global challenges including climate change, energy, security, food and water scarcity, international migration flows and new technologies are increasingly taking centre stage. In short, Weiss, et al (2009) contended that as the first decade of the twenty first-century comes to a close, mounting challenges facing the world are characterized by the intensifying interconnectedness of global and regional issues: political tensions; climate change; water shortages; financial, economic and food crises; ecosystem disruptions; increasing inequality and persistent poverty. Weiss, et al (2009) maintained that the food riots around the world in early 2008 were manifestations of this trend that blurs the boundaries between political, climate, energy, agriculture, trade, technology, and other factors. Later, the financial and economic crisis demonstrated how quickly national calamities could spread and affect development strategies far beyond the financial and economic arena in one country, requiring coordinated international responses. In all of these crises, the disjuncture between their global nature and the national centers of decision-making was obvious.

Regarding the 2008-2009 global financial crisis and the unparalleled systemic risk it posed to global governance in the 21st century, Goldin and Vogel (2010) puts it succinctly:

2008-2009 financial crisis…illustrates the failure of even sophisticated global institutions to manage the underlying forces of systemic risk…. this is symptomatic of institutional failure to keep pace with globalisation. The failure of the most developed and best-equipped global governance system, finance, to recognise or manage the new vulnerabilities associated with globalization in the 21st century highlights the state and urgency of the global governance challenge (Goldin and Vogel, 2010, p. 4).

Furthermore, the shift to a multipolar world is complicating the prospects for effective global governance. Power in the current system of global governance has become more diffused. The power shift accompanying the rise of Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa (BRICS) and other 'rising powers' pose questions about the possible reordering or shifts in the current state of global governance. To be sure, the expanding economic clout of emerging powers increases their political

influence well beyond their borders (Mishra, 2013; Jang, et al, 2016). For instance, Weiss, et al, (2009) observed that:

…the so-called unipolar moment that followed the end of the Cold War lasted for two decades but seems to have ended; China and India have been on the rise for some time as major economic and political powers; Russia's actions demonstrate the intent to reassert influence around the globe; the United States has set aside its multilateral leadership mantle since the attacks of 11 September; the traditional powers are facing stiff challenges from Japan, and increasingly a handful of emerging countries like BRICS, Indonesia and Egypt; the Gulf countries have amassed large reserves, thanks to oil revenue, and, together with China and India, have been buying Western banks and other firms. Despite the rapidly changing contours of international relations, such trends are poorly reflected in the structures and functioning of the multilateral system (Weiss, et al, 2009, pp. 10-11).

According to a jointly issued report by the United States' National Intelligence Council (NIC) and the European Union's Institute for Security Studies (EUISS, 2011, cited in Mishra, 2013, p. 623), India is ranked as the third most powerful country in the world after the US and China and the fourth most powerful bloc after the US, China and the European Union. The report concluded that current governance frameworks will be unable to keep pace with looming global challenges unless extensive reforms are implemented. It is imperative to add that, the emerging powers are highly suspicious of current institutional arrangements, which appear to favour established powers and have not only repeatedly voiced their concerns but have taken concrete measures to remedy the anomaly (Folarin, et al, 2016).

In addition, power is not only shifting from established powers to rising countries and, to some extent, the developing world, but also towards non-state actors. According to Jang, et al (2016) a multitude of actors, besides states, define and shape the current structure of global governance among which are international organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), multinational corporations, scientific experts, civil society groups, networks, partnerships, private military and security companies, as well as transnational criminal and drug-trafficking networks which provide world politics with multi-actor perspectives and take part in steering the political system. On a positive note, these diversities of actors have been equally, if not more effective than states at reframing issues and mobilizing public consciousness to global governance agenda; however, hostile

non-state actors such as criminal organizations and terrorists networks, all empowered by existing and new technologies, can pose serious security threats and compound systemic risks (Goldin & Vogel, 2010; Mishra, 2013; Joshua & Chidozie, 2015; Graham, 2015).

It is inevitable therefore; that a new structural framework for global governance has become imperative to augment and support what has been widely perceived as institutional gaps in the established international organisations. To this we turn our attention.

## 4. SDGs: A Paragon of Global Governance

With the expiration of the Millennium Developmental Goals (MDGs) in 2015, the United Nations with its integral member states and stakeholders charted another route for the overall benefit of all and sundry in the global space- the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The SDGs was designed as a successor and also as an update to improve on the shortcomings of the MDGs and is intended to run over a period of 15 years (2015-2030).

'SDGs were developed not by a growing group of experts but by an unprecedented global priority-setting process, engaging more than a million people around the world through global surveys, reports and consultations in nearly 100 countries' (Friedman & Gostin, 2016, p. 5). The 17 goal developmental agenda centers on enhancing the economic, social and environmental aspects of sustainable development; with strict focus on people, planet, prosperity, peace and partnership; areas which appear critical for humanity and the planetary system at large (Unsdsn, 2015; UN, 2015; Lead, 2016).

Specifically, in regards to humanss, it seeks to eradicate hunger and poverty in all its forms and dimensions while guaranteeing moderate conditions for man to fulfill his potentials equally and in a sane environment (UN, 2015). For the planet, the agenda seeks to cure and protect the sanity of the environment, as well as to discourage further degradation of the environment. This remains a central goal of the plan of action, in order to ensure that natural resources do not become depleted so that it becomes sustainable to serve the needs of both present and future generations (UN, 2015).

Furthermore, SDGs seeks to offer economic, technological and social prosperity to all and sundry and ensures that progress is driven in harmony with nature (UN,

2015). And as the sustainability of progress and development hinges on peaceful coexistence among humans, SDGs targets to foster peaceful, inclusive and just societies across the international system since it is imperative for sustainable development.

In the actualization of these targets, it seeks to be all embracing and all encompassing, drawing support from various actors and across many levels in the international system. Thus, mobilizing global support in combating the ambiguous challenges of contemporary international system (environment, poverty, increased inequality and war), while carrying everybody along.

Unambiguously, the 17 goal Sustainable Development Plan as designed by the United Nations essentially reflects the following:

1.  End poverty in all its forms
2.  Zero hunger, adequate food, security, improved nutrition and sustainable agriculture.
3.  Improved health and well-being for all people and ages.
4.  Quality, equitable, inclusive and lifelong learning opportunities and education.
5.  Empowerment of women and girls and improved gender parity.
6.  General availability and sustainability of clean water.
7.  Availability of affordable, reliable and sustainable up-to-date energy.
8.  Increased decent employment and inclusive-sustainable economic growth.
9.   Constructing solid infrastructure as well as sustainable and inclusive industrialization with accelerated innovations.
10.  Reduction of inequality within and among countries.
11.  Sustainable and inclusive safety of cities and human settlements.
12.  Sustainable production and consumption patterns globally.
13.  Combating climate change and its threat.
14.  Conservative use of the seas, marines and ocean resources in a sustainable manner.
15.  Promote the use of the terrestrial eco-systems in a sustainable manner, protect biodiversity, halt and restore land degradation, promote sustainable management of the forest and combat desertification.
16.  Promoting peace, justice and accountable institutions at all levels.
17. Stronger partnerships for the implementation and revitalization of the Sustainable development (UN, 2015).

Each of these 17 goals has its own specific targets, 169 in all and 230 indicators that ought to have become reality by 2030 (IAEG-SDGs, 2016). Each of the targets takes into consideration national limitations and definitions and seek solutions accordingly.

Although, the SDGs has attracted criticism from some commenters, who reason that the goals are too broad and unrealistic (Easterly, 2015), the focus on ending and not reducing poverty, hunger among others has been perceived as quite unrealistic and unattainable on a global scale. In spite of these criticisms however, the SDGs still remains an imperative plan of action for people, planet and prosperity (Kumar, 2017). As it addresses the cogent challenges confronting current international system and the planet as a whole, it represents the best plan of action to be adopted at all levels especially by international organizations, in combating common and ubiquitous challenges among its member states.

Unarguably, international organizations are indispensable actors in international relations for the conduct and operations of global governance. However, due to the backlash of globalization and the alleged ineffectiveness of these international organizations in posing constructive solutions to global and national challenges, the effectiveness and legitimacy of various international organizations have been questioned recently via the current wave of nationalistic aspirations displayed across Europe and America.

Gutner and Thompson (2010), advance that given the fact that international organizations are often undemocratic in nature as they are far removed from individual citizens, coupled with the fact that there is an absence of transparency in the decision-making process, as well as lack of accountable measures, performance therefore remains the only pathway to legitimacy. Thus, effectiveness of the organizations is key to granting of legitimacy. However, a common definition of effectiveness is whether the organisation is able to solve the problem that brought about its establishment. This can be measured basically in two ways according to Helm and Sprinz (2000): Are there any observable improvement as compared to the state of affairs before the establishment? And how close is the performance of the establishment towards solving the problem?

Since the sprouting of populist aspiration is predicated on the failures of international organizations and other cogent actors to effectively control the complex and negative vibrations of globalization (growing inequalities, poverty, terrorism, unemployment, migrant's crisis among others). It follows that, the

reduction of neo-national aspirations and the granting of legitimacy to international organizations, lie in the effectiveness of such organizations to design and implement adequate measures to combat the negative precipitation of globalization.

In order to ensure the efficiency of global governance, Wilkinson argues that the United Nations as one of the prominent international organisations, must continually play central role in global governance process, because, it represents the 'only forum where the government of the world come together on an equal footing and on a regular basis to try to resolve the world's most pressing problems' (Wilkinson, 2005, p. 28). Hence, using the SDGs, an initiative of the United Nations as a model, we argue that the global transformative agenda for people, planet and prosperity could become the most effective vehicle for promoting global governance agenda. The agenda could be a model for various international organizations to propel and coordinate development in specific regions or sub-regions since it is wider in scope, more inclusive and touches on the major problems confronting humanity at large irrespective of region.


## 5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This paper has strongly and persistently advanced the notion that prominent international organizations are fast losing their relevance and credibility on the basis of fulfilling their traditional goals of global governance. It premised this argument on the fact that changing dynamics in international relations accentuated by the vibrations of globalization are jointly responsible for the erosion of the old templates of global governance structures. Worse still, the world's multilateral institutions, with the UN at the centre, are ill-equipped, unable, or seemingly unwilling to reform and catalyse quick, necessary and drastic action in the face of major global crises. The paper repeatedly inferred that without adequate framework to bring order to an international system in flux, disorder could prevail, fuelling greater instability. Thus, the mix of old and new challenges generate new requirements for collective problem-solving, more international cooperation and innovative approaches. This, in our assessment, describes eloquently the SDGs model as a modern structure for global governance initiative.

Flowing from the above assertion, it is evident that some slow progress has been made to adjust international institutions and regimes to meet the new demands and to create workarounds, if not new frameworks. It is our view that such efforts are

unlikely to suffice if global governance, structures and processes continue to ignore the changes in the balance of power in the international system; a move that will obliterate completely these insignificant efforts. Therefore, we concur with Jang et al (2016:1) that the future of global governance will be anchored on individual empowerment, increasing awareness of human security, institutional complexity, international power shifts and the liberal world political paradigm.

## 6. References

Adeniran, T. (1982). *Introduction to International Relations*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books.

Akindele, R.A. (2000). Institutional Capacity-Building and Restructuring for the Conduct of Multilateral Diplomacy at the Global Level: Reflections on Trends and Development. In Jide Owoeye (ed.) *Nigeria in International Institutions*. Ibadan: College Press.

Albrow, M. (1990). *Globalization Knowledge and Society.* London: Sage.

Archer, C. (2001). *International Organizations: Third Edition*. London: Routledge.

Armstrong, D. & Gilson, J. (2011). Civil Society and International Governance. In David Armstrong et al (eds.) *Civil Society and International Governance: The Role of Non-State Actors in Global and Regional Regulatory Frameworks.* New York: Routledge.

Barkin, J. S. (2006). *International Organization: Theories and Institutions.* New York: Palgrave.

Commision on Global Governance. (1995). *Our Global World.* Oxford: Oxford University.

Diehl, F. P. (2005). *The Politics of Global Governance: International Organizations in an Interdependent World* (3rd ed.). Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Easterly, W. (2015, September 28). *The SDGs Should stand for Sensless, Dreamy, Garbled.* Retrieved June 12, 2017, from Foriegn Policy: http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/09/28/the-sdgs-are-utopian-and-worthless-mdgs-development-rise-of-the-rest/.

Folarin, S., Ibietan, J and Chidozie, F. (2016). Nigeria and the BRICS: Regional Dynamics in Emerging Economies' Studies, *Journal of South African Business Research*. Vol. 2016.

Friedman, A.E., & Gostin, O.L. (2016). The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals: Achieving the Vision of Global Health with Justice. *The Georgetown Public Policy Review, 21*(1), 1-25.

Goldin, I., & Vogel, T. (2010). Global Governance and Systemic Risk in the 21st Century: Lessons from the Financial Crisis. *Global Policy*. Vol.1, Issue 1, pp. 4-15.

Graham, K. (2015). *Global Studies Research Series: Research Report 1. Global Governance and the UN Security Council (Part A).* New Zealand: New Zealand Centre for Global Studies, pp. 1-13.

Gutner, T., & Thompson, A. (2010). The Politics of IO Performance: A Framework. *The Review of International Organizations, 5*(3), 227-248.

Helm, C., & Sprinz, D. (2000). Measuring the Effectivness of International Environmental Regimes. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 44*(5), 630-652.

Hurd, I. (2011). *International Organizations: Politics, Law, Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

IAEG-SDGs. (2016). *Final List of Proposed Sustainable Development Goal Indicators.* Report of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators, UN Statistical Commision. Retrieved June 9, 2017, from https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/11803Official-List-of-Proposed-SDG-Indicators.pdf.

Jang, J.; McSparren, J. & Rashchupkina (2016). Global Governance: Present and Future. United States: *Palgrave Communications*, pp. 1-5.

Joshua, S. & Chidozie, F. (2015). Al-Shabab: An Emerging Terrorist Group in Somalia. *African Renaissance Journal*, Adonis and Abbey, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 81-105.

Karns, P. M., Mingst, A. K., & Stiles, K. W. (2015). *International Organizations: The Politics and Processes of Global Governance.* Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Klabbers, J. (2005). Two Concepts of International Organization. *International Organizations Law Review, 2*(2), 277-293. doi:10.1163/157237405775093717.

Kumar, R. (2017, January 30). *Critics of the Sustainable Development Goals were wrong. Here's why.* Retrieved June 16, 2017, from World Economic Forum: https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/01/turns-out-sdg-critics-were-wrong/.

Lead. (2016, June). *Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): 2015-2030.* Retrieved June 10, 2017, from Lead: http://www.lead.org.pk/lead/attachments/SDGFlyer_english.pdf.

Mattelart, A. (2000). *Networking the World, 1794-2000.* (L. Carey-Libbrecht, & A. C. Cohen, Trans.) Minneapolis MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Mishra, P. (2013). Emerging Challenges to Global Governance in 21st Century. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies.* (MCSER Publishing, Rome, Italy). Vol. 2, No. 8, pp. 622-626.

Novotny, T.E. (2007) "Global Governance and Public Health Security in the 21st Century". *California Western International Law Journal* (CWSL). Vol. 38, No.1, Article 6, pp. 19-40.

Rosenau, N. J. (2005). Governance in the Twenty-First Century. In R. Wilkinson, *The Global Governance Reader* (pp. 45-67). New York: Routledge.

Scholte, J.A (2004). Civil Society and Democracy in Global Governance. In Timothy J. Sinclair (ed.) *Global Governance: Critical Concepts in Political Science*. New York: Routledge.

***(June, 2015). Stimson Center Report of the Commission on Global Security, Justice and Governance. Confronting the Crisis of Global Governance.

UN. (2015). *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Developement.* Retrieved June 11, 2017, from UN:

https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/21252030%20Agenda%20for%20Sustaina
ble%20Development%20web.pdf.

Unsdsn (2015, December). *Getting Started with the Sustainable Development Goals* . Retrieved from
Unsdsn:       http://unsdsn.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/151211-getting-started-guide-FINAL-PDF-
.pdf.

Weiss, T. G. (2013). *Global Governance: Why? What? Whither?* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Weiss, T.G., Kanninen, T., & Busch, M.K. (2009). Sustainable Global Governance for the 21st
Century: The United Nations Confronts Economic and Environmental Crisis Amidst Changing
Geopolitics. *Occasional Papers: Dialogue on Globalization*. No. 45, pp. 1-52.

Wilkinson, R. (2005). The Commission on Global Governance: A New Word . In R. Wilkinson, *The
Global Governance: A Reader* (pp. 26-44). New York: Routledge.

World Bank. (2000). *Poverty in an Age of Globalization.* Retrieved April 14, 2017, from World Bank:
www.worldbank.org/html/extdr/pb/globalization/povertyglobalization.