Eco-Civic Communities: Ecological Democracy and Multilevel Governance in an Era of Planetary Interdependence

Manuel Galiñanes * and Leo Klinkers

Posted Date: 22 May 2026

doi: 10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

Keywords: ecological democracy; multilevel governance; participatory governance; polycentric governance; civic ecology; sustainability transitions; Eco-Civic Communities

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

Article

Eco-Civic Communities: Ecological Democracy and Multilevel Governance in an Era of Planetary Interdependence

Manuel Galiñanes [1,*] and Leo Klinkers [2]

[1] Academy of Medical and Health Sciences of Catalonia and the Balearic Islands, 08017 Barcelona, Spain
[2] Institute for State and Administrative Law, Law Faculty, State University Utrecht, 3584 BH Utrecht, The Netherlands
* Correspondence: manuel.galinanes@gmail.com

Abstract

This article explores Eco-Civic Communities (ECCs) as a potential framework for integrating ecological governance with democratic participation across multiple scales of political organization. Drawing on scholarship in ecological democracy, deliberative governance, polycentric institutional theory, civic ecology, and multilevel governance, the article examines how localized participatory structures may contribute to broader systems of ecological coordination amid growing planetary interdependence. The study develops a conceptual and analytical model of ECCs as territorially grounded, participatory, ecologically oriented, and institutionally integrated governance formations. It further proposes an analytical framework for evaluating ECCs based on criteria such as democratic depth, ecological effectiveness, inclusiveness, accountability, institutional feasibility, scalability, and resilience. Through comparative analysis, the article situates ECCs alongside existing governance initiatives, including ecovillages, Transition Towns, participatory budgeting, eco-districts, and community-based sustainability projects. The paper also examines possible pathways for institutional integration within multilevel governance systems while acknowledging important risks, constraints, and implementation challenges. Rather than presenting ECCs as definitive solutions, the article argues that they may provide a useful framework for investigating how ecological transformation and democratic renewal can become more systematically interconnected.

Keywords: ecological democracy; multilevel governance; participatory governance; polycentric governance; civic ecology; sustainability transitions; Eco-Civic Communities

1. Introduction

The accelerating convergence of climate change, biodiversity collapse, ecosystem degradation, and resource insecurity has exposed profound structural weaknesses in environmental governance. Although ecological processes operate across interconnected planetary systems, political authority remains fragmented among sovereign states whose institutional capacities and strategic priorities often diverge sharply. This mismatch between ecological interdependence and political fragmentation has produced what many scholars call a crisis of governance scale: environmental problems are increasingly global in scope, while decision-making structures remain predominantly territorial and nationally bounded [1,2]. Existing international arrangements have enabled important coordination, yet they often lack the coherence, democratic legitimacy, and enforcement capacity needed to sustain long-term ecological transformation across multiple governance levels.

At the same time, debates on ecological governance have increasingly emphasized that environmental sustainability cannot be reduced to technocratic management alone. Ecological transition is not solely a scientific or administrative challenge but also a democratic one. Scholarship on ecological democracy argues that legitimate and durable environmental governance depends on

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

institutional arrangements that integrate ecological knowledge, public deliberation, social justice, and citizen participation into collective decision-making [3–5]. Within this perspective, democratic legitimacy emerges not merely from electoral authorization but from the ongoing capacity of citizens and affected communities to participate meaningfully in shaping ecological priorities and negotiating socio-environmental trade-offs.

Recent developments in deliberative democratic theory reinforce this broader understanding of governance. The literature on deliberative systems conceptualizes democracy as an interconnected network of communicative arenas—including formal institutions, civil society organizations, scientific bodies, local communities, and transnational publics—that collectively generate legitimacy and accountability [6,7]. From this systemic perspective, ecological governance requires not only vertical coordination across governance levels but also horizontal civic engagement that embeds ecological responsibility in everyday social practices. Yet despite growing recognition of participatory governance, many mechanisms remain largely consultative rather than genuinely co-decisional. As Sénit [8] argues in her analysis of civil society participation within the Sustainable Development Goals framework, public inclusion often operates at the procedural margins of governance rather than as a constitutive element of institutional authority.

These limitations are especially evident at the local level. Municipal and regional governments increasingly play a strategic role in climate adaptation, sustainability planning, and ecological innovation [9]. Yet local institutions often face structural constraints that limit their transformative capacity. Electoral cycles encourage short-term policy horizons; fiscal dependence restricts autonomy; administrative fragmentation undermines policy coherence; and public participation mechanisms often provide limited influence over substantive decisions [10,11]. Moreover, local governance systems are often embedded within national political economies that continue to prioritize economic growth and competitive development over ecological resilience and long-term sustainability. The result is a persistent institutional gap between ecological objectives and the democratic infrastructures needed to implement them effectively in everyday social life.

Concurrently, a wide range of civic and community-based ecological initiatives has emerged across regions worldwide. Ecovillages, transition towns, urban commons initiatives, participatory ecological planning processes, community energy cooperatives, and local resilience networks demonstrate growing societal efforts to reconnect democratic participation with ecological stewardship [12–14]. These initiatives demonstrate important capacities for collective learning, local innovation, and community-based sustainability. However, most remain fragmented, weakly institutionalized, and insufficiently integrated into broader governance architectures. While they often generate valuable localized outcomes, their broader political scalability and systemic coordination remain uncertain.

This article argues that the current literature insufficiently addresses the institutional relationship between localized ecological participation and coherent multilevel democratic governance. Existing scholarship has extensively examined participatory democracy, polycentric governance, civic ecology, urban sustainability, and deliberative environmental governance in isolation. Yet comparatively little attention has been devoted to developing an integrated conceptual framework that links local ecological agency with broader systems of regional, national, and potentially global coordination. This gap becomes increasingly significant as ecological crises intensify across scales and require governance that is simultaneously participatory, adaptive, and institutionally coherent.

To address this gap, the article develops the concept of Eco-Civic Communities (ECCs) as a potential framework for democratic ecological governance. Rather than presenting ECCs as a definitive institutional solution, the article explores their potential role as territorially grounded, participatory, and ecologically oriented governance structures that can strengthen the connection between local civic engagement and broader ecological coordination. Conceived within a multilevel and polycentric governance perspective, ECCs are analyzed as intermediary democratic formations

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

that may help integrate ecological responsibility, deliberative participation, and institutional coordination across governance scales.

Methodologically, the article adopts a conceptual and comparative approach. It synthesizes scholarship from ecological democracy, deliberative governance, civic ecology, and multilevel governance theory to construct an analytical framework for evaluating ECCs. The article further compares ECCs with existing local ecological and participatory initiatives—including ecovillages, transition towns, eco-districts, and participatory governance mechanisms—to clarify their distinctive institutional characteristics and potential contributions. The analysis is therefore not intended as empirical validation of a finalized model but as a theoretically grounded exploration of an emerging governance framework that warrants further empirical investigation and comparative research.

The article proceeds in seven stages. The next section reviews the principal theoretical traditions underpinning ecological democracy and participatory ecological governance. The third section defines the ECCs conceptually and introduces the analytical criteria used throughout the article. The fourth section examines historical antecedents and contemporary governance experiments that prefigure elements of ECCs. The fifth section compares ECCs with existing local ecological governance models. The sixth section explores how ECCs could function within broader multilevel governance arrangements, including relations with municipal, national, and transnational institutions. The seventh section proposes potential pathways for institutional scaling while also examining limitations, implementation risks, and future research directions. The conclusion reflects on the broader implications of ECCs for democratic ecological transformation in an increasingly interdependent world.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Foundations

2.1. Ecological Democracy

The concept of ecological democracy emerged from the recognition that environmental crises are not merely technical regulatory failures but manifestations of deeper structural tensions among ecological limits, economic organization, and democratic governance. Traditional liberal-democratic institutions were largely designed in a historical context that treated nature as an external resource domain rather than as a constitutive condition of political and social life. As ecological degradation intensified globally, scholars increasingly questioned whether conventional representative systems—organized around short electoral cycles, territorial sovereignty, and growth-oriented political economies—were institutionally capable of addressing long-term environmental risks and intergenerational justice [4].

In this context, ecological democracy emerged as a normative and institutional framework that seeks to reconcile democratic legitimacy with ecological sustainability. Dryzek [3] argues that ecological governance requires forms of public reasoning that integrate scientific knowledge, ethical pluralism, and participatory deliberation into environmental decision-making. Rather than reducing ecological policy to expert administration or market coordination, ecological democracy emphasizes communicative processes through which citizens collectively negotiate competing environmental values and socio-ecological priorities. Democratic legitimacy, in this perspective, depends not only on procedural representation but also on the capacity of governance systems to facilitate reflexive learning and ecological accountability.

Eckersley [4] extends this argument by challenging the anthropocentric foundations of modern sovereignty and proposing a "green state" model in which ecological stewardship is a central constitutional principle. Her analysis highlights the structural incompatibility between territorially bounded political authority and ecological systems that transcend national borders. Ecological democracy therefore requires governance arrangements that operate across scales while remaining democratically accountable to affected populations.

Similarly, Schlosberg [5] broadens ecological democracy beyond distributive environmental concerns by emphasizing recognition, participation, and capabilities as integral to environmental

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

justice. From this perspective, ecological governance must address not only environmental outcomes but also the unequal social structures that produce ecological harms and political exclusion. This approach is particularly relevant to contemporary sustainability transitions, in which questions of democratic inclusion, procedural fairness, and civic empowerment increasingly intersect with ecological transformation.

Together, these contributions establish ecological democracy as a multidimensional framework that links environmental sustainability with democratic participation, institutional accountability, and socio-ecological justice. However, while the literature provides substantial normative foundations, less attention has been devoted to the institutional forms through which ecological democracy can be operationalized at the local, national, and transnational levels.

2.2. Polycentric and Multilevel Governance

Alongside debates on ecological democracy, scholarship on polycentric and multilevel governance has sought to explain how complex environmental problems may be governed across interconnected institutional arenas. Environmental challenges such as climate change, biodiversity loss, and water governance are marked by high levels of uncertainty, interdependence, and cross-scale interaction. Centralized governance systems often lack the flexibility and contextual sensitivity needed to address these dynamics effectively, while fragmented local initiatives frequently struggle to achieve broader coordination and policy coherence.

Elinor Ostrom's work on polycentric governance is a foundational contribution in this regard. Challenging the assumption that environmental commons require either centralized state control or privatization, Ostrom [14] shows that multiple interacting centers of decision-making can, under appropriate institutional conditions, produce adaptive and resilient collective governance. Polycentric systems enable experimentation, local learning, and institutional diversity while reducing the risks associated with single hierarchical authority structures. Importantly, Ostrom argues that global environmental governance should not rely exclusively on top-down international agreements but should instead combine multiple governance levels that can interact dynamically across scales.

The broader literature on multilevel governance further develops this perspective by examining how authority is distributed across supranational, national, regional, and local institutions. Hooghe and Marks [15] argue that contemporary governance increasingly operates through overlapping jurisdictions rather than strictly hierarchical state structures. Environmental governance, in particular, often involves complex interactions among public institutions, civil society actors, scientific networks, and transnational organizations. This shift reflects the growing inadequacy of purely state-centric governance models for addressing cross-border ecological interdependence.

Jordan et al. [16] likewise emphasize that effective climate and sustainability governance depends on coordination among multiple governance centers capable of combining flexibility, participation, and institutional integration. Yet polycentric arrangements also create important tensions. Institutional fragmentation may produce inconsistencies, accountability deficits, and uneven implementation capacity across regions. Moreover, governance networks with dispersed authority may lack sufficient democratic legitimacy if participatory mechanisms remain weak or inaccessible.

Consequently, although polycentric and multilevel governance theories offer important insights into institutional complexity and adaptive coordination, they do not fully explain how democratic ecological participation can be coherently embedded across governance scales. The challenge remains to connect localized civic agency with broader institutional architectures that can sustain both long-term ecological coordination and democratic legitimacy.

2.3. Participatory and Deliberative Democracy

The literature on participatory and deliberative democracy offers an additional theoretical foundation for understanding how ecological governance may gain democratic legitimacy beyond traditional representative mechanisms. Participatory democratic theory emerged, in part, in response

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

to concerns that electoral representation alone provides insufficient opportunities for meaningful citizen influence over public decisions, particularly in complex policy domains marked by technocratic expertise and institutional distance [17].

Deliberative democratic theory further developed this critique by emphasizing the importance of public reasoning, communicative exchange, and collective learning for democratic legitimacy. Habermas [18] argues that democratic authority derives not merely from voting procedures but from inclusive processes of rational deliberation, through which citizens justify norms and policies to one another under conditions of communicative equality. In this framework, deliberation enables legitimacy to form through argumentation, reflexivity, and reciprocal justification rather than through the aggregation of pre-existing preferences alone.

These insights have become increasingly influential in environmental governance scholarship because ecological issues often involve scientific uncertainty, long-term consequences, and competing ethical values that are difficult to resolve through market mechanisms or majoritarian voting alone. Deliberative forums may facilitate the integration of expert knowledge, local experience, ethical reflection, and public participation, thereby strengthening both legitimacy and policy adaptability [19].

Fung and Wright [20] contribute to this literature with their concept of "empowered participatory governance," which emphasizes decentralized problem-solving institutions grounded in practical participation and deliberative coordination. Their approach is particularly relevant to ecological governance because it links citizen participation to concrete institutional capacities rather than treating deliberation as purely discursive. Similarly, Fishkin [21] shows that structured deliberative processes can improve public reasoning and democratic competence by enabling citizens to engage substantively with complex policy issues.

Nevertheless, participatory and deliberative governance mechanisms often remain institutionally marginal. Participatory forums are often advisory rather than decision-making bodies, and deliberative processes may suffer from unequal participation, resource asymmetries, and limited policy impact. Consequently, the literature increasingly recognizes that meaningful democratic participation requires institutional structures that embed deliberative practices within broader governance systems, rather than treating participation as an isolated procedural supplement.

2.4. Civic Ecology and Community-Based Sustainability

Alongside these theoretical developments, a growing body of scholarship has examined community-based ecological practices as sites of social learning, resilience-building, and democratic experimentation. Civic ecology research focuses on how local communities organize collectively to restore ecosystems, manage shared resources, and develop sustainable social practices in response to environmental disruption [22]. These initiatives often arise from bottom-up civic action rather than centralized government planning, reflecting a growing societal interest in localized sustainability transitions.

The literature on urban commons likewise emphasizes the collective governance of shared ecological and social resources through participatory institutions. Drawing on Ostrom's commons theory, scholars have examined how communities manage public spaces, urban agriculture, energy cooperatives, and shared infrastructure through collaborative governance arrangements that integrate ecological stewardship with civic participation [23]. These initiatives often foster social cohesion, local empowerment, and adaptive capacity that are difficult to replicate through purely centralized administration.

Related scholarship on resilience and socio-ecological transitions underscores the importance of local experimentation and institutional diversity in responding to environmental uncertainty [24]. Transition Towns, ecovillages, eco-districts, and regenerative urban initiatives have been examined as examples of grassroots innovation that foster alternative models of production, consumption, and community organization [12,13]. These initiatives often integrate ecological sustainability with participatory governance, local economic resilience, and collective learning.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

Despite their innovative potential, community-based sustainability initiatives often remain fragmented and weakly connected to broader governance systems. Many depend heavily on volunteer participation, operate with limited institutional authority, or remain vulnerable to political and economic marginalization. Moreover, while these initiatives may succeed locally, their scalability and long-term integration into multilevel governance architectures remain uncertain. Existing scholarship has therefore identified an important tension between localized ecological experimentation and the broader institutional coordination required for systemic ecological transformation.

2.5. Research Gap and Conceptual Contribution

The literature reviewed above offers substantial theoretical insights into ecological democracy, participatory governance, polycentric coordination, and community-based sustainability. Collectively, these traditions demonstrate that effective ecological governance requires not only institutional coordination across scales but also meaningful democratic participation and localized ecological engagement. They further show that ecological transition depends on governance systems capable of combining adaptability, legitimacy, collective learning, and socio-ecological accountability.

Yet despite this rich body of scholarship, important conceptual and institutional gaps remain. Existing studies often treat participatory democracy, civic ecology, multilevel governance, and ecological transition as distinct domains of analysis. Although substantial attention has been devoted to either global environmental governance or localized sustainability initiatives, comparatively little work has focused on the institutional architectures that can systematically connect these levels within coherent democratic frameworks.

In particular, the literature lacks sufficiently developed models that explain how localized ecological participation can be institutionally integrated into broader multilevel governance systems without either losing democratic depth through centralization or coordination capacity through fragmentation. Community-based initiatives often remain isolated from broader governance structures, while global governance frameworks often struggle to establish meaningful democratic roots in everyday civic life.

This article seeks to contribute to this unresolved area by developing the concept of ECCs as a potential intermediary governance framework that links localized ecological participation with broader systems of democratic coordination. Rather than presenting ECCs as a finalized institutional blueprint, the article explores their analytical value as a conceptual model situated at the intersection of ecological democracy, participatory governance, and multilevel socio-ecological coordination. Through this approach, the article aims to contribute to ongoing debates about how democratic ecological transformation may be institutionally organized across interconnected governance scales.

3. Defining Eco-Civic Communities: Conceptual Model and Analytical Framework

3.1. From Grassroots Ecological Initiatives to Institutional Governance

The growing proliferation of grassroots ecological initiatives over recent decades reflects an important transformation in the relationship among citizenship, sustainability, and governance. Across diverse geographical and political contexts, communities have increasingly organized around renewable energy cooperatives, urban agriculture, participatory budgeting, ecological restoration, cooperative housing, local food systems, and resilience-building projects [12,13]. These initiatives demonstrate that ecological transition is not solely dependent on centralized state intervention or market incentives but may also emerge through collective civic action rooted in local participation and shared stewardship.

At the same time, most community-based sustainability initiatives remain institutionally fragmented and structurally constrained. Many operate as voluntary or semi-formal networks with

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

limited legal authority, uncertain financial capacity, and limited integration into broader governance systems. While such initiatives frequently yield important localized outcomes—including reduced ecological footprints, strengthened social cohesion, and increased civic engagement—their broader scalability and long-term transformative potential often remain constrained by institutional marginality and political vulnerability [25]. Consequently, the challenge is not merely to multiply isolated ecological projects, but to assess whether more coherent institutional forms can connect localized civic agency with broader systems of democratic ecological governance.

In this context, the concept of ECCs emerges as an attempt to theorize a more institutionally integrated model of ecological democracy. ECCs are not conceived as entirely unprecedented entities or as replacements for existing municipal or representative institutions. Rather, they are proposed as intermediary governance formations that seek to institutionalize the participatory and ecological capacities already visible in many contemporary grassroots experiments while embedding them within broader multilevel governance architectures.

Unlike many localized sustainability initiatives that operate primarily as voluntary associations or advocacy networks, ECCs are conceptualized as durable civic governance structures that integrate ecological stewardship, democratic participation, and institutional coordination. Their significance lies not only in promoting sustainable practices at the community level but also in potentially strengthening democratic infrastructure through which ecological transformation may be collectively organized across scales.

3.2. Conceptual Definition of Eco-Civic Communities

For analytical purposes, ECCs may be defined as territorially grounded, participatory, ecologically oriented, and institutionally recognized civic governance structures through which citizens collectively manage local socio-ecological systems while remaining integrated within broader multilevel governance frameworks.

This definition highlights five interrelated dimensions.

First, ECCs are territorially grounded. They operate within identifiable social and ecological spaces—urban neighborhoods, municipalities, districts, rural regions, or metropolitan sectors—where environmental practices and collective decision-making directly intersect with everyday life. Territorial grounding is important because ecological sustainability depends on concrete relationships among communities, resources, infrastructure, and ecosystems rather than purely abstract policy commitments.

Second, ECCs are participatory and deliberative. Their legitimacy derives not only from electoral representation but also from ongoing citizen engagement, collective deliberation, and shared decision-making. Participation within ECCs extends beyond consultative procedures to more substantive forms of civic co-governance involving residents, associations, cooperatives, scientific actors, and local institutions.

Third, ECCs are ecologically oriented. Ecological sustainability is a constitutive rather than a secondary dimension of their governance purpose. Unlike conventional local administrative structures, whose ecological responsibilities may remain fragmented across policy sectors, ECCs integrate ecological objectives directly into community planning, resource management, local economic organization, and social development strategies.

Fourth, ECCs are institutionally recognized. Although rooted in civic participation, they are not conceived merely as informal grassroots movements. Rather, ECCs require varying degrees of legal recognition, administrative coordination, and governance integration to ensure continuity, accountability, and policy effectiveness over time.

Finally, ECCs are embedded within multilevel governance systems. They are neither isolated autonomous enclaves nor fully centralized administrative units. Instead, they operate within nested governance arrangements that link local participation to municipal, regional, national, and potentially transnational coordination mechanisms. Their role is therefore both local and systemic.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

This conceptualization distinguishes ECCs from several existing governance models. Unlike ecovillages, ECCs are not primarily intentional residential communities. Unlike participatory budgeting processes, ECCs are not confined to isolated decision-making procedures. Unlike neighborhood associations, ECCs have explicit ecological mandates and broader governance functions. Unlike transition initiatives that operate mainly through voluntary activism, ECCs seek institutional continuity and formal integration into governance systems. Their distinctive feature is the combination of ecological stewardship, democratic participation, institutional durability, and multilevel coordination within a unified governance framework.

3.3. Core Characteristics of Eco-Civic Communities

To enhance analytical clarity, Table 1 summarizes the key dimensions and characteristics of ECCs.

Table 1. Core Characteristics of Eco-Civic Communities (ECCs).

Dimension	ECCs Characteristic
Governance	Participatory and deliberative civic co-governance
Ecological Orientation	Sustainability targets integrated into planning and decision-making
Economic Organization	Promotion of local circular and regenerative economies
Social Dimension	Inclusion, social cohesion, and civic empowerment
Institutional Structure	Formal or semi-formal legal and administrative integration
Scale	Nested within multilevel governance systems
Knowledge Systems	Integration of scientific, local, and experiential knowledge
Temporal Orientation	Long-term ecological resilience and intergenerational responsibility

These dimensions should not be construed as rigid institutional requirements but as analytical characteristics that collectively distinguish ECCs from narrower forms of local participation or sustainability initiatives. Different institutional contexts may yield diverse ECC configurations, shaped by legal traditions, civic cultures, ecological conditions, and governance capacities.

Importantly, the inclusion of institutional integration and multilevel coordination distinguishes ECCs from many existing grassroots sustainability models. The objective is not merely to encourage localized ecological experimentation but to examine how community-based ecological governance might become structurally connected to broader democratic systems capable of coordinating environmental transformation across scales.

3.4. Analytical Framework for Evaluating Eco-Civic Communities

Because ECCs are proposed here as a conceptual governance framework rather than an empirically validated institutional model, a systematic analytical framework is necessary to evaluate their potential capacities and limitations. Existing discussions of ecological participation frequently rely on normative aspirations without establishing sufficiently clear evaluative criteria. To avoid this limitation, the present article uses eight analytical dimensions to compare ECCs.

Democratic Depth

Democratic depth refers to the extent to which citizens exercise meaningful influence over collective decisions rather than remaining passive recipients of policy outcomes. This includes the quality of deliberation, the accessibility of participation mechanisms, the transparency of decision-making, and the degree of civic co-governance embedded in institutional structures.

Ecological Effectiveness

Ecological effectiveness concerns the capacity of ECCs to make a meaningful contribution to sustainability goals, including emissions reduction, ecosystem restoration, biodiversity protection, resource efficiency, resilience-building, and long-term environmental stewardship.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

Inclusiveness

Inclusiveness assesses whether participation and governance capacities are equitably distributed across social groups. Ecological governance systems may reproduce inequalities if marginalized populations face barriers related to class, education, digital access, gender, ethnicity, or political representation.

Institutional Feasibility

Institutional feasibility assesses whether ECCs can realistically operate within existing or reformable legal and administrative systems. This includes questions about jurisdictional authority, administrative coordination, governance competencies, and compatibility with municipal and national institutions.

Accountability

Accountability concerns the mechanisms that keep ECC decision-makers and participatory bodies publicly answerable. Without adequate accountability structures, participatory governance risks informal concentration of influence, elite capture, or opaque decision-making.

Financial Autonomy

Financial autonomy assesses the extent to which ECCs possess stable, diversified resource capacities capable of sustaining long-term ecological and participatory initiatives. Heavy dependence on external funding may undermine institutional continuity and democratic independence.

Scalability

Scalability refers to the potential for ECCs to expand, replicate, network, or coordinate across larger governance systems without compromising democratic functionality or ecological coherence. This dimension is particularly important because many local sustainability initiatives remain isolated and difficult to institutionalize.

Resilience and Adaptive Capacity

Resilience is the ability of ECCs to respond adaptively to ecological, economic, political, and social disruptions while maintaining institutional continuity and democratic legitimacy. Adaptive governance capacities are increasingly important amid climate uncertainty and accelerating socio-ecological change.

Together, these dimensions provide a structured framework for comparing ECCs in subsequent sections of the article. They also allow for a more balanced assessment by incorporating both opportunities and potential limitations rather than treating ECCs as inherently successful or universally aplicable.

3.5. Historical and Intellectual Antecedents

Although ECCs are presented here as a distinct conceptual framework, many of their underlying principles have antecedents in earlier traditions of democratic localism, cooperative governance, ecological communalism, and multilevel federal thought.

Gandhi's concept of *gram swaraj* emphasized self-governing village communities capable of meeting basic social needs while participating in broader federative structures [26]. Mid-twentieth-century cooperatives, communes, and kibbutzim similarly explored collective economic and social organization rooted in communal participation [27]. Later, Murray Bookchin's libertarian municipalism proposed confederated municipal assemblies as democratic alternatives to centralized state structures, emphasizing ecological stewardship and direct participation at the local level [28].

Indigenous communal traditions also offer important precedents for integrated socio-ecological governance. Systems such as the Andean *ayllu* historically combined territorial stewardship, reciprocity, communal responsibility, and collective decision-making within deeply embedded ecological relationships [29]. More broadly, many Indigenous governance traditions challenge the separation between political organization and ecological interdependence that characterizes modern industrial governance systems.

Contemporary movements further extend these trajectories. Transition Towns, ecovillages, urban commons initiatives, and community energy cooperatives demonstrate practical efforts to

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

reconnect sustainability with democratic participation and local resilience [12,30]. Nevertheless, most of these initiatives remain only partially institutionalized and weakly integrated into broader governance structures.

ECCs should therefore not be understood as entirely novel institutional inventions, but rather as an attempt to synthesize and systematize diverse traditions of ecological participation, civic governance, and multilevel coordination into a more coherent conceptual framework capable of addressing contemporary socio-ecological challenges.

4. Historical Antecedents and Contemporary Precedents

The concept of ECCs does not arise in an institutional or intellectual vacuum. Although ECCs are proposed here as a distinct conceptual framework for democratic ecological governance, many of their constitutive principles—collective stewardship, participatory self-government, territorial responsibility, cooperative organization, and multilevel coordination—have antecedents in earlier civic, communal, and ecological traditions. Examining these precedents is important for two reasons. First, it shows that ECCs are not an abstract, utopian construct detached from historical practice. Second, it reveals that many contemporary ecological governance experiments already embody partial elements of the institutional logic underlying ECCs, even if they do not integrate these dimensions into a coherent and scalable governance architecture.

At the same time, it is important to avoid conflating historical precedents with the ECC model itself. None of the initiatives or traditions discussed below fully aligns with the institutional framework proposed in this article. Rather, they offer partial inspiration, governance lessons, and conceptual trajectories that illuminate how ecological participation and democratic coordination have been imagined and practiced across different contexts.

4.1. Historical Communitarian and Civic Traditions

4.1.1. Commons Traditions and Collective Stewardship

One of the deepest historical antecedents of ECCs lies in traditions of commons governance. Across numerous societies, communities developed institutional arrangements for the collective management of forests, fisheries, irrigation systems, grazing lands, and other shared resources. These systems often relied on locally embedded norms of reciprocity, mutual obligation, and participatory regulation rather than centralized state administration or purely market-based allocation [31].

Commons governance traditions are significant because they show that collective ecological stewardship can emerge from decentralized civic institutions that balance local autonomy with shared responsibility. Historical commons systems often combined ecological sustainability with social coordination through mechanisms such as monitoring, conflict resolution, and participatory rule-making. Although many commons institutions were later displaced by state centralization, enclosure, and industrialization, they continue to provide important theoretical and empirical foundations for contemporary debates on participatory ecological governance.

Importantly, traditional commons governance was typically localized and resource-specific. ECCs differ in that they are conceived not merely as systems for managing discrete common-pool resources but as broader civic-governance structures that integrate ecological stewardship with democratic participation, social coordination, and multilevel institutional integration.

4.1.2. Municipalism and Local Democratic Self-Government

The historical tradition of municipal self-government is also a major antecedent of ECCs. From medieval communes to modern municipalist movements, cities and local communities have often served as laboratories for civic participation, public accountability, and collective administration. Municipal governance has historically provided institutional spaces through which citizens could

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

exercise political agency more directly connected to everyday social life than that of distant centralized authorities.

In the twentieth century, these traditions were revitalized by various currents of democratic municipalism. Particularly influential was Murray Bookchin's theory of libertarian municipalism, which proposed decentralized municipal assemblies linked through confederal structures to coordinate broader political and ecological decision-making [28]. Bookchin argued that ecological sustainability and democratic participation required reconstructing political life at the local level, where citizens could engage directly in deliberative self-government while remaining connected to larger cooperative federations.

Although ECCs do not fully replicate Bookchin's institutional proposals, his emphasis on the relationship among ecological responsibility, participatory citizenship, and confederal coordination anticipates several core dimensions of the ECC framework. At the same time, ECCs differ by placing greater emphasis on integrating with existing governance systems rather than replacing representative institutions entirely.

4.1.3. Cooperative Movements and Economic Democracy

The historical development of cooperative movements also offers important precedents for ECCs. Since the nineteenth century, worker cooperatives, mutual aid societies, community associations, and collective ownership models have sought to democratize economic organization through participatory governance and shared ownership [32].

Cooperative traditions are especially relevant because ecological transformation increasingly requires alternative economic arrangements that balance production, social equity, and sustainability. Community energy cooperatives, cooperative housing initiatives, local food networks, and solidarity economies show how democratic economic institutions can strengthen local resilience while reducing dependence on highly centralized, extractive economic systems.

Moreover, cooperative movements have historically linked local participation with broader federative coordination structures. Cooperative federations frequently emerged to coordinate production, finance, education, and mutual support across multiple local units. This federative dimension offers important institutional lessons for understanding how localized ecological participation may scale without losing democratic rootedness.

Nevertheless, most cooperative structures historically focused primarily on economic organization rather than on integrated ecological governance. ECCs go beyond economic democracy alone by incorporating ecological stewardship and multilevel civic coordination as constitutive institutional principles.

4.1.4. Indigenous Governance Traditions and Relational Ecologies

Indigenous governance traditions constitute another important source of institutional and philosophical inspiration for ecological democracy. Many Indigenous political systems developed forms of governance grounded in relational understandings of territory, reciprocity, collective responsibility, and ecological interdependence. Rather than treating nature as an external object to be exploited, these traditions often conceptualized human communities as embedded within broader socio-ecological relationships [33].

For example, Andean *ayllu* systems integrated territorial stewardship, communal labor, reciprocity, and collective decision-making across shared ecological landscapes [29]. Similarly, many Indigenous governance systems in North America emphasized consensus-building, intergenerational responsibility, and relational accountability within decentralized, confederal structures [34].

These traditions are significant not because ECCs seek to appropriate or replicate Indigenous governance systems, but because they challenge assumptions embedded in modern industrial governance models—particularly the separation between political organization and ecological relations. Indigenous perspectives often foreground long-term ecological responsibility, communal

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

stewardship, and relational governance, which resonate strongly with contemporary ecological-democratic concerns.

At the same time, caution is necessary to avoid romanticizing Indigenous governance traditions or abstracting them from their historical and political contexts. ECCs are not presented here as equivalent to Indigenous governance systems. Rather, these traditions offer important epistemological and institutional insights into alternative ways of organizing socio-ecological relationships beyond narrowly technocratic or market-centered frameworks.

4.2. Contemporary Ecological Governance Experiments

4.2.1. Transition Towns and Community Resilience

Among contemporary ecological governance initiatives, the Transition Towns movement is one of the clearest examples of community-based sustainability experimentation. Originating in Totnes, United Kingdom, in the mid-2000s, Transition initiatives sought to strengthen local resilience to climate change, energy insecurity, and economic vulnerability through community-led action [12].

Transition projects typically promote local food systems, renewable energy cooperatives, repair economies, ecological education, and participatory community planning. Their importance lies not only in advancing environmental sustainability but also in fostering civic participation, collective learning, and localized adaptive capacity. In this sense, Transition initiatives prefigure several dimensions later incorporated into the ECC framework, particularly the integration of ecological action with participatory civic organization.

However, Transition Towns generally operate as voluntary civil society networks rather than as institutionally embedded governance structures [25]. Their capacity to influence broader policy systems, therefore, remains uneven and highly dependent on local political conditions.

4.2.2. Ecovillages and Intentional Sustainable Communities

The ecovillage movement likewise offers important precedents for ECCs. Ecovillages worldwide, consolidated through the Global Ecovillage Network (GEN), aim to integrate ecological sustainability, participatory governance, community living, and alternative economic practices within intentionally organized settlements [30].

Ecovillages have demonstrated practical experimentation with renewable energy systems, ecological architecture, agroecology, circular economies, and participatory social organization. Many serve as sites of innovation and ecological education, generating valuable knowledge about sustainable lifestyles and community governance.

Nevertheless, ecovillages often remain socially selective, relatively small-scale, and institutionally peripheral. Their intentional and semi-autonomous character distinguishes them from ECCs, which are conceived as governance structures capable of operating within broader, more socially heterogeneous territorial contexts.

4.2.3. Eco-Districts, Regenerative Cities, and Urban Sustainability

Urban ecological governance initiatives have also set important institutional precedents. Eco-districts and regenerative urbanism projects aim to integrate sustainability objectives into neighborhood planning, energy systems, mobility infrastructure, waste management, and public space design [35].

Similarly, regenerative city frameworks emphasize the capacity of urban systems not only to reduce ecological harm but also to actively restore ecological and social resilience through integrated planning and participatory governance [36]. These approaches increasingly recognize that ecological sustainability requires systemic coordination across infrastructure, governance, economic organization, and civic participation.

Yet many eco-district and regenerative city initiatives remain heavily technocratic or planner-driven. Public participation is often treated as secondary to infrastructural modernization and

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

sustainability metrics. ECCs differ in how they position democratic participation and civic co-governance as constitutive institutional dimensions rather than complementary policy instruments.

4.2.4. Participatory Budgeting and Democratic Innovation

Participatory budgeting initiatives offer another relevant precedent, showing how citizens can directly influence public resource allocation through deliberative processes. Originating in Porto Alegre, Brazil, participatory budgeting has spread internationally as a mechanism to enhance civic participation, transparency, and democratic legitimacy in local governance [37].

These initiatives are significant because they show that participatory governance can be institutionalized within formal administrative systems rather than operating exclusively through informal activism. Participatory budgeting processes have frequently strengthened civic engagement, increased public accountability, and improved responsiveness to local social needs.

However, participatory budgeting generally remains confined to specific fiscal procedures rather than to broader ecological governance functions. ECCs build on this participatory logic and extend it toward more comprehensive socio-ecological governance capacities.

4.2.5. Community Land Trusts and Territorial Stewardship

Community Land Trusts (CLTs) also offer important institutional lessons for ECCs. By removing land from speculative real-estate markets and placing it under collective or community stewardship, CLTs support affordable housing, ecological preservation, and long-term territorial sustainability [38].

The relevance of CLTs lies in their ability to institutionalize collective stewardship through durable legal and governance mechanisms. They show how communities can exercise long-term territorial responsibility while balancing local participation with institutional continuity.

Nevertheless, CLTs typically focus on specific land-governance functions rather than on broader systems of ecological-democratic coordination. ECCs could adopt similar stewardship principles and integrate them into broader participatory governance architectures.

4.3. From Isolated Innovation to Systemic Integration

Taken together, these historical and contemporary precedents show that many institutional elements associated with ECCs already exist in partial, fragmented forms across diverse governance experiments. Commons traditions illustrate collective stewardship; municipalism emphasizes participatory local governance; cooperatives advance democratic economic organization; Indigenous traditions foreground relational ecological responsibility; and contemporary sustainability initiatives demonstrate practical capacity for local ecological innovation.

Yet these initiatives also reveal recurring limitations. Many remain institutionally marginal, weakly coordinated, reliant on voluntary participation, or vulnerable to broader political and economic pressures. Their fragmented nature often limits their capacity to drive systemic ecological transformation across governance scales.

The ECC framework, therefore, seeks not merely to replicate existing initiatives but to explore how to institutionalize their participatory, ecological, and cooperative capacities within more coherent multilevel governance architectures. In this sense, ECCs are best understood not as utopian inventions detached from existing practice but as attempts to synthesize and systematize institutional trajectories already visible—albeit incompletely—within contemporary experiments in democratic ecological governance.

5. Comparative Analysis: Eco-Civic Communities and Existing Local Governance Models

The growing diversity of local governance experiments in recent decades reflects a growing recognition that ecological sustainability and democratic legitimacy cannot be secured solely through

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

centralized state institutions or market coordination. Participatory budgeting processes, ecovillages, eco-districts, Transition Towns, neighborhood councils, community development corporations, and smart-city initiatives have all sought—through different institutional logics—to strengthen local participation, urban sustainability, social resilience, or administrative innovation. Yet these initiatives vary considerably in their democratic depth, ecological orientation, institutional durability, and capacity for multilevel coordination.

The purpose of this section is not to establish the categorical superiority of ECCs over existing governance models. Such deterministic comparisons risk oversimplifying the diversity of local institutional contexts and reproducing normative rigidity. Instead, the objective is to analyze the distinct capacities, limitations, and governance orientations of ECCs relative to existing local governance frameworks, using the analytical criteria developed in the previous section. Through this comparative approach, ECCs may be better understood not as replacements for all existing models, but as a possible integrative framework that seeks to combine dimensions that frequently remain fragmented across current governance experiments.

5.1. Participatory Governance and Democratic Depth

One of the most significant distinctions among local governance models concerns the extent and quality of citizen participation. Participatory budgeting initiatives, first institutionalized in Porto Alegre in the late twentieth century, were an important innovation that enabled citizens to deliberate directly on portions of municipal expenditure [39]. These processes demonstrated that participatory governance could improve transparency, civic engagement, and responsiveness to local social priorities.

Nevertheless, participatory budgeting mechanisms often remain limited in scope. In many cases, participation is confined to relatively minor budget categories, while strategic planning, infrastructure investment, and broader policy priorities remain under conventional administrative control. Moreover, participatory mechanisms often depend heavily on political support from municipal authorities and may weaken or disappear after electoral changes.

Neighborhood councils and local advisory boards also provide spaces for citizen deliberation and community representation. However, they often function primarily as consultative bodies with limited binding authority, constrained fiscal capacity, and uneven influence over substantive policy outcomes [20]. As a result, their democratic potential is frequently constrained by institutions.

ECCs differ conceptually in that participation is not treated as an auxiliary mechanism that supplements pre-existing governance structures, but rather as a constitutive dimension of governance itself. In the ECC framework, deliberative participation, ecological planning, and community co-governance are institutionally integrated rather than procedurally peripheral. At the same time, ECCs would still face many challenges identified in the participatory governance literature, including unequal participation, civic fatigue, and the risk of informal power concentration. Their democratic effectiveness would therefore depend heavily on institutional design, accessibility, accountability mechanisms, and long-term civic capacity.

5.2. Ecological Orientation and Sustainability Integration

Existing local governance models also differ substantially in the centrality of ecological sustainability within their institutional objectives.

Transition Towns and ecovillages place ecological transition at the core of their organizational identity. Transition initiatives emphasize local resilience, community adaptation, renewable energy, local food systems, and post-carbon social organization [12]. Ecovillages likewise experiment with sustainable living practices, agroecology, ecological architecture, and cooperative economies [30]. These initiatives demonstrate significant capacity for ecological innovation and social learning.

However, many such initiatives remain relatively small-scale, voluntary, and socially selective. Their capacity to influence broader urban systems or regional governance structures is often limited.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

Furthermore, because they frequently operate outside formal governance systems, their long-term continuity may depend on activist commitment and favorable political conditions.

Eco-districts and regenerative urban projects pursue ecological objectives through infrastructure modernization, green architecture, energy efficiency, and sustainable urban planning [35,36]. These initiatives have significantly advanced urban sustainability experimentation, particularly in transportation systems, renewable energy integration, and circular resource management.

Yet eco-district governance often remains technocratic or planner-driven. Ecological priorities are often implemented through expert-led planning processes or public-private partnerships, in which citizen participation remains secondary. Consequently, ecological modernization may proceed without substantial democratization of governance structures.

ECCs, in principle, seek to integrate ecological sustainability and democratic participation more systematically. Ecological stewardship is treated not merely as a technical planning objective but as a civic and institutional responsibility embedded in collective decision-making processes. Their distinctive contribution lies less in proposing new sustainability technologies than in linking ecological transition to participatory governance and territorial co-responsibility.

5.3. Institutional Integration and Governance Capacity

Another major distinction among governance models concerns their relationship with formal institutional structures.

Many grassroots sustainability initiatives operate largely through informal or semi-formal civic networks. Their flexibility enables experimentation and innovation, but their limited institutional authority may constrain policy implementation capacity and long-term continuity. Conversely, highly institutionalized governance structures often possess stronger administrative resources while simultaneously limiting civic participation and adaptive flexibility.

Smart-city governance initiatives illustrate this tension particularly clearly. Smart-city frameworks increasingly integrate digital infrastructure, data-driven management systems, and technological optimization into urban governance [40]. These approaches may improve administrative efficiency, infrastructure coordination, and resource management.

However, critics argue that smart-city governance often prioritizes managerial optimization and technological surveillance over democratic participation and social inclusion [41]. Decision-making may become increasingly centralized within technocratic or corporate networks, reducing opportunities for substantive civic co-governance. Moreover, smart-city models often emphasize efficiency rather than broader ecological or democratic transformation.

Business Improvement Districts (BIDs), community development corporations, and related urban governance arrangements likewise demonstrate both institutional strengths and democratic limitations. These initiatives have often mobilized investment, improved infrastructure, and coordinated local development projects [42]. Yet they have also been criticized for privileging commercial interests, reinforcing socio-spatial inequalities, and limiting accountability to broader resident populations [43].

ECCs are conceptually positioned between these two poles. Unlike purely informal grassroots initiatives, they seek formal or semi-formal institutional recognition to ensure continuity, coordination, and administrative capacity. At the same time, unlike technocratic or market-centered governance models, ECCs emphasize participatory legitimacy, ecological stewardship, and civic inclusion as constitutive institutional principles. Their proposed contribution therefore lies in combining institutional durability with democratic and ecological orientation.

5.4. Economic Organization and Community Resilience

Economic governance is another area of significant differentiation. Many contemporary local governance initiatives operate within broader market-oriented development frameworks that prioritize competitiveness, attracting investment, and urban growth. While such approaches may

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

generate economic revitalization, they can also intensify inequalities, ecological pressures, and displacement dynamics.

Community-based ecological initiatives often address these limitations by promoting alternative economic practices, such as cooperative ownership, local food systems, renewable energy cooperatives, circular economies, and solidarity networks [44]. These initiatives aim to strengthen local resilience by reducing reliance on highly centralized, environmentally intensive economic systems.

ECCs build on these approaches by integrating local economic resilience into broader ecological-democratic governance structures. Their objective is not economic autarky or complete local self-sufficiency, but rather the development of more territorially embedded, participatory, and sustainable forms of economic coordination. In this sense, ECCs share affinities with cooperative and regenerative economic traditions while extending those traditions into broader governance frameworks.

Nevertheless, important questions remain about economic feasibility, fiscal sustainability, and the distribution of resources among communities. Wealthier regions may have significantly greater capacity to develop participatory ecological infrastructures than economically marginalized areas. Consequently, any realistic ECC framework would require mechanisms for redistributive coordination and multilevel support to mitigate territorial inequalities.

5.5. Comparative Framework

Table 2 summarizes the comparative capacities and limitations of ECCs relative to several prominent local governance models, using the analytical dimensions developed earlier.

Table 2. Comparative Analysis of Eco-Civic Communities and Existing Local Governance Models.

Governance Model	Democratic Depth	Ecological Orientation	Institutional Integration	Scalability	Inclusiveness	Governance Risks
Ecovillages	High within community	High	Low to moderate	Limited	Often socially selective	Isolation, limited reach
Transition Towns	Moderate to high	High	Low	Uneven	Variable	Dependence on volunteerism
Eco-Districts	Moderate	High	High	Moderate to high	Variable	Technocratic governance
Participatory Budgeting	Moderate	Usually indirect	Moderate	Moderate	Often inclusive	Limited policy scope
Neighborhood Councils	Moderate	Usually low or indirect	Moderate	High	Variable	Weak authority
Smart-City Governance	Low to moderate	Variable	High	High	Often uneven	Technocratic centralization
Eco-Civic Communities (conceptual model)	Potentially high	Integrated and constitutive	Potentially high	Intended multilevel integration	Intended broad inclusion	Participation inequality, institutional complexity

The table shows that no existing governance model fully resolves the tensions among democratic participation, ecological effectiveness, institutional capacity, and scalability. Rather than viewing ECCs as categorically superior, the comparative analysis suggests they may offer a framework for integrating dimensions that are often kept separate across existing initiatives.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

5.6. Comparative Potentials and Structural Limitations

The comparative analysis above suggests that ECCs should be understood less as a novel governance invention and more as an attempt to synthesize several institutional capacities already evident across diverse local governance experiments. Ecovillages demonstrate ecological integration; participatory budgeting illustrates democratic innovation; Transition Towns highlight community resilience; smart-city systems provide coordination; and cooperative traditions contribute models of economic participation.

The conceptual contribution of ECCs lies in examining whether these fragmented capacities could be integrated into a more coherent ecological-democratic governance framework that operates across governance scales. Their potential strength derives not from any single institutional innovation but from their proposed capacity to combine ecological stewardship, democratic participation, institutional continuity, and multilevel coordination within a unified governance architecture.

At the same time, significant uncertainties remain. ECCs may face many of the same structural limitations as existing governance experiments, including unequal civic capacities, institutional overlap, financial dependence, administrative complexity, and the risk of elite capture. Their viability would depend heavily on the political context, legal frameworks, civic culture, resource distribution, and broader governance support systems.

Consequently, ECCs are best understood not as finalized institutional solutions but as conceptual governance models whose practical feasibility and democratic effectiveness require further empirical investigation, comparative experimentation, and institutional refinement.

6. Integrating Eco-Civic Communities Within Multilevel Governance

The viability of ECCs ultimately depends not only on their internal democratic and ecological capacities but also on their integration into broader governance systems. Community-based ecological initiatives often struggle when isolated from supportive institutional environments, while highly centralized governance systems often fail to mobilize meaningful civic participation or adapt effectively to local ecological conditions. The challenge, therefore, is not simply to strengthen local participation or global coordination independently, but to examine how governance structures across multiple levels can become more coherently interconnected.

This section analyzes ECCs within the framework of multilevel and polycentric governance. Rather than treating local, national, and global governance as mutually exclusive spheres, the ECC model conceptualizes them as interdependent and overlapping dimensions of ecological democracy. From this perspective, ECCs are not intended to replace municipal governments, national states, or international institutions but to serve as intermediary civic-governance formations that strengthen coordination, participation, and ecological responsiveness across scales.

Importantly, the argument advanced here is analytical rather than deterministic. The claim is not that any single institutional arrangement is the exclusive solution to ecological governance challenges. Rather, the analysis suggests that more federal or strongly coordinated multilevel governance arrangements may offer greater capacity to link localized ecological participation with broader systems of democratic coordination amid growing planetary interdependence.

6.1. Local Governance Functions of Eco-Civic Communities

At the local level, ECCs are conceived as participatory governance structures through which citizens collectively engage in ecological planning, community coordination, and democratic deliberation. Their primary significance lies not merely in implementing isolated sustainability projects but in institutionalizing ecological responsibility within the everyday practices of civic governance.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

6.1.1. Ecological Planning and Territorial Stewardship

One of the central functions of ECCs would be to coordinate ecological planning at the territorial level. This may include renewable energy transitions, local food systems, biodiversity restoration, climate adaptation strategies, circular economy initiatives, water management, mobility systems, and ecological land-use planning. Because ecological challenges often manifest locally while connecting to broader environmental systems, territorially embedded governance structures can play an important role in translating broader sustainability objectives into context-sensitive practices.

Unlike purely technocratic environmental administration, ECCs aim to integrate ecological planning with participatory deliberation. Ecological governance is therefore conceived not only as a matter of expert management but also as a democratic process through which communities collectively negotiate sustainability priorities, distributive implications, and long-term territorial responsibilities.

This participatory dimension may strengthen policy legitimacy and public engagement while incorporating local ecological knowledge often overlooked in centralized governance systems. At the same time, participatory ecological planning also introduces challenges related to expertise, coordination, and conflicting interests. Consequently, ECCs would require institutional mechanisms that balance technical knowledge with democratic deliberation.

6.1.2. Citizen Deliberation and Civic Participation

A second core function of ECCs is the institutionalization of citizen deliberation and participatory governance. Existing democratic systems often limit citizen participation to periodic elections, leaving most ecological and infrastructure decisions within administrative or technocratic domains. ECCs, in principle, seek to expand opportunities for continuous civic engagement within local governance processes.

Such participation may include deliberative assemblies, participatory planning forums, cooperative governance mechanisms, citizen panels, community budgeting procedures, and collaborative monitoring systems. The objective is not direct democracy in a purely plebiscitary sense, but rather the creation of structured spaces where citizens, associations, experts, and local institutions can collectively shape ecological and social priorities.

Importantly, deliberative participation also serves broader democratic functions beyond policy formation. Participatory governance can strengthen civic trust, public accountability, social cohesion, and democratic learning [20]. In contexts marked by rising political polarization and declining institutional confidence, localized participatory structures may help rebuild democratic legitimacy and collective problem-solving capacity.

Nevertheless, the effectiveness of deliberative governance depends heavily on institutional inclusiveness. Participation processes may reproduce existing inequalities if barriers related to time, education, digital access, income, or social marginalization are not adequately addressed. ECCs would therefore require deliberate inclusion strategies and accountability safeguards to prevent them from being dominated by highly organized or socially privileged actors.

6.1.3. Community Resilience and Adaptive Coordination

ECCs may also help strengthen local resilience amid accelerating ecological and social instability. Climate change, resource pressures, public health crises, and economic disruptions increasingly expose the limitations of highly centralized, rigid governance systems. Localized governance structures can often respond more quickly and in context to evolving conditions while mobilizing social networks and collective capacities unavailable to distant administrative systems.

Within the ECC framework, community resilience extends beyond emergency preparedness. It encompasses adaptive capacities for ecological restoration, food security, energy decentralization, social solidarity, public health coordination, and local economic resilience. By embedding ecological

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

governance within participatory community structures, ECCs may strengthen communities' collective ability to adapt to long-term socio-ecological transformations.

At the same time, resilience should not be romanticized as local self-sufficiency. Many ecological challenges exceed local capacities and require broader coordination, redistributive mechanisms, scientific expertise, and infrastructure. Consequently, ECC resilience depends significantly on effective integration within broader governance systems

6.2. Eco-Civic Communities and Municipal/National Governments

The relationship between ECCs and existing governmental institutions is one of the most important questions about their practical feasibility. Community-based governance initiatives frequently encounter tensions over jurisdiction, authority, resource allocation, and institutional overlap. For ECCs to function effectively, they would need to complement rather than simply duplicate or compete with municipal and national governance structures.

6.2.1. Competencies and Functional Differentiation

ECCs are not intended as substitutes for representative governments or conventional public administration. Municipal governments would continue to exercise broader responsibilities for infrastructure, public services, regulatory authority, and territorial coordination. National governments would likewise retain essential functions related to constitutional order, macroeconomic policy, redistribution, national legislation, and international representation.

Rather, ECCs may serve as intermediary governance structures focused on participatory ecological coordination and localized civic engagement. Their competencies would likely vary by institutional context but could include advisory and co-governance roles in areas such as local sustainability planning, community energy systems, ecological restoration, participatory budgeting, resilience coordination, and local resource stewardship.

This functional differentiation reflects the principle of subsidiarity, which holds that governance responsibilities should be exercised at the most immediate level compatible with effective action, while larger-scale institutions intervene where broader coordination is necessary [45]. Subsidiarity does not imply local isolationism but rather seeks to balance local autonomy with systemic coordination.

6.2.2. Coordination and Institutional Integration

For ECCs to contribute meaningfully to governance systems, institutional coordination mechanisms would be essential. Without clear coordination structures, participatory governance initiatives risk fragmentation, duplication, or jurisdictional conflicts. Effective integration would therefore require legal recognition, procedural clarity, administrative cooperation, and mechanisms for resolving conflicts across governance levels.

Polycentric governance theory offers an important analytical framework for understanding these dynamics. Rather than concentrating authority within a single hierarchical structure, polycentric systems feature multiple overlapping centers of decision-making that operate at different scales while remaining partially coordinated [14]. Such arrangements may enhance adaptability, experimentation, and responsiveness in complex environments.

ECCs may be understood as potential nodes within broader polycentric governance systems. Their role would not be to centralize authority locally but to strengthen democratic and ecological coordination across multilevel governance networks linking municipalities, regions, states, civil society actors, and transnational institutions.

Importantly, polycentric governance does not automatically confer democratic legitimacy or effective coordination. Overlapping authorities may also create confusion, inequality, and accountability deficits. Consequently, the institutional design of ECC integration would remain a critical issue requiring further empirical and constitutional analysis.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

6.2.3. Fiscal Relations and Resource Capacities

A recurring limitation affecting participatory and community-based governance initiatives is financial dependence. Without stable resource capacity, local ecological initiatives frequently remain vulnerable to political shifts, external funding cycles, or administrative discontinuity.

ECCs would therefore require more stable fiscal arrangements that support long-term participatory and ecological functions. Potential mechanisms may include participatory local budgeting, shared municipal revenues, ecological transition funds, cooperative financing structures, or multilevel public financing systems linked to sustainability objectives.

At the same time, fiscal autonomy raises important equity concerns. Wealthier communities may have substantially greater capacity to finance participatory ecological infrastructure than economically marginalized regions. Without redistributive mechanisms, localized governance systems risk reproducing territorial inequalities rather than reducing them.

Consequently, ECCs would likely need to be integrated into broader fiscal coordination frameworks capable of balancing local initiative with redistributive solidarity. National governments would continue to play essential roles in ensuring equitable resource distribution and legal coherence across territories.

6.3. Eco-Civic Communities Within Polycentric and Global Governance

The growing interdependence of ecological systems poses governance challenges that transcend local and national boundaries. Climate change, biodiversity loss, ocean degradation, migration pressures, and transboundary pollution all involve systemic interactions that cannot be effectively addressed by isolated governance units alone. At the same time, highly centralized global governance structures often suffer from democratic deficits, limited legitimacy, and weak implementation capacity.

In this context, ECCs may contribute to broader discussions on polycentric and multilevel ecological governance by providing institutional links between localized participation and larger coordination systems.

6.3.1. Ecological Coordination Across Governance Scales

One of the central insights of polycentric governance theory is that complex ecological problems often require governance arrangements that operate simultaneously across multiple scales, rather than relying on purely centralized or decentralized models [14]. Localized participation may enhance contextual responsiveness and democratic legitimacy, while larger governance levels provide coordination, redistribution, scientific expertise, and regulatory coherence.

ECCs conceptually fit within this framework as localized participatory units nested within broader governance architectures. Their role would involve translating broader sustainability frameworks into territorially grounded practices while transmitting local knowledge, priorities, and democratic feedback upward into wider governance systems.

This multilevel perspective aligns with broader scholarship on ecological democracy and Earth system governance, which increasingly emphasizes the need to link democratic participation to planetary coordination mechanisms [1]. The challenge is not merely to scale up local participation mechanically, but to create governance systems that balance ecological interdependence with democratic pluralism.

6.3.2. Democracy as Connective Infrastructure

Within multilevel ecological governance systems, democracy serves a connective rather than merely procedural function. Democratic legitimacy is essential for coordinating diverse actors, scales, and knowledge systems amid ecological complexity and political diversity.

Deliberative democratic theory increasingly conceptualizes democracy as a distributed system of communicative interaction among institutions, publics, civil society actors, and governance

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

networks, rather than as a single institutional locus [6]. From this perspective, legitimacy emerges through ongoing processes of participation, contestation, justification, and accountability across multiple governance arenas.

ECCs may contribute to such deliberative systems by serving as localized democratic nodes where ecological governance is socially embedded in everyday civic practice. Their significance, therefore, lies not only in environmental administration but also in the potential to strengthen the democratic infrastructure necessary for long-term ecological coordination.

At the same time, democratic governance under conditions of planetary interdependence remains institutionally unresolved. Existing global governance systems continue to face major challenges regarding accountability, representation, enforceability, and coordination. Consequently, proposals for stronger multilevel or federal governance arrangements increasingly emerge within debates on global environmental governance and planetary politics [2,46].

Rather than claiming that any single institutional model is the exclusive solution, the present analysis suggests that more strongly coordinated multilevel governance arrangements—including potentially federal forms of ecological coordination—may better reconcile local democratic participation with broader ecological interdependence. ECCs may contribute to such arrangements by strengthening the participatory foundations on which larger governance systems ultimately depend.

6.4. From Local Participation to Multilevel Ecological Democracy

The integration of ECCs into broader governance systems should therefore be understood as part of a wider transformation of democratic and ecological governance rather than as an isolated institutional reform. ECCs are proposed neither as autonomous local enclaves nor as replacements for existing governmental structures. Rather, they represent one possible effort to reconnect ecological stewardship, civic participation, and multilevel coordination within increasingly interdependent socio-ecological systems.

Their long-term significance would depend not only on local institutional design but also on the extent to which broader governance arrangements can support democratic participation, redistributive coordination, ecological accountability, and institutional cooperation across scales. In this sense, ECCs are best understood as potential components of evolving systems of ecological democracy, whose practical viability remains open to further experimentation, comparative analysis, and institutional development.

7. Scaling Pathways: Institutional Design, Transition Mechanisms, and Policy Scenarios

The long-term significance of ECCs depends not only on their conceptual coherence but also on whether they can realistically evolve from localized governance experiments into broader institutional structures that can contribute to ecological transformation across multiple scales. Many participatory and sustainability-oriented initiatives demonstrate considerable innovation at the local level yet remain politically isolated, administratively fragile, or difficult to replicate beyond favorable contexts. Consequently, the challenge is not simply to imagine idealized governance models but to analyze plausible pathways through which participatory ecological governance may gradually expand, institutionalize, and coordinate across increasingly complex governance systems.

This section therefore shifts from conceptual definition to transition analysis. Rather than presenting a deterministic blueprint, it outlines possible developmental phases, institutional mechanisms, implementation constraints, and evaluative indicators that may guide future experimentation and empirical research on ECCs. The objective is not to predict a single institutional trajectory but to identify analytical scenarios that may inform how ECCs might evolve under different political and governance conditions.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

7.1. Phases of Development

The institutionalization of ECCs would likely proceed incrementally rather than through comprehensive systemic transformation. Ecological governance systems generally evolve through layered processes of experimentation, adaptation, networking, and institutional consolidation, rather than through abrupt constitutional redesign. This evolutionary perspective aligns with reflexive governance theories, which emphasize iterative learning, institutional adaptability, and recursive policy adjustment in the face of ecological uncertainty [47]. A phased perspective, therefore, offers a more realistic framework for understanding how ECCs might develop across different governance contexts.

7.1.1. Pilot and Experimental Phase

The initial phase would likely involve localized pilot initiatives emerging within municipalities, neighborhoods, districts, or regional communities. These early-stage ECC experiments could focus on specific ecological and participatory objectives, such as renewable energy cooperatives, climate adaptation planning, participatory ecological budgeting, food sovereignty initiatives, biodiversity restoration, or community resilience coordination.

At this stage, ECCs would primarily serve as experimental governance spaces where communities test participatory ecological practices, institutional procedures, and collaborative decision-making mechanisms. Their primary contribution would not necessarily be large-scale ecological transformation, but rather the generation of institutional learning, civic capacity, and demonstrative legitimacy.

Pilot phases are especially important because they enable governance experimentation without requiring immediate systemic restructuring. As Ostrom [14] emphasizes in polycentric governance theory, smaller-scale institutional experimentation can enhance adaptive learning and reduce the risks associated with centralized policy uniformity.

7.1.2. Municipal Integration Phase

If localized ECC initiatives demonstrate practical viability and public legitimacy, subsequent development may entail greater integration into formal municipal governance systems. Municipal governments could begin to recognize ECCs as advisory, deliberative, or co-governance institutions that participate in ecological planning, community resilience coordination, or participatory budgeting.

This phase would likely require clearer legal definitions, procedural integration mechanisms, and administrative coordination structures. Municipal integration could provide ECCs with greater institutional continuity, fiscal support, and policy influence, while strengthening democratic participation within local governance systems.

At the same time, institutional integration introduces important tensions. Increased formalization may improve stability while reducing flexibility, spontaneity, and grassroots autonomy. Balancing institutional durability with participatory openness would therefore be a central governance challenge at this stage.

7.1.3. Regional Networking and Inter-Community Coordination

As ECC initiatives expand, horizontal coordination among communities may become increasingly important. Regional networks could facilitate knowledge exchange, policy learning, cooperative resource sharing, ecological coordination, and joint advocacy across municipalities and territories.

This networking phase reflects the broader logic of polycentric governance systems, in which multiple governance units remain partially autonomous while coordinating through cooperative relationships rather than strict hierarchical control [14]. These multilevel coordination mechanisms also align with broader Earth system governance approaches that emphasize institutional diversity,

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

cross-scalar interaction, and distributed governance capacities in response to planetary ecological interdependence [2]. Dense inter-community networks may strengthen resilience by enabling communities to share institutional innovations, technical expertise, and participatory practices and to adapt them to diverse territorial contexts.

Regional coordination may be especially important for ecological systems that span municipal boundaries, including watershed management, regional mobility infrastructure, biodiversity corridors, energy grids, and climate adaptation strategies.

7.1.4. National Recognition and Policy Integration

A more advanced stage of development would entail broader legal and policy recognition at the national level. National governments could establish enabling legal frameworks that recognize ECCs as participatory entities in ecological governance and define their competencies, fiscal relations, accountability standards, and coordination mechanisms.

National integration may also include ecological transition funds, cooperative financing programs, participatory planning mandates, or multilevel governance councils that link local ecological participation to broader policy frameworks. Importantly, national coordination could help reduce territorial inequalities by redistributing resources to communities with weaker economic or administrative capacities.

Nevertheless, national institutionalization may also generate political tensions. Central governments may resist decentralization, which they perceive as administratively disruptive or politically destabilizing. Similarly, ideological conflicts over ecological regulation, participatory governance, or territorial autonomy may shape how ECCs are politically interpreted and implemented.

7.1.5. Transnational and Global Coordination

As ecological interdependence increases, more advanced forms of transnational coordination may eventually emerge among ECC networks, municipalities, regional coalitions, and international institutions. Existing examples—including transnational municipal climate networks and global urban sustainability coalitions—already demonstrate that local governance actors increasingly participate in global environmental governance processes [9].

In this scenario, ECCs could contribute to broader systems of multilevel ecological coordination by transmitting local ecological knowledge, democratic feedback, and participatory legitimacy to regional and global governance arenas. Their role would not involve replacing national governments or creating a centralized planetary administration, but rather strengthening the participatory foundations on which broader ecological coordination increasingly depends.

This perspective aligns with emerging discussions on democratic Earth system governance and multilevel ecological federalism, which emphasize linking local democratic participation to planetary governance capacities amid global ecological interdependence [1,2,46].

7.2. Institutional Mechanisms

The transition from isolated local experimentation to more durable ecological-democratic governance systems would require a range of institutional mechanisms to support participation, coordination, accountability, and continuity. Moreover, reflexive governance scholarship suggests that institutional resilience increasingly depends on mechanisms that enable continuous learning, adaptive coordination, and iterative policy revision in the face of ecological complexity and uncertainty [47].

7.2.1. Legal and Constitutional Frameworks

One important mechanism is the development of legal frameworks that recognize participatory ecological governance structures within broader institutional systems. Legal recognition may

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

provide ECCs with procedural clarity, institutional legitimacy, and administrative continuity, while defining their relationships with municipal and national authorities.

Possible legal mechanisms include municipal charters, participatory governance statutes, ecological planning mandates, community stewardship agreements, or constitutional provisions recognizing participatory ecological governance principles. The specific institutional form would likely vary considerably across political systems and legal traditions.

Importantly, however, legal formalization should not be conflated with bureaucratic centralization. Excessive procedural rigidity may undermine the adaptive and participatory capacities that are ECCs' primary contribution.

7.2.2. Participatory Assemblies and Deliberative Structures

Deliberative institutions would constitute another central mechanism in ECC development. Participatory assemblies, citizen forums, ecological councils, and deliberative planning bodies may provide structured spaces for collective decision-making, public reasoning, and civic accountability. From a systemic deliberative perspective, democratic legitimacy emerges not from isolated participatory forums alone but from interactions among multiple deliberative sites distributed across the broader governance system [6].

Deliberative structures are particularly important because ecological governance often involves long-term trade-offs, distributive conflicts, and uncertainty that require ongoing public justification rather than purely technocratic administration. Institutionalized deliberation may therefore strengthen both democratic legitimacy and collective learning.

Empirical research on environmental governance further indicates that public participation serves multiple functions beyond procedural legitimacy, such as knowledge integration, conflict mediation, trust-building, and improved policy implementation [48].

At the same time, participation mechanisms require careful institutional design to prevent domination by highly organized actors, procedural fatigue, or symbolic consultation without substantive influence.

7.2.3. Ecological Budgeting and Fiscal Mechanisms

Fiscal mechanisms are equally important to institutional viability. Participatory ecological governance cannot be durable if it depends exclusively on temporary grants or volunteer labor. Stable financing structures are therefore necessary to support ecological planning, civic participation, resilience infrastructure, and administrative coordination.

Potential mechanisms may include ecological budgeting processes, municipal sustainability funds, cooperative financing institutions, climate transition programs, or participatory allocation procedures tied to ecological indicators. These mechanisms could strengthen democratic accountability by linking public deliberation directly to resource allocation.

7.2.4. Digital Platforms and Participatory Technologies

Digital platforms may also support ECC coordination by enabling participatory communication, collaborative planning, public transparency, and inter-community networking. Digital tools can expand access to deliberation, enhance information sharing, and strengthen participatory monitoring systems across governance scales.

However, digital governance also poses significant risks, including surveillance, technological dependence, algorithmic bias, unequal access, and the exclusion of populations lacking digital literacy or infrastructure. Consequently, digital participation should complement, rather than replace, face-to-face deliberative institutions and community-based engagement. These concerns are especially relevant in contemporary democracies, where tensions are rising between technological modernization, democratic responsiveness, and post-participatory governance, as identified by Blühdorn [49].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

7.2.5. Cooperative Finance and Community Economies

Finally, cooperative financial mechanisms may strengthen local resilience and democratic economic participation within ECC systems. Community energy cooperatives, mutual credit systems, solidarity finance networks, and cooperative investment structures may support territorially embedded ecological transitions while reducing dependence on highly centralized financial systems.

Such arrangements may also help achieve a more equitable distribution of ecological transition benefits within communities. Nevertheless, cooperative economic systems would still require broader regulatory and redistributive frameworks to address structural inequalities across territories.

7.3. Risks, Constraints, and Structural Challenges

Any realistic assessment of ECCs must also acknowledge the substantial risks and limitations of participatory ecological governance. Community-based governance initiatives are not inherently democratic, inclusive, or effective simply because of local participation. Several structural challenges may significantly constrain the viability of ECCs.

7.3.1. Elite Capture and Unequal Participation

One major risk is elite capture. Participatory institutions may be dominated by socially privileged groups with greater time, education, organizational capacity, or political influence. Without adequate safeguards, ECCs could reproduce rather than reduce existing inequalities in political participation and resource access.

Similarly, participation inequalities based on gender, ethnicity, class, age, disability, or digital access may distort deliberative processes and undermine democratic legitimacy.

7.3.2. Civic Fatigue and Participation Overload

Sustained participation requires considerable time, emotional labor, and organizational commitment. Communities facing economic precarity or social fragmentation may struggle to maintain long-term participatory engagement. Excessive reliance on continuous civic mobilization may therefore lead to participation fatigue, declining engagement, or the concentration of responsibilities among small activist minorities. These dynamics may reinforce what Blühdorn [49] describes as the structural contradictions of contemporary democracies, in which expectations of participation rise even as social fragmentation, economic precarity, and institutional distrust weaken sustained civic engagement.

7.3.3. Administrative Overlap and Governance Complexity

Polycentric governance systems may also lead to institutional fragmentation and administrative complexity. Overlapping authorities, unclear competencies, and duplicated procedures can reduce accountability and create governance inefficiencies. Effective coordination mechanisms would therefore remain essential.

7.3.4. Funding Limitations and Territorial Inequalities

Financial sustainability is another major challenge. Wealthier communities may have significantly greater capacity to develop ecological infrastructure and participatory institutions than economically marginalized territories. Without redistributive coordination mechanisms, ECC systems risk reinforcing uneven territorial development.

7.3.5. Political Resistance and Institutional Inertia

Finally, participatory ecological governance may face resistance from political actors, administrative institutions, or economic interests that perceive ECCs as threats to existing power

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

arrangements or development models. Institutional inertia, partisan polarization, and ideological opposition may therefore significantly affect implementation trajectories.

These risks do not invalidate the ECC framework, but they underscore the need to treat ECCs as contingent institutional experiments that require careful design, ongoing evaluation, and adaptive governance capacities, rather than as idealized solutions.

7.4. Indicators for Future Empirical Research

Because ECCs remain primarily a conceptual governance model, future empirical research will be essential to evaluate their practical effectiveness and institutional viability. Developing measurable indicators may help facilitate comparative analysis across contexts and governance experiments.

Therefore, potential indicators for future research are listed in Table 3:

Table 3. Indicators for Future Research.

Dimension	Illustrative Indicators
Democratic Participation	Participation rates, deliberative diversity, civic engagement continuity
Ecological Performance	Local carbon reduction, biodiversity restoration, renewable energy adoption
Social Inclusion	Representation of marginalized groups, accessibility measures, social cohesion
Governance Responsiveness	Policy implementation speed, public accountability mechanisms, conflict resolution
Economic Resilience	Local cooperative activity, community investment capacity, employment generation
Institutional Integration	Coordination effectiveness across governance levels
Adaptive Capacity	Ability to revise policies in response to ecological or social feedback

Such indicators would not provide definitive measures of ecological democracy, but they may contribute to more systematic evaluation frameworks that move beyond purely normative or aspirational governance discourse.

7.5. From Conceptual Proposal to Institutional Experimentation

The scaling of ECCs should therefore be understood not as a linear blueprint for institutional transformation but as a field of evolving governance experimentation situated within broader debates about ecological democracy, resilience, reflexive governance, and multilevel Earth system governance [2,47]. The ECC framework is not intended to prescribe a single institutional model applicable universally across contexts but to explore how participatory ecological governance capacities might be more systematically integrated into existing and emerging governance architectures.

Whether ECCs can evolve beyond localized experimentation remains an open empirical question. Their long-term viability will depend on political conditions, institutional design, civic cultures, resource distribution, and broader governance support systems. Nevertheless, mounting pressures from ecological interdependence, democratic fragmentation, and governance complexity suggest that new forms of multilevel ecological participation may become increasingly necessary. ECCs represent one possible pathway for such institutional experimentation to develop.

8. Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The ECC framework developed in this article should be understood primarily as a conceptual and analytical contribution rather than as a fully validated institutional model. The paper seeks to

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

synthesize insights from ecological democracy, deliberative governance, polycentric institutional theory, civic ecology, and multilevel governance to explore how participatory ecological governance structures might contribute to broader processes of democratic and ecological transformation. While this conceptual integration offers a possible analytical framework for examining emerging governance innovations, several important limitations must be acknowledged.

First, the present study remains largely theoretical. Although the article draws on historical precedents, contemporary governance experiments, and comparative institutional literature, it does not provide systematic empirical testing of ECCs as operational governance structures. ECCs are therefore proposed as an analytical model informed by existing practices rather than as empirically demonstrated institutional solutions. The absence of longitudinal case studies, quantitative evaluation, or comparative field research necessarily limits the extent to which the framework's practical effectiveness can be assessed at present.

Second, the article relies heavily on interpretive synthesis across multiple bodies of literature drawn from distinct theoretical traditions. Ecological democracy, deliberative systems theory, civic ecology, polycentric governance, resilience studies, and federalist approaches to multilevel governance do not always share the same normative assumptions, institutional priorities, or conceptions of democratic legitimacy. Although the ECC framework seeks to integrate these perspectives coherently, tensions remain over issues such as scale, authority, expertise, participation, and institutional coordination. Future scholarship may therefore refine, revise, or contest aspects of the synthesis presented here.

Third, the institutional feasibility of ECCs would likely vary significantly across political, legal, cultural, and socioeconomic contexts. Governance arrangements that may function effectively in highly decentralized democracies with strong civic infrastructures could encounter substantial obstacles in contexts with weak local institutions, centralized administrative traditions, authoritarian political systems, limited fiscal capacity, or low levels of public trust. Consequently, the ECC framework should not be interpreted as universally transferable without contextual adaptation. Institutional design would necessarily depend on existing governance traditions, legal systems, territorial structures, and civic cultures.

Relatedly, the article does not fully address several practical governance questions central to real-world implementation. These include the precise legal status of ECCs, the allocation of competencies across governance levels, mechanisms for democratic accountability, fiscal sustainability, representation rules, conflict resolution procedures, and safeguards against elite capture or unequal participation. While the article identifies many of these challenges analytically, substantial institutional design work remains before ECCs could be translated into stable governance architectures.

The article also remains limited in its treatment of political economy constraints. Ecological governance transitions unfold within broader systems of economic power, global markets, state interests, and geopolitical asymmetries that may substantially shape the viability of participatory ecological governance models. Existing political and economic structures may resist governance decentralization, ecological redistribution, or participatory reforms perceived as threatening entrenched institutional or market interests. Future research would therefore benefit from a more detailed analysis of the relationship between ECCs and broader political-economic dynamics, including capitalism, state restructuring, technological transformation, and ecological inequality.

Another limitation concerns the scale and complexity of coordination. While the article argues that polycentric and multilevel governance arrangements may enhance ecological responsiveness and democratic participation, the coordination challenges of highly distributed governance systems remain only partially addressed. Large-scale ecological crises often require rapid decision-making, technical expertise, and coordinated policy implementation, which decentralized participatory structures may struggle to provide consistently. Future research should therefore examine more carefully the conditions under which participatory ecological governance can remain both democratically inclusive and operationally effective across scales.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

Similarly, the article only briefly addresses the risks inherent in participatory governance. Deliberative and civic institutions do not automatically ensure equitable participation or democratic legitimacy. Inequalities in participation, civic fatigue, digital exclusion, informational asymmetries, organizational dominance, and procedural complexity may significantly affect governance outcomes. Empirical research will therefore be necessary to evaluate how ECCs function amid social inequality, political polarization, and institutional fragmentation.

Despite these limitations, the ECC framework may still serve as a useful heuristic for future research on the relationship between ecological transformation and democratic governance. Several avenues for further investigation appear particularly important.

One priority is to conduct empirical case-study analyses of existing governance initiatives that partially resemble ECC characteristics. Comparative studies of ecovillages, Transition Towns, participatory ecological planning initiatives, community energy cooperatives, eco-districts, Indigenous stewardship systems, and municipal deliberative assemblies may help identify the institutional conditions under which participatory ecological governance succeeds or fails. Such research could provide valuable insight into governance effectiveness, inclusion, resilience, accountability, and long-term institutional durability.

Second, future research could develop more systematic comparative metrics for evaluating ecological-democratic governance systems. The analytical criteria proposed in this article—including democratic depth, ecological effectiveness, institutional feasibility, inclusiveness, accountability, resilience, and scalability—could serve as a foundation for comparative assessment frameworks. Operationalizing these dimensions with measurable indicators would enable more rigorous empirical evaluation across governance contexts.

Third, legal and constitutional scholarship may substantially advance understanding of how participatory ecological governance structures could be integrated into existing institutional systems. Questions about legal recognition, subsidiarity, multilevel coordination, fiscal competencies, democratic accountability, and constitutional legitimacy remain underexplored in current governance literature. Comparative analysis of decentralized governance systems, participatory constitutional reforms, and multilevel environmental governance arrangements may help clarify these institutional possibilities.

Fourth, additional research is needed on the role of digital technologies in participatory ecological governance. While digital platforms may enhance communication, coordination, and transparency, they also pose significant risks, including surveillance, exclusion, algorithmic governance, and technological dependency. Future studies should therefore examine how digital infrastructures affect democratic participation, ecological coordination, and equity in governance within community-based governance systems.

Finally, future scholarship should examine the broader relationship between localized participatory governance and planetary ecological coordination. The growing interdependence of socio-ecological systems raises unresolved questions about how to balance democratic legitimacy, ecological responsibility, and multilevel governance amid global environmental interdependence. ECCs represent only one possible approach within this broader debate. Their ultimate significance will depend not only on local institutional experimentation but also on the evolution of larger governance architectures that can reconcile ecological coordination with democratic pluralism across scales.

The present article should therefore be understood less as a definitive institutional proposal than as an invitation to further theoretical and empirical investigation. Its principal contribution is to explore how ecological democracy might become more deeply embedded within multilevel governance systems through participatory civic institutions that link local ecological action with broader structures of democratic coordination.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

9. Conclusion

This article has explored ECCs as a potential framework for reconnecting ecological governance with democratic participation across multiple scales of political organization. Drawing on scholarship in ecological democracy, deliberative governance, polycentric institutional systems, civic ecology, and multilevel governance, the analysis argues that current environmental governance challenges cannot be understood solely as technical or regulatory problems. They also involve structural questions about participation, legitimacy, institutional coordination, and the relationship between citizens and increasingly complex governance systems.

The concept of ECCs was developed here not as a finalized institutional blueprint but as an analytical model for examining these interconnected challenges. ECCs were defined as territorially grounded, participatory, ecologically oriented, and institutionally integrated governance structures capable of linking localized civic engagement with broader ecological coordination systems. The article proposed that their significance lies less in any single institutional form than in their potential to integrate ecological stewardship, democratic participation, and multilevel governance within a common analytical framework.

The comparative analysis further suggested that existing local governance models—including ecovillages, Transition Towns, participatory budgeting initiatives, eco-districts, and neighborhood councils—each offer important insights into participatory ecological governance while also exhibiting structural limitations related to scale, institutional durability, inclusiveness, or coordination capacity. In this context, ECCs were presented as a conceptual attempt to synthesize and extend some of the strengths of these initiatives rather than to replace or supersede them categorically.

Similarly, the discussion of multilevel governance emphasized that ecological transformation increasingly requires coordination across local, regional, national, and transnational scales. Yet the analysis also underscored that broader coordination mechanisms may struggle to maintain democratic legitimacy if ecological governance becomes detached from meaningful civic participation and territorial realities. The ECC framework therefore sought to examine how localized participatory structures might contribute to more coherent ecological governance without reducing democracy to either purely technocratic administration or isolated localism.

At the same time, the article acknowledged important limitations and unresolved challenges. ECCs remain largely conceptual and require substantial empirical investigation, comparative analysis, institutional experimentation, and legal clarification before their practical viability can be adequately assessed. Questions about participation inequalities, governance complexity, fiscal sustainability, political resistance, institutional overlap, and coordination effectiveness remain central to future research.

For this reason, the article does not claim that ECCs constitute a definitive solution to ecological or democratic crises. Rather, it suggests that they may offer a promising analytical and institutional framework for examining how ecological governance and democratic participation can be more systematically interconnected. Their relevance lies in their effort to bridge domains often treated separately in governance scholarship: ecological sustainability, civic participation, institutional coordination, and multilevel democratic legitimacy.

More broadly, the analysis points to a broader theoretical implication. Ecological transformation may ultimately require institutional innovations that reconnect citizens, communities, and governance systems across scales of political organization. As ecological interdependence deepens, the challenge for contemporary governance systems is not merely to regulate environmental problems more efficiently, but to cultivate forms of democratic coordination that link local participation with shared ecological responsibility under conditions of planetary interdependence.

In this sense, ECCs should be understood less as a fixed institutional prescription and more as part of an evolving inquiry into how democratic societies might reorganize governance in response to the ecological realities of the twenty-first century.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, M.G.; methodology, M.G.; validation, M.G. and L.K.; investigation, M.G.; writing—original draft preparation, M.G.; writing—review and editing, M.G. and L.K.; supervision, L.K. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Acknowledgments: The authors have reviewed and edited the output and take full responsibility for the content of this publication.".

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.:

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in this manuscript:

ECCs	Eco-Civic Communities
GEN	Global Ecovillage Network
CLTs	Community Land Trusts
BIDs	Business Improvements Districts

References

1. Dryzek, J.S.; Stevenson, H. Global Democracy and Earth System Governance. *Ecological Economics* **2011**, 70, 1865–1874.
2. Biermann, F. *Earth System Governance: World Politics in the Anthropocene*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, USA, 2014.
3. Dryzek, J.S. *The Politics of the Earth: Environmental Discourses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, UK, 1997.
4. Eckersley, R. *The Green State: Rethinking Democracy and Sovereignty*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, USA, 2004. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/3364.001.0001
5. Schlosberg, D. *Defining Environmental Justice: Theories, Movements, and Nature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, UK, 2007. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199286294.001.0001
6. Mansbridge, J.; et al. A Systemic Approach to Deliberative Democracy. In *Deliberative Systems: Deliberative Democracy at the Large Scale*, edited by John Parkinson and Jane Mansbridge, 1–26. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, UK, 2012. pp 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139178914.002
7. Stevenson, H.; Dryzek, J.S. *Democratizing Global Climate Governance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, UK, 2014. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139208628
8. Sénit, C.-A. Leaving No One Behind? The Influence of Civil Society Participation on the Sustainable Development Goals. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space* **2020**, 38, 693–712. https://doi.org/10.1177/2399654419884330
9. Bulkeley, H.; Betsill, M. Revisiting the Urban Politics of Climate Change. *Environmental Politics* **2013**, 22, 136–154. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2013.755797
10. Fung, A. Varieties of Participation in Complex Governance. *Public Administration Review* **2006**, 66, 66–75. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00667.x
11. Healey, P. Civil Society Enterprise and Local Development. *Planning Theory & Practice* **2015**, 16, 11–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2014.995212
12. Hopkins, R. *The Transition Handbook: From Oil Dependency to Local Resilience*. Totnes: Green Books, 2008.
13. Seyfang, G.; Smith, A. Grassroots Innovations for Sustainable Development: Towards a New Research and Policy Agenda. *Environmental Politics* **2007**, 16, 584–603. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644010701419121
14. Ostrom, E. Polycentric Systems for Coping with Collective Action and Global Environmental Change. *Global Environmental Change* **2010**, 20, 550–557. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2010.07.004
15. Hooghe, L.; Marks, G. Unraveling the Central State, but How? Types of Multi-Level Governance. *American Political Science Review* **2003**, 97, 233–243.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

16. Jordan, A.J.; Huitema, D.; van Asselt, H.; Forster, J. eds. *Governing Climate Change: Polycentricity in Action?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, UK, 2018.
17. Pateman, C. *Participation and Democratic Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, UK, 1970.
18. Habermas, J. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, USA, 1996.
19. Dryzek, J.S. *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, UK, 2000.
20. Fung, A., Wright, E.O. eds. *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*. London: Verso, UK, 2003.
21. Fishkin, J.S. *When the People Speak: Deliberative Democracy and Public Consultation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, UK, 2011.
22. Tidball, K.G.; Krasny, M.E. Urban Environmental Education from a Social-Ecological Perspective: Conceptual Framework for Civic Ecology Education. *Cities and the Environment* **2010**, 3, 1–20.
23. Foster, S.R.; Iaione, C. The City as a Commons. *New Haven: Yale Law & Policy Review* **2016**, 34, 281-349.
24. Folke, C.; Hahn, T.; Olsson, P.; Norberg, J. Adaptive Governance of Social-Ecological Systems. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* **2005**, 30, 441–473. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.energy.30.050504.144511
25. Aiken, G. Community Transitions to Low Carbon Futures in the Transition Towns Network (TTN). *Geography Compass* **2012**, 6, 89–99.
26. Gandhi, M.K. *Village Swaraj*. Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House, India, 1962.
27. Near, H. *The Kibbutz Movement: A History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, UK, 1992.
28. Bookchin, M. *From Urbanization to Cities: Toward a New Politics of Citizenship*. London: Cassell, UK, 1995.
29. Albó, X. *Andean People in the Twentieth Century*. In: Salomon F, Schwartz SB, eds. The Cambridge History of the Native Peoples of the Americas. The Cambridge history of the Native Peoples of the Americas. Cambridge University Press, UK, 1999: 765-871.
30. Litfin, K. *Ecovillages: Lessons for Sustainable Community*. Cambridge: Polity Press, UK, 2013.
31. Ostrom, E. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, UK, 1990. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511807763
32. Birchall, J. *The International Co-operative Movement*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, UK, 1997.
33. Whyte, K.P. Indigenous Science (Fiction) for the Anthropocene: Ancestral Dystopias and Fantasies of Climate Change Crises. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space* **2018**, 1, 224–242.
34. Borrows, J. *Recovering Canada: The Resurgence of Indigenous Law*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, Canada, 2002.
35. Register, R. *Ecocities: Rebuilding Cities in Balance with Nature*. Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers, Canada, 2006.
36. Girardet, Herbert. *Creating Regenerative Cities*. London: Routledge, UK, 2015.
37. Sintomer, Y.; Herzberg, C.; Röcke, A. Participatory Budgeting in Europe: Potentials and Challenges. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* **2008**, 32, 164–178. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2008.00777.x
38. Davis, J.E., ed. *The Community Land Trust Reader*. Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, USA, 2010.
39. Wampler, B.; Avritzer, L. Participatory Publics: Civil Society and New Institutions in Democratic Brazil. *Comparative Politics* **2004**, 36, 291–312. https://doi.org/10.2307/4150132
40. Kitchin, R. The Real-Time City? Big Data and Smart Urbanism. *GeoJournal* **2014**, 79, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-013-9516-8
41. Greenfield, A. *Against the Smart City*. New York: Do Projects, USA, 2013.
42. Peyroux, E.; Pütz, R.; Glasze, G. Business Improvement Districts (BIDs): The Internationalization and Contextualization of a 'Travelling Concept.' *European Urban and Regional Studies* **2012**, 19, 111–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/0969776411420788
43. Mitchell, D. *The Right to the City: Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space*. New York: Guilford Press, USA, 2003.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202605.1468.v1

44. Seyfang, G. *The New Economics of Sustainable Consumption: Seeds of Change*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, UK, 2009.
45. Follesdal, A. Subsidiarity. *Journal of Political Philosophy* **1998**, 6, 190–218. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9760.00052
46. Galiñanes, M.; Klinkers, L. Toward Transformative Global Environmental Governance: Nested Systems, Planetary Politics, and the Case for a World Federation. *World* **2026**, 7, 45. https://doi.org/10.3390/world7030045
47. Voß, J.-P.; Kemp, R. Sustainability and Reflexive Governance: Introduction. In *Reflexive Governance for Sustainable Development*, edited by Jan-Peter Voß, Dierk Bauknecht, and René Kemp, 3–28. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, UK, 2006.
48. Wesselink, A.; Paavola, A.; Fritsch, O.; Renn, J. Rationales for Public Participation in Environmental Policy and Governance: Practitioners' Perspectives. *Environment and Planning A* **2011**, 43, 2688–2704. https://doi.org/10.1068/a44161
49. Blühdorn, I. The Dialectic of Democracy: Modernization, Emancipation and the Great Regression. *Democratization* **2020**, 27, 389–407. https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2019.1648436