

K A Alexander^{1,2}, A Fleming¹, N Bax^{1,2}, C Garcia^{1,2}, J Jansen^{1,2}, K E Maxwell³, J Melbourne Thomas⁴, T Mustonen⁴, G T Pecl^{1,2}, J Shaw^{1,2}, G Syme¹, and E Ogier^{1,2}

¹Centre for Marine Socioecology, University of Tasmania

²Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies, University of Tasmania

³Environmental Research Institute, CSIRO, Oceans and Atmosphere, University of Waikato

⁴Affiliation not available

December 10, 2020

Alexander, K. A.^{1,2*}, A. Fleming^{1,4}, N. Bax^{1,2}, C. Garcia^{1,2}, J. Jansen^{1,2}, K. E. Maxwell³, J. Melbourne-Thomas⁵, T. Mustonen⁶, G. T. Pecl^{1,2}, J. Shaw^{1,2}, G. Syme^{1,4} and E. Ogier^{1,2}

¹. Centre for Marine Socioecology, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Tas. 7001, Australia

². Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies, University of Tasmania, Private Bag 49, Hobart, Tas. 7000, Australia

³. Environmental Research Institute, University of Waikato, Tauranga, New Zealand

⁴. CSIRO, Land and Water, Hobart, Tas. 7001, Australia.

⁵. CSIRO, Oceans and Atmosphere, Hobart, Tas. 7001, Australia

⁶. Snowchange Cooperative, FIN 81235 Lehtoi, Finland

*Corresponding author: karen.alexander@utas.edu.au

Abstract

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) envisage a desirable society where equity is a normative goal that is given attention, and ways to improve inclusivity and diversity of equity beyond concept, process and outcome are being actively explored. Here, we examine how equity is considered in a suite of papers that explored possible sustainable futures for the oceans by 2030, and mapped out pathways to achieve these, collectively aiming to move as far towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals as technically feasible. Our analysis revealed that a large range of equity issues were recognised and considered, in outcome-based (i.e. distributive), process-based (i.e. procedural) and concept (i.e. contextual) dimensions. However, often, the equity problem was not explicitly stated, but rather implied through the action pathway identified to move towards a more sustainable 2030, highlighting that reducing inequity is interlinked with improving sustainability. Based on these findings, we reflect on the way equity is conceptualised and considered within this work as well as futures science for the oceans more broadly. These reflections are distilled into lessons learnt, a key one of which is that science and knowledge production are immediate areas where we can work to improve equity in terms of building capacity to understand and include equity issues, develop mechanisms to be more inclusive and diverse and continually, and in particular, critically reflect on our own practices to fundamentally challenge how we work and think in the space of marine science research.

Keywords

Equity, sustainable development goals, oceans, 2030

Acknowledgements

This paper is part of the Future Seas project (futureseas2030.org), hosted by the Centre for Marine Socioecology at the University of Tasmania. This initiative delivers a series of journal articles addressing key challenges for the UN Decade of Ocean Science for Sustainable Development 2021-2030. The general concepts and methods applied in many of these papers were developed in large collaborative workshops involving more participants than listed as co-authors here, who we thank for their collective input. We acknowledge and pay respect to the traditional owners and custodians of sea country all around the world and recognise their collective wisdom and knowledge of our oceans and coasts.

Introduction

Changing ocean conditions and accelerating human enterprises will mean that benefits and burdens, fairness and justice, are currently distributed and governed differently across socio-ecological systems and will be into the future (Jouffray et al., 2020). Over recent decades, the ocean has seen escalating use and extraction of resources with growth of aquaculture, deep sea mining, shipping, and tourism, and increases in many other stressors, like plastics and pollution. With a projected human population of 8.5 billion by 2030, approximately 40% of which live within 100km of the coast, both the demands and the stressors on oceans are expected to increase, compounding the already substantial challenges of equitable use and sustainable development. Recognising the critical roles of oceans in the future of our society, both locally and globally, the United Nations proclaimed 2021-2030 a Decade of Ocean Science for Sustainable Development. The decade aims to improve the trajectory of ocean health and bring diverse stakeholders together behind a common framework to ensure ocean science can fully support countries in creating improved conditions for sustainable development of the ocean. However, inequity is a systemic characteristic of the current ocean economy and so major changes are required over coming decades in order to achieve sustainable development of the ocean in a way that benefits everyone (Österblom et al., 2020).

Equity is a concept rooted in Western law, philosophical and political theory (Hay, 1995). It has been applied for pragmatic purposes as a technical-legal concept in global goal-setting initiatives, such as the Sustainable Development Goals, to measure progress towards equitable outcomes. And yet equity is understood differently in the experience of Traditional and Indigenous Peoples in the autonomous and - in most cases - surrendered governance, culture and knowledge that is endemic to those peoples and not compatible with current Western legal systems (Fischer et al., 2020). Little is published in the Western scientific literature of the pre-colonial concepts of customary equity between humans and the ocean. Present-day survivors of Indigenous nations are centred as critical guides and knowledge keepers to both inform a baseline of collapse of equity in the imperialist process of the past 200-300 years and priorities of redefining the present.

Equity is understood differently again by a range of marginalised groups experiencing intersecting forms of inequity (Kleiber et al., 2017, Lokuge and Hilhorst, 2017, Cohen et al., 2019, Saunders et al., 2020). Acknowledging this pluralism of understandings of equity, we start by first defining equity and highlighting the limits of Western equity theory, before discussing the role of science production in exploring equity under future ocean conditions. We then conduct a synthesis across twelve science-informed future foresighting initiatives in ocean and marine studies. Together, these articles consider many of the key challenges facing the world's oceans, and importantly, leveraged interdisciplinary knowledge from across approximately 120 marine scientists, Indigenous knowledge holders, and environmental managers. Collectively, this suite of papers outlined pathways and associated actions to move towards sustainable futures and achieving the SDGs in the context of climate change (Trebilco et al., 2020), biodiversity conservation (Ward et al., 2020), food security (Farmery et al., 2020), ocean literacy (Kelly et al., In press), plastics and pollution (Puskic et al., 2020), human health (Nash et al., 2020b), coastal and deep sea blue economy (Bax et al., 2020), climate-driven species redistribution (Melbourne-Thomas et al., 2020), ocean governance (Haas et al., 2020), international relations (Smith et al., 2020) and Indigenous rights and access (Fischer et al., 2020). In particular, we are interested in how the futures, and the pathways to achieving those futures as described in those papers, may lead to higher or lower levels of equity.

Background

Defining equity

Equity is defined as ‘fairness’ and ‘justice’ in the ways people are treated, according to the Cambridge Free English and Merriam Webster dictionaries. Indeed, the concepts of fairness, justice and equity are considered cornerstones of a healthy society in Western culture (Carrell and Dittrich, 1978), and have their antecedents in the moral philosophies and political theories of Aristotle and Plato, and more recently of Rousseau, Locke and Hobbes. But what does it mean to be treated in a fair and just manner? These questions have long been contested because the concepts are so situated in context, power relations, subjectivity, culture and personal experience, rendering a universal definition of equity impossible. One foundational articulation of equity which contributed to Western equity scholarship was proposed in the 1960s by J. Stacy Adams in relation to employee and workplace relations (Adams, 1963). Following this, Rawls proposed two principles of justice pertaining to the distribution of benefits and burdens, drawing on theories of libertarianism, egalitarianism and meritocracy (Rawls, 2009). As noted by Cook and Hegtvedt (1983), ‘equity theory’ in Western scholarship has been more generally a theory of distributive justice. Responding to this, Leventhal (1980) and others argued that legal, economic and sociological research on social equity in public management had mainly focused on the problem of allocation (of rewards, punishments and resources), and that there were several issues in equity theory such as a uni-dimensional focus on merit, a lack of consideration of process and the exaggerated importance of fairness in social relationships. Leventhal’s contribution to the revision of equity theory was to highlight procedural as well as distributive equity as necessary foci of justice rules.

Amid the race riots and racial inequalities of the mid-twentieth century the concept of ‘social equity’ was applied by Frederickson (1971) to account for the role of social policy and public administration in the fair, just and equitable development of public policy and distribution of public services. Much social equity scholarship has focused historically on race, gender, and class as domains, but there are a variety of inequity foci including for example: ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, region, disability status, immigration status, and language of origin (Wooldridge and Gooden, 2009). The concept of environmental justice as it relates to unequal distribution of the negatives from environmental degradation also gained currency (e.g. Pellow et al., 2001).

More recently, there has been renewed interest in the concept of social equity and the role of international institutions, such as the United Nations, arising in part from the challenges of globalisation and climate change (Guy and McCandless, 2012). Both procedural and distributive dimensions of equity are acknowledged in various global governance initiatives and assessments, including the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP); the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (Allen et al., 2018), and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (or SDGs, hereafter). For example, SDG6 considers equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water for all; SDG9 promotes affordable and equitable access to infrastructure for all; SDG15 seeks fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources; and one target of SDG17 concerns promoting a universal, rules-based, open, non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading system under the World Trade Organization.

Confronting the limits of Western equity theory

In considering how equity is pursued and the extent which it is manifest, tensions in its conceptualisation and application need to be attended to. These tensions include the call for pluralism in the legal and moral basis for deciding what is equitable, as described earlier. Equity as applied and monitored in global goal-setting programs, such as the SDGs, assumes the universality of the Western legal conceptualisation of what constitutes fairness and justice and how these should be measured. While in contrast, the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (2007) acknowledges the legal and moral systems of governance of Traditional and Indigenous peoples in which conceptualisations of equity differ (Donnelly 1984).

Dominant views of equity have a political-legal history where through the colonial process lands were re-named, re-defined and subjected to a set of values and norms that had been designed as a vehicle of legitimating the incoming colonial rule. In many parts of the world this justification was based on the Euro-centric

concept of “Terra Nullius” of empty lands in need of and subject to conquest. In terms of the ocean, the first treatise on international law, *Mare Liberum* (The Free Sea) outlined a pervasive global sentiment that “the sea, since it is as incapable of being seized as air, cannot be attached to the possession of any particular nation” (Grotius, 1609). In the 21st century whilst critical academic, historical and socio-political processes have exposed the root causes and structural violence embedded in these legacies of conquest, the global structure of how power, equity and politics flows still contains elements of the “old power”. Therefore, progress on “equity” in our oceans has to be viewed also in the context of structure-agency, whose equity and fairness, when and in what context? For example, will large-scale financial transfers and limited recognition of Indigenous rights *within* these structures equate and satisfy those endemic (Mustonen, 2014) ways of being that co-developed for millennia with the seas? What is the price of the ultimate loss, genocide and subsequent attempts to redress “past wrongs” in an equitable manner at sea? These are some of the profound questions that must be reflected on by future scholars exploring equity.

Therefore, there is increasing awareness of the complexity of equity, and the different considerations involved, as well as a growing realisation of how existing structures and arrangements particularly in Western cultures, are not well equipped to respond. Equity presents a challenge for society on many different fronts, not least in terms of challenging underlying values about who and what has power and how rules are made as well as how social structures and institutions are organised and run. In short, equity is a social challenge in terms of *concept*, *outcome*, and *process*.

These tensions include the call for greater attention to the role of power in deciding what is fair and just, informed by the works of theorists such as Marx, Foucault, Habermas, and in recognising power, as well as capital, as resources or benefits in themselves which are inequitably distributed (Cook and Emerson, 1978). Access to these can have a determining influence on the ability of marginalised groups (for example, ethnic minority groups) to participate equitably in processes seeking procedural justice administered by institutions designed to give them ‘equality of opportunity’ (Mentovich, 2012, Gustavsson et al., 2014).

Further, they include the call to expand the scope of for whom or what equity is sought to be inclusive of non-human entities and concerns (Fitzmaurice, 2008, Preston, 2018, Spijkers, 2018). This contrasts with the treatment of the earth as a resource to which humans and future generations of humans have rights, as expressed in various global governance instruments. The expansion of the community of justice or moral community to encompass notions such as interspecies equity (Bosselmann, 2016) has arisen in acknowledgment of their inherent value, as well as of the role of natural systems in human wellbeing and flourishing.

In a personal story told to the authorship team, Taiwanese Indigenous leader Sutej Hugu defined the teaching of *mavaheng so panid* (the noble black-wing flying fish, *Hirundichthys rondeletii*) to the ancestors of his Tao people:

“The teaching includes two major parts: firstly, the inter-species compact for the survival and sustenance of peoples and fish and the eco-calendar, ahehep no tao, that defines the arrangement of works and ceremonies all around the year (see Mustonen et al., Submitted). This points to the ways that Indigenous peoples saw the ocean and her species as relatives and developed temporal and spatial means of co-existence over time – many of which were seen as evil, bad or hindering modernity and progress by outsiders during the hey-day of the colonial process (and therefore a subject of termination often).”

The same power discourse is present today on the role and “inefficiency” of the small-scale fisheries fleet globally (Isaacs et al., n.d) when in fact the small-scale harvesters continue to demonstrate the answers to the emptying of the oceans (see Salatou, in Mustonen et al., Submitted).

Role of science production in exploring equity under future ocean conditions

Science-informed future fore-sighting initiatives in ocean and marine studies are arenas in which visions of greater equity as central elements of desirable ocean future are increasingly being included (see Merrie et al., 2018). Ways to improve inclusivity and diversity of equity as concept, process and outcome are being actively explored. For example, Raudsepp-Hearne, Peterson et al. (2020)’s scenario development approach

is specifically designed to encompass the less tangible features of political economy, heterogeneity in values, and cultural diversity to identify system characteristics that would offer more sustainable and just futures. One reason for this is the increasing trend towards interdisciplinary ocean and marine science and integrated solution-oriented research (Visbeck, 2018). This trend allows inclusion of disciplines that have long explored issues of equity (e.g. social sciences) which make equity more likely to be explicitly considered and approaches that allow equity issues that surface more likely to be employed (e.g. co-production techniques). Furthermore, system sciences as part of knowledge production in ocean and marine science may include issues of equity, by exploring management of systems under historical conditions, Indigenous knowledge and approaches and issues of power and decision making (Hill et al., 2012). New areas of development and growth such as the Blue Economy are another avenue where equity is explicitly raised in ocean and marine studies (Bennett et al., 2019, Österblom et al., 2020).

The SDGs “represent today’s most relevant globally negotiated normative agenda for sustainability” and “a turning point in defining what sustainability means on a global scale” (Schneider et al., 2019). The development of the SDGs was aimed at improving inclusivity and diversity in response to critiques of the previous Millennium Development Goals, and equity as a normative goal received much greater attention. Yet the SDGs and the pathways to realising them still largely avoids requiring a fundamental re-alignment of social structures and institutions in which inequity is often embedded (Battersby, 2017). As we interpret Battersby, the focus on ‘outcome’ equity without also addressing concept and process issues of equity means that equity in an enduring sense, enabled by the necessary structural changes to inequitable process and institutions, is not likely to be fully realised. Furthermore, while the SDGs recognise that equity is an essential pathway to sustainability, the system transformation that this would require is not addressed, thus how equity is to be achieved is far less clear (Sexsmith and McMichael, 2015). The SDGs are a high-level aspirational vision of a desirable society but lack guidance in how to address conflicts in values and trade-offs in decision making across targets and outcomes to achieve that vision (Schneider et al., 2019).

Methods

Analytical framework

To identify the ways in which the concept of equity was considered in science-informed future fore-sighting initiatives in ocean and marine studies, we firstly developed an analysis framework based on our review of the literature (Figure 1). This framework was comprised of three key dimensions of equity. The first dimension was the outcome-based/distributive dimension, referring to the consequences of a policy, action or developmental trend, e.g. equity in the distribution of benefits and burdens (inclusive of costs as well as responsibilities) between genders, races and ethnic groups, species, classes and nation states. The second dimension was the process-oriented/procedural dimension, referring to impartiality and fairness in the process of delivering and administering justice. The third was the concept/contextual dimension, referring to informing cultural, political, economic and social world views, knowledge systems, actors and conditions of the situation, peoples and natural systems, and the interrelatedness of ecological conditions to these. For full details of this framework, see Supplementary Table 1.





Figure 1. Analytical framework; for further case study details see Table 1.

Data sample

For our sample of science-informed future fore-sighting initiatives in ocean and marine studies we used the twelve papers included in this *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries* Special Issue (Table 1) which are outputs from the large Future Seas initiative (<https://futureseas2030.org/>). We considered this to be a relevant sample to analyse as these papers covered a wide range of marine issues and dimensions, and the authorship teams covered a diversity of disciplines and knowledge systems. The co-authors were of all career stages, from 28 different organisations, and comprising 20 different nationalities with, collectively, substantial research experience across all seven continents (Nash et al., 2020a). In addition to Indigenous and Traditional knowledge holders, the disciplinary expertise of the Future Seas project team included ecology, climate science, oceanography, marine engineering, mathematics, philosophy, social sciences, economics, finance, political sciences, law, behavioural psychology, medicine, and public health, with many disciplines being represented in most papers (Nash et al., 2020a). At the stage of review, all papers were pre-peer review drafts.

Table 1. Overview of data sample of papers analysed to assess outcome-based/distributive, process-oriented/procedural and concept/contextual dimensions of equity in the pathways required to move towards achieving sustainable futures for the ocean by 2030. Short titles (as referred to in-text) are in **bold**.

Icon & reference	Title	Problem	Drivers	Sample actions
 Trebilco et al 2020	Warming world, changing ocean: mitigation and adaptation to support resilient marine systems	How to achieve a healthy, resilient, safe, sustainably harvested, and biodiverse ocean	Extreme events; human intervention to reduce climate change; appetite for climate action	Creation & enhancement of economic incentives for climate mitigation & action; deploying marine-based renewable energy; deploying marine-based negative emissions technologies
 Ward et al 2020	Safeguarding marine life: conservation of biodiversity and ecosystems	How to safeguard marine ecosystem biodiversity, function, and adaptive capacity whilst continuing to provide vital resources for the global population	Financial mechanisms, sectoral stewardship, management and governance, societal impetus	Upscale predictive capacity, expand & fund monitoring programs, increase & enhance Indigenous management & partnerships, streamline knowledge exchange
 Army et al 2020	Food for all: designing sustainable and secure future seafood systems	How can the ocean contribute to sustainably feeding the world's population	Ecosystem change; ocean governance; influence of corporations; output & efficiency of seafood systems; consumer demand; focus on nutrition	Diversification of production & consumption; co-management of marine resources; supply chain transparency; sustainable feed inputs; awareness-raising on nutritional value of seafood
 Kelly et al 2020	Connecting to the oceans: Supporting ocean literacy and public engagement	How to improve societal connections to the ocean	Education; cultural connections; technological developments; knowledge exchange & science-policy interconnections	Ocean literacy targeted across society; develop programs that are inclusive of local contexts and culture; maximise utility of technology; inclusive approaches
 Willis et al 2020	Cleaner seas: reducing marine pollution	How to reduce marine pollution	Societal behaviours, equity and access to technologies; governance and policy	Outreach & education campaigns; use of gross pollutant traps; recycling of fishing gear
 Nash et al 2020	Oceans and Society: Feedbacks between ocean and human health	How to promote desirable & minimise undesirable interactions between ocean and human health	Worldview, decision-making context, approach to behaviour change; power & agency; human development & industry; food system; lifestyle & connectedness to oceans	Science & health communication upscaled and improved; knowledge exchange; changed incentives and rules and regulations to change behaviour;
 Bax et al 2020	Ocean resource use: building the coastal blue economy	How to manage sustainable development in future exploitation of both over-utilised and emergent coastal resources	Conflict resolution	Recognising the problem & committing to action; co-management by multiple reliant groups; implement networks to maintain and enhance biodiversity
 Novaglio et al 2020	Deep aspirations: towards a sustainable offshore Blue Economy	How to develop a sustainable offshore Blue Economy	Governance, research & innovation; values of the ocean; partnership	A shift of societal values; sustainable & equitable financing; information sharing; improved legal & institutional mechanisms
 Melbourne Thomas et al 2020	Poleward bound: adapting to climate-driven species redistribution	How to manage & adapt to species redistributions and minimise negative impacts on ecosystems and human communities	Monitoring & detection; managing at multiple scales; cooperation between jurisdictions; human adaptation	Event-driven sampling; implementation of dynamic ocean management; improved communication & coordination between nations; knowledge co-production
 Haas et al 2020	The future of ocean governance	How to move towards more sustainable ocean governance aligning with SDGs	Formal rules & institutions; evidence & knowledge-based decision-making; legitimacy; stakeholder engagement & participation; empowering communities	Place-based management & planning; innovative marine business models; fair decision-making process; benefit sharing arrangements; capacity building; long-term co-operation
 Smith et al 2020	Sharing our oceans fairly: improving international relations around ocean issues	How to ensure international relations around oceans issues are fair	Governance; value of oceans; politics; transparency; engagement; goals	High-level political commitments; changes to governance structure; participatory justice; clear transparent communication
 Fischer et al 2020	Empowering her guardians to nurture our oceans future	How to envisage a fair ocean future for Indigenous and Traditional Peoples around the world	Colonisation and globalisation	Indigenous and Traditional Peoples to be handed power to make decisions over coastal & ocean spaces; scientists & practitioners to challenge processes, structures & strategies that do not include Indigenous & Traditional Peoples voice

Data analysis

The sample was reviewed using our equity analysis analytical framework (see Supplementary Table 1). All authors on this paper were co-authors on at least one of the case study papers analysed. Analysis of the case study papers was distributed across co-authors based on familiarity with the topic of each paper. For each dimension of equity, we assessed whether and which sections of each paper explicitly addressed that dimension, and in relation to what issue. Where equity was specifically considered in at least one dimension, we then asked a) whose equity was affected, b) the positive/negative outcome for equity, and c) what was proposed in the pathway to a sustainable future that could affect this. The lead author of this paper (KA) filled gaps in the analysis as necessary and made sure the framework was, as far as possible, applied consistently. Finally, data were input into an Excel spreadsheet so that patterns and gaps could more easily be identified in the equity dimensions and specific issues addressed or not addressed across the sample.

Results

The results of the analysis are presented in two ways: i) in a table format which shows whether each paper explicitly addressed that dimension; and ii) in-text where we provide examples of who was affected and how, and what was proposed to address this.

Analysis of the papers revealed that a large range of equity issues were explicitly recognised and considered across the papers, across all three dimensions (Table 2). Outcome-based/distributive equity issues were the most highly recognised, as were the decision-making-related components of procedural equity. Regarding the context of each paper, there was a substantial recognition of issues relating to the types of knowledge used to address the challenges described (e.g. Western science or Indigenous knowledge), as well as issues relating to agency. Often, the equity problem was not explicitly stated within the papers, but rather recognised through the action pathway identified to move towards a more sustainable 2030. In other words, reducing inequity was interlinked with improving sustainability. For this reason, most of the examples provided in this synthesis will relate to the action pathways identified in the papers.

Table 2. Results of the analysis of the direct recognition of the three dimensions of equity based on explicit references from each of the 12 papers analysed in this study.

	Publication											
Benefits/burdens												
Access to basic human rights												
Access to available ecosystem goods & services												
Access to culturally important areas, species & communities												
Access to public services												
Financial capital created from marine resource-based industries												
Access to share of economic benefits or rents created												
Impacts/benefits of environmental degradation												
Impacts of natural disasters												
Impacts/benefits of environmental change												
Other												
Process/procedure												
Access to decision-making processes												
Input into decision-making												
Quality of decision-making processes												
Affordance of dignity and respect												
Neutrality/benevolent intentions of decision-makers												
Other												
Conceptual/contextual												
System of law in place to determine what is fair & just												
Degree of agency held by those affected by change												
Types of knowledge systems used to understand change												
Who/what is included in scope of just & fair treatment												
Level of economic capacity required to participate in change												
Other												

Outcome-based/distributive dimension analysis

Of the outcome-based/distributive dimension of equity, the aspects most addressed by the challenges were: access to ecosystem goods and services; access to basic human rights; access to culturally important areas, species and communities; and financial capital created from marine resource-based industries (Table 1).

Access to basic human rights most commonly focused on issues around food security for all. For example, ‘Food for all’ proposed a pathway action of regulatory and market-driven improvements in domestic and low-value seafood chains to enable equitable access to food, whereas ‘Ocean resource use’ proposed integrated and participatory management to increase food security. The focus of access to ecosystem goods and services included fisher access to fish stocks and local community access to coastal and marine areas. For example, ‘Oceans and society’ recommended enforcing public access to coastal and marine areas, whereas ‘Poleward bound’ proposed a pathway action of creating indigenous and community conserved areas.

Indigenous peoples were the main group perceived to be affected regarding access to culturally important areas, species and communities. To address this, many of the papers focused on the need for recognition of Indigenous Peoples’ rights, and inclusion of Indigenous Peoples’ knowledge and cultural values. As examples, ‘Warming world, changing ocean’ proposed increased inclusion of Indigenous perspectives, and ‘Safeguarding marine life’ proposed the recognition of Indigenous peoples and traditional owners as the guardians and managers of marine areas. In regard to access to public services, various topics were addressed including the need for engagement and literacy programs to improve mental health (Connecting to the oceans) and the need to make science more discoverable and communicated (Safeguarding marine life).

The focus for financial capital created from marine resource-based industries was primarily commercial and recreational fishing – both in terms of changes to subsidies and rights for small-scale fishers. Furthermore, ‘Oceans and society’ proposed that incentives to provide micro-loans for green technology may assist disadvantaged groups whilst ‘Deep aspirations’ suggested that private-public benefit sharing mechanisms could help to address benefit hoarding by corporations and wealthy nations. ‘Oceans and resource use’ highlighted how benefit sharing requires engaged knowledge holders and conflict resolution tools to assist during a transition to sustainable livelihoods. Importantly, ‘Empowering her guardians’ made clear that recognising the maritime rights of Indigenous and Traditional Peoples, eradicating colonialism, and stopping prejudice

against Indigenous and Traditional knowledge systems would start to address equity across the distributive dimension.

Process-oriented/procedural dimension analysis

The analysis of the process/procedure-based dimension of equity revealed that the factors most addressed were input to decision-making; access to decision-making processes; and the quality of decision-making processes.

A variety of groups were recognised to have restricted access and input to decision-making processes including minority groups, small scale fishers, women, people from diverse ethnicities, and nation states themselves. Collaboration and inclusivity in decision-making frameworks were proposed as a means by which to increase participation by such groups. For example, 'Oceans and society' proposed participatory governance to decentralise power, moving it away from private corporations; 'Deep aspirations' proposed that international collaborative governance interventions may enable input from Indigenous and traditional peoples; and 'Ocean governance' proposed the creation of reflexive, balanced, transparent and inclusive decision-making frameworks to address disenfranchised groups. 'Sharing our oceans fairly' noted that in international treaty negotiations, there should be an extensive consultation process to ensure the inclusion of the global communities' interests.

Regarding quality of decision-making processes, the papers often recognised that everyone in society was likely to be affected by the changes discussed. Transparency, consultation, and knowledge sharing were viewed as the key requirements to improve quality of decision-making and equity of process. 'Warming world, changing oceans' suggested that ethical principles should be used to determine when incentives or regulation is used, and for whom. 'Ocean governance' suggested a pathway action of transparent consultation processes led by accountable authorities.

Concept/contextual dimension analysis

The types of knowledge systems used to understand change was the most commonly recognised context factor across all papers. Almost every paper recognised equity issues regarding the types of knowledge systems that are used to address sustainability with level of economic capital and capacity required and degree of agency held also being recognised by more than half of the papers.

The dominance of Western scientific knowledge was identified, as was the need to incorporate Indigenous and experiential knowledges. Collaboration and co-production of knowledge were proposed as the key routes towards addressing this equity issue. For example, 'Food for all' proposed that co-production of knowledge and technologies was required, whereas 'Ocean resource use' proposed the need for determination of strong sovereignty to underpin economic access, sustainable livelihoods and conservation.

Many papers also recognised that developing countries, and communities with less resources may find it more difficult to achieve sustainability due to financial restrictions, particularly regarding technical solutions. For example, 'Connecting to the oceans' noted that a 'digital divide' was driven by limitations of technical literacy for lower income and less well-educated populations and 'Ocean resource use' noted that landless peoples may be unable to engage in alternative livelihoods which would remove pressure from the marine environment. Although several of the papers recognised that capacity and capability needed to be developed, in most they were limited to identifying activities and groups for whom this capacity and capability development needed to occur, rather than options and pathways through which these could be further developed. For example, in 'Food for all' the need to ensure emerging mariculture and other seafood production and storage technologies were available and accessible to small-scale coastal and fishing communities experiencing food insecurity and potentially transition away from fishing was noted but enablers were specific to scenarios, such as community partnerships with non-government development organisations.

Lastly, the papers identified several groups whose agency was likely to be affected by the move towards a more sustainable future, including Indigenous groups and 'gate-keeper elites'. 'Connecting to the oceans' specifically noted that an environmental education focus in schools places a burden on the next generation.

Pathways to address such issues largely focused on enabling social learning, and increased empowerment. ‘Sharing our oceans fairly’ proposed commitments to capacity building and technology transfer, particularly to small island developing states (SIDS). ‘Empowering her guardians’ advanced Indigenous and Traditional peoples’ self-governance as a means by which to address this issue.

Discussion

Oceans are acknowledged as a domain where considerable inequity exists in terms of benefits that are generally accumulated by a few and yet costs often borne by the most vulnerable (Österblom et al., 2020). Over the coming decades as trends associated with climate change (Pörtner et al., 2019), and the great ‘blue acceleration’ both continue to grow, we run the risk of existing equity issues being magnified and growing more urgent, rather than moving towards resolution. Globally, regionally, and locally, our future plans for the oceans need to consider equity in a much broader way than has been done to date. As highlighted in the recent Blue Paper by the High Level Panel for A Sustainable Ocean Economy “Shifting a historical trajectory of persistent and increasing inequities will require strong leadership, inclusive governance and long-term planning that starts with a commitment to equity as integral to a sustainable ocean economy and relationships within and across nations” (Österblom et al., 2020). Issues of ocean equity are, therefore, not challenges that the marine research sector can solve alone, however, as a research community we can start to make the changes needed to achieve more sustainable ocean futures with improved equity outcomes.

The process of engaging with these questions of equity provoked significant personal and collective reflection amongst the co-authorship team concerning both the way equity is conceptualised and considered within the sample of futures science for the oceans, and the way it was practiced within our own research co-production for this manuscript. We distil these below and highlight some of the key lessons we will aim to take forward in future work.

For the involved Indigenous and Traditional Peoples and their communities, the central understandings flow from Sutej Hugu’s understandings which he described to the authorship team as summarised below.

*“When Indigenous governance of seas and oceans has (had) the time and space to operate within it is own scales and manner, it is often an inter-species compact building on strict laws of the sea as defined in the Indigenous governance of how humans belong with the sea. The sea and the ocean is a living, providing being which should not be under any circumstances angered or abused. Equity is building on an understanding of deep interconnections with species and humans as manifest for example in Taiwan between the Tao and noble black-wing flying fish, *Hirundichthys rondeletii*, or any other deep relation across the world on these profound connections. They form the basis of traditional concepts of equity that have since, for a number of reasons, including colonial process, self-destruction of these values and systems and imposed power structures, been lost or survived to varying degrees. However, it is important to realize that such systems have been in place and delivered endemic notions of equity as a part of the Indigenous governance of the seas historically, and in part today.”*

Small scale fleets and harvesters (Isaacs et al., n.d) are often the keepers of remaining equity management and co-existence mechanisms but are also mostly affected by the large fleets for example through exclusion of quota allocations, destruction of habitats and stocks by trawling fleets and other issues. Whilst care has to be taken to investigate each small-scale fishery case on their own, we can learn from each case and global solidarity and unity for diverse indigenous and smaller scale fisheries can be found across continents (Isaacs et al., n.d), traditional systems (Mustonen and Huusari, 2020) and globally (Mustonen et al., Submitted) in this issue.

Equity is more than achieving material outcomes or implementing processes: Addressing equity is coupled with achieving the SDGs but to be enduring, equity must focus on more than just outcomes or process. It is also about context, including the values, power, accountability and capacity of decisions and actions, and awareness of and reflection upon these things (McKeon, 2017). This was almost unanimously recognised by the papers included in this analysis, particularly about knowledge systems, the capacity required, and the degree of agency held. Equity may also be countervailing. This is illustrated in ‘Food for all’ in which greater

equity is achieved materially by providing greater access to fish stocks for small-scale subsistence fishers but which may be at the cost of localised depletion of fish stocks. Acknowledging this complexity and supporting decision-making for situations when equity and sustainability cannot both be achieved is lacking in the SDGs (Sexsmith and McMichael, 2015). While universally-declared normative frameworks have come a long way in accepting the need for equity, the mechanisms required to achieve equity, including fundamental challenges to current systems, institutions, power arrangements and values with potentially uncomfortable trade-offs and conflicts are less tangible. Furthermore, equity can never be finally achieved, it is always in a dynamic state (Boyle, 1993); to be equitable is to shift and change to share the balance of power and consequences.

Equity is *inherently relational and morally grounded*: Equity has critical process dimensions and the pursuit of its needs to reflect the foundational, dynamic, and relational cultural and political context in which what is equitable is defined. The need for inclusion of multiple knowledge systems alongside Western science knowledge with which to understand changing oceans and the changing relationships communities have with oceans was recognised in several papers. If we discuss the ocean we want, and would like to see, we then need progress on all sectors and issues to arrive in a place of restitutive rights and justice, and equity. But, even then, which is of course reflected in the many Indigenous and traditional worldviews, equity will not only be about rights, or benefits, rather, also co-dependency and "moral" responsibility to maintain good relations with other species, the ocean and the planet. For example, in New Zealand legal standing as personhood has been used as a basis for establishing rights of parts of the natural world but – further to that - for formalising relationality between peoples and rivers, as well as guardianship under Māori culture and tradition (Hsiao, 2012, Argyrou and Hummels, 2019). This is resonating through the compact between species that is, for example, still maintained in Taiwan between Tao people and noble black-wing flying fish, *Hirundichthys rondeletii*. Equity is therefore not only about rights and undoing of past wrongs, it is also about our responsibilities and renewal of responsible behaviour, from daily (Isaacs et al., n.d) to planetary scales (Mustonen et al., Submitted) in trying to undo the massive destruction of the past centuries.

Imbedded inequity cannot be overcome by more of the same: Equity as written in the SDGs is problematic because it does not address how we achieve the social and system change required. Rather, it presumes that the systems that created and embedded inequity will somehow be able to reverse it (Winkler and Williams 2017, Fukuda-Parr 2019). This lack of reckoning with the imbedded nature of some inequities is illustrated in many of the papers examined in this analysis in which these are acknowledged as needing to be overcome without including pathways or actions to enable the restitution, rights, capacity building and capital some groups may require in order to be able to overcome historical and structural factors which may reinforce inequities. This is illustrated by the contributive role of, and indeed reinforcement of, existing social inequalities by the COVID19 pandemic and the effects of the responding state-based health measures and associated economic crisis (Ahmed et al., 2020). Further illustrating this, Grazia Feyerabend, long-time director of the Indigenous and Community Conserved Area Consortium (ICCA) has identified in equity discussions how modern solutions justify countries to continue to do little or nothing on issues such as pollution. Proper 'governance and management units' which she sees as the crux of the matter should flow from principles such as subsidiarity, historical continuity, appropriate capacities, and fairness, but also ecological integrity and meaning (Mustonen et al., Submitted). Feyerabend (cited in Mustonen et al., Submitted) has often been doubtful that these puzzles can be solved with the "chainsaw of national legislation and rules applicable equally, top down, to very different conditions and realities". Modern governance has implied often presumed authority, diffused and unclear responsibility and little to no accountability for a great part of the oceans. Small-scale fishers' experiences are a direct evidence of this process (Isaacs et al., n.d).

Future oceans science must change to support pathways to more equitable futures: There is a strong commitment in the marine-science community to engage with the concept of equity, but there is still much work to be done and it will be ongoing. As is clear from the analysis, in a couple of instances equity is barely addressed, in some cases engagement with the concept is still superficial or limited to technocratic solutions, but in others there is a clear commitment to on-going learning and change. The

Future Seas process revealed to us that the values deeply embedded in science and knowledge production are not necessarily equitable or enabling of equity inquiry, as acknowledged more broadly (Ford et al., 2016). We observed the challenges to inclusivity of multiple voices in co-design and production of these science papers arising from a range of institutional characteristics, namely: the ‘expert’ peer review process; the requirement for referencing published ideas from predominantly Western and scientific literature; the specific disciplinary framing of future challenges and drivers; the “echo chamber” effect of co-authors holding (mostly) like-minded views; and the academic focus on ideas with limited participation from those involved in implementation (e.g. policy, government, public). We recognise that these are fundamental and structural issues that could not have been avoided here but are challenges for the future production of science. Moreover, there is a significant gap in training and education and financial support in science to prepare scientists to welcome and value different approaches and develop capability for thinking about equity at all levels and stages of research. Co-design and co-production seem to present promising ways forward to explore issues in more depth and breadth but perhaps there is a fundamental change in how we move forward, not as experts seeking answers separate from ourselves but as reflective practitioners inviting and working with others to build deeply personal ways forward, together.

Our own practice of marine science and research is not fully inclusive: As an authorship team we collectively have only our own subjective experience and the work presented in published peer-reviewed papers to draw from. It was our explicit intention not to co-opt others voices in a way that reduced their power or changed their intent, which is difficult without deep understanding. We can only ever present a partial and limited view and aim to open a dialogue to include others in an on-going process of learning and reflecting (Winkler and Williams, 2017). Inclusion of different voices in different ways is not intended to make those voices ‘other’ or separate, but the publication process which leads to scientific research papers is restrictive and needs to become more inclusive, especially to those at earlier career stages and diverse backgrounds (Bennett, 2018). While the authorship group for this paper does encompass a more diverse group than often encountered, we recognise that more diversity is better, and we recognise the vast number of voices not included in the research undertaken.

More broadly, despite attempts to be diverse and to actively include other voices, marine science production is still the domain of a narrow set of hegemonic interests (white/Western/middle-aged/middle-class/male/positivist scientific) (Bennett, 2018). There remains significant work for science and knowledge production to be sufficiently co-produced, inclusive and diverse (Nielsen et al., 2018, Walter and Suina, 2019), and we support the multiple efforts across marine science to address these issues. These include: specific science organisation and Indigenous and Traditional Peoples partnerships, such as the Kimberley Indigenous Saltwater Science Project in Western Australia (Western Australian Marine Science Institution, 2014); structural corrections in science organisations to address barriers to women’s participation in marine science (Sardelis et al., 2017); and formal embedding of local ecological knowledge of small-scale fishers in marine assessments in developing contexts (Berkström et al., 2019). These efforts examine equity as it manifests in futures ocean science. They show that while who gets what (e.g. distributive equity as per the SDGs) is a traditional way of looking at justice, process and procedural equity are equally important. It is also clear that each justice question will be framed differently depending on environmental, economic, and social contexts. Therefore, the basis for decision making must be underpinned by a clearly expressed conceptual framework that is acceptable to all parties and there must be openness to consider transformational change.

Conclusion

Our analysis shows that changes are needed in the way we pursue more sustainable ocean futures if we are to improve equitable outcomes. For example, rights-based approaches to sharing access and resources will need to be broadened to consider more fully who or what warrants rights and how they will be achieved. These changes will include institutional modification but will also need a progressive approach in developing decision making processes and procedures to enable more equitable outcomes, for example, active measures may be required to ensure disenfranchised minority communities have a voice in these processes. These

changes will need to accommodate multiple moral and ethical world views for relating to our oceans and the communities of concern.

In the context of the Future Seas project, we recognise that science and knowledge production are immediate areas where we have agency and can work to improve equity. This includes improvements in terms of building capacity to understand and include equity issues and develop mechanisms to be more inclusive and diverse. It necessitates a challenge to some fundamental values, at every level (e.g. formal education, research training, project design, metrics of success, resourcing, power hierarchies). Only by challenging ourselves (and others) in ways that feel uncomfortable can we start to create this positive change. As members of the marine research community we commit to taking onboard this responsibility within our own lives and our research collaborations. More broadly this effort needs to be taken on by the majority of researchers engaged in science and knowledge production, to contribute to improving processes in terms of engaging with and scrutinising concepts of, and relating to, equity. If such scrutiny becomes common practise, then processes and outcomes of equity will better reflect responsibility and inclusion of diversity in futures ocean science and in our shared future sea for generations to come.

Declarations

Funding

The research leading to these results received funding from a Research Enhancement Program grant from the University of Tasmania.

Conflicts of interest/Competing interests

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

Availability of data and material

Data can be made available on request

Code availability

Not applicable

References

- ADAMS, J. S. 1963. Towards an understanding of inequity. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 422-436.
- AHMED, F., AHMED, N. E., PISSARIDES, C. & STIGLITZ, J. 2020. Why inequality could spread COVID-19. *The Lancet Public Health*, 5, e240.
- ALLEN, M., DUBE, O., SOLECKI, W., ARAGON-DURAND, F., CRAMER, W. & HUMPHREYS, S. 2018. „Framing and Context “in Global Warming of 1.5 C: An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5 C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty. Masson-Delmotte, V., et al., World Meteorological Organization, Geneva
- ARGYROU, A. & HUMMELS, H. 2019. Legal personality and economic livelihood of the Whanganui River: a call for community entrepreneurship. *Water International*, 44, 752-768.
- BATTERSBY, J. 2017. MDGs to SDGs—new goals, same gaps: the continued absence of urban food security in the post-2015 global development agenda. *African Geographical Review*, 36, 115-129.
- BAX, N., NOVAGLIO, C., MAXWELL, K. H., MEYERS, K., MCCANN, J., JENNINGS, S., FRUSHER, S., FULTON, E. A., NURSEY-BRAY, M. & FISCHER, M. 2020. Ocean resource use: building the coastal blue economy. *Authorea Preprints* .

- BENNETT, N. J. 2018. Navigating a just and inclusive path towards sustainable oceans. *Marine Policy*, 97, 139-146.
- BENNETT, N. J., CISNEROS-MONTEMAYOR, A. M., BLYTHE, J., SILVER, J. J., SINGH, G., ANDREWS, N., CALO, A., CHRISTIE, P., DI FRANCO, A. & FINKBEINER, E. M. 2019. Towards a sustainable and equitable blue economy. *Nature Sustainability* , 1-3.
- BERKSTROM, C., PAPADOPOULOS, M., JIDDAWI, N. S. & NORDLUND, L. M. 2019. Fishers' local ecological knowledge (LEK) on connectivity and seascape management. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 6, 130.
- BOSELDMANN, K. 2016. *The principle of sustainability: transforming law and governance* , Taylor & Francis.
- BOYLE, S. 1993. Caveatable interests - the common lore distinguished. *Murdoch University Electronic Journal of Law*, 1.
- CARRELL, M. R. & DITTRICH, J. E. 1978. Equity theory: The recent literature, methodological considerations, and new directions. *Academy of management review*, 3, 202-210.
- COHEN, P. J., ALLISON, E. H., ANDREW, N. L., CINNER, J., EVANS, L. S., FABINYI, M., GARCES, L. R., HALL, S. J., HICKS, C. C. & HUGHES, T. P. 2019. Securing a just space for small-scale fisheries in the blue economy. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 6, 171.
- COOK, K. S. & EMERSON, R. M. 1978. Power, equity and commitment in exchange networks. *American sociological review* ,721-739.
- COOK, K. S. & HEGTVEDT, K. A. 1983. Distributive justice, equity, and equality. *Annual review of sociology*, 9, 217-241.
- FARMERY, A. K., ALEXANDER, K. A., ANDERSON, K., BLANCHARD, J. L., CARTER, C. G., EVANS, K., FISCHER, M., FLEMING, A., FRUSHER, S. & FULTON, E. A. 2020. Food for all: designing sustainable and secure future seafood systems. *Authorea Preprints* .
- FISCHER, M., MAXWELL, K., FREDERIKSEN, P. O., PEDERSEN, H., GREENO, D., JINGWAS, N., GRAHAM-BLAIR, J., HUGU, S., MUSTONEN, T. & MURTOMAKI, E. 2020. Empowering her guardians to nurture our oceans future. *Authorea Preprints* .
- FITZMAURICE, M. 2008. 11. Intergenerational Equity Revisited. *International Law between Universalism and Fragmentation*. Brill Nijhoff.
- FORD, J. D., CAMERON, L., RUBIS, J., MAILLET, M., NAKASHIMA, D., WILLOX, A. C. & PEARCE, T. 2016. Including indigenous knowledge and experience in IPCC assessment reports. *Nature Climate Change*, 6,349-353.
- FREDERICKSON, H. G. 1971. Toward a new public administration. *Toward a new public administration: The Minnowbrook perspective* , 309-331.
- GROTIUS, H. 1609. *Mare Liberum*, Denmark, Lodewijk Elzevir.
- GUSTAVSSON, M., LINDSTROM, L., JIDDAWI, N. S. & DE LA TORRE-CASTRO, M. 2014. Procedural and distributive justice in a community-based managed marine protected area in Zanzibar, Tanzania. *Marine Policy*,46, 91-100.
- GUY, M. E. & MCCANDLESS, S. A. 2012. Social equity: Its legacy, its promise. *Public Administration Review*, 72, S5-S13.
- HAAS, B., MACKAY, M., NOVAGLIO, C., FULLBROOK, L., MURUNGA, M., SBROCCHI, C., MCDONALD, J., MCCORMACK, P. C., ALEXANDER, K. & FUDGE, M. 2020. The future of ocean governance. *Authorea Preprints* .

- HAY, A. M. 1995. Concepts of equity, fairness and justice in geographical studies. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* , 500-508.
- HILL, R., GRANT, C., GEORGE, M., ROBINSON, C. J., JACKSON, S. & ABEL, N. 2012. A typology of indigenous engagement in Australian environmental management: implications for knowledge integration and social-ecological system sustainability. *Ecology and society*, 17.
- HSIAO, E. C. 2012. Whanganui River Agreement. *Envtl. Pol'y & L.*,42, 371.
- ISAACS, M., ONYANGO, P. & AKINTOLA, S. L. n.d. Small-Scale Fisheries in Africa: A Regional Portrait. *TBTI Global Publication Series*.<http://toobigtoignore.net/e-book-small-scale-fisheries-in-africa/>: St. John's, NL, Canada.
- JOUFFRAY, J.-B., BLASIAK, R., NORSTROM, A. V., OSTERBLOM, H. & NYSTROM, M. 2020. The Blue Acceleration: The Trajectory of Human Expansion into the Ocean. *One Earth*, 2, 43-54.
- KELLY, R., ALEXANDER, K., BETTIOL, S., CORNEY, S., CULLEN-KNOX, C., CVITANOVIC, C., DE SALAS, K., EMAD, G. R., FULLBROOK, L., GARCIA, C., ISON, S., LING, S. D., MACLEOD, C., MEYER, A., MURRAY, L., MURUNGA, M., NASH, K. L., NORRIS, K., OELLERMAN, M., SCOTT, J., STARK, J., WOOD, G. & PECL, G. T. In press. Connecting to the oceans: Supporting ocean literacy and public engagement. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries* .
- KLEIBER, D., FRANGOUEDES, K., SNYDER, H. T., CHOUDHURY, A., COLE, S. M., SOEJIMA, K., PITA, C., SANTOS, A., MCDOUGALL, C. & PETRICS, H. 2017. Promoting gender equity and equality through the small-scale fisheries guidelines: experiences from multiple case studies. *The small-scale fisheries guidelines*. Springer.
- LEVENTHAL, G. S. 1980. What should be done with equity theory?*Social exchange*. Springer.
- LOKUGE, G. & HILHORST, D. 2017. Outside the net: Intersectionality and inequality in the fisheries of Trincomalee, Sri Lanka. *Asian Journal of Women's Studies*, 23, 473-497.
- MCKEON, N. 2017. Are equity and sustainability a likely outcome when foxes and chickens share the same coop? Critiquing the concept of multistakeholder governance of food security. *Globalizations*,14, 379-398.
- MELBOURNE-THOMAS, J., AUDZIJONYTE, A., BRASIER, M. J., CRESSWELL, K., FOGARTY, H. E., HAWARD, M., HOBDAV, A. J., HUNT, H. L., LING, S. D. & MCCORMACK, P. C. 2020. Poleward Bound: Adapting to climate-driven species redistribution. *Authorea Preprints* .
- MENTOVICH, A. 2012. *The power of fair procedures: The effect of procedural justice on perceptions of power and hierarchy* , New York University.
- MERRIE, A., KEYS, P., METIAN, M. & OSTERBLOM, H. 2018. Radical ocean futures-scenario development using science fiction prototyping. *Futures*, 95, 22-32.
- MUSTONEN, T. 2014. Endemic time-spaces of Finland: aquatic regimes. *Fennia-International Journal of Geography*, 192, 120-139.
- MUSTONEN, T. & HUUSARI, N. 2020. How to know about waters? Finnish traditional knowledge related to waters and implications for management reforms. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries* , 1-20.
- MUSTONEN, T., MAXWELL, K., MUSTONEN, K., JONES, R., PEDERSEN, H., FREDRIKSEN, P. O., GRAHAM, J., GREENO, D., HUGU, S., FISCHER, M. & MURTOMAKI, E. Submitted. Who is the Ocean?
- NASH, K. L., ALEXANDER, K., MELBOURNE-THOMAS, J., NOVIOAGLIO, C., SBROCCHI, C., VILLANUEVA, C. & PECL, G. T. 2020a. Developing Achievable Alternate Futures for Key Challenges during the UN Decade of Ocean Science for Sustainable Development. *Authorea Preprints* .

- NASH, K. L., VAN PUTTEN, I., ALEXANDER, K., CVITANOVIC, C., BETTIOL, S., DAMBACHER, J., FARMERY, A. K., FLIES, E. J., ISON, S. & KELLY, R. 2020b. Oceans and Society: Feedbacks between ocean and human health. *Authorea Preprints* .
- NIELSEN, M. W., BLOCH, C. W. & SCHIEBINGER, L. 2018. Making gender diversity work for scientific discovery and innovation. *Nature human behaviour*, 2, 726-734.
- OSTERBLUM, H., WABNITZ, C. & TLADI, D. 2020. Towards ocean equity. *Washington, DC: World Resources Institute. Available online at www.oceanpanel.org/how-distribute-benefits-oceanequitably* .
- PELLOW, D. N., WEINBERG, A. & SCHNAIBERG, A. 2001. The environmental justice movement: Equitable allocation of the costs and benefits of environmental management outcomes. *Social Justice Research*, 14, 423-439.
- PORTNER, H., ROBERTS, D., MASSON-DELMOTTE, V., ZHAI, P., TIGNOR, M., POLOCZANSKA, E., MINTENBECK, K., ALEGRIA, A., NICOLAI, M. & OKEM, A. 2019. IPCC Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate (SROCC). Cambridge University Press.
- PRESTON, B. 2018. What's equity got to do with the environment? *Justice Brian J Preston, 'What's Equity got to do with the Environment*, 92.
- PUSKIC, P., WILLIS, K. A., GONCALVES, C. S., RICHARDSON, K., SCHUYLER, Q. A., PEDERSEN, H., ANDERSON, K., STARK, J., VINCE, J. & HARDESTY, B. D. 2020. Cleaner Seas: reducing marine pollution. *Authorea Preprints* .
- RAUDSEPP-HEARNE, C., PETERSON, G. D., BENNETT, E., BIGGS, R., NORSTROM, A. V., PEREIRA, L., VERVOORT, J., IWANIEC, D., MCPHEARSON, T. & OLSSON, P. 2020. Seeds of good anthropocenes: developing sustainability scenarios for Northern Europe. *Sustainability Science*, 15, 605-617.
- RAWLS, J. 2009. *A theory of justice* , Harvard university press.
- SARDELIS, S., OESTER, S. & LIBOIRON, M. 2017. Ten strategies to reduce gender inequality at scientific conferences. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 4, 231.
- SAUNDERS, F., GILEK, M., IKAUNIECE, A., TAFON, R. V., GEE, K. & ZAUCHA, J. 2020. Theorizing Social Sustainability and Justice in Marine Spatial Planning: Democracy, Diversity, and Equity. *Sustainability*, 12, 2560.
- SCHNEIDER, F., KLAY, A., ZIMMERMANN, A. B., BUSER, T., INGALLS, M. & MESSERLI, P. 2019. How can science support the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development? Four tasks to tackle the normative dimension of sustainability. *Sustainability science*, 14, 1593-1604.
- SEXSMITH, K. & MCMICHAEL, P. 2015. Formulating the SDGs: Reproducing or reimagining state-centered development? *Globalizations*, 12, 581-596.
- SMITH, D., HAWARD, M., MCGEE, J., WOOD, G., SYME, G., TREBILCO, R., BOSSI, L. & VINCE, J. 2020. Sharing our Oceans Fairly: Improving International Relations around Ocean Issues. *Authorea Preprints* .
- SPIJKERS, O. 2018. Intergenerational equity and the sustainable development goals. *Sustainability*, 10, 3836.
- TREBILCO, R., FLEMING, A., HOBDA, A. J., MELBOURNE-THOMAS, J., MEYER, A., MCDONALD, J., MCCORMACK, P. C., ANDERSON, K., BAX, N. & CONSTABLE, A. J. 2020. Warming world, changing ocean: mitigation and adaptation to support resilient marine systems. *Authorea Preprints* .
- VISBECK, M. 2018. Ocean science research is key for a sustainable future. *Nature communications*, 9, 1-4.
- WALTER, M. & SUINA, M. 2019. Indigenous data, indigenous methodologies and indigenous data sovereignty. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 22, 233-243.

WARD, D., MELBOURNE-THOMAS, J., PECL, G. T., EVANS, K., GREEN, M., MCCORMACK, P. C., NOVAGLIO, C., TREBILCO, R., BAX, N., BRASIER, M. J., CAVAN, E. L., EDGAR, G., HUNT, H. L., JANSEN, J., JONES, R., LEA, M.-A., MAKOMERE, R., MULL, C., SEMMENS, J. M., SHAW, J., TINCH, D., VAN STEVENINCK, T. J. & LAYTON, C. 2020. Safeguarding marine life: conservation of biodiversity and ecosystems. *Authorea Preprints* .

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN MARINE SCIENCE INSTITUTION. 2014. *Indigenous Knowledge: Kimberley Indigenous Saltwater Science Project* [Online]. Available: <https://www.wamsi.org.au/research-site/indigenous-knowledge> [Accessed 7 October 2020].

WINKLER, I. T. & WILLIAMS, C. 2017. The Sustainable Development Goals and human rights: a critical early review. Taylor & Francis.

WOOLDRIDGE, B. & GOODEN, S. 2009. The epic of social equity: Evolution, essence, and emergence. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 31, 222-234.