



**Table 7.3** A summary of performance by different layers of governance in terms of the five OPASI criteria of 'good governance'.

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Local</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>European</b>	<b>Global</b>
Openness	Formally open and accessible processes of consultation; the layer of governance that is closest to citizens, which is seen as key to sustainability. The Web helps openness for those with access and skills.	Governments publish consultations on e.g. energy and transport, but there is heavy media management. Freedom of information laws help openness but are not always observed. The Web aids openness and reforms.	Many documents are easily available but in impenetrable language. Little media attention. The Aarhus Convention on citizens' environmental rights shows how the EU can prompt national action and openness.	Structures of 'global governance' in their infancy. Difficult to keep tabs on national politicians (e.g. in climate change talks). Webcasts of open sessions help increase openness.
Participation	Low turn-outs for local elections, although citizens may participate also via consultations or single issue campaigns	Formal participation through voting is generally falling, but elections are transparent and legitimate.	Low turn-outs for European Parliament elections. Council of Ministers made up of elected politicians. Unelected lobbyists and campaigners are also active.	Developed-world government and business are most influential players. Participation by local or excluded communities and NGOs is often only tokenistic.



Accountability	Strong formal accountability through clearly identifiable councillors. Environmental considerations habitually come second to the goal of local economic growth. Examples of integration of these goals are rare.	Strong formal accountability via elected politicians. Environment departments are the main voice on sustainability in government, but are rarely powerful in budgetary or political terms.	EU is a new kind of <b>supranational body</b> . Power shared by Council of Ministers, the Parliament and Commission. The Environment Directorate in the Commission (DGXI) is a whistleblower and adviser to others, but is weak.	Global governance structures are weak. Trade bodies (e.g. WTO) are most influential, and are deemed by NGOs and other critics to be dominated by business interests. UN environment bodies are comparatively weak. There is no international environmental court or ombudsman.
Subsidiarity	Formally open and Grassroots activism is always key to environmentalism. This is the delivery end. But can the mass of local actions add up to global sustainability?	National governments are often the best scale on which to translate globally agreed goals into policies achievable in a specific context, such as housing, energy standards or taxation.	Although growth is central to the EU, it has advanced environmental policies; efficiencies and benefits flow due to the size of the market and 'level playing field' of regulations.	Global level difficult but essential. Although outcomes are often weak (e.g. Kyoto), they can be important reference points and motivate national and local actions.



<p>Integration</p>	<p>Local policies have to live alongside national and neighbouring local policies. Contradictions can be most evident at this level (e.g. in planning, waste, transport).</p>	<p>National government has the best chance of achieving policy integration: in most countries it has most control over tax and spending. Also authority both on global and local stages. But indicators show poor integration.</p>	<p>ESustainable development in key documents (e.g. the Maastricht Treaty), but economic growth is a primary driver of policies and programmes.</p>	<p>In 2002 WSSD showed how the complexity of both environmental change issues and the politics surrounding them makes integration difficult at global level.</p>
--------------------	---	--	--	--