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In this extended issue of the Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning, we are pleased to include a special section on disproportionality in climate change policy, consisting of four articles, as well as 12 regular articles. The special section ‘Governing climate change: The (dis)proportionality of policy responses’, guest-edited by Jale Tosun, Andrew Jordan and Moshe Maor, engages with the growing scholarship on patterns of sustained policy over-reactions or over-investments – also known as policy bubbles. This literature builds on the punctuated equilibrium theory, which theorizes policy change as infrequent disruptions of routine policy characterized by incremental policy adjustments, in emphasizing the importance of new policy ideas more generally. Sustained under-reactions have been acknowledged as another form of disproportionate policy response. The main aim of the special section is to refine the theoretical concepts of policy over- and under-reaction and apply them – for the first time – to the study of an empirical topic, namely climate policy. A separate editorial note introduces the theme and highlights the main findings. Next to the special section, this issue features 12 regular papers that geographically span five continents. They reflect the diversity of environmental policy issues and cover inter alia natural resource management (NRM), transboundary environmental cooperation, marine and land management and planning, climate change, air quality, flood risk governance (FRG) and wind power. The article by Lotten Westberg and Cecilia Waldenström addresses the gap between demands for participatory approaches in NRM policies and lack of such approaches in the work of environmental authorities. Drawing on practice theory, their case study of Swedish County Administrative Board (CAB) officials shows that their practices aim to protect nature and mitigate resistance from stakeholders through information. The underlying problem interpretations have acquired a reified nature, so that they become taken for granted and maintain the gap between demands for participation in national policies and their implementation. To enable change in the CAB practice, the NRM officials would need to reinterpret their objectives and guidelines in ways that are justifiable within their legal and institutional context while facilitating stakeholder participation. Numerous governments around the world have adopted statutory mandates on the content of NRM plans, based on the assumption that they lead to greater consistency and higher quality of plans. While a number of studies have examined the relationship between mandates to develop plans and plan quality, there has been a limited study of the influence of state mandates for plan content on plan quality in a regional NRM planning context. Ruth Potts’ assessment of 22 regional NRM plans in New South Wales and Queensland, Australia finds that the presence of statutory mandates does not systematically affect the plan quality. Megacities in low- and middle-income countries face unique threats from climate change as vulnerable populations and infrastructure are concentrated in high-risk areas. In their article, Malcolm Araos, James Ford, Lea Berrang Ford, Robbert Biesbroek and Sarah Moser develop a theoretical framework to characterize adaptation readiness. They apply the framework to Dhaka, Bangladesh, a city with acute exposure and projected impacts from flooding and extreme heat. The framework developed in the paper offers a systematic and standardized means to assess and monitor the status of adaptation planning in cities in the Global South and identifies the constraints and opportunities for adaptation. Although framing has been widely recognized as a powerful mechanism for determining policy agendas, the planning and policy literature has not yet devoted much attention to the analysis of interactional framing in processes of policy change. Hetty van der Stoep, Noelle Aarts and Adri van den Brink analyse the framing processes that created tipping points in landscape planning policy in a Dutch peri-urban region. They identify two framing mechanisms: the conjunction of issue frames, relationship frames and interaction frames, and the 2017 resemiotization of established frames to link environmental concerns to the self-referential frames of target actors within and outside government. Certificate trading schemes have been discussed as a cost-efficient means of reducing urban land consumption in Germany by capping and
reallocating permissions to regulate building projects. The article by Till Proeger, Lukas Meub, Kilian Bizer and Ralph Henger presents a laboratory experiment that captures politicians’ incentives connected to electoral cycles in a cap & trade scheme for land consumption, in which tradable certificates are auctioned and grandfathered in equal shares. They find the cap & trade system to be broadly efficient but vulnerable to politically relevant distortions under certain conditions. Elena Bondarouk and Duncan Liefferink’s article offers an analysis of the implementation challenges facing the EU Ambient Air Quality directive, using 13 municipalities in the Netherlands as comparative cases. Focusing particularly on the obligation to design air quality policy, the findings illustrate great differences in the effectiveness of implementation between municipalities and give a nuanced picture of the meaning of ‘compliance’, ‘non-compliance’ and ‘over-compliance’. The article also provides a framework for analysing the implementation of EU framework regulation more broadly. In places like Canada, fast-paced wind turbine development combined with policy that limits local decision-making power has resulted in strong opposition to specific projects. Some studies suggest that anti-wind sentiment is tied to inadequate financial benefits for host communities. In their article, Chad Walker and Jamie Baxter report on the findings from a mixed-methods study concerning preferred distributive justice elements in rural communities in Ontario (a ‘technocratic-based’ model) and Nova Scotia (a ‘community-based’ model) living with turbines. Residents’ perceptions of economic benefits are complex and differentiated, but this empirical work shows that both the fair distribution and the amount of local benefits are important predictors of project support. How science and policy interact has been a major research focus in the International Relations (IR) tradition, as well as in the alternative perspective of Science and Technology Studies (STS). Fred P. Saunders, Michael Gilek and Sebastian Linke ask whether science should be autonomous and as apolitical as possible in order to ‘speak truth to power’, or whether the inevitable entanglement of science and politics should be accepted and embraced so as to make advice more conducive to negotiating the explicit nature of political decision-making. After comparing science-policy interactions in the issue areas of eutrophication and fisheries management in the Baltic Sea, the authors call for a re-conceptualization of coherence and a more reflexive practice in science-policy interactions. Because seas and coastlines are shared between states, marine spatial planning (MSP) is a transboundary endeavour. As Jan P. M. van Tatenhove observes in a paper that is based on his inaugural lecture at Queen’s University Belfast, the actors involved in MSP must be able to adapt their governance arrangements and to challenge the existing (national-oriented) MSP discourses. After assessing the un/reflexivity of four transboundary planning processes in different European seas, he specifies conditions for a reflexive marine governance arrangement. Henry Boer applies the concept of welfare environability to analyse Indonesia’s emerging national and project-based incentive frameworks, a key component to the climate programme reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD+). The article adapts governmentality theory to explore the rationale and design of various incentive instruments, including government institutions to disburse financial payments and co-benefits to multiple recipients, based on a study of a local demonstration project in Central Kalimantan Province. The findings show how incentive frameworks also restructure relations between people and environmental resources. After signing a peace accord in 1994, joint projects were initiated between Israel and Jordan that aimed at enhancing environmental protection and resource management. Michelle E. Portman and Yael Teff-Seker discuss the Red Sea Dead Sea Canal, the Eilat-Aqaba Municipal Cooperation initiative, the Joint Oil Spill Contingency Plan and the Red Sea Marine Peace Park (RSMPP). The article identifies two success factors not commonly included in the literature about transboundary environmental cooperation: peripheral geographic location and intensive work among professionals. Against the background of widespread calls for citizen involvement in the implementation of FRG, Hannelore Mees, Ann Crabbé and Peter P.J. Driessen aim to explain under which circumstances co-production of flood risk policy creates benefits. Based on an extensive literature review, they develop a framework that identifies conditions for successful co-produced FRG in terms of resilience, efficiency and legitimacy. The conclusions of the articles in this issue of the Journal go beyond the specific cases analysed. They contribute to current academic debates about
environmental policy and planning in developed and developing countries. Overall, the papers demonstrate a focus in environmental governance on attempts to (re-)structure relationships between the actors in environmental policy fields, be it through participatory arrangements, relationship framing, reflexive governance arrangements, co-production of governance arrangements, incentive-based institutions or the generation of community benefits. At the same time, the papers highlight an entanglement of structural barriers to effective environmental policy and planning that stretch from resource constraints and political opposition to entrenched expertocratic problem perceptions and the self-referentiality of organizational discourses. We are sure that these papers will inspire future research as well as practical debates among environmental policy-makers and planners on how environmental challenges can be successfully addressed.
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