



**HAL**  
open science

## Poor online information on European marine protected areas impairs public participation under the Aarhus Convention

Valentina Rossi, Carlo Pipitone, Katherine Yates, Fabio Badalamenti, Giovanni D'anna, Cristina Pita, Fátima Alves, Jesús Argente-García, Jelena Basta, Joachim Claudet, et al.

### ► To cite this version:

Valentina Rossi, Carlo Pipitone, Katherine Yates, Fabio Badalamenti, Giovanni D'anna, et al.. Poor online information on European marine protected areas impairs public participation under the Aarhus Convention. *Marine Policy*, 2024, 161, pp.106012. 10.1016/j.marpol.2024.106012 . hal-04446734

**HAL Id: hal-04446734**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04446734>**

Submitted on 8 Feb 2024

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 Poor online information on European marine protected areas impairs public participation under the  
2 Aarhus Convention

3  
4 Valentina Rossi<sup>1</sup>, Carlo Pipitone<sup>2,3</sup>, Katherine L. Yates<sup>4</sup>, Fabio Badalamenti<sup>2,3</sup>, Giovanni  
5 D'Anna<sup>3,5</sup>, Cristina Pita<sup>6</sup>, Fátima L. Alves<sup>6</sup>, Jesús E. Argente-García<sup>7</sup>, Jelena Basta<sup>8</sup>,  
6 Joachim Claudet<sup>9</sup>, Karsten Dahl<sup>10</sup>, Simonetta Fraschetti<sup>11,12,13</sup>, Ioannis Giovos<sup>14</sup>, Peter  
7 Mackelworth<sup>8,15</sup>, Mairi Maniopolou<sup>16</sup>, Vasiliki Markantonatou<sup>17</sup>, Márcia Marques<sup>6</sup>,  
8 Pedro Noguera-Méndez<sup>7</sup>, Joanna Piwowarczyk<sup>18</sup>, Violin Raykov<sup>19</sup>, Gil Rilov<sup>20</sup>, Bob  
9 Rumes<sup>21</sup>, Alicia Said<sup>22</sup>, María Semitiel-García<sup>7</sup>, Yael Teff-Seker<sup>23,24</sup>, Tomás Vega  
10 Fernández<sup>12</sup>, David Goldsborough<sup>25</sup>

11  
12 1 CNR-IRISS, Via G. Sanfelice 8, 80134, Napoli, Italy  
13 2 CNR-IAS, Lungomare Cristoforo Colombo 4521, 90149 Palermo, Italy  
14 3 National Biodiversity Future Centre (NBFC), Palermo, Italy  
15 4 School of Science, Engineering and Environment, Salford University, Manchester, UK  
16 5 CNR-IAS, Via Giovanni da Verrazzano 17, 91014 Castellammare del Golfo, Italy  
17 6 CESAM, University of Aveiro, Campus Universitário de Santiago, 3810-193 Aveiro,  
18 Portugal  
19 7 University of Murcia, Spain  
20 8 Blue World Institute, Veli Lošinj, Croatia  
21 9 National Center for Scientific Research, PSL Université Paris, CRIOBE, USR 3278  
22 CNRS-EPHE-UPVD, Maison des Océans, Paris, France  
23 10 Institute of Bioscience - Aarhus University, Frederiksborgvej 399 DK-4000 Roskilde,  
24 Denmark  
25 11 Dep. of Biology, University of Naples Federico II  
26 12 Stazione Zoologica Anton Dohrn, Naples  
27 13 CoNISMa, Rome, Italy  
28 14 iSea, Environmental Organisation for the Preservation of the Aquatic Ecosystems,  
29 Kritis 12, 54645, Thessaloniki, Greece  
30 15 Institute for Tourism, Zagreb, Croatia  
31 16 Hellenic Centre for Marine Research, 46,7 km Athinon - Souniou, Anavyssos, Attiki,  
32 Greece  
33 17 Department of Marine Sciences, University of the Aegean, 81 100, Mytilene, Greece  
34 18 Institute of Oceanology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Powstańców Warszawy 55,  
35 Sopot, Poland  
36 19 Institute of Oceanology, Bulgarian Academy of Science, 40 Parvi Mai str., 9000 Varna,  
37 Bulgaria  
38 20 National Institute of Oceanography, Israel Oceanographic and Limnological Research  
39 (IOLR), Haifa 3108001, Israel  
40 21 Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences, Brussels, Belgium  
41 22 Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture, Malta  
42 23 Technion - Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel  
43 24 Department of Sociology, University of California, Davis, USA  
44 25 Van Hall Larenstein, University of Applied Sciences, Leeuwarden, The Netherlands

45  
46 Corresponding author: Carlo Pipitone, CNR-IAS, Lungomare Cristoforo Colombo  
47 4521, 90149 Palermo, Italy. [carlo.pipitone@cnr.it](mailto:carlo.pipitone@cnr.it)

#### 48 49 **Highlights**

- 50 • Aarhus Convention's pillars are the mainstay of democratic environmental governance
- 51 • European MPAs websites were surveyed to check for the application of the Convention

- A minor part of European MPAs websites comply with the Convention's principles
- MPAs partly fail to use ICT tools to ensure public participation in MPA management

## Abstract

The Aarhus Convention is a globally recognized benchmark for democratic environmental governance. However, no assessment exists on whether European MPAs comply with the legal standards set out by the Convention. Here, we focus on public authorities' websites on MPAs as tools for promoting transparency, public involvement, and democratic processes. We assessed the websites of 61 European MPAs in thirteen countries using a survey structured by the three pillars of the Convention: access to information, participation in decision-making, and access to justice. We show that while most websites are used to disseminate information, they do not serve yet as participatory instruments. Very few have an area dedicated to public participation in decision-making and, when available, they provide scarce information on the outcomes of public involvement. Most websites provide general information on the MPA conservation objectives, but less than half provide access to reports on the results of management. Few websites provide information on available means to challenge unlawful acts. Websites' potential as one of the most widely used, easily accessible, cost-effective sources of information and means for interaction with the general public should be better exploited. Increasing and facilitating the ability of the public to participate in MPA processes is key to ensure MPA success and environmental justice.

**Keywords:** democratic governance, information and communication technologies, environmental justice, legal standards, European legislation

## 1. Introduction

Over the past few decades, public participation in government decisions that may have a significant effect on the environment has emerged as an essential element of a new model of environmental governance (Bennett & Satterfield, 2018; Bennett et al., 2019; Bodin, 2017; Cumming et al., 2020). Public participation is intended to foster sustainability of development policies, thus promoting economic efficiency, environmental effectiveness, equity, and political legitimacy (Luyet et al., 2012; Jentoft & McCay, 1995; Gray, 2005). Often using overlapping terms, such as *public participation*, *environmental democracy*, and *civic engagement*, the underlying idea is that people have the right to influence decisions that are likely to affect their environment and, ultimately, their wellbeing.

The international community has acknowledged the importance of public participation in environmental matters in a variety of instruments, first and foremost in Principle 10 of the UN Declaration on Environment and Development (Rio Declaration)<sup>1</sup>, which identified for the first time the three pillars of public participation: *access to information*, *participation in decision-making processes* and *access to judicial and administrative proceedings* (UNGA, 1992). Accordingly, in the present paper the expression 'public participation' is used to indicate such three components. This approach has been reflected in acts, policies, regulations and judicial decisions adopted in several international fora (Birnie et al., 2009; Richardson & Razzaque, 2006), including environmental fora (UNEP, 2010), organizations for development (WB, 2013; OECD, 2022), and human rights mechanisms and courts (Boyle, 2012; UNGA, 2018). In this process, a key role has been played by the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters<sup>2</sup>, known as the Aarhus Convention (hereafter also the Convention),

---

<sup>1</sup> UN Doc. A/CONF.151/26 (1992):

[https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A\\_CONF.151\\_26\\_Vol.I\\_Declaration.pdf](https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A_CONF.151_26_Vol.I_Declaration.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> <https://unece.org/DAM/env/pp/documents/cep43e.pdf>

98 adopted in the context of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE, 1998). For  
99 a long time, the Convention has been the only legally binding instrument putting into practice  
100 Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration with a comprehensive and structured approach. It focuses on the  
101 decision-making process as the key legal element in sustainable development (Birnie et al., 2009),  
102 and is based on the premise that public participation is an indispensable means for more equitable,  
103 legitimate and effective decisions, resulting in enhanced implementation and reduced conflicts  
104 (Richardson & Razzaque, 2006; Adger et al., 2003). The Aarhus Convention is globally recognised  
105 as a benchmark for democratic environmental governance due to the ground-breaking character of  
106 the treaty, which goes to the heart of the relationship between governments and society in the  
107 environmental sector. The Convention combines notions and approaches from the environmental and  
108 human rights law and imposes obligations on State Parties, focusing on the interactions between  
109 States' public authorities and the public (individuals or legal persons and their groups or associations),  
110 with a right-based approach. Further, traditional means of control and enforcement have proved to be  
111 scarcely effective in ensuring effectiveness of international environmental law (Hoffman et al., 2022;  
112 Treves et al., 2009). This is due to the fact that traditional means of international dispute settlement  
113 are not well suited for public interest environmental disputes resolution, because of legal and technical  
114 issues, i.e. evidence of the causal link. The Aarhus Convention, similarly to other multilateral  
115 environmental agreements, provides for a regime-specific system to control and assist  
116 implementation and compliance, modelled in part on those existing in human rights systems. Based  
117 on Article 15 of the Convention, in October 2002, the Meeting of the Parties (MOP) has established  
118 the Aarhus Convention Compliance Committee (UNECE, 2002). The Committee represents a  
119 relevant innovation: coherently with the human right based approach of the Convention, this  
120 international compliance mechanism may be triggered not only by State parties but also by members  
121 of the public, entitled to submit communications to the Committee concerning a Party's compliance  
122 with the Convention (Tanzi & Pitea, 2009). As explained in detail later in this article, the Compliance  
123 Committee is showing how important it is to have an independent international body to review  
124 compliance with environmental law by state Parties and to open this body to communication by non-  
125 State actors. Finally, despite regional in scope, the Convention was designated as a global instrument:  
126 it is opened to accession by any UN Member. To date, it has been ratified by 47 Parties, including the  
127 EU and all its Member States. The European Union (EU) has adopted Directives 2003/4/EC and  
128 2003/35/EC to ensure the uniform implementation of the first two pillars by member States, and has  
129 issued an *ad hoc* regulation (Reg. 1367/2006) concerning its implementation by EU institutions and  
130 bodies. This means that the Convention provisions have been transposed in EU law and are subject  
131 to judicial (and very effective) control of the EU Court of Justice (EUCJ) (see, *ex multis*, Case  
132 C-243/15, Judgment 8 November 2016).

133 The governance approach of the Convention is reaffirmed in Sustainable Development Goal 16 of  
134 the Agenda 2030<sup>3</sup> on peace, justice and strong institutions, which sets out for the first time targets  
135 concerning the governance component of sustainability and embraces transparency, public  
136 involvement and access to information and justice (UNGA, 2015). The international community has  
137 thus endorsed public participation as a crucial element of democratic governance that, according to  
138 the United Nations Development Programme, is based on the essential characteristics of good  
139 governance (IFAD, 1999) but must also be concerned with institutions' accountability and human  
140 rights matters (UNDP, 2008).

141 This governance approach based on public participation is particularly relevant in nature conservation  
142 (Lockwood et al., 2010). Biodiversity is a public good that provides an array of ecosystem services  
143 (Mace et al., 2012), and its regulation requires instruments and approaches adequate to address its  
144 complex distributive and procedural justice implications. In this regard, public participation has been  
145 recognized as an important tool to foster a fair balance between all competing interests and to help  
146 ensure the understanding and articulation of alternative and universal perspectives (Redgwell, 2002).

---

<sup>3</sup> UN Doc. A/RES/70/1: <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N15/291/89/PDF/N1529189.pdf>

147 In the specific context of Protected Areas (PAs), the cornerstones of biodiversity conservation on  
148 land and at sea, it has long been suggested that disregard for justice implications is one important  
149 reason for the experienced conflicts and the lack of regulatory effectiveness (Paavola, 2004). The  
150 growing attention on the procedural justice dimension of PAs governance is reflected in recent  
151 practice of the bodies of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)<sup>4</sup>, with substantive and  
152 procedural equity aspects becoming a central issue during the Conferences of the Parties<sup>5</sup>. Analysing  
153 progress towards Aichi Target 11<sup>6</sup> on effectively and equitably managed PAs, the Subsidiary Body  
154 on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice of the CBD examined the procedural component  
155 of this Target and pointed out the need to evaluate this element effectively and broadly, in particular  
156 through site-level assessment (Franks et al., 2018; Schreckenberget al., 2016; Zafra-Calvo et al.,  
157 2017; CBD-SBSTTA, 2018a, 2018b).

158 The importance of public participation is especially critical in the marine environment, where  
159 boundaries are often unclear, and interactions and tensions between concurrent and new interests,  
160 coupled with the increasing accessibility of marine space and resources, are challenging the existing  
161 regulatory regimes (Rahman et. al, 2022). An example of implementation of such approach is the EU  
162 International Ocean Governance Forum (IOG Forum)<sup>7</sup>, a platform for online engagement of ocean  
163 experts and stakeholders, from Europe and beyond, that identified the key international ocean  
164 governance ‘Actions’ to be implemented by the EU to help set the course for a sustainable blue planet.  
165 One of the priority Actions identified is to support the systematic and expanded application of  
166 Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) across  
167 all marine spaces. Enhanced transparency in how assessment results are used to support decisions is  
168 also deemed necessary for these decisions to gain wider social acceptability. In this perspective, one  
169 of the recommendations proposes to make the results of these assessments publicly available and  
170 easily accessible through a dedicated portal/web page (e.g. dedicated page of the European Maritime  
171 Forum), in relation to the ecological implications of all investments supported by EU funds (EU IOG  
172 Forum, 2021). This was also confirmed during the recent intergovernmental conference on an  
173 international legally binding instrument under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea<sup>8</sup>  
174 on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity of areas beyond national  
175 jurisdiction. The implementing BBNJ (Biodiversity Beyond National Jurisdiction) Agreement  
176 officially adopted on 19 June 2023, (UNGA, 2023), in its Part III on “Measures such as area-based  
177 management tools, including marine protected areas”, devotes an article to consultations on and  
178 assessment of proposals regarding the establishment of marine protected areas (MPAs) in areas  
179 beyond national jurisdiction. The article provides for consultations on proposals that “shall be  
180 inclusive, transparent and open to all relevant stakeholders [...] as well as civil society, the scientific  
181 community, Indigenous Peoples and local communities”.

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.cbd.int/doc/legal/cbd-en.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> CBD, COP 10, *Decision X/31 on Protected Areas* (UNEP/CBD/COP/DEC/X/31) 29 October 2010; CBD, COP 11, *Decision XI/24 on Protected Areas*, (UNEP/CBD/COP/DEC/XI/24), 5 December 2012 ; CBD, COP 13, *Decision on Progress towards the achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12*, (UNEP/CBD/COP/DEC/13/2), 12 December 2016; CBD, COP 14, *Decision XIV/1 on Updated Assessment on Progress Towards selected Aichi Biodiversity Targets and options to accelerate progress*, (UNEP/CBD/COP/DEC/14/1) 30 November 2018; CDB, COP, *Decision XIV/16 Methodological Guidance concerning contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities*, (UNEP/CBD/COP/DEC/14/16), 30 November 2018; CBD, SBSTTA, *Note by the Secretariat. Voluntary Guidelines on effective governance models for management of protected areas, including equity*, (CBD/SBSTTA/22/6 Annex II), 22 March 2018.

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.cbd.int/aichi-targets/target/11>

<sup>7</sup> The EU International Ocean Governance Forum, [https://maritime-forum.ec.europa.eu/theme/governance/ocean-governance-forum\\_en](https://maritime-forum.ec.europa.eu/theme/governance/ocean-governance-forum_en)

<sup>8</sup> [https://www.un.org/depts/los/convention\\_agreements/texts/unclos/unclos\\_e.pdf](https://www.un.org/depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unclos/unclos_e.pdf)

182 Although the need to set up an inclusive and transparent process for the designation, management  
183 and enforcement of PAs has been constantly emphasized, international and national practice on these  
184 issues appears fragmented and highly heterogeneous (Bennett & Satterfield, 2018; Barnhart & Ferse,  
185 2023). Public participation is a complex and dynamic concept that evolves following political, social  
186 and technological developments, and can be achieved through different rules, procedures and  
187 implementing instruments (Arnstein, 1969). A good example of a very structured public participation  
188 process is the extensive stakeholder engagement in the planning and implementation of the MPA  
189 network along the California coast that followed the California Marine Life Protection Act Initiative  
190 (Sayce et al., 2013). However, participatory processes are often implemented in flexible ways and  
191 through open informal experiences that are not sufficient to sustain the desired political and social  
192 transformation in PA governance (Jones, 2009).

193 The role that the Aarhus Convention may play in fostering and enhancing public participation in the  
194 specific context of PAs is recognised by CBD's bodies as well as in several documents adopted by  
195 the United Nations Environment Programme, the Food and Agriculture Organization and the  
196 International Union for Conservation of Nature. The fact that all EU Member States and the EU itself  
197 are parties to the Convention adds further value: its provisions represent common binding minimum  
198 standards for public participation in environmental matters in the EU. As a matter of fact, all EU  
199 Member States are legally bound to put its provisions into practice in the environmental domain,  
200 including the specific case of PAs management.

201 In this context, an important role has been gained by information and communications technologies  
202 (ICTs), increasingly recognized as efficient and effective tools to enhance and support the  
203 implementation of the Convention standards (UNECE, 2005) and more generally, to promote  
204 democratic environmental governance in initiatives of nature conservation. This is highlighted in  
205 several documents adopted by the Aarhus Convention bodies, such as the Recommendation on  
206 Electronic Information Tools (REIT)<sup>9</sup> to provide public access to environmental information  
207 (UNECE, 2005), as well as in reports and recommendations of the Task Forces on Electronic  
208 Information Tools, on Public Participation in Decision-making and on Access to Information.  
209 Similarly, in recent years, EU environmental regulations have constantly stressed the crucial role of  
210 ICTs in the implementation of environmental standards, also in the specific frame of nature  
211 conservation, as for instance in the Action Plan for nature, people and the economy (EC, 2017a; Peters  
212 et al., 2014).

213 The present paper is based on the internationally agreed legal standards on public participation in  
214 environmental matters, as provided by the Aarhus Convention<sup>10</sup>, focusing on one of the instruments  
215 available to that purpose i.e., MPAs' public authorities' websites. In fact, websites are among the  
216 most widely used and easily accessible sources of information and means for interaction for the  
217 general public (EC, 2017a; Peters et al., 2014). According to several documents adopted by the  
218 Aarhus Convention bodies (see *infra*), many instruments can be used, such as government  
219 publications, radio and tv broadcasts, newspapers, environmental information centres with accessible  
220 catalogues and databases. However, all these instruments need to be used together, in a systematic  
221 and coherent way, playing each one its own role; and this is especially true for on-line instruments,

---

<sup>9</sup> Un Doc. ECE/MP.PP/2005/2/Add.4:

<https://unece.org/DAM/env/documents/2005/pp/ece/ece.mp.pp.2005.2.add.4.e.pdf> An updated version of the Recommendation was adopted in 2021, UN Doc. ECE/MP.PP/2021/2/Add.2: [https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2022-08/ECE\\_MP.PP\\_2021\\_2\\_Add.2\\_E\\_0.pdf](https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2022-08/ECE_MP.PP_2021_2_Add.2_E_0.pdf)

<sup>10</sup> Pursuant article 10 of the Aarhus Convention, the Parties keep under continuous review the implementation of the Convention on the basis of regular reporting. National reports are available at <https://unece.org/environment-policy/public-participation/reporting-mechanism-1>. Further, reports providing an overview of the implementation of the Convention are prepared by its bodies for the periodical Meeting of the Parties; they are available at <https://unece.org/env/pp/aarhus-convention/mop-introductory-page>. For further information, see also the website of the Aarhus Clearinghouse, which provides information relevant to the implementation of Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration at the global, regional and national levels: <https://aarhusclearinghouse.unece.org>

222 like websites. The main objective of this study is to investigate to what extent such instruments,  
223 widely recognized as potentially highly valuable and cost-effective tools, are actually used to  
224 implement the Aarhus Convention participatory standards in the specific case of MPAs in EU seas.  
225 In other words, based on the legal standards of the Convention, the paper aims at evaluating the role  
226 played by public authorities' websites in conveying ecological, administrative, and legal information  
227 regarding MPAs, and in fostering public participation in decision making and access to environmental  
228 justice in the context of MPAs in European seas.

## 230 **2. Methods**

231  
232 In line with the definition of "public authority" adopted by the Aarhus Convention, which is based  
233 on a functional approach, the concept of public authorities' websites embraces websites (including  
234 pages/sections inside broader-focused websites) published and managed by a national or local  
235 government body or by a private entity performing public administrative functions (e.g. NGO,  
236 institution or consortium) that is responsible for the MPA management. When there was more than  
237 one website for a single MPA, the one providing the most detailed information has been chosen for  
238 inclusion in the study. This was for example the common case in Italy, where the web portal dedicated  
239 to national MPAs by the competent ministry delivered very poor information while the websites run  
240 by the MPA management bodies were always much more informative.

241 The MPAs included in the study are all located in European seas, which means that they are subject  
242 to the same common binding (minimum) standards for public participation in environmental matters  
243 set by the Aarhus Convention and transposed in EU law. In order to obtain a homogeneous sample  
244 among the wide variety of MPA typologies, the MPAs included in the study were only those  
245 designated under the national legislation of an EU member State (Fraschetti et al., 2018) that  
246 corresponded to (or included) a Natura 2000 site according to the EC Habitat Directive<sup>11</sup>.

247 A total of sixty-one websites - one for each selected MPA - from thirteen countries was analysed. Co-  
248 authors selected a minimum of one and a maximum of three MPAs from their own country, with the  
249 aim of including all the regional seas around Europe as defined by the EC Marine Strategy Framework  
250 Directive<sup>12</sup>. The full list of selected MPAs is provided in the supplementary material (Table SM1).

251 The analysis of public authorities' websites was conducted through a questionnaire (supplementary  
252 material, Table SM2) that was filled between April and October 2018 by all co-authors after careful  
253 inspection of the websites. The questionnaire was based on the three pillars of the Aarhus Convention:  
254 (1) access to information, (2) participation in decision-making, and (3) access to justice, and  
255 comprised five questions each with a number of information parameters. Each parameter was allowed  
256 either a "1" (when the required parameter was directly or indirectly - i.e., through a link to an external  
257 website - present in the MPA website) or a "0" score. The sum of scores for each information  
258 parameter was used to calculate the percent frequency of occurrence for each question across the 61  
259 websites. The five questions were elaborated starting from the Convention principles and provisions,  
260 as clarified and developed in the practice of the Convention bodies; such principles and provisions  
261 were adapted to the specific context of MPAs, in order to translate them into concise information  
262 parameters.

## 264 **3. Results and discussion**

265  
266 The results are divided into three sections corresponding to the three pillars of the Convention. Within  
267 each section, summary tables provide an overview of the availability of the different types of  
268 information found on MPAs' websites.

---

<sup>11</sup> Council Directive 92/43/EEC:

<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:31992L0043&from=EN>

<sup>12</sup> Directive 2008/56/EC: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32008L0056&from=EN>

269  
 270  
 271  
 272  
 273  
 274  
 275  
 276  
 277  
 278  
 279  
 280  
 281  
 282  
 283  
 284  
 285  
 286  
 287  
 288  
 289  
 290  
 291  
 292  
 293

### 3.1. Access to environmental information

According to the Aarhus Convention, environmental information has to be made available to the public with two complementary approaches: in response to a request (passive approach) and through active dissemination (proactive approach). The object of these obligations i.e., “environmental information”, is defined in very broad terms (art. 2): it embraces information on the state of elements of the environment, which explicitly include biological diversity, but also information on factors, activities and measures (e.g., legislation, policies and plans) suitable to affect the environment as well as cost/benefit and other economic analyses and assumptions used in environmental decision making. Our study shows that MPA management authorities commonly use ICT tools to provide a range of information on MPAs, suggesting that such authorities are increasingly aware that public participation is a well-established principle of democratic governance and that websites are crucial in this perspective. However, the results obtained from our survey show that MPAs’ websites are predominantly used to disseminate limited typologies of information; further, they show that the information they provide is often inconsistent and incomplete in terms of the standards set out by the Convention bodies.

#### 3.1.1. Environmental information available on the websites

The first question is articulated in parameters corresponding to different typologies of environmental information, taking into account the priority categories of information to be made progressively publicly accessible through the internet, according to the REIT (UNECE, 2005), and bearing in mind the specificities of MPAs (Table 1).

<b>Q1. What ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION is publicly available on the website?</b>	<b>% occurrence</b>
1.1 Generic information on the state of the environment in the MPA	75.4
1.2 Detailed/ analytical information on the state of the environment in the MPA	42.6
1.3 Text of environmental legislation, regulations and policies	83.6
1.4 Act of formal designation of the MPA	80.3
1.5 Information on the MPA conservation objectives	91.8
1.6 MPA Management plan	52.5
1.7 MPA zoning and activities prohibited /restricted in each zone	73.8
1.8 MPA educational activities and awareness campaigns/events for the public	62.3
1.9 MPA management bodies	82.0
1.10 Proposed and existing activities and plans that may significantly affect the environment in the MPA	36.1
1.11 Progress in the achievement of nature conservation objectives and/or on implementation of the Management plan	45.9
1.12 Processes, methods and standards of environmental data collection	34.4
1.13 Type and scope of environmental information accessible to the public	39.3
1.14 Procedures and conditions to request environmental information not available on the website	26.2
1.15 Contact details to whom the public can ask further information and clarifications	80.3
<b>Total of Environmental Information</b>	<b>60.4</b>

294  
 295  
 296  
 297

Table 1. Information parameters from Question 1 of the questionnaire. % occurrence refers to the number of websites where the parameter was directly or indirectly available among the 61 European MPAs websites analysed.



298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348

The analysis of the websites has shown that only a few typologies of environmental information are widely available, either directly or indirectly. This is especially true for the information on the environmental legislation, on formal designation, on conservation objectives, on management bodies, and on contact details (parameters 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.9, 1.15). Notably, the available information on the legislative and institutional framework occurs in general with the highest frequencies and covers environmental legislation, regulations and policies (including the act of formal MPA designation), MPA's management bodies, zoning and prohibited or restricted activities and contact details. Much less common is the information on management plans, which are the necessary tool to manage MPAs and to allow the fulfilment of conservation objectives. The available information also decreases noticeably with respect to other categories of information such as, detailed information on the state of the ecosystem (e.g., reports or environmental monitoring data) and information on the progress in the achievement of nature conservation objectives and/or on the implementation of the management plan. Further, the information became very limited when dealing with relevant and sensitive issues such as proposed or existing activities and plans that may affect the environment in the MPA. Yet, the Convention principles and provisions are intended to promote environmental awareness and information, in order to allow the public to exercise a widespread control over the activities of public authorities. It aims to create the conditions to enable every person to play an active role in the achievement of environmental objectives and to defend their right to live in an environment adequate to human health and wellbeing. From this perspective, the Convention stipulates that each State Party shall provide information on the performance of public functions relating to the environment by governments at all levels (art. 5.7). In particular, active dissemination of plans and progress reports on their implementation is expressly provided for (art. 5.5.a). Further, in order to ensure that the environmental information is effectively accessible, the Convention emphasizes the importance of the type and scope of environmental information publicly accessible and of that concerning procedures and conditions to request the information that is not available on the website.

Finally, an important topic is the availability of information on methods and standards of data collection (parameter 1.12). This typology of information is crucial to make data comparable for future data users, whether they are citizens, researchers or policy makers. Lack of access to this information means that the assets created and held by public authorities with public money, cannot produce all the economic, social and environmental benefits they could (and should) generate for the benefit of the society. This is in contrast with the principle that public authorities hold environmental information not for themselves but in the public interest (preamble 17 of the Convention), and with the final aim of fostering public active engagement in MPA management.

Our results show that accessible environmental information is still incomplete and scattered to a large extent. We acknowledge that widespread recognition of transparency as a fundamental element of democratic governance and rapid development of ICT has radically changed the way public authorities communicate with the public. Biodiversity conservation is no longer only a matter for specialists or an attraction for tourists; public authorities widely use websites to disseminate information on MPAs to the public as regards their institutional role and MPA objectives and organization. Nonetheless, only limited information is available on activities, projects and results of MPAs' management i.e., the sort of information that would allow the public to evaluate the performance of environment-related public functions. In particular, the lack of results from monitoring activities normally included in the management plans prevent the public to evaluate the MPA efficiency and to contribute to possible adjustments. In most cases, with only a few exceptions, it seems that websites are still considered an instrument that MPA management authorities are required to adopt and that, behind institutional information, are used as showcases to publish only the information they decide to make available, such as public events or educational activities.

### 3.1.2. Sources of the information available on the websites

349 The second question is articulated in parameters corresponding to different typologies of information  
 350 sources identified as useful and relevant in international practice (Table 2).  
 351

<b>Q2. What INFORMATION SOURCES are available on the website?</b>	<b>% occurrence</b>
2.1 Official documents (legislation, plans, manuals, reports, studies)	91.8
2.2 Instruments for dissemination of information (e.g., press releases, non-technical summaries)	77.0
2.3 Regular information or reporting instruments (newsletters, journals, periodical reports)	41.0
2.4 Link to pages/profiles on social networks (e.g., Twitter, Facebook, Google plus)	41.0
2.5 Instruments providing spatial attributes of information (e.g., geo-referenced data, interactive maps)	52.5
<b>Total of Information Sources</b>	<b>60.7</b>

352  
 353 Table 2. Information parameters from Question 2 of the questionnaire. % occurrence refers to the  
 354 number of websites where the parameter was directly or indirectly available among the 61 European  
 355 MPAs websites analysed.  
 356

357 Besides official documents and the instruments for dissemination of information of occasional nature  
 358 (parameters 2.1, 2.2), which are widely available, regular information or reporting instruments  
 359 (periodical reports, newsletters) are quite limited as well as the instruments providing spatial  
 360 attributes of information (e.g., interactive maps on the distribution of habitats and human uses). Still  
 361 the importance of periodical reporting instruments is stressed in several international guidelines in  
 362 order to allow the general public and the relevant stakeholders to monitor the achievement of  
 363 environmental objectives and evaluate policies and actions put in place. Even the use of social  
 364 networks, which have a huge diffusion among the global population is limited, although they could  
 365 be a useful and inexpensive tool to establish a dialogue with potentially interested stakeholders. Points  
 366 2.3 to 2.5 need dedicated staff with specific expertise and relevant funds (more so for point 2.5) to be  
 367 implemented, which can surely be a critical issue for many MPA management bodies.  
 368

### 369 3.1.3. Quality and effective accessibility of information available on the websites

370  
 371 According to the Convention, environmental information made available to the public has to comply  
 372 with a few fundamental requirements: it has to be updated (art. 5.1, 5.4), comprehensible (art. 5.7(b,  
 373 6.6(d), and effectively accessible (art. 4.1(b, 4.8, 5.2) (UNECE, 2014; Andrusyevych & Kern, 2016).  
 374 Table 3 deals with these requirements.  
 375  
 376

<b>Q3. What is the QUALITY and EFFECTIVE ACCESSIBILITY of the information available on the website?</b>	<b>% occurrence</b>
3.1 The last update is less than 90 days old (since the date of access to the website)	39.3
3.2 Basic information available in English	50.8
3.3 Availability of data, information and documents provided in an easy-transferable format (e.g., word, PDF)	82.0
3.4 Availability of a “search” option to search for specific information	62.3
3.5 Availability of instruments to make the website user friendly (e.g., FAQ, glossary, site map)	47.5
3.6 Opportunity to request access to information not available on the website by electronic means (e.g., emails addresses, online format)	73.8
3.7 Availability of mechanisms for the assessment of user-needs (e.g., opportunity to provide feedback, surveys, number of accesses)	16.4
<b>Total of Quality and Accessibility of Information</b>	<b>53.2</b>

377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419

Table 3. Information parameters from Question 3 of the questionnaire. % occurrence refers to the number of websites where the parameter was directly or indirectly available among the 61 European MPAs websites analysed.

Our survey has shown that the information available is often out-of-date (parameter 3.1). This could be due to several reasons, including the lack of relevant environmental information to communicate (e.g., no new monitoring data, events, licensing, etc.), of funding, of staff, of human capacity or expertise in website management, or simply lack of interest in providing information. However, it is important to point out that according to the Convention (article 5.1.a), public authorities are required to possess and update environmental information which is relevant to their functions, and the Convention Implementation Guide urges Parties to establish systems that ensure a regular flow of information from operators, monitoring systems, researchers and others to the public authorities in charge (UNECE, 2014). In brief, public authorities cannot simply abstain from collecting and providing to the public information that could turn out to be thorny.

From the same perspective, the Convention bodies have emphasized that environment-related information should be made available in an easily accessible (UNECE, 2014, Implementation Guide p. 81 and 105) and user-friendly manner (*ibidem*, p. 63 and 65). Actually, such tools as documents in easy-transferable format and ‘search’ options (parameters 3.3, 3.4) are often available, whereas basic information in English and other user-friendly instruments are available to a rather limited extent. Nonetheless, these tools are expressly recommended by the REIT (UNECE, 2005) and by the Convention Implementation Guide (UNECE, 2014). Further, the number of websites that contained mechanisms for the assessment of user needs (like the possibility to provide feedback, surveys on information demand, and number of accesses to pages or content: parameter 3.7) is extremely small, although such mechanisms are crucial to identify and meet the demand of information requested by the public and to improve the provision of information over time.

### 3.2. Participation in decision-making

The participation of the public concerned in environmental decision-making is regulated in the Convention, which provides different levels of public involvement for different kinds of environment-related decisions, such as authorization of specific activities, preparation of plans, programmes and policies, preparation of executive regulations and legally binding normative instruments. According to the Convention, public participation in environmental matters must be *informed, early* (i.e., when all options are still open) and *effective*. Less than half of analysed MPAs use the websites as an instrument for the involvement of the public. On the basis of the degrees of participation identified by the Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development, the analysed websites are currently instruments for ‘dissemination of information’ but for the most part, not yet for ‘consultation’, which implies the opportunity to provide feedback on analysis, alternatives or decisions, nor are they instruments for ‘active participation’ in decisions, which would require participation in development of alternatives and identification of possible solutions (OECD, 2001).

---

**Q4. Does the website provide information on MODALITIES OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION in the decision-making processes affecting the MPA (e.g., projects authorization, approval of plans, licensing, ...) and opportunities and/or instruments for effective participation?**

---

4.1 Specific entry/area dedicated to public participation in decision-making processes	16.4
4.2 Information concerning specific decisions to be adopted (e.g., approval of projects, adoption of plans, licensing)	50.8

4.3 Information on environmental impacts of proposed projects/activities or draft plans/policies/regulations	24.6
4.4 Alerts to the public about opportunities for participation in decisions on proposed projects, plans, or regulations	24.6
4.5 Information on public hearings, roundtable discussions, stakeholder committees, aimed at public participation in decisions concerning projects, plans or regulations	31.1
4.6 Opportunity to provide feedback on proposed projects, plans or regulations that affect / are suitable to affect the MPA	24.6
4.7 Information on the outcomes of public participation	18.0
4.8 Information on the final decision	44.3
<b>Total of Information/Opportunities/Instruments for Public Participation</b>	<b>29.3</b>

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

Table 4. Information parameters from Question 4 of the questionnaire. % occurrence refers to the number of websites where the parameter was directly or indirectly available among the 61 European MPAs websites analysed.

Table 4 shows that very few websites have a specific area dedicated to public participation in decision-making processes (parameter 4.1) and only half of them provide information concerning specific decisions that affect or are likely to affect the MPA (parameter 4.2). The number of websites providing information on the environmental impacts of proposed projects and activities or draft plans, policies and regulations (i.e., environmental impact assessments, strategic impact assessments, habitat appropriate assessment documentation, and the like: parameter 4.3) is even lower, as is the percentage of websites providing notice to the public about opportunities for participation in decisions (parameter 4.4). These results are not in line with the Convention, which states that “the necessary information” must be provided to the public and, with reference to some types of decision, it identifies in detail such information. Effective involvement in the decision-making processes concerning the MPA obviously requires that the information needed to evaluate the possible effects of the decision itself is made available to the public. The Convention Implementation Guide (UNECE, 2005) clarifies that the word “necessary” should be understood in the frame of effective participation, in keeping with the objective of the Convention to encourage widespread public awareness and to ensure public participation in environment-related decisions.

Information concerning public hearings, roundtable discussions, stakeholders’ committees aimed at public involvement in decisions concerning the MPA (parameter 4.5) while still with a low percentage, is ranked relatively high if compared with other parameters under Q4. This suggests that public participation is still based on non-structured processes, often of occasional nature. Importantly, such information is only sparingly accompanied by opportunities to provide feedback by electronic means (e.g., with e-mails, online forms, or surveys: parameter 4.6). Yet it is widely recognized and stressed by the Implementation Guide (UNECE, 2005), that one of the functions of public participation is to assist public authorities in gathering high-quality information and to widen the range of choices considered. Critics of stakeholder participation have argued that it can hamper governance and prolong planning processes, as well as make them more cumbersome and expensive (Kusters et al., 2018). Additionally, in cases where experts are consulted, the information provided by stakeholders and the general public may be seen by some as less valuable, with experts perceived as more objective than stakeholders, the latter by definition non-objective (Gleason et al, 2010; Gopnik et al., 2012; Olsen et al., 2014). Nevertheless, while scientists supply a large amount of data and knowledge, they may lack the access stakeholders have to the local situation (Bingham et al., 2005). Moreover, stakeholder participation increases chances that plans and policies will be accepted and upheld by them, as long as they feel that their feedback is taken into consideration (Arnstein, 1969; Aronson, 1994; Barbaro & Bagajewicz, 2004; Yates, 2018). In this perspective, it is worth pointing out that information on the outcomes of public participation is extremely scarce in websites. Even the information on the final decision (the plan adopted or the project approved: parameter 4.8)

460 is available in only 44.3% of cases. Such small numbers are indicators of lack of effectiveness of  
 461 public involvement in decision making. However, the Convention provisions require public  
 462 authorities to disseminate the information concerning the outcomes of the participatory process and  
 463 the final decisions, in order to enable the public involved to assess if the outcomes of the process have  
 464 been taken into due consideration. The final aim is clearly to call public authorities to account for  
 465 their decisions and to discourage purely formal participation.

466  
 467 **3.3. Access to justice**

468  
 469 The third pillar of the Aarhus Convention is access to justice, which is also supposed to ensure the  
 470 proper functioning of the previous two pillars. As shown in Table 5, the websites devote very little  
 471 attention to this topic.  
 472

<b>Q5. Is information on PUBLIC ACCESS TO JUSTICE in environmental matters available on the website?</b>	<b>% occurrence</b>
5.1 Information on appeal procedures against refusal of access to information	18.0
5.2 Information on means to challenge project level decisions requiring public participation	13.1
5.3 Information on procedures available to the public to challenge unlawful acts and omissions prejudicial to the objectives of the MPA	18.0
5.4 Information on ongoing and/or past legal proceedings involving the MPA	23.0
Total of Information on Access to Justice	18.0

473  
 474 Table 5. Information parameters from Question 5 of the questionnaire. % occurrence refers to the  
 475 number of websites where the parameter was directly or indirectly available among the 61 European  
 476 MPAs websites analysed.

477 According to the Convention, Parties are required to ensure access to different kinds of review  
 478 procedures, such as appeal procedures relating to information requests, and should enable the public  
 479 to challenge the legality of project-level decisions requiring public participation as well as the general  
 480 violations of national environmental laws. To make these appeal instruments effective it is crucial  
 481 that the public is informed about the means at its disposal to challenge public authorities' decisions.  
 482 Our findings indicate that the information concerning review procedures was very rarely available  
 483 for all of the three components of access to justice (parameters 5.1 to 5.3). Only 18% of the analysed  
 484 websites provide information on available means to challenge unlawful acts and omissions that may  
 485 be prejudicial to the objectives of the MPA, whereas this could be a powerful instrument to scrutinize  
 486 the exercise of public functions. Even the information on ongoing and/or past legal proceedings  
 487 involving the MPA is extremely scarce. The results show that provisions on information concerning  
 488 access to justice in the case of MPAs are rarely implemented. It is worth noting that this is the only  
 489 pillar of the Convention for which the EU has not adopted a directive to support uniform  
 490 implementation in member States, because these are very reluctant to accept a European regulation  
 491 that would directly affect their judicial systems (EC, 2017b).  
 492

493 **4. Conclusions**

494  
 495 The Aarhus Convention has triggered a global process of change towards environmental democratic  
 496 governance which includes biodiversity protection and MPA management. In this specific context,  
 497 the Convention is widely recognized as the reference legal standard for public participation and  
 498 environmental justice in many international regulations and guidelines. The main purpose of the  
 499 Convention was to oppose the top-down approach adopted in most environmental decisions.  
 500 Encouraging public participation in environmental decisions and processes - like the creation of a  
 501 protected area - was a step forward towards people's awareness, but also a way to have their say on

502 the creation and management of MPAs. The fact that in most of the MPA websites examined, the  
503 Aarhus Convention is only partially - sometimes very poorly - implemented should push politicians,  
504 government institutions, research organizations and the media to promote the Convention and  
505 encourage MPA management bodies to implement it.

506 The present study shows that there is still a long path to travel. Specifically, as regards MPA  
507 management, the implementation of the Convention principles and rules seems to be lagging behind  
508 when it comes to the recommended use of ICTs - e.g., MPAs official websites - as crucial tools to  
509 enhance public awareness and public involvement in decisions that may affect the environment. ICTs  
510 have dramatically simplified the availability of information and the involvement of the public, and in  
511 modern society, the digital connection between people and nature should become an integral part of  
512 improving ecosystem management and promoting participation (Ives et al., 2017). Our analysis  
513 clearly shows some positive results in terms of meeting the Convention standards in this respect, yet  
514 there are still a number of critical issues.

515 Overall, it appears that websites are still conceived as a legal obligation and not yet as effective  
516 participatory instruments. In other words, their potential as one of the most widely used, easily  
517 accessible, cost-effective sources of information and means for interaction for the general public is  
518 far from being fully exploited. The limited availability of information does not allow the public to  
519 exert a widespread control over the activities of public authorities, and makes it very difficult to  
520 establish a dialogue with stakeholders that are directly involved in the MPA. Mechanisms for  
521 participation are crucial to identify and meet stakeholder demands in terms of information, although  
522 deficiencies in the effectiveness of this process may be a symptom of major problems in MPA  
523 management related to funding, staff, managerial capacity and expertise. Against this background,  
524 the legal standards provided by the Aarhus Convention can play a decisive role.

525 In our opinion, two complementary perspectives need to be considered. Firstly, it is crucial to promote  
526 public authorities' awareness that making information on MPA management available to the public,  
527 and actively disseminating it, is a legal obligation. In addition, it is crucial to enhance public  
528 awareness of 'environmental procedural rights'.

529 It is widely recognized that public participation in biodiversity conservation must go beyond local  
530 communities and vulnerable groups, such as indigenous peoples. True participation requires input  
531 from industry and other stakeholder groups, individuals and civil society organisations. Each of these  
532 sectors are entitled to the protection and sustainable use of biodiversity which should be considered  
533 as a universal public good, relevant for all humankind, regardless of where it is endangered or  
534 damaged (Díaz-Reviriego et al., 2019).

535 The 'environmental procedural rights' provided by the Convention enable individuals, sectors, and  
536 communities to play an active role in the pursuit of the objectives of nature conservation as set by the  
537 international community. A confirmation of the role that non-State actors have gained thanks to the  
538 Aarhus Convention in environmental protection, is the practice of the Compliance Committee  
539 established by the Convention. This is confirmed by data released by the Convention bodies: as of  
540 October 2021, out of 193 cases received by the Committee, 188 (97%) were Communications  
541 submitted by members of the public, in most cases environmental NGOs (States are very reluctant to  
542 point the finger against each other). Further, 67% of the submission were admissible or preliminarily  
543 admissible. In such cases, the Committee adopts findings and, if non-compliance is found, it may  
544 make recommendations either to the MOP or, with the Party's agreement, directly to the Party  
545 concerned. As of October 2021, 98% of the findings and recommendations were issued in relation to  
546 communications from the public<sup>13</sup>. The effectiveness of the mechanism has increased its success: the  
547 number of communications received between each MOP has continuously increased. Unfortunately,  
548 nature conservation and biodiversity are not included in the main sectors addressed by the

---

<sup>13</sup> <https://unece.org/env/pp/cc/communications-from-the-public>

549 communications, confirming that the rights base approach, the environmental procedural rights and  
550 the existing instruments are not yet sufficiently known and exploited in this domain. As regards  
551 official websites, they are often mentioned by the Committee among the instruments to be used to  
552 inform and involve the public. As an example, in its Findings and Recommendations adopted on 23  
553 July 2021, the Committee dealing with a case of public participation in a transboundary EIA, stated  
554 that the notification of a hearing to the public concerned (only) on a governmental website, may be  
555 sufficient in some contexts to respect the requirement of “an adequate, timely and effective notice”  
556 (art. 6.2) but it may not in other contexts (para 62)<sup>14</sup> (UNECE, CC, 2021). In addition, the relevance  
557 of websites, and electronic tools in general, has gained great attention during the pandemic. In such  
558 context, as regards carrying out public participation procedures, the Committee has highlighted  
559 several matters as worthy of particular attention (UNECE, CC, 2020), making reference to “the  
560 websites of the relevant public authorities, radio, television and social media”, as well as to the “good  
561 practice” to establish user-friendly online portals where the public concerned can easily access all the  
562 relevant information<sup>15</sup> (paras. 22 - 69).

563 This means that non-State actors, being allowed to bring their public authorities before an  
564 international compliance mechanism, are playing a crucial role in monitoring and promoting the  
565 Convention implementation. In the EU, this role has been enhanced by the direct applicability, and  
566 justiciability by the EU Court of Justice (EUCJ), of the provisions of the Convention that have become  
567 an integral part of the EU legal order. While, on the one hand, this has facilitated (and still is  
568 enhancing) the Convention implementation, on the other hand, in a game of reciprocal influences, it  
569 has pushed the EUCJ to broaden the criteria for the legal standing of NGOs according to the  
570 Convention requirements (Pallemaerts, 2011). It is clear by now that the recognition of these rights,  
571 that enable and protect an informed and effective participation in decision-making processes at all  
572 government levels, allows individuals, NGOs, sectors and communities to exert an element of control  
573 over the implementation of environmental regulations by the national authorities. Thus, making these  
574 authorities not only responsible for the protection of the general interest to nature conservation but  
575 also to the citizens they serve.

### 576 577 **CRedit authorship contribution statement**

578  
579 V. Rossi: conceptualization, writing - original draft. C. Pita: questionnaire design. F. Badalamenti, G.  
580 D’Anna, C. Pita: data curation, formal analysis. J.E. Argente-Garcia, J. Claudet, G. D’Anna, D.  
581 Goldsborough, P. Mackelworth, C. Pipitone, C. Pita, V. Rossi, M. Semitiel Garcia, Y. Teff-Seker K.  
582 L. Yates: writing - review & editing. All co-authors: data collection from case studies, final draft  
583 acceptance.

### 584 585 **Acknowledgements**

586  
587 The authors thank the MarCons CA15121 COST Action for funding the meetings and workshops that  
588 led to the preparation of this paper.

### 589 590 **Competing interests**

591  
592 The authors declare no competing interests.

### 593 594 **Declaration of interest**

---

<sup>14</sup> ECE/MP.PP/C.1/2021/13

<sup>15</sup> ECE/MP.PP/C.1/2021/6

595  
596  
597

Declaration of interest: none.

598 **References**

599

600 Adger, W. N., Brown, K., Fairbrass, J., Jordan, A., Paavola, J., Rosendo, S., & Seyfang, G. 2003.  
601 Governance for sustainability: towards a ‘thick’ analysis of environmental decision making.  
602 *Environment and planning A*, 35(6): 1095-1110. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a35289>

603 Andruskevych, A., Kern, S. (Eds.) 2016. Case Law of the Aarhus Convention Compliance Committee  
604 2004 - 2014, 3rd Edition. RACSE, Lviv: 234 pp.  
605 [https://unece.org/DAM/env/pp/compliance/CC\\_Publication/ACCC\\_Case\\_Law\\_3rd\\_edition\\_eng.pdf](https://unece.org/DAM/env/pp/compliance/CC_Publication/ACCC_Case_Law_3rd_edition_eng.pdf)  
606 [f](https://doi.org/10.1068/a35289)

607 Arnstein, S. R. 1969. A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*,  
608 35(4): 216-224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225>

609 Aronson, J. 1994. A pragmatic view of thematic analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, 2(1): 1-3.  
610 <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/1995.2069>

611 Barbaro, A., & Bagajewicz, M. J. 2004. Managing financial risk in planning under uncertainty.  
612 *AICChE Journal*, 50(5): 963-989. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/aic.10094>

613 Barnhart, W. B., & Ferse, S. C. (2023). Indonesia Case Study: Let Us Get Political: Challenges and  
614 Inconsistencies in Legislation Related to Community Participation in the Implementation of Marine  
615 Protected Areas (MPAs) in Indonesia. In: Wolff M., Ferse S. C. A., & Govan, H. (Eds.), *Challenges  
616 in Tropical Coastal Zone Management: Experiences and Lessons Learned*. Springer International  
617 Publishing, 149-164. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-17879-5\\_10](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-17879-5_10)

618 Bennett, N. J., Di Franco, A., Calò, A., Nethery, E., Niccolini, F., Milazzo, M., & Guidetti, P. 2019.  
619 Local support for conservation is associated with perceptions of good governance, social impacts,  
620 and ecological effectiveness. *Conservation letters*, 12(4): e12640. <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12640>

621 Bennett, N. J., & Satterfield, T. 2018. Environmental governance: A practical framework to guide  
622 design, evaluation, and analysis. *Conservation Letters*, 11(6): e12600.  
623 <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12600>

624 Bingham, L. B., Nabatchi, T., & O’Leary, R. 2005. The new governance: Practices and processes for  
625 stakeholder and citizen participation in the work of government. *Public administration review*, 65(5):  
626 547-558. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2005.00482.x>

627 Birnie, P., Boyle, A., & Redgwell, C. 2009. Non-State actors: Environmental Rights, liability and  
628 crimes. In: Birnie, P., Boyle, A., & Redgwell, C. (Eds.), *International Law and the Environment*, 3<sup>rd</sup>  
629 edition, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 268 - 334.  
630 <https://doi.org/10.1093/he/9780199594016.003.0005>

631 Bodin, Ö. 2017. Collaborative environmental governance: achieving collective action in social-  
632 ecological systems. *Science*, 357: 6352. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aan1114>

633 Boyle, A. E. 2012. Human rights and the environment: Where next. *European Journal of International  
634 Law*, 23: 613 - 642. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chs054>

635 CBD-SBSTTA (Convention on Biological Diversity - Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and  
636 Technological Advice) 2018a. Updated status of Aichi biodiversity target 11,  
637 CBD/SBSTTA/22/INF/30.  
638 <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/5a93/21ba/d085c6e64dcb8a505f6d49af/sbstta-22-inf-30-en.pdf>



639 CBD-SBSTTA (Convention on Biological Diversity - Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and  
640 Technological Advice) 2018b. Protected and conserved areas governance in the Convention on  
641 Biological Diversity: a review of key concepts, experiences, and sources of guidance,  
642 CBD/SBSTTA/22/INF/8.  
643 <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/75d4/07a8/95d2c59b0963a9845fd40d3d/sbstta-22-inf-08-en.pdf>

644 Cumming, G. S., Epstein, G., Anderies, J. M., Apetrei, C. I., Baggio, J., Bodin, Ö., Chawla S.,  
645 Clements H.S., Cox M., Egli L., Gurney G. G., Lubell M., Magliocca N., Morrison T.H., Muller B.,  
646 Seppelt R., Schluter M., Unnikrishnan H., & Weible, C. M. 2020. Advancing understanding of natural  
647 resource governance: a post-Ostrom research agenda. *Current Opinion in Environmental*  
648 *Sustainability*, 44: 26-34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2020.02.005>

649 Díaz-Reviriego, I., Turnhout, E., & Beck, S. 2019. Participation in inclusiveness in the  
650 intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services. *Nature*  
651 *Sustainability*, 2: 457-464. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0290-6>

652 EC (European Commission) 2017a. Communication from the Commission to the European  
653 Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the  
654 Regions - An Action Plan for nature, people and the economy, COM(2017)198final, (Actions 14 and  
655 15). Brussels. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52017DC0198>

656 EC (European Commission) 2017b. Commission Notice on access to justice in environmental  
657 matters, 2017/C 275/01. [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52017XC0818(02))  
658 [content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52017XC0818\(02\)](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52017XC0818(02))

659 EU IOG Forum (European Union International Ocean Governance Forum) 2021. Setting the course  
660 for a sustainable blue planet - Recommendations for enhancing EU action. EU IOG Forum.  
661 [https://3rd-iog-forum.fresh-thoughts.eu/wp-content/uploads/sites/89/2021/04/IOG-](https://3rd-iog-forum.fresh-thoughts.eu/wp-content/uploads/sites/89/2021/04/IOG-recommendations-2021-WEB.pdf)  
662 [recommendations-2021-WEB.pdf](https://3rd-iog-forum.fresh-thoughts.eu/wp-content/uploads/sites/89/2021/04/IOG-recommendations-2021-WEB.pdf)

663 Franks, P., Booker, F., & Roe, D. 2018. Understanding and assessing equity in protected area  
664 conservation. IIED Issue Paper. International Institute for Environment and Development. London.  
665 pp. 38. <https://www.iied.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/migrate/14671IIED.pdf>

666 Frascchetti, S., Pipitone, C., Mazaris, A. D., Rilov, G., Badalamenti, F., Bevilacqua, S., Claudet, J.,  
667 Caric, H., Dahl, K., D'Anna, G., Daunys, D., Frost, M. T., Gissi, E., Goke, C., Goriup, P., Guarnieri,  
668 G., Holcer, D., Lazar, B., Mackelworth, P., Manzo, S., Martin, G., Palialexis, A., Panayotova, M.,  
669 Petza, D., Rumes, B., Todorova, V., & Katsanevakis, S. 2018. Light and shade in marine conservation  
670 across European and contiguous seas. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 5: 420.  
671 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2018.00420>

672 Gleason, M., McCreary, S., Miller-Henson, M., Ugoretz, J., Fox, E., Merrifield, M., McClintock W.,  
673 Serpa P., & Hoffman, K. 2010. Science-based and stakeholder-driven marine protected area network  
674 planning: a successful case study from north central California. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 53(2):  
675 52-68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2009.12.001>

676 Gopnik, M., Fieseler, C., Cantral, L., McClellan, K., Pendleton, L., & Crowder, L. 2012. Coming to  
677 the table: early stakeholder engagement in marine spatial planning. *Marine Policy*, 36(5): 1139-1149.  
678 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2012.02.012>

679 Gray, T. S. 2005. Theorising about participatory fisheries governance. In: Gray, T. S. (Ed.),  
680 *Participation in fisheries governance*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed., Springer, Dordrecht: 1-25.

681 Hoffman, S. J. 2022. International treaties have mostly failed to produce their intended effects.  
682 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119 (32): e2122854119.  
683 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2122854119>

684 IFAD (International Fund for Agricultural Development) 1999. Good Governance: An Overview,  
685 EB99/67/ INF.4. <https://webapps.ifad.org/members/eb/67/docs/EB-99-67-INF-4.pdf>

686 Ives, C. D., Giusti, M., Fischer, J., Abson, D. J., Klaniecki, K., Dorninger, C., Laudan, J., Barthel, S.,  
687 Abernethy, P., Martín-López, B., Raymond, C. M., Kendal, D., & Wehrden, H. V. 2017. Human–  
688 nature connection: a multidisciplinary review. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 26–  
689 27: 106-113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2017.05.005>

690 Jentoft, S., & McCay, B. 1995. User participation in fisheries management: lessons drawn from  
691 international experiences. *Marine Policy*, 19(3): 227-246. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0308-  
692 597X\(94\)00010-P](https://doi.org/10.1016/0308-597X(94)00010-P)

693 Jones, P. J. 2009. Equity, justice and power issues raised by no-take marine protected area proposals.  
694 *Marine Policy*, 33(5): 759-765. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2009.02.009>

695 Kusters, K., Buck, L., de Graaf, M., Minang, P., van Oosten, C., & Zagt, R. 2018. Participatory  
696 planning, monitoring and evaluation of multi-stakeholder platforms in integrated landscape  
697 initiatives. *Environmental management*, 62(1): 170-181. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-017-0847-y>

698 Lockwood, M., Davidson, J., Curtis, A., Stratford, E. & Griffith, R. 2010. Governance principles for  
699 natural resource management. *Society and Natural Resources*, 23: 986-1001.  
700 <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920802178214>

701 Luyet, V., Schlaepfer, R., Parlange, M. B., & Buttler, A. 2012. A framework to implement  
702 stakeholder participation in environmental projects. *Journal of environmental management*, 111: 213-  
703 219. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2012.06.026>

704 Mace, G. M., Norris, K., & Fitter, A. H., 2012. Biodiversity and ecosystem services: a multilayered  
705 relationship. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 27: 19-26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2011.08.006>

706 OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development) 2001. Citizens as Partners.  
707 OECD Handbook on Information, Consultation and Public Participation in Policy-Making.  
708 <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264195578-en>

709 OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development) 2022. Recommendation of the  
710 Council on Open Government. C(2017)140.  
711 <https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/public/doc/359/359.en.pdf>

712 Olsen, E., Fluharty, D., Hoel, A. H., Hostens, K., Maes, F., & Pecceu, E. 2014. Integration at the  
713 round table: marine spatial planning in multi-stakeholder settings. *PloS one*, 9(10): e109964.  
714 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0109964>

715 Paavola, J. 2004. Protected areas governance and justice: theory and the European Union’s Habitats  
716 Directive. *Environmental Sciences*, 1(1): 59-77. <https://doi.org/10.1076/evms.1.1.59.23763>

717 Pallemarts, M. (Ed.) 2011. The Aarhus Convention at Ten: Interactions and Tensions between  
718 Conventional International Law and EU Environmental Law. Europa Law Publishing, Groningen,  
719 2011.

720 Peters, R. L., Snelhage, M., Van Gossum, H., Vancauwenberghe, G., Vandenbroucke, Veronika  
721 Mikos, Amor Torre-Marín, D., Vertriest, L., & Lammerant, J. 2014. Active dissemination of  
722 environmental information in relation to the Birds and Habitats Directive. Final report on improving  
723 data availability for conservation of wild birds, natural habitats and flora and fauna conservation.  
724 Assignment commissioned by the European Commission, ENV.D.4/ETU/2013/0063r.  
725 [https://www.academia.edu/67330756/Active\\_dissemination\\_of\\_environmental\\_information\\_in\\_rela  
726 tion\\_to\\_the\\_Birds\\_and\\_Habitats\\_Directive\\_Final\\_report\\_on\\_improving\\_data\\_availability\\_for\\_cons  
727 ervation\\_of\\_wild\\_birds\\_natural\\_habitats\\_and\\_flora\\_and\\_fauna\\_conservation](https://www.academia.edu/67330756/Active_dissemination_of_environmental_information_in_rela)

- 728 Rahman, M. K., Masud, M. M., Akhtar, R., & Hossain, M. M. 2022. Impact of community  
729 participation on sustainable development of marine protected areas: Assessment of ecotourism  
730 development. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 24(1), 33-43.  
731 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2480>
- 732 Redgwell, C. 2002. The International Law of Public Participation: Protected Areas, Endangered  
733 Species and Biological Diversity. In: Zillman, D. M., Lucas, A., & Pring, G. (Eds.), *Human Rights*  
734 *in Natural Resource Development: Public Participation in the Sustainable Development of Mining*  
735 *and Energy Resources*. Oxford University Press. New York: 187-214.  
736 <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199253784.003.0006>
- 737 Richardson, B. J., & Razzaque J. 2006. Public participation in environmental decision-making. In:  
738 Richardson, B., & Wood, S. (Eds.), *Environmental law for sustainability*. Hart Publishing, Oxford:  
739 165-194.
- 740 Sayce, K., Shuman, C., Connor, D., Reisewitz, A., Pope, E., Miller-Henson, M., Poncelet, E., monié,  
741 D., & Owens, B. 2013. Beyond traditional stakeholder engagement: public participation roles in  
742 California's statewide marine protected area planning process. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 74:  
743 57-66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2012.06.012>
- 744 Schreckenber, K., Franks, P., Martin, A., & Lang, B. 2016. Unpacking equity for protected area  
745 conservation. *Parks*, 22(2): 11-26. <https://doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.CH.2016.PARKS-22-2KS.en>
- 746 Tanzi, A., & Pitea, C. 2009. Non-Compliance Mechanisms: Lessons Learned and the Way Forward.  
747 In: Treves, T., Tanzi, A., Pitea, C., Ragni, C., & Pineschi, L. (Eds.), *Non-Compliance Procedures and*  
748 *Mechanisms and the Effectiveness of International Environmental Agreements*. Asser Press, The  
749 Hague, The Netherlands: 569-580. [https://air.unimi.it/retrieve/dfa8b9a4-3719-748b-e053-  
750 3a05fe0a3a96/32\\_Tanzi\\_Pitea.pdf](https://air.unimi.it/retrieve/dfa8b9a4-3719-748b-e053-3a05fe0a3a96/32_Tanzi_Pitea.pdf)
- 751 Treves, T., Tanzi, A., Pitea, C., Ragni, C., & Pineschi, L. (Eds) 2009. *Non-Compliance Procedures*  
752 *and Mechanisms and the Effectiveness of International Environmental Agreements*. Asser Press, The  
753 Hague, The Netherlands.
- 754 UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) 2008. *Mainstreaming Anti-Corruption in*  
755 *Development. Anti-Corruption Practice Note*.  
756 [https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/publications/Mainstreaming\\_Anti-  
757 Corruption\\_in\\_Development.pdf](https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/publications/Mainstreaming_Anti-Corruption_in_Development.pdf)
- 758 UNECE (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe) 1998. *Convention on Access to*  
759 *Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental*  
760 *Matters*, Aarhus, Denmark, 25 June 1998. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe.  
761 <https://unece.org/DAM/env/pp/documents/cep43e.pdf>
- 762 UNECE (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe) 2002. *Decision I/7 on Review of*  
763 *Compliance*, ECE/MP.PP/2/Add.8.  
764 <https://unece.org/DAM/env/pp/documents/mop1/ece.mp.pp.2.add.8.e.pdf>
- 765 UNECE (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe) 2005. *Decision II/3 on Electronic*  
766 *Information Tools and the Clearing-house Mechanism*, ECE/MP.PP/2005/2/Add.4.  
767 [https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/543994/files/%5BE%5DECE\\_MP.PP\\_2005\\_7-EN.pdf?ln=en](https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/543994/files/%5BE%5DECE_MP.PP_2005_7-EN.pdf?ln=en)
- 768 UNECE (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe) 2014. *Aarhus Convention: An*  
769 *Implementation Guide*. 2nd Edition.  
770 [https://unece.org/DAM/env/pp/Publications/Aarhus\\_Implementation\\_Guide\\_interactive\\_eng.pdf](https://unece.org/DAM/env/pp/Publications/Aarhus_Implementation_Guide_interactive_eng.pdf)

771 UNECE/MOP/CC (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, MOP, Compliance  
772 Committee) 2021. Findings and recommendations with regard to submission ACCC/S/2015/2  
773 concerning compliance by Belarus, adopted on 23 July 2021, ECE/MP.PP/C.1/2021/13.  
774 [https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2021-06/ECE\\_MP.PP\\_WG.1\\_2021\\_6\\_E.pdf](https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2021-06/ECE_MP.PP_WG.1_2021_6_E.pdf)

775 UNECE/MOP/CC (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, MOP, Compliance  
776 Committee) 2020. Recommendations with regard to request for advice ACCC/A/2020/2 by  
777 Kazakhstan, adopted on 1 July 2020.  
778 [https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2021-06/ECE\\_MP.PP\\_WG.1\\_2021\\_6\\_E.pdf](https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2021-06/ECE_MP.PP_WG.1_2021_6_E.pdf)

779 UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme) 2010. Guidelines for the Development of National  
780 Legislation on Access to Information, Public participation in decision-making and Access to Justice  
781 in Environmental Matters (Bali Guidelines).

782 UNGA (United Nations General Assembly) 1992. Report of the United Nations Conference on  
783 Environment and Development (Rio de Janeiro, 3-14 June 1992) Annex I - Rio Declaration on  
784 Environment and Development. A/CONF.151/26 (Vol. I).  
785 [https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A\\_CONF.151\\_26\\_Vol.I\\_Declaration.pdf](https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A_CONF.151_26_Vol.I_Declaration.pdf)  
786

787 UNGA (United Nations General Assembly) 2015. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on  
788 25 September 2015, 70/1. Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.  
789 United Nations General Assembly A/RES/70/1.  
790 [https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A\\_RES\\_70\\_1\\_E.pdf](https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A_RES_70_1_E.pdf)  
791

792 UNGA (United Nations General Assembly) 2018. Human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment  
793 of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment. United Nations General Assembly A/73/188.  
794 <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N18/231/04/PDF/N1823104.pdf?OpenElement>

795 UNGA (United Nations General Assembly) 2023. Draft agreement under the United Nations  
796 Convention on the Law of the Sea on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological  
797 diversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction. United Nations General Assembly (*Advanced,*  
798 *unedited, pending paragraph renumbering*). A/CONF.232/2023/L.3. <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/LTD/N23/073/63/PDF/N2307363.pdf?OpenElement>  
799

800 WB (The World Bank.) 2013. Operational Policy 4.01 - Environmental Assessment, (1999 revised  
801 2013). The World Bank. Washington D.C., United States of America.  
802 [https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/29598c8bc38cbde55106dd1f6be5a7c4-  
803 0290012023/original/BP-4-01-Environmental-Assessment.pdf](https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/29598c8bc38cbde55106dd1f6be5a7c4-0290012023/original/BP-4-01-Environmental-Assessment.pdf)

804 Yates, K. L. 2018. Meaningful stakeholder participation in marine spatial planning with offshore  
805 energy. In: Yates, K. L., & Bradshaw, C. J. A. (Eds.), *Offshore Energy and Marine Spatial Planning*.  
806 Routledge, London: 169-188.

807 Zafra-Calvo, N., Pascual, U., Brockington, D., Coolsaet, B., Cortes-Vazquez, J. A., Gross-Camp, N.,  
808 Palomo I., & Burgess, N. D. 2017. Towards an indicator system to assess equitable management in  
809 protected areas. *Biological Conservation*, 211:134-141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2017.05.014>