

1 **Role of transformative capacity in river basin management transformations**

2 Aleksi Räsänen^{1,2*}, Paula Schönach¹, Alexandra Jurgilevich¹, Milja Heikkinen¹, and Sirkku Juhola¹

3 ¹ Ecosystems and Environment Research Programme, Faculty of Biological and Environmental

4 Sciences, and Helsinki Institute of Sustainability Science (HELSUS), University of Helsinki, Helsinki,

5 Finland

6 ²Department of Geography, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway

7 *Corresponding author, aleksi.rasanen@helsinki.fi, ORCID: 0000-0002-3629-1837

8

9 **Acknowledgements**

10 This research was funded by Helsinki University Centre for Environment (HENVI) [project number
11 77255106], the Academy of Finland [grant 286676] and Tiina and Antti Herlin Foundation [Grant No.
12 20160025]. We thank Anja Nygren, Mira Käkönen, Adrián Monge Monge and Markku Kanninen for
13 helping in the planning and carrying out the stakeholder scenario workshop.

14

15 **Highlights**

- 16 - Lack of studies analyzing transformative capacity in RBM in a multi-scale setting
- 17 - We analyzed transformations and transformative capacity in the River Vantaa basin, Finland
- 18 - Temporal analysis by examining earlier research, policy documents and a stakeholder workshop
- 19 - Three transformations can be identified that have steadily improved the water quality
- 20 - Transformations and transformative capacity are in a multidimensional relationship

21

22

23

24 **Abstract**

25 To tackle problems related to water quantity and quality, transformations in water management systems
26 have become of increasing interest. Transformative capacity can be defined as the ability first to adapt to
27 changes, and if needed, to carry out fundamental changes in a specific system. Using a framework of ten
28 components of transformative capacity and an analysis of earlier historical research, policy documents
29 and data gathered in a stakeholder scenario workshop, we examine the relationship between past and
30 future transformations and transformative capacity in river basin management in the River Vantaa basin,
31 located in southern Finland. In the past, River Vantaa was heavily polluted by municipal wastewater.
32 The water quality has gradually improved but is still not considered good. The most successful changes
33 have been concentrated on point source pollution, such as municipal wastewater, and they have mostly
34 been driven by public administration and municipal coordination. In the future, more effort should be put
35 on diffuse pollution, especially agricultural loading, and this requires changes in societal values and new
36 forms of governance. We show how the past transformations have partly been driven by transformative
37 capacity, but some transformations have enabled changes in the components of transformative capacity,
38 indicating the interconnectedness of the different components. Furthermore, the interplay between
39 transformations and transformative capacity occurs across spatial and temporal scales. We discuss how
40 transformations take time, how transformative capacity evolves over longer time-spans, and how
41 capacity and trajectories in local and wider scales are in a continuous interaction.

42

43 **Keywords:** river basin management; transformation; transformative capacity; water governance; water
44 management; water quality

45

46

1. Introduction

Multiple stressors, including increasing urbanization and population, land use changes and climate change, have influenced changes in the water quality and quantity patterns in various basin areas across the globe (Ferguson et al. 2013; Pahl-Wostl 2015; Abel et al. 2016; Gillon et al. 2016). Due to these changes, many have argued that transformations toward sustainability are needed in order to reduce the risks caused by unsatisfactory water quality, floods and droughts (Ferguson et al. 2013; Pahl-Wostl 2015).

Transformative capacity across governance levels is needed to achieve these transformations (Folke et al. 2010; Chaffin et al. 2016; Pahl-Wostl 2017; Wolfram et al. 2016). Transformative capacity is defined “as the ability of a governance system to first adapt and, if required, transform structural elements as a response to current or anticipated changes in the social or natural environment” (Pahl-Wostl 2015, p. 27). So far, previous research on transformative capacity has focused, for example, on identifying its components (Wolfram 2016).

In river basin management (RBM), past studies have identified transformations in the governance structures toward integrated basin-scale management and more inclusive governance (Daniell and Barreteau 2014; Abel et al. 2016; Jager et al. 2016). Specifically, the Water Framework Directive (WFD) has set ambitious goals for RBM and governance within the European Union. The WFD aims for “good ecological status” of European water bodies, and this should be achieved with participatory, basin-scale, governance. Currently, the results in achieving changes in the water quality and governance are mixed (Jager et al. 2016). In addition to these studies on transformations in RBM, there have been calls for better understanding of how transformations related to water can be governed (Pahl-Wostl 2017). As

71 transformative capacity is needed in achieving transformations, it is crucial to understand what
72 transformative capacity is composed of and how its components interact with each other over time. Thus,
73 the dynamics of capacity, actors and interactions between them are of a particular interest (Pahl-Wostl
74 2017). However, the research on transformative capacity has so far been limited (Chaffin et al. 2016).
75 Furthermore, there is a lack of studies that analyze transformative capacity in RBM taking into account
76 multi-scale interactions, and we address this gap.

77

78 We analyze the past 60 years and potential future changes in the water quality management in the River
79 Vantaa basin, located in southern Finland. Although we concentrate on the river basin scale, we evaluate
80 changes that have happened from local to international scales over time. By using Wolfram's (2016)
81 framework and analysis of earlier historical research, policy documents and data gathered in a
82 stakeholder scenario workshop, we examine the relationship between transformative capacity and
83 transformations in the Vantaa RBM. We argue that previous literature about transformative capacity has
84 merely speculated how transformative capacity is needed for transformations. We show how the
85 relationship between transformations and transformative capacity is bidirectional and multi-scalar and
86 that transformations themselves can trigger changes in capacity.

87

88 **2. River basin management and transformative capacity**

89

90 **2.1. Water governance and the issue of scale**

91

92 Water governance has become one of the prominent challenges in the past decades, aiming to balance
93 between retaining water quality and quantity and satisfying societal needs, in the context of multi-scalar
94 and multi-sectoral interests and management practices (Pahl-Wostl 2015, 2017). The need for sustainable

95 water governance that is able to meet these demands and function in the above-mentioned environment
96 is high (Pahl-Wostl 2017).

97

98 Water resources are governed at different scales, with local and transboundary approaches, such as the
99 RBM. River basin approach to managing water resources has already been used for many decades, due
100 to two reasons: (1) river basin being a natural and thus logical unit for water resources management, and
101 (2) due to the multitude of purposes and stakeholders involved in river use (Downs et al. 1991, Newson
102 1997). RBM, being the cornerstone of integrated water resources management, suggests moving away
103 from detached sectoral approaches toward incorporating those structures and processes that affect water
104 quality and quantity. It also aims to reconcile approaches between the governmental and non-
105 governmental stakeholders, including industry, and those sectors that are not directly involved in the
106 water management but are influenced by it (Heathcote 2009; Molle 2009). However, some scholars have
107 voiced concerns about potential “local traps”, arguing that re-scaling water governance from the (inter-
108)national to local level may not necessarily result in empowering of local actors and more efficient
109 governance (Norman and Bakker 2008).

110

111 **2.2. Transformations and transformative capacity**

112

113 Numerous definitions have emerged for transformations recently, and whilst some differences exist, most
114 consider a transformation to be a fundamental change in a system, which involves multiple actors across
115 scales (O’Brien 2012; Park et al. 2012). More recently, there has been specific interest in transformative
116 change in water-related systems, e.g. at the basin level (Abel et al. 2016) or in urban water systems
117 (Ferguson et al. 2013). These studies highlight the complexity of these systems, as well as the necessity
118 for change toward a more sustainable state. Furthermore, in order to achieve transformative change, we

119 consider, similarly to Folke et al. (2010) that transformations in a system are enabled by transformative
120 capacity.

121

122 Transformative capacity is closely linked to adaptive capacity but presupposes larger, systemic changes
123 (Pahl-Wostl 2017). Whereas adaptive capacity is defined as “the ability of a governance system to alter
124 processes and to adapt structural elements as a response to current or anticipated changes in the social or
125 natural environment”, transformative capacity is defined as “the ability of a governance system to first
126 adapt and, if required, transform its structural elements” (Pahl-Wostl 2017, p. 5). The purpose of
127 developing such capacity is to enable and drive systemic change toward sustainability (Wolfram 2016).

128

129 In this study, we utilize the urban transformative capacity framework (Wolfram 2016), which is the most
130 comprehensive typology of different components of transformative capacity (Table 1). In order to
131 analyze transformations and capacity in a RBM system, we take into account the surrounding institutional
132 context, identifying its comprising elements, governance structures and actors.

133

134 **3. Study area**

135

136 Our study is conducted in the context of River Vantaa that runs through the most densely populated and
137 heavily utilized landscapes in Finland. The 100-km long river runs southward toward its mouth at the
138 Gulf of Finland, approximately 8 km north of the city center of the country’s capital, Helsinki. The basin
139 of 1,685 km² is distributed among fourteen municipalities with several rather small, and seven larger
140 population centers. The river has a modest average flow of 16 m³/s; however, due to small natural
141 capacity to level changes in river flow, the extremes vary considerably. The upper reaches of the basin

142 consist of mainly forest and agricultural land, while increasingly urbanizing areas dominate the southern
143 parts of the basin (Räsänen et al. 2018).

144

145 River Vantaa has been concretely attached to the urbanity of Helsinki since 1876, when the city began a
146 municipal water supply, using the river as its fresh water source. The river's environmental state has been
147 crucial to the capital, and water quality problems that have been reported since the 1930s. The
148 deterioration of river water quality accelerated, especially during the post-WWII decades, when pollution
149 due to industrial chemicals and nutrient surplus from the municipal wastewaters and run-offs from the
150 intensifying agricultural activity changed the river's water composition. The river served as a natural
151 outlet for upstream communities' wastewater, which increased steadily, due to population growth and
152 the construction of sewers that concentrated the discharges into the river. By the end of the 1950s, poorly
153 or entirely untreated wastewaters of more than fifty thousand people turned the river into an open sewer
154 (Schönach 2007). River water quality was at its worst during the 1970s. Despite gradual recovery, the
155 water quality is still not considered good, according to the EU WFD classification. This is primarily due
156 to the nutrient leakage from agricultural lands, and other non-point sources, such as surface runoffs
157 (Vahtera and Männynsalo 2018).

158

159 We argue that the River Vantaa basin is well suited as a case to explore transformative capacity, because
160 (1) it is the example of a continuous and currently on-going urbanization of the river basin area, a process
161 that is increasingly relevant on a global scale (Chin 2006); (2) despite its rather small size, River Vantaa
162 is one of the most important rivers in the national context, due to its long-lasting interconnectedness to
163 many societal functions, such as water supply and recreation, and; (3) the most important and active
164 stakeholders in the river basin management act within the urban context. Thus, this case also aligns with
165 Wolfram's (2016) framework, which applies a broad understanding of 'urban', including a strictly urban

166 setting, and also places in an urban context or having implications for the city. For the purpose of this
167 study, we study transformations related to water quality, affected by diffuse and point source pollution
168 over a period, ranging from the 1950s to the future.

169

170 **4. Methods**

171

172 Since we investigated transformations and related capacity along a long temporal trajectory, we applied
173 multiple methods to analyze past and future oriented transformations. First, to evaluate past trends in the
174 River Vantaa basin, our analysis consisted of five steps: (i) review of existing publications, (ii)
175 identification and selection of three key transformations, (iii) analysis of the transformations with the
176 help of existing publications and additional data sources, (iv) identification of the components of
177 transformative capacity, and (v) assessment what components of transformative capacity were linked to
178 each transformation and other components. Second, we analyzed data gathered in a stakeholder scenario
179 workshop to sketch potential future transformations and capacity that is needed for transformations.

180

181 The history of the River Vantaa management has been recorded extensively, and existing publications
182 provide a valid synthesis of the historical changes of the river and its basin (Herranen 2001; Rahikainen
183 2001; Schönach 2007, 2015; Juuti 2015; Heikkinen et al. 2016). These studies are based on a diverse set
184 of historical sources, which are referenced in detail in the respective publications. The sources include
185 primary, archival documents, policy documents, and media material. We leaned on these studies, and
186 based on their findings, we first constructed a narrative of the historical changes in the River Vantaa
187 basin. Furthermore, three transformations were identified and selected for closer scrutiny. The
188 transformations (problem awareness, detachment, overflow) could be loosely dated along three key
189 temporal phases, although they comprised of both diverse, interlinked, and context-bound trajectories,

190 and single events, which were of importance in the transformations. Additional sources for the analysis
191 of the identified key phases were gathered in a heuristic process (see e.g. Berg 2009, pp. 301–303;
192 Winiwarter and Knoll 2007, pp. 78–80).

193

194 In order to identify the components of transformative capacity, and to analyze their interaction with each
195 other, we drew on Wolfram’s (2016, p. 126) description of transformative capacity as “a qualitative
196 measure for an emergent property that reflects attributes of [...] stakeholders, their interactions, and the
197 context they are embedded in.” In our qualitative content analysis of the material (e.g. Cresswell 2014),
198 we utilized altogether up to 60 factors that indicated and specified different components of transformative
199 capacity (C1-C10), as presented by Wolfram (2016). Our first round of analysis revealed that the
200 identified components of transformative capacity were connected to the culmination events of the
201 transformations in a variety of ways. To better understand the role and qualitative characteristics of these
202 components, we then conducted another round of analysis, in which we filtered components that were
203 linked to each transformation and explored how the components themselves were connected to other
204 components of transformative capacity.

205

206 In addition to the analysis of past transformative capacity, we examined possible futures and desired
207 future transformations in the River Vantaa basin with the help of data gathered during a one-day
208 stakeholder scenario workshop on 2 September 2015. It has been argued that stakeholder scenario
209 workshops are particularly useful in building future scenarios, as well as sharing views and knowledge
210 (Priess and Hauck 2014). Twenty key stakeholders from different levels of administration, academia and
211 civil-society organizations participated in the workshop. We invited stakeholders, who have had long-
212 term experience of the river and who represented various stakeholder groups, including environmental
213 administration, municipal and regional planning, as well as agricultural, environmental and residential

214 organizations. In small groups of 4-6, the participants (1) discussed the major changes in the basin during
215 the past 30 years, (2) voted for the most important drivers of change in the next 30 years, (3) built
216 narratives of four different future scenarios, of which directions were chosen by the workshop organizers,
217 (4) drew potential land use and water management changes in each of the scenarios on a map of current
218 land use, (5) sketched strategies on how the most desirable future could be achieved, and (6) identified
219 barriers that inhibit the scenario to happen (see Räsänen et al. 2017 for more detailed description of the
220 workshop). The data gathered in the workshop was used to consider future changes in the basin but some
221 of the data was also utilized in the historical analysis. From the data, the components of transformative
222 capacity were analyzed using qualitative content analysis (Cresswell 2014).

223

224 **5. Results**

225

226 **5.1. Past transformations at River Vantaa**

227

228 *5.1.1. Transformation I (T1): Awareness transformation*

229

230 In the first transformation, awakening to the poor water quality initiated municipal coordination and
231 improvement in municipal wastewater treatment (Fig. 1). The gradual deterioration of the water quality
232 in River Vantaa was a growing concern, especially since it was the source of water supply of the City of
233 Helsinki. The concern culminated during the 1950s (Schönach 2015). Chemicals, especially phenols,
234 increasingly polluted the river, and caused a repulsive taste in the tap water in Helsinki, caused by
235 reactions of pollutants with water purifying substances. These problems drew national attention, and the
236 Office of the Chancellor of Justice and the Central Criminal Police began investigations into the culprits
237 in 1958 (Juuti 2015). Furthermore, an unprecedented algal bloom of a particularly obnoxious

238 cyanobacteria occurred in the upstream parts of the river in late summer of 1959. While the purified tap
239 water was safe for use, there was a strong taste and smell of mold in the water. Moreover, multiple use
240 of water for cooking, washing and watering, spread the repulsive smell all over the capital (Rahikainen
241 2001; Schönach 2007). These critical events triggered broader acknowledgement and understanding of
242 the vulnerability of the riverine ecosystem to the anthropogenic discharges and the long-lasting negative
243 effects that the past pollution caused in the system (C4).

244

245 In addition to the local events, the national Water Protection Committee recommended an intensification
246 of water protection activities and cooperation with voluntary-based, regional associations in its report
247 (Vesistönsuojelukomitea 1958), and the Water Protection Association of the River Vantaa and Helsinki
248 Region was eventually founded in 1963. With all the municipalities of the basin and several communities
249 and industrial establishments as members, the Association became an intermediary organization that has
250 since its foundation contributed to the diversity of actors involved in the RBM (C1). The leaders of the
251 Helsinki Waterworks have especially been influential and active proponents of the activities within the
252 Association (C2) (Schönach 2007). The Association has also developed into an important actor in
253 knowledge production about the river basin and its condition (C5). Concrete cooperation between the
254 municipalities to protect the river water from further pollution was realized in 1960, when the
255 construction of a wastewater treatment facility became topical in the municipality of Vantaa, just north
256 of Helsinki. Instead of investing in own treatment facilities in Vantaa, the two municipalities agreed on
257 an alternative solution (C5, C10). The wastewater was redirected via transfer pipes to a treatment plant
258 in Helsinki. As this plant discharged directly to the Gulf of Finland, the river was thus spared from
259 additional wastewater loads. The following year, the township of Kerava also followed this arrangement
260 (Schönach 2007). In general, the national legislative developments influenced the increasing emphasis
261 on the river protection (C10) (Rahikainen 2001). For instance, following the new Water Act, which came

262 into effect in 1962, Helsinki established a municipal Board of Water with the aim to prevent the pollution
263 of River Vantaa (C7) (Schönach 2007).

264

265 *5.1.2. Transformation 2 (T2): River detachment from water supply and sewerage*

266

267 In the second transformation, improvement in water quality and a detachment from water supply allowed
268 considerations of river multi-functionality (Fig. 1). The above discussed new water legislation was an
269 important milestone that influenced Finnish wastewater treatment in the long run (C10). The law imposed
270 effective wastewater treatment, even though the implementation of it was at first sluggish, due to
271 exceptions granted to municipalities (Katko 1997). During the following decades, more population
272 centers were attached to the sewage systems within the river basin, and investments in the wastewater
273 purification capacity increased (C7). Most importantly, the trend of diverting wastewaters away from the
274 river through municipal cooperation was extended (C10) (Herranen 2001; Schönach 2007). As
275 highlighted by the workshop participants, increasing investments in technological facilities, such as
276 pumping stations and transfer sewers, were crucial in enabling a reduction of wastewater discharges into
277 the river and thus, its gradual recovery from its degraded state (C7). On the other hand, the costly
278 wastewater treatment and other pollution abatement measures have been subject to a constant debate
279 about priorities in the municipal investments, and the lack of sufficient resources has been highlighted
280 throughout the different phases (Vantaanjoki-toimikunta 1985; Schönach 2015).

281

282 Regional cooperation and close links between the governance regime and the technological arrangement
283 have played a strong role in the River Vantaa RBM. A federation of municipalities, formed in 1976, has
284 also been an important transboundary organization tasked with the promotion of sanitation and water
285 protection issues at the regional level (C1, C2) (Herranen 2001). It has been a key actor in implementing

286 national policies at the regional level, and with its resources (C7) and mandate for coordinative leadership
287 (C2) has contributed significantly to the local level sustainability transformation (C10).

288

289 In 1982, River Vantaa was detached from the fresh water supply of Helsinki, when an aqueduct from a
290 more distant Lake Päijänne was completed, after more than a decade of planning and construction
291 (Herranen 2001). This meant the beginning of a new era in the management of the river (Schönach 2015).
292 As a result, alternative, recreationally motivated, collective visions of the river's future emerged (C5).
293 The slowly recovering former sewage outlet became a subject of intensive planning (see e.g.
294 Vantaanjoki-toimikunta 1985; Helsingin kaupunki 1988), with new stakeholders, such as NGOs, and
295 new initiatives for broader public participation to be involved (C1, C3, C5). Local, participatory
296 restorative projects were launched, for instance, at the Lake Tuusulanjärvi, which was severely
297 eutrophicated (C9, C10) (Hietala 2017). Considerable new funding (C7) flowed into projects, such as
298 fishway construction and the restoration of rapids for fishery (Haikonen et al. 2013). Facilities for
299 canoeing and swimming improved and the river banks became popular recreational areas (see e.g.
300 VHVSY 2017). These developments contributed to a more pronounced understanding and recognition
301 of the ecological value of the river valley (C4), highlighted by the 17 areas that form a part of the Pan-
302 European Natura 2000 network. There was an increasing importance of the river basin as a broadly
303 valued environmental asset, both locally and also extending further in the urbanizing region (C5, C9,
304 C10).

305

306 *5.1.3. Transformation 3 (T3): Wastewater overflow transformation*

307

308 In the third transformation, a concern over wastewater overflows led to a new form of co-operation (Fig.
309 1). The water quality in the river has improved significantly since its worst days, and the wastewater

310 treatment is considered efficient in general. However, periodic wastewater overflows have developed
311 into a contested, socio-technical problem during the last decades. For example, abnormal summer
312 flooding caused large scale wastewater emissions in 2004 (Saura et al. 2005; Vahtera et al. 2005;
313 Heikkinen et al. 2016). Stakeholders have had varied interpretations of the role of wastewater overflows
314 in terms of damages to the river ecosystem. However, they still regarded the overflows and the
315 wastewater a continued source of pollution (Heikkinen et al. 2016).

316

317 The public debates have become polarized between those claiming that the overflows should be
318 completely prevented, and those claiming that there is no realistic opportunity to reach that goal
319 (Heikkinen et al. 2016). In 2013, the representatives of the wastewater treatments plants (WWTPs)
320 announced that their new goal is to reach a situation in which all the overflows can be prevented (C2),
321 and this united the stakeholders behind the same goal (C5) (Heikkinen et al. 2016). A new cooperative
322 meeting system was created in the same year (C1, C3) to increase and improve the communication
323 between NGOs, WWTP representatives and other stakeholders. It seems that while the annual meetings
324 have brought the stakeholders' views closer to each other, a lack of concrete planning might hamper a
325 discernible change in the near future (Heikkinen et al. 2016). As the transformation of overflow
326 management is currently on-going, it is too early to make definite conclusions about the resulting role of
327 transformative capacity and the actual realization of transformative change.

328

329 **5.2. Transformations in the future**

330

331 In the past, water quality management efforts to tackle point source pollution have been more successful
332 than curbing diffuse loads in the River Vantaa RBM. In the future, the reduction efforts need to be
333 focused on the diffuse pollution, including agricultural nutrient pollution and pollution from sparsely

334 populated areas and urban storm water (Fig. 1). During 2011-2016, 47% of the nitrogen load was caused
335 by agriculture, 27% by background (natural) loading and 15% by point source loading, whereas main
336 phosphorus sources were agriculture (57%), sparsely populated areas (21%) and natural loading (14%)
337 (Vahtera and Männynsalo 2018). Participants in the workshop considered an increase in the coverage of
338 urban area and changes in the agricultural management practices as the most important drivers of change
339 in the future. This calls for changes in the RBM and different components of transformative capacity
340 need to be mobilized and strengthened.

341

342 Stakeholders expressed a preference for a radical transformation toward sustainability, but they
343 considered that it is more plausible that shifts continue to be modest in the future. In terms of
344 transformative capacity, participants desired for more inclusive and participatory governance in the river
345 basin to include various actors in the decision processes (C1), changes in values and a collective vision
346 toward a greener future (C5), increase in experimentation to promote more sustainable agricultural
347 practices (C6), work across the administrative levels, and a reinforcement of the basin-scale governance
348 (C10). It was considered that the EU WFD is one of the drivers in the governance shifts and
349 acknowledged that the current governmental system, societal values and economic priorities inhibit
350 further improvement in the water quality management. For instance, according to the recent policy
351 document (Karonen et al. 2015), there have only been modest funds for environmental measures in
352 agriculture, and only part of the suggested measures are implemented.

353

354 **5.3. Transformative capacity component connections to transformations and other components**

355

356 In the Vantaa RBM, two different types of connections between transformations and transformative
357 capacity can be delineated. Transformations 1 and 3 were primarily enabled by changes in the capacity,

358 while transformation 2 acted as a trigger that initiated changes in various components of transformative
359 capacity. Apart from the connections between capacity and transformations, there are also connections
360 between different components of transformative capacity (Table 2). For instance, according to our
361 analysis, the increased awareness of vulnerability of the River Vantaa ecosystem (i.e. transformation 1)
362 was a change in component 4, which acted as a driver for changes in other components.

363

364 **6. Discussion and conclusions**

365

366 Our findings show that the role of transformative capacity in transformations is not just about driving
367 changes. Instead, transformations and transformative capacity are in a multidimensional relationship
368 across spatial, administrative and temporal scales. Transformative changes are enabled not only by
369 capacity, but also by the overall changes in the societal, political and socio-economic context over time.
370 Furthermore, the capacity itself is formed and influenced by such changes. Next, we will discuss in more
371 detail the relationship between transformative capacity and transformations.

372

373 Previously, it has been argued that forced transformation is more likely to be initiated at a larger scale
374 than the focal scale (Folke et al. 2010). In the River Vantaa RBM, many of the changes have been driven
375 by changes in larger scale governance structures, most prominently by the enforcement of the national
376 Water Act in 1962 and the EU-wide WFD in 2000. Both triggered changes in various components of
377 transformative capacity, which in turn drove regional and local changes in the management of river basin
378 and water resources. The Water Act was the main driver for the eventual build-up of wastewater
379 treatment infrastructure, and the WFD has been the key pressure for more inclusive governance at River
380 Vantaa (cf. Jager et al. 2016), which according to the stakeholder perspectives, has been instrumental in
381 achieving more sustainable RBM.

382

383 Currently, a wide set of actors are included in RBM, and there is basin-scale coordination on many issues.
384 However, our long-term analysis also shows that the governance structure had gone through significant
385 changes well before the WFD, and that these legislative changes have only been one part of the enabling
386 factors of transformations. At River Vantaa, the capacity for intercommunal cooperation and working
387 across the geographical levels in the form of joint investments have significantly decreased pollution
388 levels in the river. Thus, our case supports the perception of bridging political-administrative levels as
389 crucial in RBM and water governance (Daniell and Barreteau 2014; Pahl-Wostl 2017). This is
390 particularly noteworthy in Finland, where traditionally strong municipal autonomy challenges
391 cooperation (Joas 2001). However, while there are evident benefits of the basin scale governance for the
392 sustainability transformations, the potential emergence of new problems in institutional interplays and
393 complexity, power relations and value conflicts should be addressed carefully (e.g. Wallis & Ison 2011;
394 Daniell and Barreteau 2014; Abel et al. 2016; Jager et al. 2016).

395

396 Another prominent transformative change in the River Vantaa RBM was the construction of the Päijänne
397 aqueduct in 1982 (Transformation 2), which freed the river from its previous function as the primary
398 water supplier to Helsinki metropolitan area and changed how water resources are managed in the basin.
399 The aqueduct construction was driven by the need to develop the capital's water security, and it ended
400 up being a mobilizer of capacity. It was thus a smaller scale transformation inside RBM, but it initiated
401 changes in the whole RBM (see Folke et al. 2010). As long as the utilization of the river was clearly
402 dominated by the critical water supply function and its technocratic management, the alternative visions
403 for the future of the river, including outlooks emerging from the community, were limited. The functional
404 detachment of the river from the urban water supply shifted the former balance of coexistence between
405 strong, single-issue-driven leadership (Waterworks) and more inclusive, collaborative governance of a

406 multi-functional river toward the latter. These mobilized and changed components of capacity again
407 affected the governance regime and the entire RBM.

408

409 Our analysis reveals that certain critical events act as triggers for mobilizing latent capacity for the future
410 transformative change. The accelerating river degradation culminated in the critical years characterized
411 by the episodes of infamous river pollution around the late 1950s and marked the reach of a critical
412 threshold, where the river system could not satisfactorily serve as the capital's main water supply
413 anymore (Transformation 1) (cf. Chaffin et al. 2016). Similarly, half a century later, the abrupt and
414 obnoxious wastewater overflow episodes proved to be momentous events that threatened the ecological
415 and recreational values of the river, and triggered the mobilization of dormant, yet existing capacity
416 (Transformation 3). Next to the typically occurring, immediate, post-crises public and political awareness
417 and pressure, a mobilization and strengthening of capacity to strive for transformative change in the
418 critical conditions, revealed by the crises, could be observed (Chaffin et al. 2016). The components of
419 transformative capacity were not generated through the critical events, but components that have built-
420 up over longer time are actualized in the wake of these critical events. New priorities in the allocation of
421 municipal resources enabled the investments in sanitary infrastructure and facilitated the creation of
422 intercommunal cooperative solutions and new arenas for broader-based deliberation and participatory
423 possibilities.

424

425 Our findings show an overall increase in transformative capacity over time. Shifting emphasis of the
426 different components of transformative capacity in relation to transformations can also be observed,
427 which supports the perception of transformative capacity not as static (Coleman and Chiasson 2002), but
428 fluctuating and mobilized in different contexts. The case also reveals the significance of financial
429 resources as capacity for transformative change, which however, over our long time span investigation

430 have evoked contradicting perceptions (see also Pahl-Wostl 2015). While the wastewater investments
431 have enabled transformative changes in the wastewater system attached to the river, at the same time, the
432 lack of sufficient funding has been perceived as one of the single most important factor preventing further
433 transformative change.

434

435 Similarly, while increasing capacity to an inclusive governance regime can be observed, present day
436 stakeholders consider more inclusivity and participatory modes of action necessary to reach future
437 sustainability transformations. This is particularly significant, as further improvement in river water
438 quality can only be achieved through effectively decreasing diffuse pollution (Vahtera and Männynsalo
439 2018). Since reducing point source pollution has been more successful in the past, a shift toward curbing
440 diffuse pollution is necessary, which in turn requires active involvement of all levels, including
441 individuals and farmers (Wright and Jacobsen 2011; Wardropper et al. 2015; Gillon et al. 2016), and
442 possibly a new balance between top-down and bottom-up governance processes (Pahl-Wostl 2017).
443 Similar challenges have been evident also in other river basins, such as Yahara in Wisconsin, USA, where
444 there has been no significant reduction in phosphorus loading, despite continuous effort (Wardropper et
445 al. 2015; Gillon et al. 2016). Although there are similarities between river basins across the world, a
446 direct comparison is challenging due to context-specificity of historical trends and main drivers of change
447 (cf. Räsänen et al. 2017, 2018).

448

449 Our analysis highlights how past transformations have (1) decreased point-source loading, (2) increased
450 multi-functionality of the river basin and water resources, and (3) gradually improved water quality.
451 However, our analysis also shows how there is a need for changes in transformative capacity, partly
452 because the basin areas and societies are continuously changing. In managing water quality, the drivers
453 of change are dynamic; e.g., land use patterns and climate change over time, which call for constant

454 changes in RBM (Godden et al. 2011; Gillon et al. 2016). The long temporal horizon of our study also
455 reveals a shifting emphasis in dominant uses of the river, thus influencing the goal setting for RBM.
456 Furthermore, societal values also change over time and shifts in the values imply new requirements on
457 societally accepted and desired ways of RBM (Méthot et al. 2015).

458

459 Although the transformative capacity framework (Wolfram 2016) was originally developed for the urban
460 context, our study shows that it is applicable for other settings as well. In comparison to strictly urban
461 contexts, the river basins potentially cover large geographical areas, include a variety of land uses and
462 are often divided into a multitude of administrative areas and levels. In river basins, the importance and
463 challenge of transformative capacity to function across the horizontal and vertical political-administrative
464 levels is pronounced. Furthermore, we show how capacity cannot be treated in an isolated manner;
465 instead, it should be linked to broader societal developments over long time scales. There is an evident
466 multidimensional relationship between the capacity and transformations, which evolves over time.
467 However, we could only touch on how transformations and capacity interact across the spatial and
468 temporal scales, and these questions should be addressed in future research.

469

470 Conflict of Interest – None

471

472 **References**

473

474 Abel N, Wise RM, Colloff MJ, Walker BH, Butler JRA, Ryan P, Norman C, Langston A, Anderies JM,
475 Gorddard R, Dunlop M, O’Connell D (2016) Building resilient pathways to transformation when “no
476 one is in charge”: insights from Australia's Murray-Darling Basin. *Ecol Soc* 21(2): 23

477 Berg BL (2009) *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. 7th edition. Pearson Allyn and
478 Bacon, Boston

479 Chaffin BC, Garmestani AC, Gunderson LH, Benson MH, Angeler DG, Arnold CA, Cosens B, Craig
480 RK, Ruhl JB, Allen CR (2016) Transformative environmental governance. *Annu Rev Env Resour* 41:
481 399-423

482 Chin A (2006) Urban transformation of river landscapes in a global context. *Geomorphology* 79(3): 460-
483 487

484 Coleman WD, Chiasson C (2002) State power, transformative capacity and adapting to globalization: an
485 analysis of French agricultural policy, 1960-2000. *J Eur Public Policy* 9(2): 168-185

486 Cresswell JW (2014) *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*, 4th
487 edition. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks

488 Daniell KA, Barreteau O (2014) Water governance across competing scales: coupling land and water
489 management. *J Hydrol* 519: 2367-2380

490 Downs P, Gregory K, Brookes A (1991) How integrated is river basin management? *Environ Manage*
491 15(3): 299-309

492 Ferguson B, Brown R, Deletic A (2013) A diagnostic procedure for transformative change based on
493 transitions, resilience, and institutional thinking. *Ecol Soc* 18(4): 57

494 Folke C, Carpenter SR, Walker B, Scheffer M, Chapin T, Rockstrom J (2010) Resilience thinking:
495 integrating resilience, adaptability and transformability. *Ecol Soc* 15(4): 20

496 Gillon S, Booth EG, Rissman AR (2016) Shifting drivers and static baselines in environmental
497 governance: challenges for improving and proving water quality outcomes. *Reg Environ Chang* 16(3):
498 759-775

499 Godden L, Ison RL, Wallis PJ (2011) Water governance in a climate change world: appraising systemic
500 and adaptive effectiveness. *Water Resour Manag* 25(15): 3971-3976

501 Haikonen A, Paasivirta L, Helminen J, Tolvanen O (2013) Vantaanjoen yhteistarkkailu - Kalasto ja
502 pohjaeläimet vuonna 2012. Kala- ja vesitutkimus Oy, Kala- ja vesitutkimuksia nro 105, Klaukkala

503 Heathcote IW (2009) Integrated watershed management: principles and practice, 2nd Edition. John
504 Wiley, New York

505 Heikkinen M, Schönach P, Massa I (2016) Politicization of wastewater overflows: the case of the Vantaa
506 River, Finland. *Water Policy* 18(6): 1454-1472

507 Helsingin kaupunki (1988) Vantaanjoki - pääkaupungin kehdestä virkistysten valtasuoneksi:
508 toimenpideohjelma (1987-88) 1989-1993. Helsingin kaupungin johtajistotoimikunta, Working group
509 report, Helsinki

510 Herranen T (2001) Vettä ja elämää: Helsingin vesihuollon historia 1876-2001. Helsingin Vesi, Helsinki

511 Hietala J (ed.) (2017) Tuusulanjärven kunnostus vuosina 1999-2013: Hoitotoimia ja seuranta.
512 Uudenmaan elinkeino-, liikenne- ja ympäristökeskus, Report 56/2017, Helsinki

513 Jager NW, Challies E, Kochskämper E et al (2016) Transforming European water governance?
514 Participation and river basin management under the EU water framework directive in 13 member states.
515 *Water* 8(4): 156

516 Joas M (2001) Reflexive modernisation of the environmental administration in Finland: essays of
517 institutional and policy change within the Finnish national and local environmental administration. Åbo
518 Akademi University Press, Turku

519 Juuti P (2015) Valkea kaupunki, mustat vedet: Helsingin vedet 1800-luvun lopusta 2000-luvulle.
520 Tampere University Press, Tampere

521 Karonen M, Mäntykoski A, Lankiniemi V, Nylander E, Lehto K, Jalava L (eds) (2015) Uudenmaan
522 vesienhoidon toimenpideohjelma vuosille 2016 - 2021. Uudenmaan elinkeino-, liikenne- ja
523 ympäristökeskus, Raportteja 134 / 2015, Helsinki

524 Katko T (1997) *Water!:* evolution of water supply and sanitation in Finland from the mid-1800s to 2000.
525 Finnish Water and Wastewater Works Association, Helsinki

526 Méthot J, Huang X, Grover H (2015) Demographics and societal values as drivers of change in the Great
527 Lakes–St. Lawrence River basin. *J Great Lakes Res* 41: 30-44

528 Molle F (2009) River-basin planning and management: The social life of a concept. *Geoforum* 40(3):
529 484-494

530 Newson M (1997) *Land, water and development: sustainable management of river basin systems.*
531 Routledge, London

532 Norman E, Bakker K (2009) *Transgressing Scales: Water Governance Across the Canada–U.S.*
533 *Borderland.* *Ann Assoc Am Geogr* 99(1)

534 O’Brien K (2012) Global environmental change II From adaptation to deliberate transformation. *Prog*
535 *Hum Geogr* 36(5): 667-676

536 Pahl-Wostl C (2015) *Water Governance in the Face of Global Change: From Understanding to*
537 *Transformation.* Springer, Cham

538 Pahl-Wostl C (2017) An evolutionary perspective on water governance: from understanding to
539 transformation. *Water Resour Manag* 31(10): 2917-2932

540 Park SE, Marshall NA, Jakku E, Dowd AM, Howden SM, Mendham E, Fleming A (2012) Informing
541 adaptation responses to climate change through theories of transformation. *Glob Environ Chang* 22(1):
542 115-126

543 Priess JA, Hauck J (2014) Integrative scenario development. *Ecol Soc* 19(1): 12

544 Rahikainen E (2001) Kuohuva vuosisata: Vantaanjoki ja helsingin vedenotto. In: Laakkonen S, Laurila
545 S, Kansanen P, Schulman H (eds). *Näkökulmia helsingin ympäristöhistoriaan: Kaupungin ja ympäristön*
546 *muutos 1800- ja 1900-luvuilla.* Helsingin kaupungin tietokeskus, Helsinki, Finland, pp 206-225

547 Räsänen A, Juhola S, Monge Monge A, Käkönen M, Kanninen M, Nygren A (2017) Identifying
548 mismatches between institutional perceptions of water-related risk drivers and water management
549 strategies in three river basin areas. *J Hydrol* 550: 704-715.

550 Räsänen A, Nygren A, Monge Monge A, Käkönen M, Kanninen M, Juhola S (2018) From divide to
551 nexus: Interconnected land use and water management changes shaping risks and vulnerabilities. *Appl*
552 *Geogr* 90C: 106-114.

553 Saura A, Könönen K, Yrjölä R, Rinne J (2005) *Vantaanjoen yhteistarkkailu kalasto vuonna 2004 ja*
554 *pohjaeläimet vuosina 2002–2004*. Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute, Kala- ja
555 riistaraportteja nro 368, Helsinki

556 Schönach P (2007) Vantaanjoen suojeluyhteistyö toisen maailmansodan jälkeen. *Historiallinen*
557 *aikakauskirja* 105(1): 22-33

558 Schönach P (2015) Expanding Sanitary Infrastructure and the Shaping of River History: River Vantaa
559 (Finland), 1876-1982. *Environ Hist* 21(2): 201-226

560 Vahtera H, Muukkonen P, Männynsalo J, Lahti K (2005) Vantaanjoen yhteistarkkailu. Vedenlaatu
561 vuosina 2000–2004. Vantaanjoen ja Helsingin seudun vesienhoitoyhdistys, Report 56/2005, Helsinki

562 Vahtera H, Männynsalo J (2018) Vantaanjoen yhteistarkkailu - Vedenlaatu 2017. Vantaanjoen ja
563 Helsingin seudun vesienhoitoyhdistys, Report 11/2018, Helsinki

564 Vantaanjoki-toimikunta (1985) Vantaanjoki-toimikunnan mietintö. Ympäristöministeriö, Helsinki

565 Vesistönsuojelukomitea (1958) Vesistönsuojelukomitean mietintö, 13. Kululaitosten ja yleisten töiden
566 ministeriö, Helsinki

567 VHVSY (2017) <http://www.vhvsy.fi/sivut/virkistyskaytto>. Accessed 1 Feb 2017

568 Wallis PJ, Ison RL (2011) Appreciating institutional complexity in water governance dynamics: a case
569 from the Murray-Darling Basin, Australia. *Water Resour Manag* 25(15): 4081-4097

570 Winiwarter V, Knoll M (2007) *Umweltgeschichte: Eine Einführung*. Böhlau Verlag, Köln

571 Wardropper CB, Chang C, Rissman AR (2015) Fragmented water quality governance: constraints to
572 spatial targeting for nutrient reduction in a Midwestern USA watershed. *Landsc Urban Plan* 137: 64-75
573 Wolfram M (2016) Conceptualizing urban transformative capacity: A framework for research and policy.
574 *Cities* 51: 121-130
575 Wright SA, Jacobsen BH (2011) Participation in the implementation of the Water Framework Directive
576 in Denmark: The prospects for active involvement. *Water policy* 13(2): 232-249
577

Component	Description
C1: Inclusive and multiform governance	C1 includes participatory governance, multimodality of governance forms and actor networks and presence and efficiency of intermediary organisations
C2: Transformative leadership	C2 is socially embedded and should be polycentric, inclusive and play translational role between communities, societal groups and discourses
C3: Empowered and autonomous communities of practice	C3 presupposes strong human agency, communities with access to resources, autonomy and environment for them to form associations and coalitions based on shared experiences and concerns in order to articulate common needs and form responses
C4: System awareness and memory	C4 is necessary in transformation process in order to ensure the understanding among stakeholders of lock-ins, path dependencies and interactions. C4 needs a created and sustained shared knowledge network
C5: Urban sustainability foresight	C5 presupposes creating a shared vision of the targets and paths in transformation process as well as potential scenarios
C6: Diverse community-based experimentation with disruptive solutions	C6 includes practical experimentation that is necessary for acquiring transformational knowledge and possibility of scaling up radical solutions
C7: Innovation embedding and coupling	C7 includes space and context for the innovations to be embedded into routines, institutions, legal norms and practices
C8: Reflexivity and social learning	C8 relates to feedback loops, social learning and assessment to create reflexivity routines in order to critically question progress and manage new transformational knowledge
C9: Working across agency levels	C9 presupposes developing capacity in working across different agency levels such as individuals, organisations, institutions, networks and whole society
C10: Working across administrative, geographical and political levels/scales	C10 needs to be developed given the multi-scalar and multi-sectoral nature of governance and actors involved

581 *Table 2. The manifestations of transformative capacity in our data and the identified connections to other*
 582 *components of capacity. Only the most evident connections are listed. Desired changes in future capacity are*
 583 *marked with italics and connections to other components are not given to them. WPA refers to Water Protection*
 584 *Association.*

Component of transformative capacity	Description/ manifestation in data in regard to different transformations (T) and potential future transformation (TF).	Identified connections to other components
C1: inclusive and multiform governance	Foundation of WPA (T1)	Required C2, contributed positively to C4 and C5
	Federation of municipalities (T2)	Enabled C2 and C7
	Cooperative meeting system (T3)	Required C2, enhanced C3 and C5
	<i>More inclusive and participatory governance (TF)</i>	
C2: transformative leadership	Leadership of Helsinki Waterworks within the WPA (T1)	Enabled C1
	Federation of municipalities (T2)	Required C1, enabled C7
	Work toward the acceptance of a new goal and the creation of a new cooperative meeting system (T3).	Enabled C1
C3: empowered and autonomous communities of practice	Planning with new stakeholders (T2)	Enhanced C1, C5 and C7
	Public participation initiatives (T2)	Enhanced C1, C5 and C9
	Active NGOs and local activists (T3)	Enhanced C1, C5 and C9
C4: system awareness and memory	Broader acknowledgement of the vulnerability of the ecosystem (T1 and T2)	Identified as a basis for the other capacity
	Broader recognition of the ecological values of the river valley (T3)	Enabled C3 and C5
C5: urban sustainability foresight	WPA as knowledge producer (T1)	Required C1, enhanced C4
	Technical collaboration between Cities of Helsinki and Vantaa (T1)	Required C10
	Alternative collective visions of future (T2)	Enabled C3 and C7
	Broader participation in planning (T2)	Interacted with C7, enabled C9
	Natura 2000 network contributed to understanding of river values (T2)	Required C4 and C10, enabled C9

Stakeholders accepting new common goal (T3) Required C1, C2 and C3

Changes in values and collective visions toward greener future (TF).

C6: diverse community-based experimentation with disruptive solutions *Experimentation for more sustainable agriculture (TF)*

C7: innovation embedding and coupling Municipal Board of Water in Helsinki (T1)
Investments in infrastructure, resources for Federation of Municipalities, and new projects with new funding (T2) Required C1-5

C9: working across agency levels Locally engaging restoration (T2) Reciprocity with C1 and C3
Diverse set of actors from individuals to institutions (T3) Reciprocity with C1 and C3


C10: working across administrative, geographical and political levels/scales National legislation, like Water Act (T1) Obligated C7, enabled C2 and C5
Administrative co-operation between municipalities (T1 and T2) Enabled C5
Natura 2000 network (T2) Enabled C3 and C5
Working across administrative levels and reinforcement of basin-scale governance (TF)

585

586

587

588



589

590 *Figure 1. Simplified temporal flow of the causes and consequences of the different transformations: awareness*
 591 *transformation (T1), river detachment from water supply and sewerage (T2), wastewater overflow*
 592 *transformation (T3), and potential future transformations (TF). Potential future linkages are shown with*
 593 *dashed lines, while already happened linkages are shown with full lines.*