New Integrated Framework to grasp transforming Science-Politics 'coupling practices'

Participatory European coastal & marine water management

C. Carter¹, A. Thomas¹, D. Salles¹, N. Caill-Milly², G. Morandeau², I. Auby³, H. Oger Jeanneret³ ¹ Irstea Bordeaux France, ² Ifremer Anglet France, ³ Ifremer Arcachon France. *Contact:* <u>Caltriona.Carter</u>

Context

- The interdisciplinary project ECOGOV (A political sociology of ECOsystem sciences: theories, narratives, interactions and GOVernance) examines transforming Science-Politics (S-P) 'coupling practices' in natural resource governance
- In European coastal & marine water management, the 'Ecosystem Approach' (EA) is a central philosophy for governing interactions between biotic, abiotic & anthropic factors at different scales.
- The EA potentially fosters new forms of participatory management (Van Leeuwen et al, 2014). How can interdisciplinary research grasp changing configurations of science/knowledge, institutions and stakeholders which the EA invites?

Methodology

Literature review on EA & Science-Politics (S-P)

- relations Design framework to identify 4 sets of S-P coupling practices (4A framework) Apply 4A framework to gather & analyse
- qualitative data on 1st phase of implementation of the European Union Marine **Strategy Framework Directive**
- (MSFD) in New Aquitaine, SW France Data sources: documentary analysis; participant observation; 19 semi-structured interviews with different categories of actors involved in implementation (public officials, scientists, e

Preliminary Results

NGOs. industry)

• The making of a Marine Action Plan for Bay of Biscay (Fr) implementing MSFD

When defining problems, which scientific & institutional resources & visions of coastal & marine futures were acquired?

1. Acquisition

- · Existing public policies/rules/protocols already operating on the marine environment & data mobilised within these policies (e.g. CFP, WFD)
- Expansive range of new data (scientific, user/industry, project impact assessment, e-NGO) per MSFD descriptor Knowledge gaps (e.g. water column effects; noise, marine
- mammals; chemical contaminants; recreational activities) New actors (e.g. decentralised state services; industry;
- ports; e-NGOs; physicists) brought together with actors already governing coastal waters/local territories in new arenas (e.g. Maritime Advisory Council - MAC)

Spirit of knowledge sharing, but MSFD descriptors fragmented acquisition - little discussion of local visions **MSFD EA**

descriptor topics: biodiversity; nonindigenous species; commercial fish; food webs; eutrophication; sea floor integrity; hydrographical conditions; contaminants; seafood contaminants; marine litter; energy & underwater noise

What consequences for coastal & marine futures

4. Accumulation

- Co-leadership by state ministries. decentralised state actors, national public scientific hodies
- Institutional resources: norms, participation monitoring instruments mechanisms, networks, rules & measures
- New S-P power resources which strengthen already entrenched positions, but provide new opportunities for new actors; potential for new S-P interactions

On-going local translation of EA philosophy in the governing of the marine environmen

When setting objectives & instruments, which scientific & institutional resources and visions were aggregated?

2. Aggregation

- Aggregation of institutional resources data. protocols, monitoring networks, measures, other policies on marine environment
- But tensions over knowledge gaps coupled with budgetary problems, legal questions & policy deadlines worked to produce a minimal approach
- reported dissatisfaction Actors with 'unambitious' aggregation, but understood why this had come about

Overall actors supported aggregation but within a philosophy of EA adaptive management, i.e. not wanting to 'rock the boat' but wait for the 2nd cycle to make improvements

were science & policy communicated?

When legitimizing choices, how

3. Articulation

- Numerous new formal & informal moments of articulation with different audiences: in different formats (expert reports; public consultation); with different consequences (e.g. MAC 'no' vote caused re-writing of measures, but public consultation largely one-way)
- Usage also made of tools & arenas linked to public policies already in place (e.g. CFP, WFD)

Tools of EA democracy enlarged to the marine environment as a new space of public action, but limits apparent (e.g. criticisms of consultation with public; level & type of expertise required to access governing process)

Discussion Points

- Local MSFD choices & local meaning of an 'EA' emerged from complex, socially embedded and often opaque governing processes (Cleaver & Franks 2005; Van Tatenhove 2013), as distinct from deliberate, designed government with linear input from science.
- Unambitious outcome should not be confused with a departure from an EA
- Complexity associated with an EA was not upheld by actors as an immediate barrier to governing
- Complexity did make it hard for both actors (and analysts) to grasp the 'bigger picture' or 'panoramic vision' (Leslie & McLeod 2007) associated with an EA as implemented in New Aquitaine
 - SA 56 modified state





 Disparity of S-P temporal scales (rather than spatial) posed more immediate local difficulties: e.g. mismatch strict policy deadlines vs long term policy effects; mismatch urgent science needs vs budget timeframes

Perspectives: How the EA is interrogating S-P coupling practices merits continued study. The ECOGOV project will apply the 4A framework to the governing of other ecosystems in New Aquitaine (e.g. 'forestry', 'estuary') to compare the consequences of the EA for participation.



This study has been carried out with financial support from the French National Research Age (ANR) in the frame of the Investments for the future Programme, within the Cluster of Excellence (ANR-10-LABX-45).