Maritime cultural landscape: collaborative governance for resilience and sustainability

MASSIMO CLEMENTE, GAIA DALDANISE, ELEONORA GIOVENE DI GIRASOLE

CNR-IRISS, National Research Council of Italy - Institute of Research on Innovation and Services for Development, via Cardinale Guglielmo Sanfelice 8, 80134 Naples, Italy

corresponding author: g.daldanise@iriss.cnr.it

ABSTRACT

The paper develops the issue of the sea-coast system as a "maritime cultural landscape", using the theory of the "commons". The maritime cultural landscape is understood as a common good and this implies the need to involve urban and maritime communities in both its care and enhancement. Based on this assumption, we consider the maritime cultural landscape as a "cultural ecosystem", an expression of the heterogeneity of urban and maritime communities and their interrelationships. In this perspective, the research proposes a framework to analyse "cultural values" and "cultural services" for the maritime cultural landscape enhancement by involving the coastal community through collaborative governance processes.

KEYWORDS: maritime cultural landscape, commons, collaborative governance.

1. MARITIME CULTURAL LANDSCAPE AND COASTAL COMMUNITIES

In seaside cities and coastal territories (Carta, 2012; Clemente, 2013; Clemente & Giovene di Girasole, 2017; Greco, 2009; Hein, 2019; Kalaora & Konitz, 2004; Russo, 2010; Soriani, 2002), environmental issues perception has been growing (Billé, 2008; Esteban Chapapría, 2012; Estrada Llaquet, 2012; Giovinazzi & Moretti, 2009), the concept of cultural landscape as a set of material and immaterial values has been established (Fusco Girard, 2013; UNESCO, 2011; Veldpaus, Pereira Roders, & Colenbrander, 2013), and the cities and territories intended as ecosystem has been developed (Cerreta et al., 2021; Cerreta & Poli, 2017; Hogan et al., 2014).

The coastal areas show the fusion of urban and maritime culture (Clemente, 2011), named by Konvitz as "urban maritime culture" (Konvitz, 1978; 2020). Maritime culture represents a common heritage, the historical, cultural, economic substrate that merges together the communities living along coastal areas. In this perspective, a specific attention to coastal areas is proposed, considering the land-sea interaction (European Commission, 2020). In this perspective, the core of the enhancement action is the tangible and intangible maritime cultural heritage, intended as "maritime cultural landscape".

The maritime cultural landscape development process, as a cultural project, starts from the urban and maritime community. At the same time, in coastal areas we can simultaneously find the defining traits of the commons, or those ecological characters (which distinguish a wetland from a fishing bench, the global climate from the local microclimate), or intrinsic qualities appreciated by humankind (often they directly contribute to the existence of man or are necessary conditions for man's life on earth), or the quality of social facts (products of human interaction and history) that the human mind has produced, or is capable of appreciating or recognizing as something that is valid, for the individual as well as for the whole humankind (Donolo, 2010).

In this perspective, we can consider the maritime cultural landscape as a common heritage (Clemente et al., 2015b). Therefore, recognition of the maritime cultural landscape as a common good can allow the construction of "common ground" conditions that Elinor Ostrom (Ostrom, 2006; Ostrom et al., 1994) considered fundamental to achieve trust, reliability and reciprocity among the community members, who identify shared values, objectives and rules for the use of the maritime cultural landscape. Thus, the maritime cultural landscape can represent a common good in which institutions together with the urban and maritime community recognise a shared value, becoming common (Clemente et al., 2015a).

This implies an individual and collective responsibility within collaborative governance processes in which political institutions recognise the importance of "no-state stakeholders" (Ansell & Gash, 2008, p. 544) and the need for their direct contribution in decision-making processes is interesting.

Through the activation of collaborative decision-making processes (Tisdall, 2013; Wilson, 2003), it is possible to build relationships among the various actors of the coastal community (institutions, urban community, tourists, stakeholders, shipping companies, etc.) and to bring together the different instances (of conservation, protection, development, etc.), thus favouring conflicts resolution and developing shared projects (Clemente et al., 2015a).

Coastal communities could be relevant to trigger strategies for a fair and sustainable sea-coast use and for the land-sea interactions strategies definition. Coastal communities are bearers of environmental, cultural, historical, economic values, which reveal new possible territorial vocations. In this perspective, collective actions could be collected in a shared plan, to identify objectives and rules to combine environmental protection with the cultural enhancement of the sea-coast resource.

2. MARITIME CULTURAL ECOSYSTEM FRAMEWORK

The maritime cultural landscape as commons represents, therefore, the heterogeneity of urban and maritime communities and of their interrelationships oriented to build development processes. In this perspective, triggering strategies for a sustainable use of the maritime cultural landscape implies the recognition of a shared value in the coast-sea-community system as a "cultural ecosystem" (Antrop, 2001). This needs the identification of cultural functions that contribute, directly or indirectly, to the well-being of individuals.

Generally, the ecosystem definition (Odum, 1977) is closely related to the identification of "ecosystem services" (Costanza & Folke, 1997; MEA, 2005) that consider the multiple landscape functions (Bastian et al., 2014; Cerreta & Poli, 2017; Wu, 2013). In this context, referring to ecosystem services is useful as they are defined as the result of an evolution over time of natural processes, uses, rules of use and social norms (Chan, Satterfield, & Goldstein, 2012; MEA, 2005).

We can classify ecosystem services as: "habitat", "regulatory", "production" and "information services" (Gómez-Baggethun et al., 2013; MEA, 2005). "Habitat services" are related to the capacity of the natural system to maintain biological and genetic diversity in the processes of evolution. "Regulatory services" are oriented towards regulating the ecological processes essential for maintaining the life of systems. "Production services" (food, energy resources, genetic material, etc.) are the processes necessary for the survival of the population. Finally, "information services" contribute to the maintenance of human health by creating opportunities for cognitive development, spiritual enrichment and recreation.

Several classification systems have been proposed at the international level (Haines-Young & Potschin, 2012; MEA, 2005; The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB, 2010), such as the MEA system (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment) including the TEEB system (The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity) and the CICES system (Common International Classification of Ecosystem Services).

In order to build a new point of view for maritime cultural landscape planning (Clemente et al., 2020), the "cultural ecosystem services" (Chan et al., 2012; Haines-Young & Potschin, 2012; Poli & Daldanise, 2021) identify some interesting categories of functional values for research. In fact, these values are defined by the three aforementioned classifications according to the following interpretations:

1. "spiritual and religious value, cultural diversity, aesthetic value, knowledge systems and values of education, recreation and ecotourism" (MEA classification);
2. "culture and art, information for cognitive development, spiritual experience, aesthetic information, recreation and tourism" (TEEB classification);
3. "spiritual, aesthetic, information, community activity and recreation" (CICES v4).

These three categories of values allow researchers to identify the different dimensions linked to a cultural service and the relationships generated with the cultural ecosystem.

In the MEA classification (1), a key role is given to spiritual and religious values, as well as to the cultural diversity and the educational values that tangible and intangible cultural heritage are able to generate. In the TEEB classification (2), special attention is given to the experiential part of cultural and tourism activities and, at the same time, to the informational function that these experiences are able to trigger. Finally, in the CICES v4 classification (3), the distinctive character with respect to the other classifications is the relational one, including in the value system those generated by community and recreational activities.

Using the three classifications described above (MEA, CICES v4, TEEB), we can attribute a key role to three categories of values and related services: spiritual and religious values, cultural diversity and educational values which are associated with the services derived from the use of tangible and intangible cultural heritage; social and community values linked to community and recreational activities; cultural, experiential and information values which generate quality cultural and tourism experiences.

For this purpose, it is necessary to identify the different subjects, institutional and non-institutional, involved in the construction of cultural services in the coastal ecosystem, assuming a model of collaborative governance, understood as: "a governing arrangement where one or more public agencies directly engage non-state stakeholders in a collective decision-making process that is formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative and that aims to make or implement public policy or manage public programmes or assets" (Ansell & Gash, 2008, p. 544).

This governance model highlights six important criteria: (1) the model is started by public agencies or institutions; (2) participants are also "non-state stakeholders"; (3) participants are engaged directly in the decision-making process and are not merely "consulted"; (4) the model is formally organised and have collegial meetings; (5) the model aims to make collective decisions by consensus; (6) the focus of collaboration is on public policies and projects.

Starting with these considerations, co-assessment processes (Krogstrup & Mortensen, 2021; Van Der Meer & Edelenbos, 2006) can be structured to analyse "cultural ecosystem values" (cultural, social and economic) and co-planning (Evans & Foord, 2008; Sarkissian, Hurford & Wenman, 2010) could define innovative "cultural ecosystem services".

3.   PERSPECTIVES FOR A SUSTAINABLE USE OF THE MARITIME CULTURAL LANDSCAPE

Coastal areas have always been crossroads of goods traffic between peoples, places of contamination and cultural richness. These areas are characterised by huge resources linked to history, culture, traditions, architecture, environmental peculiarities, and the activities that are representative of their "urban maritime culture".

The strong identity and the belonging to water and land are elements characterising coastal areas that have specific critical issues requiring appropriate responses.

The coast is, therefore, a high value landscape but also with great fragilities and its environmental, social and economic specificities highlight a differentiated and targeted demand for active protection. In this perspective, the research framework can represent the key to carry out capillary analyses on coastal areas in order to bring out social, cultural, economic, ecological and environmental values, which are able to enhance the sea and the coast as "maritime cultural landscape".

In a world that is facing an unprecedented crisis generated by the COVID-19 pandemic, collaborative decision-making processes applied to the logic of ecosystem services can be a great opportunity for sea cities development. In fact, starting from the recognition of a specific asset (in this case the maritime cultural landscape) as a common good, they allow the identification of shared rules, objectives and values.

In order to rebuild our economy and to introduce the necessary recovery plans, it is essential to move from a vertical (government) to a horizontal (governance) vision in order to, on the one hand, achieve a common vision of the coast (starting from its cultural value) and, on the other hand, overcome the fragmentation of plans and projects on the coastal system. In the collaborative governance model, a crucial role is played by the system of institutional and non-institutional actors and the responsibility to plan and act through a common strategic vision.

Through a governance process aiming at a collaboration between the "prosumers" (Rifkin, 2014) of the coast and the sea, it is possible to identify a relevant resource in the local culture, in particular in the urban maritime culture, to be enhanced for its central role in the coastal landscape. The separations between maritime and coastal clusters can therefore be overcome by developing models in which socio-cultural and economic forces work together to reconstruct maritime cultural landscape.

In this perspective, it is relevant that public and research entities, cultural organisations, citizens, associations, and companies can be involved in the processes of coastline enhancement, intended as maritime cultural landscape, in order to improve the competitiveness and the quality of the whole coastal ecosystem in its cultural, environmental, economic and social contexts.

4. REFERENCES

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *18*(4), pp. 543-571. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032

Antrop, M. (2001). The language of landscape ecologists and planners: A comparative content analysis of concepts used in landscape ecology. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, *55*(3), pp. 163-173.

Bastian, O., Grunewald, K., Syrbe, R.-U., Walz, U., & Wende, W. (2014). Landscape services: the concept and its practical relevance. *Landscape Ecology*, *29*(9), pp. 1463-1479.

Billé, R. (2008). Integrated coastal zone management: four entrenched illusions. *S.A.P.I.EN.S. Surveys and Perspectives Integrating Environment and Society*, *5*.

Carta, M. (2012). Waterfronts between Sicily and Malta: an integrated and creative planning approach. *PortusPlus*, (3).

Cerreta, M., Daldanise, G., Giovene di Girasole, E., Poli, G., & Regalbuto, S. (2021). Decision-making processes for Naples Circular City-Port: approaches and tools. *Urbanistica Informazioni*, (special issue 06).

Cerreta, M., & Poli, G. (2017). Landscape services assessment: a hybrid multi-criteria spatial decision support system (MC-SDSS). *Sustainability*, *9*(8), pp. 1-18.

Chan, K. M. A., Satterfield, T., & Goldstein, J. (2012). Rethinking ecosystem services to better address and navigate cultural values. *Ecological Economics*, *74*, pp. 8-18.

Clemente, M. (2011). *Città dal mare. L'arte di navigare e di costruire le città*. Napoli: Editoriale Scientifica.

Clemente, M. (2013). Identità marittima e rigenerazione urbana per lo sviluppo sostenibile delle città di mare. *BDC. Bollettino Del Centro Calza Bini*, *13*(1), pp. 181-194.

Clemente M., Arcidiacono C., Giovene di Girasole, E., & Procentese, F. (2015a). Trans-disciplinary approach to maritime-urban regeneration in the case study "Friends of Molo San Vincenzo", port of Naples, Italy. In S. Santos Cruz, F. Brandão Alves, & P. Pinho (eds), *Citta 8th annual conference on planning research Aesop tg / public spaces & urban cultures meeting Generative places, Smart approaches, Happy people* (pp. 701-718). Porto: Citta.

Clemente, M., Daldanise, G., Giovene di Girasole, E., & Stella, S. (2020). Maritime Cultural Landscape collaborative governance. *PORTUSplus_the Journal of RETE*, *9*.

Clemente, M., Giovene di Girasole, E., Cannatella, D., & Martucci, C. (2015b). Cultural landscape by the sea as commons: collaborative planning for the metropolitan waterfront of Naples. *BDC. Bollettino Del Centro Calza Bini*, *1*, pp. 113-130.

Clemente, M., & Giovene di Girasole, E. (2017). Friends of Molo San Vincenzo: Action Research and Collaborative Planning. *PORTUS: The Online Magazine of RETE*, *34*. Available at http://portusonline.org/category/this_issue/34/focus-this-issue-34/

Costanza, R., & Folke, C. (1997). Valuing ecosystem services with efficiency, fairness and sustainability as goals. In G.C. Daily (ed). *Nature's Services: Societal Dependence on Natural Ecosystems* (pp. 49-70).Washington, DC; Covelo, CA: Island Press.

Donolo, C. (2010). *Identificare i beni comuni*. Retrieved from https://www.labsus.org/2010/07/identificare-i-beni-comuni

Esteban Chapapría, V. (2012). Medio ambiente y cambio climático, la encrucijada de los puertos. *Portus*, 24, pp. 26-29.

Estrada Llaquet, L. J. (2012). La sostenibilidad ambiental en los puertos. Una visión panorámica Environmental Sustainability of Ports. An Overview. *Portus*, 24, pp. 12-19.

European Commission (2020). Maritime Spatial Planning "Land sea interactions". Retrieved from https://www.msp-platform.eu/faq/land-sea-interactions-msp

Evans, G., & Foord, J. (2008). Cultural mapping and sustainable communities: planning for the arts revisited. *Cultural Trends*, *17*(2), pp. 65-96.

Fusco Girard, L. (2013). Toward a Smart Sustainable Development of Port Cities/Areas: The Role of the "Historic Urban Landscape" Approach. *Sustainability*, *5*(10), pp. 4329-4348. https://doi.org/10.3390/su5104329

Giovinazzi, O., & Moretti, M. (2009). Città portuali e waterfront urbani: trasformazioni e opportunità. *TeMA*. *Journal of Land Use, Mobility and Environment*, *2*(3), pp. 7-16.

Gómez-Baggethun, E. et al. (2013). Urban Ecosystem Services. In T. Elmqvist, M. et al. (eds). *Urbanization, Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services: Challenges and Opportunities* (pp. 175-251). Dordrecht: Springer. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7088-1_11

Greco, N. (2009). *La città e i suoi mari. Il waterfront tra sostenibilità e governance*. Milano: Franco Angeli.

Haines-Young, R., & Potschin, M. (2012). *CICES Version 4: Response to Consultation*. Report to the European Environment Agency. Retrieved from https://cices.eu/content/uploads/sites/8/2012/07/CICES-V43_Revised-Final_Report_29012013.pdf

Hein, C. M. (2019). The port cityscape: Spatial and institutional approaches to port city relationships. *PORTUSplus*, *8* (Special Issue), n.p.

Hogan, D.M., Shapiro, C.D., Karp, D.N., & Wachter, S.M. (2014). *Urban ecosystem services and decision making for a green Philadelphia*. US Geological Survey.

Kalaora, B., & Konitz, A. (2004). Le Conservatoire du littoral: entre patrimonialisation et médiation. In *Annales de géographie*, 113, pp. 87-99. Société de géographie.

Konvitz, J. W. (1978). *Cities & the sea: port city planning in early modern Europe*. Baltimore. MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Konvitz, J.W. (2020). *Cities & the Sea: Port City Planning in Early Modern Europe*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Krogstrup, H.K., & Mortensen, N.M. (2021). The Fifth Evaluation Wave: Are We Ready to Co-Evaluate? In *Processual Perspectives on the Co-Production Turn in Public Sector Organizations*, pp. 59-78. IGI global.

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA). (2005). *Ecosystems and human well-being: synthesis*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Odum, H.T. (1977). The ecosystem, energy, and human values. *Zygon*, *12*(2), pp.109-133.

Ostrom, E. (2006). *Governare i beni collettivi*. Venezia: Marsilio (Or.: Governing the commons. New York: Cambridge Univerity Press, 1990).

Ostrom, E., Gardner, R., Walker, J., Walker, J. M., & Walker, J. (1994). *Rules, games, and common-pool resources*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Poli, G., & Daldanise, G. (2021). Creative Ecosystem Services: Valuing Benefits of Innovative Cultural Networks. In *International Conference on Computational Science and Its Applications* (pp. 193-209). Springer.

Russo, M. (2010). Napoli e la sua costa. Contraddizioni di un territorio duale. In Savino, M., *Waterfront d'Italia. Piani politiche progetti*. Milano: FrancoAngeli.

Sarkissian, W., Hurford, D., & Wenman, C. (2010). *Creative community planning: Transformative engagement methods for working at the edge*. London; Washington, DC: Earthscan.

Soriani, S. (2002). *Porti, città e territorio costiero: le dinamiche della sostenibilità*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB). (2010). *The economics of ecosystems and biodiversity: ecological and economic foundations.* London; Washington, DC: Earthscan. Retrieved from www.teebweb.org/our-publications/teeb-study-reports/ecological-and-economic-foundations/

Tisdall, A. (2013). Collaborative Decision Making. In *Advanced ATM Symposium and Workshops*. Montréal: ICAO Headquarters.

UNESCO. (2011). *UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape*. Retrieved from

https://whc.unesco.org/en/hul/

Van Der Meer, F.-B., & Edelenbos, J. (2006). Evaluation in multi-actor policy processes: accountability, learning and co-operation. *Evaluation*, *12*(2), pp. 201-218.

Veldpaus, L., Pereira Roders, A.R., & Colenbrander, B.J.F. (2013). Urban Heritage: putting the past into the future. *The Historic Environment*, *4*(1), pp. 3-18.

Wilson, M. A. (2003). *Collaborative decision making: Building consensus group decisions for project success*. Paper presented at PMI® Global Congress 2003 - North America, Baltimore, MD; Newtown Square, PA: Project Management Institute. Retrieved from www.pmi.org/learning/library/collaborative-decision-making-group-7667

Wu, J. (2013). Landscape sustainability science: ecosystem services and human well-being in changing landscapes. *Landscape Ecology*, *28*(6), pp. 999-1023.