



Aalborg Universitet

AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

An internal report as input for the participatory governance framework

Toonen, Hilde M.; Ferguson, Laura; Flannery, Wesley; Hansen, Carsten Jahn

Publication date:
2019

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Toonen, H. M., Ferguson, L., Flannery, W., & Hansen, C. J. (2019). *An internal report as input for the participatory governance framework*. PERICLES. <https://www.pericles-heritage.eu/pericles-papers-and-reports/>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



PERICLES_D2.2_v1.0_final
Dissemination Level: PU



2020-SC6-CULT-COOP-2016-2017

PrEseRvIng and sustainably governing Cultural heritage and Landscapes in European coastal and maritime regions

Project no.: 770504

Project full title: PrEseRvIng and sustainably governing Cultural heritage and Landscapes in European coastal and maritime regions

Project Acronym: PERICLES

Deliverable number:	D2.2
Deliverable title:	An internal report as input for the participatory governance framework
Work package:	WP2
Due date of deliverable:	M12
Actual submission date:	M12 - 30/04/2019
Start date of project:	01/05/2018
Duration:	36 months
Reviewer(s):	Carina Jensen (AAU)
Author/editor:	Hilde Toonen (WUR), Laura Ferguson (QUB), Wesley Flannery (QUB) and Carsten Jahn Hansen (AAU)
Contributing partners:	All

Dissemination level of this deliverable	PU
Nature of deliverable	R

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 770504. Further information is available at www.pericles-heritage.eu.

Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary	3
2	Introduction.....	4
3	Survival and transformative resilience	5
4	Participatory and deliberative governance	6
5	PERICLES Governance Framework	9
	Bibliography.....	10

1 Executive Summary

This document describes deliverable D2.2 “an internal report as input for the participatory governance framework”. This report is based on the task work conducted in PERICLES Work Package 2 on the second and third PERICLES pillars (Resilience and Adaptation; and Deliberative and Participatory Governance). It thus particularly builds on the review of both academic and policy perspectives of the concepts of resilience and adaptation and the overview of deliberative and participatory governance for sustainable management and conservation of European coastal and maritime CH and landscape.

Coastal and marine changes are experiencing periods of intense change due to poor governance and increased exploitation. These changes include increasing urbanization, population changes, and the rapid industrialisation of coastal areas. All these changes have the potential to have positive and negative impacts on coastal cultural heritage. For example, the rapid rise in Blue Growth industries may fundamental alter seascapes and may supplant traditional coastal industries. There is a critical need, therefore, to develop strategies and practices that enhances the resiliency and adaptability of coastal and marine cultural heritage.

Resilience and adaptation strongly relate to the first PERICLES pillar of Space, Place, and Identity. The development of a common sense of space, place, and identity can enhance the resilience of coastal areas as it can support the development of strong social ties. However, in globalised society it cannot be assumed that all inhabitants of an area will share in this common identity, the mobilisation of which may be used to exclude or marginalise particular groups. If this mobilization and strategies and practices aimed for enhancing resilience are carried out purposefully, the third PERICLES pillar Deliberative and Participatory Governance comes into play. Participatory and deliberative forms of governance can enhance the resilience of particular areas. By engaging with a broad community of actors, deliberative governance mechanisms can reveal subjective understandings of resilience, can foster common strategies and develop more inclusive action.

In this report, it is suggested to use a typology of ‘Survival Resilience’ and ‘Transformative Resilience’ to define the steering efforts that are to be identified, described and analysed in the PERICLES governance framework. Survival Resilience is defined as the deliberate efforts to reduce harm to particular groups and ensure their own interests are met within any resilience-building process; transformative resilience is defined as a “dynamic process in which change and constant re-invention provide the grounds for social, economic, and/or environmental strength” (Raco & Street, 2012, p. 1069). In operationalizing governance, it is deemed important to recognize similarities, differences and overlap between participatory and deliberative modes, for example in terms of legitimacy (input, output, throughput), and of rights and capabilities of those who engage in participation and deliberation (and who do not). It is also suggested that strategies for or enactment of modes of governance is to be sought in practices of social learning, allowing to work through mechanisms relevant for the adoption of (new) values and practices, and foster co-management, co-creation and/or social transformation.

2 Introduction

This report provides input for the participatory governance framework, which will be developed in the project. It is an internal report aimed to clarify relevant forms of resilience and the modes of governance deemed relevant for adaptive management within the context of cultural heritage. The final aim of the framework is to contribute to a better understanding of how forms of resilience affect or are affected by participatory and deliberative modes of governance, and how this works out in the different case study regions of the project.

Coastal areas experience intense and sustained pressures from a diverse range of social and environmental sources, all of which have the potential to become risks to the preservation and utilisation of cultural heritage. Some examples are: overdevelopment and over-exploitation, environmental change that results in flooding or drought and abandonment when certain ways of life are no longer a viable means of making a living. Our coasts host many of the EU's major centres of commerce and are subject to the attendant pressures that emanate from these cities (e.g. urban sprawl and rapid development).

Due to globalisation and resulting MacDonaldisation of cities, many urban centres are at risk of losing their inherent uniqueness as waterfronts and high streets are increasingly designed to resemble each other and are disembodied from their coastal heritage. For many of us, coasts are the preferred location to reside and to sojourn for leisure, recreation and tourism activities (Martínez et al., 2007). Coastal tourism and leisure both places cultural heritage at risk and offers potential opportunities for its preservation. Mass tourism increases the pressure on popular coastal areas and often does not engage with local heritage beyond viewing coasts as 'sun and sea' holiday locations. Tourism offers opportunities to develop strategies for the sustainable exploitation of unique cultural heritage, as mass tourism markets become saturated and increasingly holiday-makers are turning towards more sustainable forms of tourism (e.g. ecotourism, nature-based tourism).

Coastal population growth, urbanisation and expanding coastal tourism development increases pressure on coastal environments, resulting in ecosystem degradation (Duxbury and Dickinson, 2007) and the loss of associated cultural heritage. Environmental change is also increasingly manifest in the type and quality of fish stocks available for exploitation. However, throughout history, coastal communities have responded to outside forces such as external markets and trade, globalisation, environmental change, politics and governmental policies, through the rise and fall of states, economies, and institutions, revealing an ability of the peoples of coastal and maritime zones to often be resilient and adaptive.

In dealing with these risks, challenges and opportunities, management of cultural and natural heritage has shifted from government- and expert-led decision-making to more participatory forms of governance. Participation is deemed central to the governance of cultural heritage and landscapes in coastal areas, particularly referring to engagement of local communities who live (in/with) heritage. These communities are the first to be affected as their identities and livelihoods are formed by CH. Also, integrating their knowledge, values and perspectives in assessing risks and exploring opportunities broadly improves decision-making processes. Participatory governance can be linked to enhanced deliberation and (social) learning, so going beyond "voices being heard", to establish

processes of social exchange and trust building. Deliberative modes of governance put emphasis on communication, exchanging viewpoints, and formulating common understanding and objectives.

The structure of this report is as follows: section 3 sets out the main insights on forms of resilience, suggesting two forms are relevant to be operationalized in the participatory governance framework: Survival Resilience and Transformative Resilience. Section 4 highlights participatory and deliberative modes of governance, as understanding of these two modes has been defined as crucial to the project's goals of understanding, assessing and mitigating risks to cultural heritage in coastal areas. Section 5 provides a short outlook for the development of the PERICLES governance framework.

3 Survival and transformative resilience

Resilience has rapidly become popularised in the environmental management literature. Resilience is, mainly, conceptualised in two main ways: bounce back resilience and bounce forward resilience. Bounce back resilience comes from the use of the term in the engineering and ecological sciences and means the capacity of a system to return to a previous state (Holling, 1973). Bounce forward resilience is associated with socio-ecological research and relates to the capacity of a system to adapt to changes and to take on new forms yet provide key functions (Walker et al, 2004; Folke et al, 2010; Davoudi et al, 2012). However, the critical social science literature argues that these conceptualisations of resilience do not pay sufficient attention to the social dynamics that impact resilience-building processes (Brown, 2014). For example, the literature around both fails to account for agency and how actors may steer resilience-building processes to favour them and their interests, to the detriment of less powerful actors. Similarly, these conceptualisations of resilience have underplayed the role of social structures and how they can create path dependencies, institutional inertia and system lock-in, which can drastically curtail the capacity to steer systems towards more resilient formations. Bounce back and forward conceptualisations of resilience also tend to not question the status quo (i.e. the current state of a system) and, largely, ignore questions related to justice and fairness: e.g. is the current state desirable, by whom, and if it should be maintained.

An alternative typology of 'Survival Resilience' and 'Transformative Resilience' has been suggested. This typology is more attuned to socio-political dynamics of system changes and provides a lens through which some of these issues can be explored.

Survival resilience is viewed as the deliberate efforts to reduce harm to particular groups and ensure their own interests are met within any resilience-building process. Although the conceptualisation of resilience as a "survival" process has its origins in the ecological and disaster management literatures, it can useful be deployed to categorize strategies in society that seek to limit radical departures from the status quo (Shaw, 2012). Survival resilience focuses on uncertainty, vulnerability and recovery. Actors aligned with survival forms of resilience seek to reduce risks to them and act to ensure they recover, bounce-back and persist after a crisis (Valikangas, 2010). Framing resilience as a survival processes reproduces post-political responses to dealing with crises (Shaw, 2012). This approach to resilience is produces interventions that do not question prevailing socio-economic hegemonies and, instead, depoliticises these issues through 'neutral' techno-managerial management processes e.g. ecosystem management or risk mapping processes (Cannon and Mueller-Mahn, 2010).

While survival resilience is largely instigated through post-political process, that depoliticises resilience, and facilitated by the adoption of techno-managerial approaches which views threats and risk management in a very narrow way and results in incremental changes to current practices, transformative resilience is viewed as the deliberate effort to steer systems to more sustainable, fair and just configurations. Rather than seeing resilience as a process of ensuring the perseverance of existing social structures, a transformative framing of resilience views it as a “dynamic process in which change and constant re-invention provide the grounds for social, economic, and/or environmental strength” (Raco & Street, 2012, p. 1069). Transformative resilience, therefore, focuses how to radically change dominant socio-economic systems and seeks to develop more just and fair futures (Leach, 2008). Within this transformative framing, resilience is not regarded as the capacity to bounce back or preserve original states after a “shock”, but, rather, is framed as the capacity to change to a new, more sustainable, just and fair state than the pre-shock one (Shaw, 2012). Transformative conceptualisations of resilience deride processes that frame resilience as a return to business as usual and link resilience to bottom-up initiatives that explicitly seek to overturn existing regimes (Shaw, 2012). This, in itself, is not a revolutionary idea and could be framed as a minor extension of the bounce forward framing of resilience. What is radically different about the transformative framing of resilience is that it explicitly acknowledges that regime shifts are not just the outcome of an external shocks, that change can arise from internal stresses and that these can be developed and steered by marginalised communities (Davoudi et al, 2012).

There is clearly an emerging debate in the literature about how resilience is conceptualised in cultural heritage. Due to its strong link to conservation and preservation, cultural heritage management is more closely aligned to survival forms of resilience. Here, resilience is largely framed as the capacity of cultural heritage to survive external shocks and to be transmitted unadulterated to subsequent generations. A more recent school of thought, frames resilience in cultural heritage as its capacity to change through creative transformation. It is argued that viewing cultural heritage as a static entity that must be not be altered will eventually lead it is loss as it will, at some future point, be unable to withstand external stressed. However, viewing cultural heritage as something that undergoes creative transformation in response to stresses will enhance its resilience.

The form of resilience that is developed within cultural heritage initiatives is highly dependent on the quality and form of the participatory processes that have been employed.

4 Participatory and deliberative governance

Governance can be defined as socio-political processes involved ‘in solving societal problems and creating societal opportunities through interactions among civil, public and private actors’ (Kooiman et al, 2008: 17). This definition serves analytical and normative purposes. An analytical approach describes what different actors (state, market and civil society) play a role, and scrutinizes how they do so, and which values (implicitly or explicitly) guide their interactions and form the basis of an institutional set-up. Such analysis helps to better understand questions of authority, power and legitimacy, and to identify key determinants enabling and constraining effective decision-making (Stoker, 1998; Fung and Wright, 2005; Van Tatenhove, 2013). A normative approach underlines the need for this public-private interaction and points out how best it can be organised. Based on

underlying societal values, a normative approach takes a predefined starting point in what are the societal problems to be solved, and what societal opportunities that need to be created. Management approaches often have built-in normativity, since it is about facilitating day-to-day activities at seas and oceans, often including reducing overlap and conflicts by integration of objectives and fostering planning, such as in Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM). Conceptualizing socio-political processes in CH in terms of governance brings in a broader and deeper concept, allowing to scrutinize the organization, objectives and values of the authority underpinning management.

In literature, both participatory and deliberative modes of governance are used to foster understanding of sustainable heritage management. The terms are sometimes used interchangeably, as both refer to themes like stakeholder involvement, democracy, and the rights and capabilities of those who are (to be) included in management processes. However, whereas participatory governance seems to be mainly concerned with inclusion and equal participation as a virtue in itself, deliberation is more concerned with expanding and using discussions in decision-processes.

Generally, participatory governance has been associated with the broader shift from 'government' to 'governance', wherein vertical, top-down, state-led forms of steering has been replaced, and complimented by, networked forms of collaboration (Papadopoulos and Warin, 2007). Although legal frameworks are less ambiguous at land compared to the sea, challenges in coastal areas are also deemed complex. Integrated coastal zone management (ICZM), defined as a process of governance to ensure sustainable coastal developments, relies on participation of stakeholders to improve the quality of life of communities dependent on coastal resources (UN, 1992). Participatory governance is herein promoted because stakeholders have information that helps to define trade-offs, which facilitates efficiency in the process and can lead to more effective solutions (Papadopoulos and Warin, 2007). Another reason lies in the need to have decisions based on the collective judgement and shared values of stakeholders, to create common responsibility for hard choices that were made (Reed, 2008; Rockmann et al, 2015; Kenter et al, 2015). As such, participation can strengthen both output and input legitimacy (Scharpf, 2003; Papadopoulos and Warin, 2007).

This general understanding resonates well with heritage management in which governance is often value-laden (e.g. "good governance" or linked to sustainable development) and participation is celebrated as virtue, and a right, in itself. More specifically, heritage management rides the waves of the established human rights discourse, which allows for a shift from an either/or language to a more unified language to define and discuss global inequalities, injustice, and historic repressions (Meskell, 2010; Baird, 2010; Logan, 2014). One's heritage can be seen as a human right that needs to be respected and protected, and forms a basis for control, access and benefits (whether social, economic, spiritual) (Meskell, 2010). Human right discussion is useful as it is in constant flux, and about social negotiation 'over what is right and wrong in the particular historical context in which we find ourselves' (Hodder, 2010: 866). At the same time, this fluidity can be problematic because particular rights can be marginalized with other agendas and discussions.

In deliberative governance, public or a wider (deliberate) discussion is considered a virtue in itself, that leads to more reflected, shared and meaningful choices. Deliberation is about reviewing and rethinking collaborative or participatory governance approaches, based on the criticism towards them, e.g. that equal participation may not necessarily equalise power relations. Also, the question is whether the average citizen will really be that interested in all kinds of decisions? (cf. Allmendinger, 2009). Also, a

deliberative process is not a simple bargaining process, rather it is a matter of persuasion, argumentation and the construction of a new legitimacy across differences (cf. Escobar, 2017). Deliberation is concerned with careful thought, consideration, and discussion, and hence it can be argued that deliberative governance would then be concerned with a strategic approach to participation, involvement, consultation, advice, debate, discussion, etc. As such, stakeholder involvement in deliberative governance is not so much about equal representation and obstacles to inclusion. It is more a matter of the 'throughput' dimension of policy making (Papadopoulos, 2007; Schmidt, 2013). While these may still be important, the primary concern is not on rights for stakeholders to participate, and more with how certain capabilities may be fruitful and productive for discussions. Capabilities thinking is an emerging in heritage literature, allowing for a more flexible understanding of what people themselves think is a life worth living, individually and collectively. Various authors draw on ideas on social justice, wellbeing and human flourishing (following Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum) and suggest that looking into the abilities to participate and deliberate provides nuance and allows for 'varied voices in the community to decide their categories of relevance' (Baird, 2010: 50). Such approaches go beyond universal, state-induced and internationally pronounced norms, and allow for listening rather than imposing worldviews (Meskell, 2010).

It is suggested to emphasize the importance of (social) learning for both participatory and deliberative modes of governance because participation and deliberation in itself do not necessarily equate to a clear strategy or consensus (Fatoric et al, 2013; Walsh, 2019). Enhancing processes of learning in cultural heritage management is generally considered useful for avoiding conflict and tension. More specifically, social learning has often been emphasized, which is defined by Reed et al (2010) as a change in understanding beyond the individual level, that occurs through social interactions and processes, and that becomes socially situated and widely practiced. Social learning is closely related to deliberation, and indeed has been one of the main mechanisms proposed for how deliberation can shape values and beliefs of individuals and social groups (Kenter et al, 2016). Social learning is an essential mechanism in the adoption of new values and practices, and has been conceived as a mechanism for social transformation when it occurs between different sectoral groups of stakeholders, including through formal and informal deliberative processes (Everard et al, 2016). The literature does report a broad range of tools and approaches that can be used to foster social learning in cultural heritage management. Interesting to note is the (potential) role of new ICT tools such as GIS, storytelling platforms and virtual and augmented reality (Paskaleva-Shapiura et al, 2008; Dollani et al, 2016; Bonacini, 2018; Vanclay et al, 2004; Kuflik et al, 2015). Across different studies, participants were generally self-selected, participation focused more on mapping and awareness raising than on governance and learning was primarily conceived of as individual, and ICT can be exclusive to some social groups in terms of access and use (Vanclay et al, 2014). However, democratisation potential of ICT-based tool is also often recognized, and importance of using different, targeted activities for different communities or groups is emphasised (rather than a one-size-fits all approach for participation and deliberation).

5 PERICLES Governance Framework

During the life time of the project, PERICLES will explore the link between the different forms of resilience and the type and quality of the participatory and deliberative processes that have been employed in cultural heritage governance. This is for example done through the work in Work Package 4 which is aimed to develop a comprehensive, participatory framework for sustainable management, conservation and exploitation of European coastal and maritime cultural landscapes. Case study work will feed into the framework design, by assessing, for example, if and how survival forms of resilience have been facilitated through exclusionary forms of governance, using the industrial heritage of Belfast port as a case study. In this case, PERICLES will explore how some heritage narratives have been captured by dominant interests to promote particular tourist focused forms of resilience and how these are being countered in informal governance spaces. Development and application of methods and tools also provide input for the framework, such as the Visual Problem Appraisal (VPA) in the Wadden Sea case region. This film-based learning strategy with ethnographic and artistic aspects allows for a deliberative mode of governance and the inclusion of underrepresented stakeholders (e.g., women, youth, ageing population, remote professions) which as such could strengthen survival resilience, yet might also be useful in illuminating internal stresses in a governance process and work well with a transformative conceptualization of resilience.

Bibliography

- Allmendinger, P. (2009). Critical reflections on spatial planning. *Environment and Planning A*, 41(11), 2544-2549.
- Baird, M. F. (2014). Heritage, human rights, and social justice. *Heritage & Society*, 7(2), 139-155.
- Bonacini, E. (2018). Heritage Communities, Participation and Co-creation of Cultural Values: The# izi TRAVELSicilia Project. *Museum International*, 70(1-2), 140-153.
- Brown, K. (2014). Global Environmental Change I: A Social Turn for Resilience? *Progress in Human Geography*, 38, pp.107–117.
- Cannon, T., Mueller-Mahn, D. (2010). Vulnerability, resilience and development discourses in the context of climate change, *Natural Hazards*, 55(3), pp. 621–635.
- Davoudi, S., Shaw, K., Haider, L. J., Quinlan, A. E., Peterson, G. D., Wilkinson, C., Fünfgeld, H., McEvoy, D., Porter, L., Davoudi, S. (2012). Resilience: A Bridging Concept or a Dead End? “Reframing” Resilience: Challenges for Planning Theory and Practice Interacting Traps: Resilience Assessment of a Pasture Management System in Northern Afghanistan Urban Resilience: What Does it Mean in Planning Practice? Resilience as a Useful Concept for Climate Change Adaptation? The Politics of Resilience for Planning: A Cautionary Note, *Planning Theory & Practice*, 13(2), pp.299-333.
- Dollani, A., Lerario, A., Maiellaro, N. (2016). Sustaining cultural and natural heritage in Albania. *Sustainability*, 8(8), 792.
- Duxbury, J., Dickinson, S. (2007). Principles for sustainable governance of the coastal zone: in the context of coastal disasters. *Ecol. Econ.* 63, 319–330, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2007.01.016>.
- Escobar, O. (2017). Pluralism and democratic participation: what kind of citizen are citizens invited to be?. *contemporary pragmatism*, 14(4), 416-438.
- Everard, M., Reed, M.S., Kenter, J.O. (2016). The ripple effect: Institutionalising pro-environmental values to shift societal norms and behaviours 21, 230–240. doi:10.1016/j.ecoser.2016.08.001
- Fatorić, S., Seekamp, E. (2018). A measurement framework to increase transparency in historic preservation decision-making under changing climate conditions. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 30, 168-179.
- Folke, C., Carpenter, S. R., Walker, B., Scheffer, M., Chapin, T., Rockstrom, J. (2010). Resilience Thinking: Integrating Resilience, Adaptability and Transformability. *Ecology and Society*, 15(4), no pagination.
- Fung, A., Wright E.O. (2001). Deepening Democracy: Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance. *Politics & Society* 29, no. 1, 5-41.

- Hodder, I. (2010). Cultural heritage rights: From ownership and descent to justice and well-being. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 83(4), 861-882.
- Kooiman, J., Bavinck, M., Chuenpagdee, R., Mahon, R., Pullin, R. (2008). Interactive governance and governability: an introduction. *Journal of Transdisciplinary Environmental Studies*, 7(1), 1-11.
- Holling, C. S. (1978). *Adaptive Environmental Assessment and Management*. New York: John Wiley.
- Kenter, J.O., O'Brien, L., Hockley, N., Ravenscroft, N., Fazey, I., Irvine, K.N., Reed, M.S., Christie, M., Brady, E., Bryce, R., Church, A., Cooper, N., Davies, A., Evely, A., Everard, M., Fish, R., Fisher, J.A., Jobstvogt, N., Molloy, C., Orchard-Webb, J., Ranger, S., Ryan, M., Watson, V., Williams, S. (2015). What are shared and social values of ecosystems? *Ecological Economics* 111, 86–99. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.01.0066
- Kenter, J.O. (2016). Integrating deliberative monetary valuation, systems modelling and participatory mapping to assess shared values of ecosystem services. *Ecosystem Services* 21, 291–307. doi:10.1016/j.ecoser.2016.06.010.
- Kenter, J.O., Reed, M.S., Fazey, I. (2016). The Deliberative Value Formation model. *Ecosystem Services* 21, 194–207. doi:10.1016/j.ecoser.2016.09.015
- Kuflik, T., Wecker, A. J., Lanir, J., & Stock, O. (2015). An integrative framework for extending the boundaries of the museum visit experience: linking the pre, during and post visit phases. *Information Technology & Tourism*, 15(1), 17-47.
- Leach, M. (2008). *Re-framing Resilience: A Symposium Report*. Brighton: STEPS Centre.
- Logan, W. S. (2007). Closing Pandora's box: human rights conundrums in cultural heritage protection. In *Cultural heritage and human rights* (pp. 33-52). Springer, New York, NY.
- Martínez, M.L., Intralawan, A., Vázquez, G., Pérez-Maqueo, O., Sutton, P., Landgrave, R. (2007). The coasts of our world: ecological, economic and social importance. *Ecol. Econ.* 63, 254–272, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2006.10.022>.
- Meskell, L. (2010). Human rights and heritage ethics. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 83(4), 839-859.
- Papadopoulos, Y. (2007). Problems of democratic accountability in network and multilevel governance. *European law journal*, 13(4), 469-486.
- Papadopoulos, Y., Warin, P. (2007). Are innovative, participatory and deliberative procedures in policy making democratic and effective?. *European journal of political research*, 46(4), 445-472.
- Paskaleva-Shapira, K., Azorin, J., Chiabai, A. (2008). Enhancing digital access to local cultural heritage through e-governance: innovations in theory and practice from Genoa, Italy. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 21(4), 389-405.
- Raco, M., Street, E. (2012). Resilience Planning, Economic Change and The Politics of Post-recession Development in London and Hong Kong. *Urban Studies*, 49(5), 1065–1087. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098011415716>

- Reed, M.S. (2008). Stakeholder participation for environmental management: A literature review. *Biol Conserv* 141, 2417–2431. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2008.07.014
- Shaw, K. (2012). Reframing Resilience: Challenges for Planning Theory and Practice. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 13(2), 308-312.
- Röckmann, C., van Leeuwen, J., Goldsborough, D., Kraan, M., Piet, G. (2015). The interaction triangle as a tool for understanding stakeholder interactions in marine ecosystem based management. *Marine Policy*, 52, 155-162.
- Scharpf, F. W. (2003). Problem-solving Effectiveness and Democratic Accountability in the EU (No. 03/1). MPIfG working paper.
- Schmidt, V.A. (2013). Democracy and legitimacy in the European Union revisited: Input, output and 'throughput'. *Political Studies*, 61, 2-22.
- Stoker, G. (1998). Governance as theory: five propositions. *International social science journal*, 50(155), 17-28.
- Valikangas, L. (2010). *The Resilient Organization: How Adaptive Cultures Thrive Even When Strategy Fails*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Vanclay, F., Lane, R., Wills, J., Coates, I. A. N., & Lucas, D. (2004). "Committing To Place" And Evaluating The Higher Purpose: Increasing Engagement In Natural Resource Management Through Museum Outreach And Educational Activities. *Journal of Environmental Assessment Policy and Management*, 6(04), 539-564.
- van Tatenhove, J. P. (2013). How to turn the tide: developing legitimate marine governance arrangements at the level of the regional seas. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 71, 296-304.
- Walker, B. H., Holling, C. S., Carpenter, S. R., Kinzig, A. (2004). Resilience, Adaptability and Transformability in Social-ecological Systems. *Ecology and Society*, 9(2), no pagination.
- Walsh, C. (2019). Integration of expertise or collaborative practice?: Coastal management and climate adaptation at the Wadden Sea. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 167, 78-86.