

Designing Ecological Democracy: Agonistic and More-than-Human Approaches to Environmental Governance in Flanders

Kseniia Obukhova

School of Social Sciences / Faculty of Architecture and Arts

Hasselt University

Hasselt, Belgium

kseniia.obukhova@uhasselt.be

Abstract

This PhD research investigates how participatory and political design can intervene in environmental governance by promoting more ecologically informed forms of democracy. Situated within the FWO project “Redesigning Democracy” and empirically grounded in Flanders, Belgium, this study explores how design might challenge the technocratic rationalities of policymaking and open institutional processes to more-than-human participation, using regional water governance as a lens. The research examines the design’s potential to act both within and against governance frameworks—being for politics and political at once—through an analysis of several local initiatives aimed at tackling water-related issues, and by experimenting with material engagements with local waterbodies. It further argues that design’s generative and provocative capacities can mediate between institutional logics and ecological agencies, enabling new forms of coexistence among human and more-than-human actors. The research contributes to Participatory Design (PD) by advancing a notion of design for ecological democracy—a critical and generative practice for re-politicizing environmental governance and reimagining what it means to live and decide together in more-than-human worlds amid the frictions of environmental crisis.

CCS Concepts

• Human-centered computing; • Interaction design; • Interaction design process and methods; • Participatory design;

Keywords

more-than-human governance, water, ecological democracy, political design, agonism

ACM Reference Format:

Kseniia Obukhova. 2026. Designing Ecological Democracy: Agonistic and More-than-Human Approaches to Environmental Governance in Flanders. In *Participatory Design Conference 2026, Vol. 2: Exploratory Papers and Doctoral Colloquium (PDC 2026 Vol. 2)*, June 15–19, 2026, Milan, Italy. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 5 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3789492.3796477>

1 Introduction

Framed within an FWO-funded project on “Redesigning Democracy” in an interdisciplinary setting that combines political and design sciences, this doctoral research examines the role of design in promoting more participatory and engaged decision-making within existing governance frameworks during times of environmental crisis. A common struggle of environmental governance initiatives today consists of balancing the urgent need to implement ecological measures to achieve more democratic (inclusive, empowering, and just) governance frameworks [29]. This normative challenge has been described by Pickering and colleagues as the ‘democracy-environment nexus,’ referring to the two ideals as being in conflict. To analyze the relations between the two, the scholars provide a distinction between the ‘environmental’ and ‘ecological’ democracy, with the former aiming to achieve the balance by reforming current liberal and capitalist institutional frameworks, and the latter seeking to fundamentally critique and disrupt the existing neoliberal centers of power by adopting more transformative and participatory ecocentric approaches [18, 29]. My research aspires toward the latter. By examining participatory and political design as both critical and generative modes of inquiry, I ask how design might challenge the institutional structures that have failed to deliver on their ecological promises, instead perpetuating human-centered, technocratic forms of governance [14].

The research is situated in Flanders, a Belgian region increasingly confronted with the challenges of the climate crisis, where growing natural disasters have significantly impacted regional governance and policy strategies over the last several years. Belgium is, in fact, among the European countries experiencing the highest water distress [40], and regional policymakers recognize that the issue cannot be addressed “on the spot,” but requires a holistic and collaborative action. My attention has been drawn to a series of participatory initiatives in this domain, among which Water-Landscape (WLS)—a governance project guided by the Flemish Land Agency (VLM)—serves as a key case. WLS aims to address water-related challenges in rural areas by convening farmers, experts, and citizens around shared environmental objectives.

Despite their participatory ambitions, such initiatives remain situated within conventional institutional frameworks that reflect what would be classified as environmental democracy. Preliminary research suggests that they often fall into an overarching framework of (human) rationality and linear policymaking, where existing power hierarchies and institutional backing largely define the decision-making trajectory. Moreover, while “nature” occupies



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. *PDC 2026 Vol. 2, Milan, Italy*

© 2026 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-2469-5/2026/06

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3789492.3796477>

a central rhetorical position in these initiatives, the actual consideration of more-than-human (MTH) subjectivities in decision-making remains minimal. The waterscapes—being the focus of my work—that form the very core of these processes are often treated as mere resources (objects), and rarely as relational entities (subjects), capable of shaping governance themselves. This observation underpins the broader motivation of my PhD and leads to the following research questions: How do the existing logics and structures of environmental governance foreclose more critical, ecocentric approaches to ecological democracy? And what forms of design practices—be those generative, participatory, or political—might contribute to the emergence and negotiation of ecological democracy in practice?

Ecological democracy is not merely about incorporating environmental concerns into democratic processes; it is built on engaged and open participation in decision-making by both human and nonhuman actors [29]. This requires a profound ontological shift, one that design, thanks to its long-standing relationship with democracy, has the power to mediate. Design, in its capacity to see relationships between humans and nonhumans as themselves 'objects' of design [34], can reconfigure the conditions of democratic participation itself. My research thus unfolds as an inquiry into how design can re-democratize environmental governance and cultivate the coexistence of diverse agencies (human and MTH) within decision-making processes.

2 Design, Democracy, and the Politics of Participation

Participatory Design (PD) has long negotiated the space between design and democracy. Emerging from Scandinavian labor movements in the 1970s, PD positioned design as a political practice—an instrument for empowerment and collective agency. Yet, over time, its democratic promise has been strained by managerial appropriation and institutionalization, particularly in the public realm. Participation is now frequently deployed as a procedural mechanism of legitimacy rather than a means of political transformation. Against this backdrop, my work revisits the historical and theoretical relationship between design and democracy, aiming to locate design not only within democratic institutions but also against them, where it may act politically.

The political potential of design has long been recognized. Papanek's "Design for the Real World" [28] and the experiments of the Global Tools movement in Italy aimed to redefine design as a socially and ecologically responsible practice. Arnstein's [2] "ladder of participation" gave form to the power dynamics inherent in participatory processes. Later, scholars such as Winner [36] explored the political qualities of designed objects and systems, while Buchanan [5] articulated design as a form of political rhetoric capable of co-shaping societies and grounding principles for new actions, framing the designer as a "speaker who fashions a world." Domínguez Rubio and Fogué [9] argue that at the rise of these theories, the discipline was still primarily seen through its capacity to "prescribe politics" into matters of design, such as things, materials, environments, or bodies. By the 21st century, however, the focus had shifted toward the politics of design itself, acknowledging design as a key actor in the broader "cosmos of the political" [9].

In examining democracy, Saward [32] draws a distinction between its required principles—freedom, equality, rights—and its ordering principles, such as participation, deliberation, or representation. Democratic design, he argues, operates most fruitfully in the latter space: it enacts democracy rather than defines it. Similarly, Warren [35] frames democracy as a continual striving toward empowered inclusion, emphasizing the processes through which collective will and capacity are formed. My research draws from these accounts, focusing less on the 'what' of democracy and more on the 'why': why and for whom democracy is enacted, and how design might intervene in this enactment.

Several design theorists have explored this intersection from different angles. Bonsiepe [4] urged design to take a critical stance toward centers of power, recognizing democracy as a site of contestation rather than consensus. Fry [13] identified design's complicity in the systemic "unsustainability" of modernity, calling to "make design a politics." Margolin [21], later with Manzini [20], elaborated on the role of design in democratic structures, proposing frameworks such as "design for democracy" and "design as democracy." Yet, as DiSalvo [6–8] has argued, the truly political capacity of design lies not in supporting existing governance but in generating spaces of agonistic pluralism [23].

DiSalvo's distinction between design for politics and political design remains instructive. The former serves established policy aims, while the latter seeks to expose contradictions, create contestation, and make visible the conflicts inherent in democratic life. Likewise, Richardson et al. [30] differentiate between design acting for, with, or against policy. Acting against policy, in particular, opens generative space for critique—repositioning design as a practice capable of unsettling dominant institutional rationalities and surfacing alternative modes of knowing and governing.

My research resonates strongly with these perspectives. It investigates how design might simultaneously collaborate with [16] and challenge institutional systems—how it might be for politics and political at once. To do so, I draw upon Erloff's [10] notion of provocation as a critical design attitude: a way of opening institutional processes to contradiction and inviting democratic reinterpretation. By engaging with participatory and political design in this sense, my doctoral research examines whether and how design can reinstate agonism—the productive presence of dissent—within public environmental governance.

3 Role of Design in Enacting Ecological Democracy

Environmental governance, as a domain of practice, is often marked by what I refer to as 'dryness': a rationalized, depoliticized mode of decision-making that privileges technocratic efficiency over affective and relational engagement. This dryness is symptomatic of a broader "post-political" condition in which environmental issues are treated as managerial rather than political challenges. To counter this, several scholars, including Mouffe [25] and Machin [19], have suggested that agonistic theory might be extended to environmental politics—re-politicizing the realm by reintroducing the necessary friction of democratic condition into ecological discourse.

Agonistic theory aligns closely with the principles of ecological democracy [29], which calls for decision-making processes

that are both open and ecocentric, ensuring that nonhuman entities and future generations are represented within governance. Ecological democracy demands an expanded understanding of participation—one that accounts for the agencies, dependencies, and intelligences of the MTH world. Yet, such inclusion cannot rely solely on metaphorical representation, as it requires new forms of institutional practices capable of translating ecological interdependence into democratic expression [38].

Design is particularly suited to this task. Its methods of material exploration and relational mediation can be mobilized to prototype new democratic modes of political representation. By materializing ecological relations—through cultural probes, participatory sessions, speculative artifacts, or performative encounters—design can help reframe current understanding of the role of MTH actors in governance. In my work, I further tweak these design approaches with more provocative, agonistic, and generative features that can challenge the anthropocentric rationalities that dominate environmental governance, especially in the context of water policymaking in Flanders.

4 Conflict, Power, and More-Than-Human Participation in the WLS Project

To ground these theoretical explorations, my empirical research engages with participatory governance projects in Flanders, using water management as a lens through which to study the politics of MTH participation. Central among them is the Water-Landscape (WLS) program. Conceived in 2017 by the Open Space Platform and the Flemish Minister for Environment and Agriculture, WLS responds to an urgent need to unite regional policymakers around environmental issues, foster resilient water, agricultural, and landscape systems, and rebuild trust with local communities [41, 42]. Under the guidance of the Flemish Land Agency (VLM), 29 local coalitions—comprising policy actors, experts, and local stakeholders such as farmers—co-create strategies to address specific water-related challenges. The initiative gained additional relevance after the “water bomb” of 2021, one of Belgium’s most disastrous environmental events, which revealed the fragility not only of river systems, but also that of sectorized governance infrastructures [39].

Waterscapes and waterbodies—the declared protagonists of the WLS program—emerge as sites of intertwined ecological, social, and political conflicts. These tensions extend across a dense network of actors, human and non-human, institutional and non, whose interactions shape the project’s everyday operations. In Mouffe’s [23] terms, such conflicts are not aberrations but the very “raison d’être of politics,” and their suppression in the name of consensus risks depoliticizing the democratic condition [24]. Analyzing the roots of conflict and the distribution of roles within WLS thus enables a deeper understanding of the dynamics between diverse actors, explicitly addressing the role (or absence) of MTH subjectivities within participatory governance.

Over the past months, I have been conducting a series of participatory sessions with members of the WLS coordination team and several coalition groups. For this inquiry, I designed a participatory activity that revisits Mendelow’s [22] power-interest matrix, integrating it with Yaneva and Heaphy’s [37] urban controversies method. Mendelow’s framework enables the positioning of

relevant actors according to their perceived influence and level of engagement. Controversy mapping, on the other hand, facilitates the visualization of the governance landscape through actors and their agencies, while simultaneously tracing the origins of ongoing conflicts and relational tensions.

The activity revolves around a printed impact matrix accompanied by symbolic shapes representing various actors: individuals (human and non-human), organized groups, non-profits, private enterprises, and governmental bodies. Participants assemble these representations, situating them across project phases and linking them through relations of influence, cooperation, and conflict.

These preliminary observation sessions, repeated three times to date, have already provided insight into how institutional actors perceive the distribution of power and relational dynamics within the initiative. MTH entities (waterbodies, soils, or landscapes) rarely appear unless I explicitly introduce them, and even then, they are rarely treated as political subjects. This confirms my initial hypothesis regarding the limited recognition of MTH actors within participatory policy frameworks. Subsequent iterations will broaden participation, incorporate field visits to gain a more grounded understanding of the context, and compare mappings across different project phases—from coalition formation to solution implementation—to trace how power relations evolve and whether they allow for MTH subjectivities.

5 Material Engagement with Water

While the previous section explained the institutional configurations of power and participation within one of my cases, I will now turn to the material agencies of waterbodies themselves. This strand explores the materiality of water and my positioning in relation to it: specifically, what it means to engage with water not as an object of governance but as a site of knowing?

Drawing on new materialism [3] and relational theories from the blue humanities, posthumanism, and MTH design, I recognize the importance of building a relationship with local waterbodies [26, 27]. Relational ontologies help reimagine water as an active participant not only in ecological, but also in social life, capable of mediating forms of MTH connection and stimulating practices of planetary caretaking. The blue humanities challenge inherited paradigms of water ecologies that sustain “chronically exploitative relationships” [12] with the MTH world, drawing attention to water’s cultural and affective presence as well as its often underestimated political agency. At the same time, a MTH turn in design is also a demonstration of a shift in the focus from a human-centered perspective to one that reconsiders politics itself by allowing more ontologies—or relational ways of making the world—to be part of it [1, 11, 15, 17, 31].

My engagement with Flemish waterscapes builds on these perspectives through situated material practices. The region’s waterbodies—be those canals, reservoirs, or artificial lakes—are highly anthropogenic, embodying long histories of strategic engineering and management. Working with these waters exposes why a culture of control is so deeply rooted in Northern Belgium.

One experiment has been to explore open-water swimming as a form of agonistic practice of relating to water. Although generally prohibited, many people still reclaim the right to swim in fresh



Figure 1: Getting to know local waterbodies: view from the Lys River in Kortrijk. Photograph by the Author.

waters. In Flanders, swimming is not a simple recreational activity, but a political claim, as it asserts that water and nature cannot be fully controlled, regulated, or separated from human life. These embodied encounters that I experience now through my engagement with waterbodies will, hopefully, inform future research collaborations at the institutional level. Those might include bringing in perspectives from the water or getting “wet” together with policymakers to engage bodily with the matters of their governance, thereby unsettling technocratic approaches to governance through MTH participation.

6 Looking ahead

Navigating interdisciplinarity—encompassing both political and design sciences—means facing conceptual, methodological, and epistemological complexity. Design invites experimentation and embodied engagement, while political science demands objectivity and rigor. Additionally, working with political institutions as a design researcher inevitably entails navigating hierarchies of legitimacy and accountability, where, as previously discussed, design is often expected to deliver concrete solutions *for politics*, rather than provoke *political* reflection. Engaging with policymakers entails negotiating expectations of usefulness while sustaining a critical stance, and balancing collaboration and provocation—being for politics and political at once—remains an ongoing negotiation that defines my work.

At the same time, translating theoretical concepts like agonism and ecological democracy—still poorly applied in practice—into situated design actions that can actually thrive within institutional constraints is another challenging task. What design approaches best align with my ambition? What concrete actions can be adopted to hold together positions that are in tension without collapsing into the same limitations that de-politicized practices that I critique?

Methodologically, engaging with water, my primary MTH actor, requires rethinking participation as a relational and attunement-based process rather than a simple representation. This raises ethical questions: How can MTH entities be acknowledged as agents in governance without being instrumentalized or symbolically appropriated? What does it mean to design with water, to recognize its agency while remaining accountable to human collectives and institutional structures? These questions necessitate a reevaluation of how participation and politics are understood, allowing me to inhabit the conflict within my own work.

Looking ahead, the next phase of the PhD will build on the insights gained from both the inquiry into regional water governance initiatives and the material engagements with water. I plan to develop a series of agonistic design experiments that explicitly connect these institutional and material domains through collaborative interventions with governance actors. These experiments will likely take hybrid forms, including, but not limited to, speculative design-driven workshops, performative and provocative activities (e.g., guerrilla swimming sessions), or collective encounters that bring

policymakers, citizens, and waterbodies into an agonistic and affectively rich dialogue. The aim is not to “solve” governance problems, but to reveal their relational and ontological foundations—to materialize, in practice, the idea of ecological democracy. Simultaneously, I will continue to study design’s potential as both a political and ecological practice, bringing together the agonistic commitments of political design with MTH’s participatory methodologies.

My contribution to PD lies in extending its democratic project beyond the human, demonstrating how design can act as a critical mediator between institutional rationalities and ecological realities. Aligned with the PDC 2026 theme of “Peace, Dialogue, Coexistence,” I understand coexistence as the capacity to live with friction [33]. This doctoral research thus positions design as a practice of coexistence: politically and materially engaged, capable of transforming governance through the slow, difficult, and necessary work of designing for living together.

Acknowledgments

This research is conducted as part of the “Redesigning Democracy” project, funded by FWO (Research Foundation Flanders).

References

- [1] Yoko Akama, Ann Light, and Takahito Kamihira. 2020. Expanding Participation to Design with More-Than-Human Concerns. In *Proceedings of the 16th Participatory Design Conference 2020 - Participation(s) Otherwise - Volume 1*, June 15, 2020. ACM, Manizales Colombia, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3385010.3385016>
- [2] Sherry R. Arnstein. 1969. A Ladder Of Citizen Participation. *J. Am. Inst. Plann.* 35, 4 (July 1969), 216–224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225>
- [3] Karen Barad. 2006. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822388128>
- [4] Gui Bonsiepe. 2006. Design and Democracy. *Des. Issues* 22, 2 (April 2006), 27–34. <https://doi.org/10.1162/desi.2006.22.2.27>
- [5] Richard Buchanan. 1985. Declaration by Design: Rhetoric, Argument, and Demonstration in Design Practice. *Des. Issues* 2, 1 (1985), 4–22.
- [6] Carl DiSalvo. 2010. Design, Democracy and Agonistic Pluralism. In *Design and Complexity - DRS International Conference 2010*, July 2010. Montreal, Canada. Retrieved from <https://dl.designresearchsociety.org/drs-conference-papers/drs2010/researchpapers/31>
- [7] Carl DiSalvo. 2012. *Adversarial design*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- [8] Carl DiSalvo. 2022. *Design as Democratic Inquiry: Putting Experimental Civics into Practice*. The MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/13372.001.0001>
- [9] Fernando Domínguez Rubio and Uriel Foguè. 2017. Unfolding the Political Capacities of Design. *Diseña* 11, (June 2017), 96–109. <https://doi.org/10.7764/disen.11.96-109>
- [10] Michael Erlhoff. 2021. Desocracy – Contradictions and Possibilities within and between Democracy and Design. In *Design & Democracy: Activist Thoughts and Examples for Political Empowerment*, Maziar Rezaei and Michael Erlhoff (eds.). De Gruyter, 85–94. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783035622836>
- [11] Arturo Escobar. 2020. *Pluriversal Politics: The Real and the Possible*. Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9781478012108>
- [12] Simon C. Estok. 2021. Introduction to the special cluster “Never really far from us—epidemics and plagues in literature.” *Neohelicon* 48, 2 (December 2021), 435–442. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11059-021-00612-y>
- [13] Tony Fry. 2011. *Design as politics* (English ed. ed.). Berg, New York.
- [14] Maarten A Hajer and Jeroen Oomen. 2025. *Captured Futures: Rethinking the Drama of Environmental Politics*. Oxford University Press Oxford. <https://doi.org/10.1093/9780198955382.001.0001>
- [15] Sarah Heitlinger, Ann Light, Yoko Akama, Kristina Lindström, and Åsa Ståhl. 2025. More-Than-Human Participatory Design. In *Routledge international handbook of contemporary participatory design*, Rachel Charlotte Smith, Daria Loi, Heike Wünschiers-Theophilus, Liesbeth Huybrechts and Jesper Simonsen (eds.). Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, London New York, 77–108. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003334330>
- [16] Liesbeth Huybrechts, Henric Benesch, and Jon Geib. 2017. Institutioning: Participatory Design, Co-Design and the public realm. *CoDesign* 13, 3 (July 2017), 148–159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15710882.2017.1355006>
- [17] Ann Light. 2024. More-than-Human Participatory Approaches for Design: Method and Function in Making Relations. In *Participatory Design Conference 2024*, August 11, 2024. ACM, Sibul Malaysia, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3661455.3669862>
- [18] Odin Lysaker. 2024. *Ecological Democracy: Caring for the Earth in the Anthropocene*. Taylor & Francis, Erscheinungsort nicht ermittelbar.
- [19] Amanda Machin. 2019. Democracy and Agonism in the Anthropocene: The Challenges of Knowledge, Time and Boundary. *Environ. Values* 28, 3 (June 2019), 347–365. <https://doi.org/10.3197/096327119X15519764179836>
- [20] Ezio Manzini and Victor Margolin. 2017. Open Letter to the Design Community: Stand Up for Democracy. *Diseña* 11, (June 2017), 11–17.
- [21] Victor Margolin. 2012. *Design and Democracy in a Troubled World*. School of Design, Carnegie Mellon University.
- [22] A. L. Mendelow. 1981. Environmental Scanning-The Impact of the Stakeholder Concept. 1981. Retrieved March 31, 2025 from <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Environmental-Scanning-The-Impact-of-the-Concept-Mendelow/7b361652157989c77ed442dd387ec9b1a9b99632>
- [23] Chantal Mouffe. 1993. *The return of the political*. Verso, London New York.
- [24] Chantal Mouffe. 2013. *Agonistics: thinking the world politically*. Verso, London New York (N.Y.).
- [25] Chantal Mouffe. 2022. *Towards a green democratic revolution: left populism and the power of affects*. Verso, London; New York.
- [26] Astrida Neimanis. 2017. *Bodies of water: posthuman feminist phenomenology*. Bloomsbury academic, London.
- [27] Serpil Oppermann. 2023. *Blue Humanities: Storied Waterscapes in the Anthropocene*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009393300>
- [28] Victor Papanek. 2022. *Design for the Real World: Human Ecology and Social Change* (3rd ed.). Thames & Hudson, London.
- [29] Jonathan Pickering, Karin Bäckstrand, and David Schlosberg. 2020. Between environmental and ecological democracy: theory and practice at the democracy-environment nexus. *J. Environ. Policy Plan.* 22, 1 (January 2020), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908X.2020.1703276>
- [30] Liz Richardson, Catherine Durose, Lucy Kimbell, and Ramia Mazé. 2025. How do policy and design intersect? Three relationships. *Policy Polit.* (June 2025), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1332/03055736Y2025D000000072>
- [31] Stanislav Roudavski. 2022. The Ladder of More-than-Human Participation: A Framework for Inclusive Design. *Cult. Sci.* 14, 1 (December 2022), 110–119. <https://doi.org/10.2478/cs-2024-0015>
- [32] Michael Saward. 2021. *Democratic design* (First edition ed.). Oxford University, Oxford.
- [33] Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing. 2005. *Friction: an ethnography of global connection*. Princeton university press, Princeton (N.J.).
- [34] Henriëtte Waal and Clemens Driessen (Eds.). 2025. *Water Works: Ecosocial Design*. Valiz, Amsterdam.
- [35] Mark E. Warren. 2017. A Problem-Based Approach to Democratic Theory. *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.* 111, 1 (February 2017), 39–53. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000605>
- [36] Langdon Winner. 1980. Do Artifacts Have Politics? *Daedalus* 109, 1 (1980), 121–136.
- [37] Albena Yaneva and Liam Heaphy. 2012. Urban controversies and the making of the social. *Archit. Res. Q.* 16, 1 (March 2012), 29–36. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1359135512000267>
- [38] Zehra Zaidi and Indy Johar. 2024. Position Paper for the Planetary Civics Inquiry: A New Framework for Planetary Futures. Retrieved from [https://cdn.prod.website-files.com/668400197070c499d03bb489/67124296cf139c5400cf85d8_PCI_PositionPaper_A%20New%20Framework%20for%20Planetary%20Futures%20\(2\).pdf](https://cdn.prod.website-files.com/668400197070c499d03bb489/67124296cf139c5400cf85d8_PCI_PositionPaper_A%20New%20Framework%20for%20Planetary%20Futures%20(2).pdf)
- [39] 2022. Weerbaar Waterland: Ons voorbereiden op wat al gebeurt. Advies van het expertenpanel hoogwaterbeveiliging aan de Vlaamse Regering. Retrieved from <https://www.vlm.be/nl/SiteCollectionDocuments/Water-Land-Schap/advies-weerbaar-waterland.pdf>
- [40] Belgium - European Commission. Retrieved August 25, 2025 from https://environment.ec.europa.eu/topics/water/water-wise-eu/belgium_en-Water-Land-Schap
- [41] Water-Land-Schap. *Vlaamse Landmaatschappij*. Retrieved January 20, 2025 from <https://www.vlm.be/nl/projecten/vlm-projecten/waterlandschap>
- [42] Water+Land+Scape. *Architecture Workroom Brussels*. Retrieved January 20, 2025 from <https://www.architectureworkroom.eu/en/projects/557/water-land-scape>