International Journal of Innovative Research in Computer Science & Technology (IJIRCST)
ISSN: 2347-5552, Volume-10, Special Issue-9, September-2022
Innovative Projects 2022
Organized by Presidency University, Bangalore, India

A Study on Some International Informal Agreements

Ranjeet Mathew Jacob
Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email Id-ranjeet.mathew@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

The most prevalent and least researched kind of international cooperation is informal agreements. They enable governments to reach advantageous agreements without the formalities of treaties, ranging from simple oral agreements to intricate executive agreements. They vary from treaties in many ways than simply the way that they operate. Tradition dictates that the purpose of treaties is to increase the legitimacy of commitments by putting a nation's reputation on their adherence. Informal agreements are advantageous because of their more ambiguous character. They are selected in order to avoid formal, public national commitments, to bypass political roadblocks associated with ratification, to make agreements swiftly and covertly, and to provide room for future modification or even repudiation. Although the Cuban missile crisis was resolved by informal agreement, they vary from formal agreements since the underlying pledges are less clear and more ambiguous. Thus, the predominance of such informal tools exposes not just the potential for global cooperation but also the real-world challenges and institutional constraints on endogenous enforcement.

KEYWORDS:

Agreements, Informal, International, Treaties.

I. INTRODUCTION

Samuel Goldwyn once stated, "Verbal contracts aren't worth the paper they're written on." However, unwritten agreements and verbal deals permeate the world of politics. They are the shape that global collaboration takes on a variety of topics, from nuclear weapons to currency rates. Take money matters as an example. Since the collapse of the Bretton Woods system in 1971, there have been no official, comprehensive agreements on exchange rates, with the exception of the regional European Monetary System. Despite several attempts to revive the pegged-rate system, which were created and formally signed, they were unsuccessful. Private financial markets just outperformed these government initiatives, and central bankers finally agreed. The only major agreement since then, reached in Jamaica in 1976, just confirmed an unanticipated system of variable rates.

In order to deal with erratic currency fluctuations, financial arrangements have evolved over the last fifteen years into a series of informal, indefinitely lasting accords, most notably the Plaza Communique and the Louvre Accord. In its last years, the Bretton Woods system itself was dependent on such accords. The secret agreement of European central banks not to convert their significant dollar holdings into gold kept it together. When Germany and France backed out of that pledge, the system collapsed. They did so because they thought the US had broken its own (tacit) promise to control inflation and steer clear of significant current account imbalances. In other words, the Bretton Woods system's fundamental core the U.S. official guarantee to convert dollars into gold at $35 per ounce was supported only by tacit promises that America wouldn't be required to do so. These unwritten understandings are essential in security partnerships as well [1], [2].

Relations between the United States and the Soviet Union have often hinged on unspoken agreements. These unspoken connections are important for two reasons. First, in terms of actual treaty commitments, the Americans and the Soviets made relatively few, and even less in crucial national security sectors. Second, both sides were outspoken in their denial of the benefits and even the legitimacy of collaboration for a significant portion of the postwar period. At times, the rhetoric went far further, questioning the enemy's ability to rule at home, its fundamental security interests abroad, and its credibility in international relations. Despite this, both the US and the USSR typically formulated their fundamental security strategies in a more cautious and cautious manner. Even at the height of Cold War hostilities, the U.S. chose containment over "rollback," which was a covert recognition of the Soviet sphere of influence in Eastern Europe. The United States did little to support resistance groups in Germany, Poland, and Hungary or to prevent their brutal repression when mass uprisings began in the

1950s. Such measures have been referred to as the "unspoken rules" of superpower diplomacy by Paul Keal. Not all informal agreements between the superpowers include unwritten norms. Both the Americans and the Soviets openly declared that they would uphold the first SALT pact once it came to an end in October 1977 in the matter of strategic weapons constraints. The main objective was to maintain a cooperative atmosphere while SALT II was being discussed. Even throughout the significant armament buildup during the Reagan administration, the unratified pact was legally followed [3], [4].

Despite the lack of a formal agreement, both sides limited certain classes of long-range nuclear weapons to comply with SALT II restrictions. The Reagan administration insisted that its nuclear policy was voluntary and unilateral at all times. However, it spent a lot of time worrying about potential Soviet "violations" of a pact that never existed. These transgressions were significant because President Reagan consistently insisted that progress toward a new arms pact and Soviet reciprocity were necessary for U.S. weapons limitations. Reagan regularly condemned the Soviet Union on both counts, but in reality, he kept the SALT limitations in place far beyond the intended treaty's expiry date. Despite being tacit, the agreement was still in place. Informal agreements between governments and international actors are common. Such agreements' scope and variety suggest that they are a common occurrence in international politics, rather than being uncommon and incidental. The extreme informality of so many accords sheds light on fundamental tenets of world politics. It draws attention to the ongoing quest for global collaboration, the variety of shapes it takes, and the significant barriers standing in the way of longer-lasting commitments. All international agreements, official or informal, are promises about how a country will act in the future. Genuine agreements must have reciprocal pledges or behaviors that suggest future obligations in order to be deemed agreements. If a state doesn't fully and authoritatively ratify a treaty, as is the case with most agreements, such agreements may be seen as being more or less informal [5], [6].

The degree to which agreements are informal varies along two main dimensions. The first factor is the level of government where the agreement is formed. Short of a ratified treaty, a promise made by the head of state (an executive agreement) is the most obvious and reliable indication of policy objectives. Lower-level bureaucrats' pledges to key issues are less successful in securing binding national policy. They simply impose fewer restrictions on heads of state, top political figures, and other parts of the government, in part because they have no discernible negative effects on the image of the country. The second dimension is the way an agreement is articulated, or the shape it takes. It may be described in a lengthy written document, or it could entail a less formal exchange of notes, a joint statement, an oral agreement, or even a tacit agreement. Written agreements provide more detail-focus and more explicit assessment of potential situations. They enable the parties to define the parameters of their commitments, to more precisely manage them, or to purposefully introduce uncertainty and omissions on contentious issues [7], [8].

Oral and tacit agreements fall at the opposite extreme of the range, where they are the most informal of all. Their assurances are often vaguer and less precisely defined, and it may even be in question whether they have the legal right to make and carry them out. It is sometimes difficult to define what was meant ex ante if issues subsequently develop. It could be challenging to demonstrate that an agreement existed. With implicit norms and unspoken agreements between the parties, the interpretation issues are made much more severe. Are these agreements indeed cooperative ones? That depends. If they only include each actor making their best strategic decision in light of the decisions made by others, they are not. Without collaboration, this Nash equilibrium may result in regular behavior and steady expectations, or order and predictability. Genuine tacit collaboration requires more. It is predicated on common expectations that each party may enhance its own result by altering its strategic decisions in anticipation of similar modifications by others. In either scenario, shared "understandings" may develop. They do not serve as a specific indicator of cooperation partnerships [9], [10].

The complex forms of mutual dependence and the potential for betrayal and remorse are what set cooperation apart, whether it is implicit or explicit. Definitions of tacit agreements and other informal contracts are presented here not for taxonomic purposes but rather to categorize them. The objective is to comprehend how various types of agreements might be utilized to structure international relations. It is crucial to investigate the justification, applications, and constraints of informal ways of international cooperation. At the same time, we shouldn't confuse all agreements for unofficial, voluntary contracts.

II. DISCUSSION

The best way to understand informality is as a tool for reducing barriers to collaboration on both a national and worldwide scale. What are the obstacles? What benefits do informal agreements have in dealing with them? First, informal agreements may be changed more easily than treaties. They are not oaks, but willows. They may be modified to deal with ambiguous circumstances and unforeseen shocks. According to a legal advisor at the

British Foreign Office, "one of the greatest benefits of an informal instrument" is "the ease with which it can be amended." Although renegotiation provisions are often included in treaties, doing so is lengthy, difficult, and almost usually impracticable. Another, less apparent way to state this idea is that participants to informal agreements are not need to provide as much information. There is no need for negotiators to attempt to foresee every possible future situation and explicitly bargain for it. Second, informal agreements may be reached and put into effect swiftly if necessary since they don't need to be elaborately ratified. Speed is a distinct advantage in circumstances that are complicated and changing quickly. Finally, even when they are not secret, informal agreements are often less well-known and visible. Significant repercussions for democratic scrutiny, administrative control, and diplomatic precedent result from this decreased visibility. Informal agreements may avoid the publicity-generating ratification discussion issues. They may stay away from the revelations, one-sided "understandings," and changes that sometimes occur in that open procedure.

They are also more closely regulated by the government bureaucracy that negotiate and carry out the agreements because to their lower profile, and other agencies are less likely to intrude on them. The use of informal agreements allows organizations working on particular international concerns, such environmental pollution or foreign espionage, to quietly negotiate deals with their foreign counterparts without being closely watched or actively involved by other government organizations with competing interests. Informal agreements are less restrictive as diplomatic precedents because of their lower prominence and lack of a formal national commitment. They do not have the same public and all-encompassing policy obligations that treaties often have. For both local and foreign audiences, the most delicate and embarrassing aspects of an agreement may remain ambiguous or unspoken, or even kept a secret from them, in all of these ways.

However, each of these diplomatic advantages has a cost, and often a very costly one. Since informal agreements are more adaptable, they are also simpler to break. Avoiding public discussions hides the breadth of support for an agreement throughout the country. Ratification discussions may also be used to organize and bring together the many constituencies who are interested in a deal. During the implementation phase, agreements are supported by these policy networks of public authorities (executive, legislative, and bureaucratic) and corporate players. Joint declarations and executive agreements circumvent these fundamental democratic procedures. The final agreements are often less trustworthy for all parties as a result of this avoidance.

These expenses and advantages point to the fundamental justifications for selecting informal agreements:

(1) The desire to refrain from making official, public vows,
(2) Wanting to prevent ratification,
(3) The flexibility to adjust or renegotiate as circumstances evolve, or
(4) The urgency of reaching agreements.

We would anticipate that informal agreements will be employed often because speed, simplicity, adaptability, and secrecy are all essential diplomatic criteria. We would also anticipate discovering a distinctive pattern of formal and informal agreements since the accompanying costs and benefits varied depending on the situation. Finally, we would anticipate discovering a variety of informal agreements that are employed to address specific requirements. The advantages and disadvantages of informal agreements are examined in this article. It is an investigation of the underappreciated institutional barriers to international collaboration and the inadequate solutions to remove them. It takes into account the fundamental decisions between informal instruments and treaties, as well as the decisions between other categories of informal agreements, all of which may be used to represent cooperation between nations. And last, it asks what these various types of collaboration might teach us about the more fundamental barriers to global consensus. The purpose of this study is to investigate various issues with rational collaboration in international affairs, especially in terms of their institutional and contextual aspects.

Self-Help and the Limits of International Agreement

When states work together, they have a broad range of options for how to convey their commitments, responsibilities, and expectations. Bilateral and multilateral treaties are the most formal because they require governments to accept their commitments as legally enforceable agreements with full standing under international law. Oral agreements, in which agreements are explicitly made but not recorded, and tacit agreements, in which duties and commitments are implicit but not explicitly stated, represent the opposite extreme. There are a number of written documents that may be used in between formal treaties and tacit or oral agreements to convey national duties more clearly and openly but still lacking official ratification and national commitments. These nonbinding treaties and executive agreements may be combined with memoranda of understanding, joint declarations, final communiqués, agreed minutes, and agreements based on laws. These

informal agreements, unlike treaties, often take effect without ratification and do not call for international publishing or registration. Legal experts seldom ever make a distinction between these agreements, despite the fact that they vary in structure and political aim. The general consensus is that, unless expressly stated differently, all international agreements, regardless of their title, are enforceable against the signatories. As a result, informal agreements that make clear guarantees are mistaken for treaties. With the exception of "nonbinding" agreements like the Helsinki Final Act, they are seldom explicitly researched. It is customary to make this difference between contracts with legal effect and those that do not. The Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties' technical definition of a treaty is centered on it. Treaties are "binding upon the parties" and "shall be performed by them in good faith," according to Article 26. Similar to this, textbooks on international law underline the fact that treaties and a variety of other international agreements are binding.

The implication is that overseas contracts are similarly enforceable and binding to domestic contracts. This assertion is blatantly false. It is an inaccurate and legalistic portrayal of actual international agreements, and it provides a poor explanation of why some governments choose to express agreements via treaties while others choose to do so through informal ways. Despite the fact that international agreements constitute contractual obligations, any straightforward comparison to domestic contracts is incorrect for a number of reasons. First, under domestic legal systems, courts with the support of state authority decide and uphold legally binding agreements. Whether or whether a promise was meant to be a contract, courts have the power to determine its meaning and hold parties accountable for it. When parties negotiate compliance after contracts have been signed, they do so under the watchful eye of governmental and judicial enforcement. Agreements are supported and made easier by the provision of efficient, court-ordered arbitration, regardless of whether the dispute concerns straightforward commitments or intricate business transactions. In the ultimate resort, it does this by enforcing adherence to agreements made privately or, more often, by exacting compensation for violated obligations. Additionally, the possibility of such enforcement influences negotiations outside of court. The legitimacy of these judicial duties is uncontested. They are essential in complicated capitalist systems where free actors collaborate voluntarily. Legal academics disagree on the fundamentals of what should control damage payments in cases when commitments are breached rather than the appropriateness of enforcement authority.

It is obvious that the courts provide political support for the exchange of promises and, in fact, for the institution of promising in all its dimensions, regardless of the threshold for damages. Their function offers persons who receive promises an essential level of protection. It lessens the need for self-defense, decreases the cost of transactions, and encourages contracts and trade in general. Self-protection's burdens may be lessened, but not completely removed. It might be expensive or impractical to uphold agreements in local courts. Contractual rights and responsibilities are not always upheld. The likelihood that contractual breaches will not be reimbursed or would be compensated insufficiently is increased by these expenses and uncertainty. Knowing this, the parties must search inside themselves for some kind of opportunistic defense. Additionally, it is true that domestic courts do not arbitrate contract issues on their own will. They are requested by disputing parties, who do so on their own initiative, at their own expense, and at their own risk. In that regard, access to the legal system might be seen of as an addition to other types of self-help. Similar to these other types, it is expensive and has a hazy outcome.

Even while self-help is a feature of all agreements, there are still significant distinctions between domestic and international agreements. Whether or not the disagreements are resolved in court, the possibility of judicial interpretation and execution looms over domestic agreements. These functions in international accords have simply no comparable. Naturally, the parties to an international conflict may agree to pursue court resolution or private arbitration. States may also voluntarily agree in advance to the employment of dispute resolution processes under multilateral accords. There may be teeth to these operations. They may lessen the difficulties of reprisal and increase the diplomatic costs of infractions. However, the penalties are also quite limited. Most of the time, they only describe and defend certain, restrained actions of self-enforcement or retaliation. They may, at best, compel a violation to renounce membership in a multilateral organization or agreement and withdraw from it.

That may constitute punishment, to be sure, but the penalties for breaking domestic contract laws are far more severe. There, the withdrawal rights are accompanied with external enforcement of damages, which is often based on unmet profit expectations. These fundamental distinctions between domestic and international agreements shouldn't be overshadowed by the fact that all agreements have certain components for self-protection and some institutions for private governance. Domestic legal systems not only support the enforcement of contracts but also effectively define the parameters of their nature and extent. The private, voluntary arrangement of relationships is restricted by laws and judicial decisions. For instance, a significant percentage of criminal law is dedicated to prosecuting certain types of private agreements, such as prostitution, gambling, and the selling of illegal narcotics. The justification is that greater public goals should take precedence over the wants of the

immediate participants, hence their agreements should be prohibited or limited. For better or worse, all civil laws pertaining to rent control, usury, insider trading, cartel price-fixing, gay marriage, and indentured slavery are intended to prohibit private agreements. These limitations and the laws that control them are fundamental components of domestic legal systems.

Similar to how it may limit what agreements can look like. The U.S. Statute of Frauds, which mandates that some agreements be in writing, is one specific and well-known example. Again, neither the structure nor the content of international agreements are subject to any such constraints. Simply put, the realm of potential international agreements is the realm of acceptable accords. Although they are undoubtedly lacking, the absence of an international legislative and administration is not the only cause of this lack of restriction. It is also a result of the lack of an efficient adjudication mechanism. A significant restriction on illegal domestic transactions is that they are not subject to judicial enforcement, in addition to any direct penalties. This limits such deals by making them more expensive to carry out. Implementing illicit contracts requires particular safeguards and sometimes involves creating a larger network of institutional arrangements, or criminal business.

Extralegal agreements face significant challenges because of these expensive self-enforcement costs and the risks of opportunism. In fact, if they fail to address such fundamental issues as moral hazard and temporal inconsistency, the costs can be exorbitant. The same challenges are a necessary part of interstate negotiating and must be overcome if agreements are to be reached and implemented. The parties' preference orderings, the openness of their preferences and decisions (asymmetrical information), and the private institutional structures put up to protect their agreements all play a role in how they are resolved. However, whether or whether a global agreement is regarded as "legally binding" has no bearing on the matter. The distinction between selling whiskey illegally in Al Capone's Chicago and lawfully selling the same product 10 years later is significant in domestic affairs, on the other hand.

Therefore, the phrase "binding agreement" in international relations is a deceptive exaggeration. States must act on their own behalf in order to uphold their agreements. This restriction is important because it acknowledges that international politics is a field of conflicting sovereign powers. Because of this, it is incorrect to interpret treaties (as international lawyers sometimes do) as solely formal, legal documents that in some way obligate governments to keep their word. It is undoubtedly true that formal obligations are expressed in treaties via precise promises and words like "we shall" and "undertake." The use of such formal diplomatic language is a hallmark of contemporary accords. However, such phrase is unable to fulfill its grandiose goal of requiring nations to keep their obligations. The inability to do so places a restriction on negotiations for international cooperation. It implies that all foreign agreements, including treaties, must be upheld internally.

What Do Treaties Do?

Why do nations use such phrase if treaties do not really bind them? Why are contracts written in such format? The main reason, in my opinion, is that states are utilizing a recognized form to convey their objectives with exceptional intensity and seriousness. The choice to codify a deal in treaty form is largely made to emphasize the significance of the contract and, much more, the longevity and value of the underlying commitments. In other terms, the phrase "binding commitments" refers to a diplomatic message sent to other signatories and often to outside parties. Treaties utilize customary forms to denote a seriousness of commitment in the absence of international institutions that facilitate effective self-binding or provide external assurances for pledges. The parties make it clear that they at least intend to uphold a specific agreement by making that commitment formal and public. Treaties thus have the effect of increasing the political costs of noncompliance. That expense increases for oneself as well as for others.

The reputational consequences of disobedience are larger the more formal and public the commitment. The expenses are greatest when the agreement includes precise written pledges that are made in public by high-ranking individuals and are fully endorsed by the state. States consciously decide to bear these expenses so they may profit from the counterpromises (or other people's actions). These explicit commitments are the closest that governments may get to precommitment to a contractual exchange of promises given the inherent limitations of international organizations. In summary, the fact that treaties openly risk the parties' reputations on their promises is a significant component of them. In terms of the policy calculation, the loss of confidence (due to intentional breaches) is a genuine loss, but it is certainly not always a decisive one. Because there is less at risk in terms of reputation, informal agreements are often less trustworthy and compelling. The stakes are lower either because high-level officials are less directly engaged or because the agreements are less public.

Reputation has importance in a world where we lack complete knowledge and cannot know with certainty what others' preferences are now or in the future. It may thus be used as a "hostage" or bond to back contracts. A loss

of reputational capital results from breaching a contract or even just seeming to do so since it damages reputation. Although it cannot ensure compliance, the possibility of such loss encourages it. Whether it is successful is determined by (1) the immediate advantages of breaching an agreement, (2) the stream of future benefits lost and the rate at which that stream is discounted, and (3) the anticipated reputational penalty of particular breaches. Not all offenses result in equal dishonor. First of all, not all are seen.

Some of the violations that are seen may be justified or excused, maybe because others have already broken the agreement, because the situation has changed considerably, because compliance is no longer possible, or because the terms of the contract seem unclear. Thus, social learning and constructed meaning, as well as memory, inference, and context, all important. Second, not every performer has a reputation that merits protection. Some people just have nothing to lose, regardless of whether their infractions are apparent. Additionally, they could decide against investing in reputation since, presumably, the expenses associated with establishing a solid reputation exceed the additional stream of benefits. For instance, sovereign debtors place the least importance on their reputation when they do not anticipate borrowing again. Alternately, performers with a bad reputation (or little experience) can decide to invest in them specifically to raise expectations for their performance in the future. It can be prudent to make such investments if these expectations are likely to result in a steady stream of benefits and if the future is highly valued. As a result, the worth of reputation loss relies on how transparent and clear promises and performance are, how valuable an actor's past reputation is, and how important reputation is seen to be in sustaining other agreements. As I've said, treaty compliance is intended to be a prominent concern backed by reputation. Unfortunately, reputation is not always a reliable hostage. Some states anticipate minimal benefit from improved reputation, either because the costs are too great in the short term or because the benefits are coming too slowly. They could cynically sign accords, knowing they can easily break them.

Others could really agree to accords but simply break them if their projections of future benefits shift. Finally, some governments may make significant investments in order to back up their claims and demonstrate that they are trustworthy partners who are not tempted by potential short-term profits from defecting. In other words, the issue of numerous equilibria is still present despite the significance of reputation in general. There may be diplomatic environments where some governments are dependable treaty partners and others are not, just as there can be economic marketplaces with some vendors of high-quality products and some dealers of poor items, both of them sensible. So reputation may help, if not guarantee, treaty self-enforcement. Self-enforcement simply implies that an agreement continues to be in effect because each side now feels that maintaining the agreement will benefit them more than ending it. All future advantages and disadvantages are included into that calculation and correctly discounted to determine their current worth. One such advantage is enhancing one's dependability reputation. It is especially helpful to governments involved in a variety of international business dealings that call on mutual dependence and trust. Naturally, other expenses and advantages can offset these reputational problems. The crucial thing to remember is that reputation may be utilized to promote international collaboration and has significant effects on how it takes shape. The decision to adopt a formal, public instrument, like a treaty, strengthens self-enforcement and amplifies the reputational implications of adherence.

III. CONCLUSION

The many applications of informal agreements provide light on the potential for global collaboration as well as certain recurring constraints. They stress that collaboration is often limited and that its boundaries could be crucial to the parties. They often seek to limit the length and scope of agreements and prevent any oversimplification of their effects. Often, the techniques are ad hoc while the aims are particularistic. Deals made informally are immediately restricted. Most of the time, there is no desire to expand them to include larger situations, more parties, longer time frames, or more formal duties. They simply do not mark the start of a more extensive or long-lasting cooperative effort. The shape that agreements may take is shaped by these limitations. Interstate agreements are typically made with the intention of keeping them secret from domestic stakeholders, avoiding parliamentary approval, avoiding other states' notice, or being renegotiated. They could have been created without any long-term goals or objectives in mind. They are only temporary arrangements, useful for now but able to be discarded or rearranged when conditions change. Use of informal agreements rather than treaties reduces the diplomatic fallout and reputational ramifications. Time constraints may sometimes lead to the selection of informal agreements. It may be necessary to reach an agreement swiftly and unambiguously to end a crisis; lengthy documentation may not have time to be drafted. They are typical instruments for international collaboration since they can accept these limitations. States commonly employ them to accomplish their national objectives via international agreements. Both adaptable and typical, they are. They make up a "vast substructure of intergovernmental paper," as Judge Richard Baxter once observed. Their existence attests to the ongoing efforts and institutional diversity of international collaboration. Silently, its shape bears witness to its limitations.

REFERENCES

[1] M. Eilstrup-Sangiovanni, "Why the World Needs an International Cyberwar Convention," Philos. Technol., 2018, doi: 10.1007/s13347-017-0271-5.

[2] C. Johns, A. Thorn, and D. VanNijnatten, "Environmental regime effectiveness and the North American Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement," Int. Environ. Agreements Polit. Law Econ., 2018, doi: 10.1007/s10784-018-9385-1.

[3] A. Shevchuk and D. Strebkov, "Safeguards against Opportunism in Freelance Contracting on the Internet," Br. J. Ind. Relations, 2018, doi: 10.1111/bjir.12283.

[4] D. M. Thai and M. Falch, "Universal service in Vietnam: An institutional approach," Telecomm. Policy, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.telpol.2017.10.003.

[5] A. Talberg, P. Christoff, S. Thomas, and D. Karoly, "Geoengineering governance-by-default: an earth system governance perspective," Int. Environ. Agreements Polit. Law Econ., 2018, doi: 10.1007/s10784-017-9374-9.

[6] Q. Tianbao and H. Fang, "China's National Plan on Implementation of the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals: from the Perspective of National Performance of Multilateral Environmental Agreements," J. Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian Natl. Univ., 2018, doi: 10.15330/jpnu.5.2.55-66.

[7] M. E. Recio, "Transnational REDD+rule making: The regulatory landscape for REDD+ implementation in Latin America," Transnatl. Environ. Law, 2018, doi: 10.1017/S2047102518000122.

[8] I. V. Small, "Affecting mobility: Consuming driving and driving consumption in Southeast Asian emerging markets," J. Consum. Cult., 2018, doi: 10.1177/1469540517745704.

[9] F. O. Unuabonah and R. O. Oladipupo, "'You're not staying in Island sha o': O, sha and abi as pragmatic markers in Nigerian English," J. Pragmat., 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2018.07.007.

[10] T. Delreux, "Multilateral Environmental Agreements: A Key Instrument of Global Environmental Governance," in European Union External Environmental Policy, 2018. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-60931-7_2.