In the United States, effective coordination norms of law are characteristic of higher regional legislation, including state constitutions [1, 89].

For example, the Coordinating norms of law are quite widespread in the Constitution of the State of Massachusetts [2].

In a separate group of coordinating constitutional norms, it is possible to combine the norms on the coordination of the activities of government bodies as separate units.

For example, article 5 of section 3 of the Constitution suggests ways to coordinate the adjournment and adjournment of a council meeting.

The Governor, by the advice of the council, has full power and authority, during the sitting of the general court, to adjourn or adjourn the same for any time that both Houses may desire; [and to dissolve the same on the day preceding the last Wednesday in May;] and in the recess of the said court, to adjourn the same from time to time, not exceeding ninety days in any recess; and to convene it before the time for which it may be adjourned or postponed, if the welfare of the commonwealth so requires.; and in the event of any contagious plague prevailing at the place where the said court is to meet at any time, or for any other reason which may endanger the health or life of the members from their presence, it may order the meeting to be held at some other most convenient place within the State.

In the event of a disagreement between the two Houses as to the necessity, expediency, or time of adjournment or postponement, the Governor, on the advice of the Council, has the right to adjourn or adjourn the General Court for no more than ninety days, as he determines that the public good requires it (article 6, section 3 of the Constitution).

This also seems to include the rules on the special coordination powers of certain authorities.

For example, article 1 of section 3 of the Constitution details the coordinating powers of the Council. Article 87 of the amendments to the Constitution provides a detailed scheme for the State Governor to coordinate the organization of the activities of the executive authorities.

Thus, as we can see, the coordinating norms of law in the Constitution of the State of Massachusetts are quite diverse.
Their advantages include the obvious conditionality of the objective necessity of management issues, the versatility of the relations regulated by these norms, and the skillful use of coordination as an effective and flexible management method.

Among the disadvantages of the coordination rules of law in the Constitution of Massachusetts we reckon weak procedural, organizational elaboration of these rules, among them the lack of proper standardization, use of the most primitive ways of coordinating and tools, and not addressing issues of legal liability for failure to execute coordinated decisions by any of the members of the coordinating process.
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