**Qualitative Comparison Table: Across cases**

| **Dimension** | **Online survey (cross-cases)** | **Norway** | **Iceland** | **Scotland** | **Denmark** | **NL** | **Key points of comparison** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Direct contact:**  **Conflict over oil exploration & extraction** | - n/a | - Mostly, the two development pathways co-exist, but become contentious around expansions of new oil frontiers, particularly around Loften (LoVeSe) and the Arctic. Oil-fisheries conflict is more visible and significant, but both fisheries and tourism economies are seen as relatively more sustainable development pathways put at risk by oil development. | - Not a lot here. But there some interviewees note a potential point of tension in terms of rethinking Icelandic oil prospectivity in relation to the green nation image (which is part of the Icelandic tourism image)  - Some friction does come up around renewable energy development: renewable energy infrastructure impacts wilderness values that are among the key tourism attractors. On the other side, other interviewees see Iceland’s renewable energy orientation as part of the green self-image and its tourism image.  *(KB: Conflict over further renewable energy development (geothermal and hydro), is a persistent feature of energy discourse in Icelandic eco-politics.)* | - Not many signs of conflict. There are references to the Greenpeace Brent Spar conflict as a key historical event, and to anti-fracking movements, but these aren’t specifically linked to tourism.  *(PM: really interesting how Brent Spar has been memorialized, become a key event. Interesting comparisons re: BP spill, 2010. Distinct part of this case, and cuts across many dimensions.)* | - Generally low visibility of direct conflict. Except for the very localized and episodic conflict (No Heliport campaign), nature-based tourism and offshore oil co-exist and are viewed as complementary development paths in the Wadden Sea region.  - Otherwise, there is an ENGO focus on the expansion of Arctic oil frontiers, framed more through climate change and the “global Arctic” than through direct conflict with tourism per se. | - Conflict is more exceptional and sporadic rather than normal and ongoing. Conflict erupts when oil exploration is proposed to extend into regions that have established tourism (and fisheries) economies. Gros Morne national park is a particular rallying point, whose ecological and economic significance is seen as being put at risk by oil and gas development (onshore-offshore fracking). The Old Harry conflict serves as another similar point of conflict. Concerns are raised about seabirds, whales, ocean environments, but often insofar as these are valued as the basis of nature-based tourism economies. | - Across cases, conflict is more episodic and exceptional, rather than an ongoing feature of eco-politics of oil & tourism development. It mostly emerges in specific cases where new oil exploration, extraction impinges on established, valued tourism (and fisheries) landscapes, i.e. controversies around Lofoten, Gros Morne, Gulf of St. Lawrence.  - Opposition to Arctic oil development more broadly in Norway & Denmark is also noteworthy, though linked to ecological value and constructions of a “global Arctic” more than opposition grounded in tourism specifically.  - In the Scottish case, the memorialization of the Brent Spar conflict as a critical event shaping oil sector practices re: sustainability & decomissioning is noteworthy.  - Conflict over oil has largely subsided in the Icelandic case, but ongoing tensions over renewable energy development highlights points of friction in decarbonizing or shifting to renewable energy systems. |
| **Direct contact:**  **Threat of oil extraction as “envirotisement” for tourism – increasing tourism as strategy for opposition to oil** | - n/a | - Not present. | - Not present. | - Not present. | - Not present. | - Not present. | - This is an idea that comes up in other work on resource extraction and nature-based tourism. But, this is not really visible here. |
| **Direct contact:**  **Oil as a tourism attractor** | - Not present. | - Oil as a tourism attractor comes up primarily in relation to the Petroleum Museum in Stavanger (but also at other tourist sites, i.e. aquariums, maritime museums) - the main site that is a bridging tie across oil and tourism. It enacts tourist-oriented narratives about the social, economic, historical and cultural importance of oil for Norwegian society. Notably, the Petroleum Museum in not only boosterish, but offers some space for environmental reflexivity around climate change. | - Not present. | - Oil appears as a tourism attractor at sites like the Aberdeen Maritime Museum, science centres, boat tours (i.e. Firth of Forth), demonstrating co-existence and the ways positive narratives about oil as part of regional culture and history are enacted and presented for tourists. | - Oil as tourism attractor appears in the Esbjerg Maritime Museum, which is a key hub where the historical, contemporary social and economic importance of oil are enacted as a tourism narrative at a tourism site. In this Museum and in Esbjerg more broadly, histories of oil development fit into tourism narratives of the region. | - Not a dominant theme, but this comes up in a sporadically at specific sites, particularly the Johnson Geocentre and the Rooms. These tourism sites enact narratives of the social-economic importance of oil to the region. Oil companies are also visible as supporters of these attractors. | - This is not a major theme, but most cases do have specific examples of tourism, educational sites that enact narratives about oil and its social-economic importance for host regions, that weave petro-histories into narratives of place for visitors. |
| **Direct contact:**  **Oil money supports tourism development** | - Not present. | - This is peripheral, and is most obvious at the Petroleum Museum, the main connector across oil and tourism. | - Not present. | - This comes up in a couple ways: 1) in a more general sense in the ways that the oil sector creates infrastructure that benefits tourism development; and 2) through oil sector sponsorship of tourism sites, including those with an oil-oriented tourism focus. | - Not too much here, other than some peripheral references to Maersk as a funder of the arts and culture sector (which works in part as a tourism attractor). | - Not a dominant theme, but also comes up in specific instances where the spillover effects of oil economies provide supports for educational/tourism attractors (Manuels River centre, Fluvarium, Geocentre, Petty Harbour Mini-Aquarium) and arts & culture (NL folk festival), thereby indirectly supporting tourism amenities and infrastructure. | - This is also somewhat marginal, but there are specific examples of flows of money, resources from oil to tourism development across most cases, often specifically related to oil-oriented tourism sites, but also to supports for arts and culture events/sectors that are indirectly part of the tourism infrastructure. |
| **Indirect contact:**  **tourism is carbon intensive** | - Not present. | - Across data, we see the intimate connections between tourism and carbon-intensive forms of mobility – especially around cruise ships, boat tours, etc. (aquamobility), but also airplane and car use. This is often presented unproblematically.  - However, there is also some critical reflection on carbon intensity and impact of transportation related to tourism as an environmental drawback.  - There is also material focusing on attempts to lower the carbon footprint of tourism transportation through technological innovation as a way that the tourism sector can contribute to dealing with climate change. | - There are repeated references, across data sources, on the carbon-intensive mobilities that are woven into Icelandic tourism – aeromobility, automobility, boat tours. There are also frequent mentions of the US and China as key but distant tourism markets that are tied to aeromobility.  - There is often environmental reflexivity (particularly in interviews) about the role of tourism in contributing to and responding to climate change via its carbon-intensive mobilities (aeromobility, automobility, boat tours). There are examples attempting to lower the tourism carbon footprint across interviews and netnography.  - There are also invocations of “ecological irony” (in Szerszynski`s sense) between the self-image of Iceland as a green nation, Paris agreement commitments, and the carbon-intensive dimensions of the current tourism boom.  - Across data sources, perhaps aeromobility is the most intractable problem in terms of carbon footprint and Icelandic tourism flows.  *(KB: Changes in tourism during the last few years have really brought this dilemma of carbon-based mobilities into light – mainly in three ways I think: a) the (until very recently) exponential growth of flights with now two Icelandic airlines bringing in about 80% of all tourists coming by air; b) great increase in cruise ships, many very large, all using oil to produce electricity also while in harbour; and c) the great increase in the rental car fleets, with corresponding increase in traffic esp. along the south coast. Occasionally this is discussed in terms of emissions, both in global terms (the inability of Iceland to achieve reduction targets) and local terms (e.g., air pollution from cruise ships in harbour).)* | - Automobility and Aeromobility come up a lot as pathways for tourist travel. This is often presented uncritically, but there is also environmental reflexivity about the carbon intensity of tourism travel and links to climate change. There is also material on measures to mitigate or address this through technological innovation or sustainability practices. There is also some reflection about how the lack of transportation alternatives leads to a more carbon-intensive, car-dependent tourism sector. | - Tourism mobility come up frequently (automobility, aeromobility, to a lesser extent aquamobility) as a limitation or challenge to tourism sustainability in relation to carbon intensity and climate change contributions. There are also indicators of attempts to address this limitation (i.e. VisitDenmark promoting airlines that participate in carbon offsetting). From this perspective, tourism is *relatively sustainable* as a development pathway, but there are steps to be taken to address its dependency on carbon-intensive automobilities and aeromobilities. | - Various modes of carbon-intensive mobility come up quite often – automobility, aeromobility, aquamobility, boat tours. However, these are rarely problematized in terms of tourism’s carbon footprint or contribution to climate change, which is mostly bracketed out.  - The interviews provide some more reflexivity about the carbon intensity of tourism, though this is often minimized by framing tourism’s contribution as marginal within a broader, global context, and also by framing tourism mobility networks as macro issues that are beyond the control of local/regional tourism sector actors. The overall narrative of tourism is environmentally sustainable, with positive impacts for host communities. | - Carbon-intensive mobility systems (automobility, aeromobility, cruise ships, boat tours, ferries, etc…) come up repeatedly across cases, and are deeply woven into tourism. However, these are often not problematized and are presented in a taken for granted way, not in ways that highlight the carbon intensity of these mobility systems.  - Greater environmental reflexivity about the carbon intensity of tourism travel is more evident in the interviews, where we see tourism more often framed as “relatively” sustainable, and tourism’s carbon footprint (plane and car travel) viewed as an issue that needs to be addressed. This may be most evident in the Icelandic case, which is also experiencing the most rapid tourism boom in the region?  - Most cases (other than NL) point to specific examples of projects of technological innovation or sustainability practices are being undertaken to reduce the carbon intensity of tourism. |
| **Indirect contact:**  **tourism environments impacted by climate change** | - n/a | - This comes out most in the website and document data, where negative impacts of climate change on coastal communities (sea level rise, extreme weather events) and Arctic ecologies are addressed. This is often framed in broader terms than specifically oriented around tourism per se. Though there is some talk about how climate change may impact things like hiking and boat tours. | - The material on climate change impacts is generally broader than tourism, and focuses on protecting nature (i.e. Arctic nature, wilderness values) in the face of climate change impacts. For Iceland, projected impacts also include cooling temperatures and increasingly severe extreme weather, which may have spillover effects on tourism. There are episodic moments where tourism sites narrate climate change impacts (i.e. melting glaciers). There are also allusions to increased cruise ship travel and interest in Arctic tourism due to ice melting in Arctic. | - Climate change comes up somewhat peripherally, but at tourist sites as part of environmental education. Impacts on coastal environments include severe weather, coastal erosion, sea level rise, impacts on wildlife and biodiversity. The other tourism-oriented landscape impacted by climate change is the Highlands in relation to skiing. | - As key touristic spaces, Danish coastal environments (which are relatively flat and low-lying) are seen as particularly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change (i.e. flooding, coastal erosion and storms).  - Greenland also comes up as a place that experiencing particularly pronounced climate change impacts. Consequences like glacial ice melt may have further reaching effects across the North Atlantic region. | - There is a lot of variation in the visibility and salience of climate change across different data sources. Climate change impacting on tourism environments is largely invisible/marginal in the mass media and website analysis (i.e. publicly facing tourism discourse), but is more visible in other data sources.  - Key impacts include sea level rise, changing weather patterns, extreme weather and flooding, milder winters. These are seen as having the potential to alter tourism landscapes and seasonal tourism cycles (i.e. negative impacts on winter tourism). | - Where climate change impacts in the region are discussed, it is often broader than just around tourism. In general, this includes ecological and landscape change around coastal erosion, sea level rise, flooding, melting glaciers, increased extreme weather, and more amplified changes in the high north (Greenland, the Arctic).  -Peripherally, we see how these may have spillover effects on tourism by shifting landscapes and seasonal, but also impact on specific tourism practices like hiking, boat tours, and winter sports.  - There is also some attention to how the changing Arctic is also increasing cruise ship travel and Arctic tourism interest. |
| **Indirect contact:**  **oil infrastructure supports tourism** | - Not present. | - Not present. | - Not present. | - This contact point comes up particularly in interviews, where oil development is seen as supporting infrastructure that also benefits tourism (air routing, airport capacity, hotels, restaurants). This is part of seeing these as complimentary development paths and seeing the oil sector as having spill-over benefits for tourism development. | - Not too much here, other than some material on synergies between oil and tourism in Esbjerg, which both come into the self-promotion of Esbjerg municipality as complimentary forms of regional development and municipal identity. | - Not present. | - This idea doesn’t come up very often. The main exceptions are in the oil cities in Scotland (Aberdeen), and Denmark (Esberg) where one of the sill-over benefits of oil development is building up infrastructure and resources that support help tourism as complementary development pathways. |
| **Culture:**  **Mediated representations of coastal communities & environments as spaces for nature-based tourism and oil extraction** | - n/a | - Most of the focus is on coastal environments as spaces for oil extraction and oil prospectivity, which are valued and seen as economically and socially significant.  - The notion of coastal environments as sites of oil development is disturbed through particular conflicts over the expansion of oil frontiers into Lofoten and the Arctic, where this comes into conflict with tourism and fisheries economies (Lofoten) or impinges on unique, vulnerable ecologies (Arctic).  - Representations of coastal environments as tourism landscapes focus on mountains, fjords, wildlife (whales, seabirds), and hiking, boat tours, and cruise ships as major modes of interaction. History (i.e. Vikings) is also a key tourism attractor.  - Representations of Arctic environments are particularly notable. They appear in a range of ways: as sites of climate change impacts, environmental education (via tourism), as sites of emerging Indigenous tourism, and as sites of oil prospectivity and potential exploration, as well as conflict around this. | - In general, coastal communities and environments are depicted much more as tourism spaces than as spaces of oil exploration and extraction. *(KB: This is an understatement… I think that (apart from one or two communities in the northeast) the oil scenario is totally absent from depictions of coastal communities!)*  - Tourism attractors are mainly nature-based, including wildlife (especially whales, puffins), geysers/hot springs, northern lights, volcanic landscapes, waterfalls, glaciers. Main valued modes of interaction with coastal environments include boat tours and hiking.  - Photography as tourism practice, and the ways that social media structure tourism mobility are also interesting themes, pointing to how the mobilities of the tourism boom are shaped through practices of social media use and photography.  - Beyond nature-based tourism attractors, there is also an emphasis on history (particularly Vikings), arts and culture.  - In general, tourism is oriented around notions of being close to nature, wilderness, and sustainability discourse. Tourism is positioned as a potential sustainable development pathway (though with some critical reflexivity on the carbon intensity of tourism mobilities). *(KB: there is a lot of talk about how to make tourism more sustainable.*)  - Enactments of coastal environments as sites of oil prospectivity are generally peripheral, with oil as more hypothetical or future oriented. Exploration licences have, in fact, recently been taken back, as collaborator KB notes.  - There are some tensions around coastal environments as spaces of oil prospectivity. There is some critical reflection on the potential negative impacts of oil development (i.e. netnographies) (such as impacts on whales and wilderness values) and the notion that Iceland does not have an imperative for oil development because of its renewable energy resources.  - Conversely, there is also discussion about linking oil prospectivity to the Finnafjord development in the northeast of the country, which is generally outside the current tourism boom, as well as talk about the potential positive impacts of future oil development for host societies more generally. | - More of the data focuses on tourism-oriented representations. The TDI (Tourism Destination Image) “package” includes a bundle of inland and coastal landscapes (highlands, mountains, coastal places); attractors (food and drink, history); modes of interaction (hiking, boat tours, cruise ships, golf); and wildlife (seabirds, puffins, dolphins, seals, whales).  - Coastal environments as sites of oil extraction also comes up frequently, particularly via the oil sector and at oil-oriented tourism sites, including museum and science centre displays. Part of the narrative of coastal environments as sites of oil extraction is that the Scottish North Sea is largely a post-peak seascape, so issues of decommissioning are increasingly important.  - These varied representations of coastal environments don’t really come into conflict. The corpus analysis similarly shows a high degree of interconnection between oil and tourism-oriented themes, though oil is more linked to economy and government, while tourism is more linked to coastal environments. | - The fieldwork points primarily to enactments of coastal communities and environments as touristic spaces, framed around being close to nature, coastlines/seascapes as focal points, with iconic animals including shorebirds and seals, and key modes of interaction including cycling, hiking, and beach walking. There are ideas that Danish coastal environments need to be protected from overdevelopment, because this is a large part of their appeal as a nature-based tourism space. The Wadden Sea national park is also particularly important as a tourism & environmental education space. Viking history also comes up as part of the tourism package.  - Extending this to the textual data (netnography, documents) reinforces the idea that there is an urban-rural (or CPH vs. rest of country) divide in terms of tourism flows and tourism destination image, with CPH more focused on urban amenities (arts, culture, history, cycling).  - Tourism-oriented representations of coastal environments & communities are generally more prevalent than oil-oriented representations. Coastal environments are represented as spaces of oil extraction, but particularly in spaces like Esbjerg and the Esbjerg maritime museum (this museum is a space where oil and tourism appear as parallel and non-conflictual development paths, and is also where we see notions of offshore oil & renewable energy development).  - Most points of tension appear to be relatively isolated and minor. An exception is with Danish ENGOs, whose discourse on risks of oil focus more on the extension of Arctic oil frontiers. | - The dominant tourism imaginary of coastal communities & environments focuses on seascapes & coastlines, whales, puffins, seabirds, icebergs as tourism attractors, Gros Morne as a particularly significant protected area and tourism attractor, and hiking and boat tours as modes of interaction with coastal environments. Wilderness discourse is recurrent. The notion of rural communities as sites of history and authenticity is also a core part of the tourism imaginary; and arts, craft and culture are also important tourism attractors.  - By contrast, the oil imaginary represents coastal environments primarily as sites of ongoing oil extraction and future prospectivity. While similar imagery is often invoked across tourism and oil representations, the oil imaginary is more likely to frame coastal environments as harsh, risky operating environments. Whereas icebergs appear as key tourism attractors in the tourism imaginary, in the oil imaginary they are defined as sources of risk to be navigated. | - Representations of coastal environments as tourism spaces focus on seascapes/coastalines as well las iconic landscapes that differ across the region (fjords, mountains, geysers, hot springs, northern lights, glaciers, highlands, beaches, icebergs). The nature-based “tourism destination image” also drawn on a range of iconic animals, commonly seabirds, puffins, and whales, but also regional differences, i.e. seals (DK & Scotland). The overall image of tourism is positive and linked with sustainability discourse. Tourism is a way to “be close to nature.”  - Across cases, hiking and boat tours come up repeatedly as valued modes of interaction with coastal environments. Other modes of interaction get more or less attention on a case-by-case basis (i.e. cruise ships, golf, cycling).  - Parks and protected areas come up as particularly significant sites in the Danish (Wadden Sea) and NL (Gros Morne) cases, where these are particularly interesting networks of actors & actants (to use ANT terms) that are embedded into the oil-tourism interface.  - Other key dimensions of the tourism package across the region include historical attractors (Vikings, castles, etc…); arts, craft & culture; food and drink. Again, there are regional differences, but these broad foci are shared.  - The notion of rural coastal communities as highly-valued sites of authenticity and historicity also comes up as part of the tourism package, though this is most pronounced in the NL case.  - By contrast, the Danish case evidences a particularly notable divide between Copenhagen and the rest of the country in terms of the tourism imaginary, with Copenhagen as a the metropolitan (and eco-friendly) city break destination, with nature-based tourism largely located elsewhere.  - Coastal environments as sites of oil extraction come up across cases. These representations often draw on similarly idyllic representations of coastal environments as we see in tourism discourse. However, here coastal environments are also seen as inhabited by oil infrastructure and technology, and visualized through oil licensing and cartographies. Whereas tourism discourse presents the North Atlantic seascape as close to nature, sites of adventure, wilderness, and wildlife habitat, here, we see a contrasting discourse of the North Atlantic as a harsh operating environment.  - Coastal environments are also represented as future-oriented sites of oil prospectivity, especially in Norway and NL, which are engaged in extending oil frontiers.  - Prospectivity is less visible in the other cases. In Scotland there is more attention to the notion of the Scottish North Sea as largely a post-peak region, where decommissioning is a more central part of the energy futures conversation. In Denmark, there is more focus on oil as a “sunset industry” and a rapid scaling up of offshore wind as central to energy futures and a redefinition of social-ecological relationships with ocean & coastal environments.  - Iceland is particularly noteworthy here, insfofar as the tourism imaginary is very visible, while notions of coastal environments as places of oil extraction or prospectivity are much more marginal and limited to specific sites, and are overshadowed by tourism representations. |
| **Culture:**  **Discourses of positive & negative social-environmental impacts of tourism development** | - Not much variance on opinion questions about positive/negative impacts of tourism, high level of consensus that tourism is a positive mode of development. | - In general, tourism is viewed positively in terms of social-ecological impacts, especially as an economic driver for more rural and remote communities, i.e. in Lofoten, or with emerging Sami community-based tourism development.  - At the same time, there is quite a bit of reflexivity demonstrated about the limitations and negative impacts of tourism. For the most part, this deals with local impacts of overcrowding of tourism spaces, travel routes, localized waste management issues, or the expansion of Air BnB that risks displacing rental housing. The solution is viewed as better tourism governance, not a retreat from tourism development. In other words, tourism is sustainable “if managed correctly.”  - There is also some more critical reflection linked to cruise ship tourism, in particular, around carbon intensity and contributions to climate change, as impacts on Arctic nature (for example, for sites like Svalbard). Here, we see attention to both the localized and extra-local environmental drawbacks of tourism. | - The `master frame` is that Iceland is in the midst of a tourism boom, with tourism flows growing rapidly. Relatedly, there is talk about tourism cycles and the notion that Icelandic tourism (*esp.* in the capital region) becomes less attached to seasonal cycles because of the boom. *(KB: The explosive growth of tourism has decreased (but not stopped – there is still some growth in tourism arrivals), now the sector is bracing itself for somewhat leaner times.)*  - Much of the interpretation of tourism is positive, framed in terms of economic & employment impacts (i.e. interviews, netnography), and broader community and social impacts, particularly for rural communities (i.e. fieldnotes).  - In general, tourism is linked with: sustainability discourse, notions that tourism works as a valuable site of ecological education (especially linked with boat tours and whales), that tourism can help legitimize nature preservation, that there are tourism-renewable energy synergies, and that tourism fits well with the auto-stereotype of Iceland as a green nation.  - There is also quite a bit of reflection on the challenges and drawbacks of tourism (particularly in interviews and fieldnotes, more so than netnographies). In terms of social-economic impacts, this includes the negative impacts on rental housing (i.e. Air BnB as villain) and overcrowding of tourism spaces. This is reflected in the document analysis by data showing local residents’ increasing frustration and annoyance with tourism. This also connects to the notion of an uneven terrain of tourism benefits (with much of the tourism boom focused in Reykjavik and the broader capital region), and a need to ensure tourism flows and benefits to be better distributed.  - In terms of environmental drawbacks, there is reflexivity about both local and extra-local environmental impacts of tourism. At the local level, this includes impacts on natural areas or national parks in face of the increased demands on infrastructure (hiking trails, etc.). At the extra-local level, impacts are linked to the carbon intensity of various forms of tourism mobility (automobility, aeromobility, boat tours).  - Drawing on Wong`s use of Goffman in environmental governance, the positive view of tourism, in economic, social, and environmental terms, is the "front stage" narrative of websites, etc., while the more complex picture of positive and negative social-ecological impacts is more visible in the "back stage" spaces of interviews and field note sites. | - There is quite a bit of acknowledgement or reflection on both positive and negative impacts of tourism development.  - Positive impacts are often viewed through an economic lens, as an economic driver, but also in terms of social, community and environmental impacts. Tourism development can be particularly beneficial to more rural areas, and is often seen as a relatively sustainable development pathway compared to resource extraction. It can legitimate nature preservation and provide sites of environmental education. There is also a significant focus on tourism sustainability and green tourism practices/initiatives.  - Negative impacts include localized social and environmental drawbacks, such as overcrowding, trail degradation, impacts on wilderness values of infrastructure development, need to manage Air BnB, etc. Localized impacts are largely things to manage via tourism governance, cultivating better standards of behaviour among visitors, etc. rather than a rationale to turn away from tourism development.  - There is also attention to extra local impacts, particularly the carbon intensity of automobility and Aeromobility and tourism’s connection to climate change via these transportation networks. | - The growing tourism sector is generally framed in a positive light in terms of its economic and employment impacts, but also in terms of community and social impacts, i.e. the sense of pride in increased international visibility of communities, creating amenities and contributing to communities’ liveability, etc. Tourism in spaces like Wadden Sea national park also contributes to environmental education and literacy. Generally, tourism development is seen as well-aligned with the Danish self-image as a green society and renewable energy transitions.  - The reflection on the negative impacts of tourism development tends to focus on risks of potential overdevelopment in coastal areas. There is also some reflection about tourism practices’ potential impacts on wildlife, and about tourism’s carbon intensity & footprint. However, these themes are less prevalent than the broadly positive view of tourism as a sustainable development pathway.  - However, the uneven terrain of tourism benefits is another recurring theme. It connects to a perceived CPH vs. rest of the country divide, in terms of which communities are most benefitting from and capturing tourism flows. | - Tourism is mostly framed as having positive economic impacts, but also social impacts and community benefits for local, rural, and Indigenous communities. Tourism is largely positioned as sustainable and as a site for environmental education, with Gros Morne often coming up as a key attractor in the context of sustainable tourism. The notion that tourism legitimates nature preservation also comes up here.  - The positive impacts are emphasized across all data sources. By contrast, reflection on challenges and negative impacts are less visible in the public facing content (i.e. media, websites, documents) than in the fieldnotes and interviews. Challenges typically relate to labour issues and problems of seasonality. Reflection on negative impacts on host communities is less visible, though there is some discussion of waste management and appropriate infrastructure development. | - For the most part, tourism discourse is positive, linked to sustainability and positive impacts for host communities. There is a general social consensus around tourism as a positive and sustainable development pathway for the region that aligns positively with self-images as a “green society” (i.e. Denmark, Iceland, in particular). In particular sites (i.e. NL and northern Norway) this tourism development is also linked to specific benefits for Indigenous communities.  - Tourism is also largely seen as contributing to environmental education and awareness, especially at specific tourism sites including national parks. For the most part, this is focused on ecological literacy about local environments and wildlife, and less often takes the form of critical reflection on environmental problems and issues.  - In contrast to “public facing” data (i.e. websites, documents, tourism sites), the interviews demonstrate greater environmental reflexivity about the environmental and social costs or problems associated with tourism, such as issues around overcrowding, housing, Air BnB, waste management, negative impacts on natural areas, and the downsides of cruise ship tourism. This is perhaps most visible in the Icelandic case, largely reflecting the ongoing tourism boom. However, similar concerns come up with localized tourism increases in sites like Lofoten and the Norwegian Arctic. |
| **Culture: Discourses of positive & negative social-environmental impacts of oil extraction** | - Opinion questions about positive/negative impacts of oil, however, illustrate more variance, with ENGOs/tourism more inclined to see the negative impacts (though, exception is perception of positive economic/employment benefits), while government & oil are more aligned in emphasizing the positive dimensions. This is at least suggestive that the sectors align into two epistemic communities in terms of interpreting oil as a mode of development. | - The dominant discourse is of the positive impacts of the oil sector for Norwegian society, in terms of being an economic driver, contributing to government revenues and employment, and being the foundation for Norway’s social welfare system and high quality of life. Norway is viewed as a global leader in terms of technological innovation, social responsibility, and environmental sustainability relative to the global oil industry. It is generally viewed as an important part of Norwegian culture and history.  - Negative impacts focus primarily on risks of opening new oil frontiers on fisheries and Arctic ecologies.  - Climate change also comes up here, in multiple ways: oil sector contributions to climate change as a negative impact (and the ironies of Norway`s Paris commitments coupled with its carbon-intensive economy), but also the potential for the oil sector to respond to climate change through technological innovation, resource efficiencies and restricting into a broader “energy sector” that is expanding renewable energy investment and transition. Here, there is also an interesting discourse of “climate cosmopolitanism” (mostly from the energy sector and government) that delocalizes Norwegian oil and considers it in a global perspective, arguing that if cleaner, more environmentally sustainable Norwegian can displace “dirtier” fossil fuels from the global energy system, this is a net gain from a climate perspective. | - In general, oil extraction is rather peripheral to public and political discourse in Iceland at present.  - When oil does come up, it is around prospectivity and future-oriented development. More often, this is linked to oil’s positive impacts, both on the northeastern part of the country (which has not especially benefitted from the tourism boom), but also on the nation as a whole. Positive impacts are framed mostly in economistic terms.  - There is a less visible critical discourse, focused on oil posing risks to wildlife and wilderness values *(KB: also, oil accidents’ impacts on the marine environment have been brought up every now and then)*, and talk about whether oil development is compatible with Icelandic climate change commitments, the self-image as a green society (connecting to Iceland’s tourism image). With its renewable energy wealth, tourism boom that is premised on wilderness and an image of a green society, is there an imperative to Icelandic oil development? | - Much of the discourse of the oil sector is very positive. Oil sector is linked with economic development, positioned as an important part of regional history and culture, and also linked to the potential for Scottish independence.  - This generally positive narrative is disturbed by the recent price downturn and issues of volatility, which are hurting oil-dependent communities and need to be navigated through restructuring, policy change, etc.  - Oil risks to coastal environments and impacts in terms of climate change are acknowledged, but risk mitigation is generally seen as well-done, and there is an optimistic emphasis on technological innovation as a route to addressing the climate impacts of the sector. An interesting (and unique to Scotland) point is the ways the Brent Spar conflict is invoked occasionally as a key moment that provoked better environmental responsibility in the sector.  - The Scottish case also includes a particular focus on the “energy trilemma”: the world has a growing demand for energy; oil is tied to economic development and wellbeing in Scotland; we are living in an increasingly carbon-constrained world that demands climate action. The challenge (or trilemma) is how to balance these three competing priorities.  - Decommissioning is also an interesting part of the Scottish discourse, including discussions about how to do this in an environmentally responsible manner, and whose financial responsibility and burden (i.e. corporate sector vs. public sector) it is to manage decommissioning. | - Whereas broadly-positive views of tourism are prevalent, views of oil are more heterogeneous. Overall, there is a sense that the oil sector makes significant economic and employment contributions, especially historically and within particular regions (i.e. Esbjerg). There is a discourse that the oil sector is an important part of Danish history and culture, which is particularly evident in Esberg and in key oil-tourism spaces like the Esberg maritime museum.  - Otherwise, there is a perceived tension between oil’s economic significance, but its marginality within much of the public and political imaginary of Denmark (beyond Esbjerg and other particular pockets).  - The notion that Denmark is well into a renewable energy transition is also a relatively prevalent notion. While oil may co-exist with renewables for the time being, the Danish continental shelf is in decline (i.e. post-peak) and is perceived by many as a sunset industry. That said, there are also some points of tension around renewable energy development and its impacts.  - For the most part, Danish oil extraction is not seen as posing significant social or environmental risks, but is seen as generally quite responsible, and has avoided any major episodes of catastrophe. Where concerns are raised, they are quite specific and localized (i.e. No Heliport), or are directed more at concern over the expansion of Arctic oil frontiers (i.e. Danish ENGOs). | - The dominant narrative across data sources is that oil is positive for host communities as an engine for economic development, with benefits primarily framed in terms of regional economic wellbeing and employment. Oil as a source of environmental risk is acknowledged, but usually as a prelude to (or in conjunction with) framing oil risk mitigation and governance as well done and ensuring sustainability in the sector. Similarly, there are acknowledgements of the oil sector’s impacts on climate change, but usually in conjunction with material on oil industry responses to climate change through technological innovation. As such, the dominant narrative around oil present it as basically positive, economically significant, and sustainable.  - The main critical counter-discourse appears in interviews and ENGO (and sometimes tourism) content, wherein oil is seen as a source of environmental risk for whales, seabirds, and a threat to the valued ecological and tourism places like Gros Morne National Park. The critical narrative of oil risk tends to focus on new oil development impinging on valued and established tourism and fisheries economies, with Gros Morne (and the Gulf of St. Lawrence more generally) being contested spaces. This counter-discourse focuses on specific episodes of contention and isolated development projects, rarely extending to a general critique of the sector.  - In terms of energy futures, we see a dual (and parallel) focus on not only renewable energy transitions (often encompassing both hydro and newer alternative energy systems), but also future oil prospectivity and extraction. These two future visions often go together, envisioning oil and renewables as part of an evolving energy mix into the future, so that coastal environments are spaces of oil prospectivity extended out into an indefinite future horizon. | - In contrast to tourism discourse, oil discourse is more heterogenous. Broadly, oil is seen as a positive force for host communities, mostly in terms of economic and employment benefits in NL, Scotland, and Norway. Norway has perhaps the strongest expression of this, via the “Norwegian fairytale” that proper management of oil development has led the country to one of the highest standards of living in the world.  - In Denmark, this positive narrative is more regionally specific to oil regions, rather than an overall dominant narrative. In the Danish case, there is a tension oil’s perceived economic significance (within the sector) but relative marginality from the social and political imaginary, as well the social perception that oil is in a sunset period and that Denmark is committed to a renewable energy transition.  - In the Icelandic case, oil is more peripheral, and the focus is more future oriented, with potential benefits to specific regions.  - Across cases, there are often acknowledgements of oil’s environmental risks or contributions to climate change, but this is often coupled with claims that oil risk mitigation is well done (there is generally a high level of trust in oil governance and risk mitigation across cases), measures for responding to climate change within the oil sector through technological innovation and resource efficiencies, and links to oil sector sustainability or corporate environmental responsibility discourse.  - In comparison to tourism, there are more critical counter-discourses, which often emerge in interviews, but also in ENGO communications (and sometimes from tourism) that focus on environmental risks and negative impacts of oil development. This includes risks to particular, localized environments and social-ecological relationships (tourism, fisheries) in places like Lofoten, Gros Morne, the Gulf of St. Lawrence and others. This also includes broader risks to Arctic ecologies with expanding oil frontiers, and the more global risks and impacts of oil’s carbon footprint and contribution to climate change.  - In terms of oil and energy futures, we see multiple discourses at play, including a strong focus on renewable energy transitions (Denmark, Iceland; Norway and Scotland to lesser extents?); ongoing, future-oriented oil prospectivity and extraction (Norway, NL); and the need for decommissioning (Scotland). Future-oriented oil extraction is framed around notions of climate cosmopolitanism (Norway) and the energy trilemma (Scotland), where oil is seen as a valuable part of a changing global energy mix in coming decades, which is often linked with a discourse of co-existence between oil and the renewables transition.  - While renewables are largely seen as a positive, more sustainable step forward for national and global energy systems, there are also points of tension and conflict around renewables transitions, particularly in Iceland with ideas that new renewable energy infrastructure may negatively impact wilderness values that are part of the tourism destination image. |
| **Culture:**  **Dominant discourse of relationship between oil & tourism as different development pathways – antagonism, co-existence, or silos (black-boxing)** | - Government & oil sector responses suggest a co-existence epistemic perspective, with both tourism & oil seen as positive in terms of social-economic impacts.  - By contrast, ENGO & tourism responses lean more towards an epistemic perspective of tourism as positive and sustainable, contrasted with oil as more controversial, troublesome – more of an antagonistic perspective in terms of social-ecological wellbeing. | - Oil is the dominant development pathway, central to economic development and national politics and policy. By contrast, tourism is more peripheral and locally-significant in particular regions. Often, the relationship is one of black-boxing connections across the sectors, including in the social-ecological spaces where they co-exist.  - The major exceptions to this are the controversies over extending new oil exploration/extraction frontiers, such as at Lofoten and the Arctic. Opposition is often grounded more in risks to fisheries and Arctic ecologies, but tourism is also brought in here and is positioned as a relatively sustainable development pathway for coastal communities in contrast to oil extraction, while oil development may have negative impacts on the image as a nature-oriented tourism destination.  - The main sites of co-existence are tourism sites that include oil-oriented narratives – particularly the Petroleum Museum in Stavanger, but also at other museums, aquariums, etc. that position these as complimentary development paths. | - Mostly, the relationship is siloed (or black-boxed) between tourism and oil development. Oil development is hypothetical, future-oriented, based on prospectivity. And given cooling interest in Arctic oil exploration (in general) and Icelandic oil exploration (in particular) in the wake of recent price declines and uncertainty, oil development is largely out of the public and political sphere. Rather, more of the focus is on tourism development and boom, including how to cope with the “challenges of success.”  - Around the margins, though, there are a few implicit “contact points”: a) noting that oil development may be incompatible with the tourism economy because it is based on notions of Iceland as a green nation and images of wild nature (interviews); b) the changing Arctic, which opens opportunities for both increased tourism and resource exploration (fieldnotes); c) the carbon intensity of Icelandic tourism, with its reliance on aeromobility and automobility and prominence of boat tours (interviews, netnographies). | - Specific connections are often black boxed – tourism and oil are often interpreted as parallel, but complimentary development pathways, not in contact or conflict.  - There are also points where they are seen as complimentary and co-existing development paths, i.e. in talk about how oil infrastructure supports tourism development, or more explicitly in oil-oriented tourism sites or content.  - Interpretations of oil and tourism as incompatible or antagonistic are marginal, though there is a counter-discourse that oil development can have the effect of crowding out tourism development. | - In the country as a whole, the relationship across sectors seems to be generally black-boxed, with tourism development taking up more cultural space within the public imaginary.  - However, within the oil-dependent region of Esbjerg, which sits alongside Wadden Sea national park, the strongest impression is of oil and tourism as complementary development paths. The complementarity is made particularly explicit at the Esbjerg Maritime Museum (oil as a tourism attractor) and in the promotional materials of the city of Esbjerg, where the two sectors are both seen as making positive economic and community impacts, and as largely co-existing without conflict or tension.  - Other than this physical co-existence and instances of oil-as-tourism attractor within places like Esbjerg, the relationship between sectors appears to be largely siloed, or black-boxed in terms of governance. Though the city of Esbjerg does seem to be thinking about synergies and cross-sectoral planning in terms of infrastructure needs. | - The dominant relationship is of co-existence as parallel (and often separate) development pathways, both of which are generally positive for host communities.  - Antagonism and the notion of tourism and oil as incompatible comes up less often, and is generally limited to specific episodes of contention where proposed oil development impinges on existing tourism landscapes and economies, particularly around Gros Morne and western NL in general. | - The main discourse is of black-boxing connections across sectors, but seeing them as complementary and parallel development paths, both of which are viewed as positive for host societies. Within this interpretive framework, the Norwegian case appears to have more of an oil-oriented focus in general (with regionally-important tourism economies); while Iceland and Denmark have more of a tourism-oriented focus in general (with regionally important oil economies in Denmark).  - More explicit narratives of oil and tourism as complementary are peripheral in general, but are quite visible at specific oil-oriented tourism sites (i.e. Maritime and Oil museums across cases), and in talk about how oil funding and resources can spill over into supporting tourism development. Wadden Sea National Park and Esberg also represent a particularly unique space of more obvious co-existence.  - Interpretations of oil and tourism as antagonistic or conflicting development pathways comes up more epidically around specific projects and controversies, i.e. Loften and the Arctic (Norway; though this is often more strongly connected to fisheries), or Gros Morne and the Gulf of St. Lawrence (NL). Critical discourse about oil-tourism antagonism is more likely from ENGO voices and tourism sectors. |
| **Governance:**  **“Connective” element - Political spaces for engagement within and across oil & tourism** | - n/a | - The connective element is weakly developed, though in light of contention around extending oil frontiers (Lofoten, the Arctic in general) there is a sentiment that more connectivity in the political sphere would be good. At present connectivity is episodic and focused on specific points of conflict and controversy.  - Part of the absence of connectivity relates to scale and the structure of the respective fields: oil is more central to governance and national-level political spaces and policy making, it has more political visibility and influence. By contrast, tourism development unfolds at more regional/local scales, and is a sector that is more diffuse, fragmented, with less visibility or political influence.  - Where we see co-existence, or the idea that they are complimentary development paths, this is more in the cultural spaces of tourism sites, rather than in the political sphere. | - Generally not a lot here. The oil issue/governance has largely moved to the margins of public and political discourse. Rather, the tourism sector is a higher priority in public and political debate.  - Around the margins, a few notable themes are: a) that the tourism sector is not really engaging with issues of oil prospectivity, governance, etc. ; b) oil development is opposed by some ENGOs based on wilderness values, Iceland’s image as a green society – although not explicitly linked to tourism, it is an implicit part of the Icelandic tourism imaginary.  - While generally not made explicit, it is interesting that the 2008 crisis comes up in narratives of both oil and tourism development as a critical event driving the emergence/acceleration of both development pathways as part of the recovery.  *- (KB: Yes. And it will be interesting to see what happens now, with tourism growth levelling off. Some see similarities between the situation now and that just before the 2008 crash… signs of instability in the most important companies (then banks, now airlines) etc. Will oil again come up for serious consideration if things turn sour?)* | - Overall, there is a sense of oil and tourism as complimentary development paths (including through oil-as-tourism sites). The corpus analysis has both as central and strongly linked to each other, though oil clusters more with government, politics, and independence. That said, there is little direct engagement across sectors in the political sphere. | - There is generally not much evidence of connectivity across sectors in terms of governance. While oil and tourism are seen as complimentary by many interview participants in terms of indirect contact (particularly in the Esbjerg/Wadden Sea region), there is less sign of political engagement across sectors. | - While the general sense is of co-existence of oil and tourism development, there are few governance forums or processes that actually create connectivity across sectors. They are mostly siloed in terms of governance. The main exception is around the fracking controversy in Gros Morne, where we see the emergence of the Western NL fracking panel as a forum for bridging sectors. Where conflict between sectors emerges, the provincial government and CNLOPB become key organizational actors and potential mediators. | - While oil and tourism are often positioned as complimentary (albeit separate) development paths, the connective dimension of governance is weakly developed. The main exception are episodic points of conflict and controversy that are most visible in the Norway and NL cases. In these cases, there appears to be more of an oil-government alignment vs. tourism-ENGO alignments, with tourism positioned as a more sustainable development pathway (along with fisheries) compared with the environmental risks of new oil development. These controversies are triggered when new oil development or prospectivity impinges on established values.  - A partial exception is in the Wadden Sea/Esbjerg region, where there appears to be informal connectivity and contact across sectors, though still less evidence of formalized relationships in governance processes.  - One explanation for lack of connectivity may be asymmetries in the importance of the sectors in political economies and social imaginaries of the different cases, where oil is much more central in Norway, while tourism is more central in Denmark and Iceland. However, this holds true as well in the cases of Scotland and NL, where both are given quite a bit of focus in the cultural imaginary (though, oil is more dominant in the political economy of NL). |
| **Governance:**  **“vertical” element – governance as local, regional, national, international** | - The collaboration network questions illustrate that tourism collaboration networks tend to be more localized/regionalized in comparison with oil sector collaboration networks, which are more regional-national. This speaks to differences of scale in the geographic, social and political networks of tourism vs. oil. | - Issues of scale play out in interesting ways. There is the notion that oil governance (and contention) is much more central to the national political sphere, while tourism development and developing governance to deal with negative impacts is much more a local-regional concern (and peripheral from the national scale). So, there is a scale mismatch in developing conversation across sectors.  - However, the international scale also enters at various points, including in discussions about whether there should be a national park or UNESCO site for Lofoten (which could create barriers to oil development in the region), as well as in talk about the Paris COP meetings and agreement as a global critical event that is relevant to Norwegian debate about oil, social futures, decarbonisation, etc. (which impinge on debates about oil development). | - What emerges of interest is mostly tourism focused (primarily from interviews), where key actors are mostly local (tourism, government) or national (tourism), with a sense of relatively weak connectivity along the vertical dimension. There is the notion that tourism governance is relatively underdeveloped, linked to the notion of tourism development/governance as primarily a local issue. *(KB: Not sure. There has certainly been a lot of talk of the need for some central agency to take care of tourism planning etc. Some attempts have been made by the central govt, but these have not been particularly successful.)*  - Other interesting international dynamics exist along the vertical dimension, though these are not central: a) Iceland is embedded within tensions between emerging attention to the “global Arctic” and local Arctics, with relevance to issues of oil prospectivity and climate policy and governance (fieldnotes); b)Tourism is connected to international agencies/initiatives such as the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and EU Blue Flag program (fieldnotes, netnography); c) The Paris Agreement comes up as a critical event, including being leveraged by ENGOs, linked to the need for better environmental protection. | - The main thing that relates to the vertical dimension is tensions between Scotland and the UK, including around independence and Brexit, which is creating uncertainty, challenges, and tension.  - The vertical dimension also comes up in the corpus analysis with oil clustering more around government in general, while tourism is clustered more around city and community.  - The vertical dimension also comes up with regard to Aberdeen as an oil city that has not been overly successful at capturing the social benefits of oil at the local level.  - With regard to tourism, the vertical dimension also comes up in the idea that tourism governance needs to evolve to better manage scale: that tourism governance is generally concerned with the local-regional, while technological change is global. | - The main focus on the vertical dimension is on tourism development. The vertical dimension is most prominently around the Wadden Sea national park in terms of its creation, governance and the creation of a Tourism Destination Image, which links local communities, national government and UNESCO. The National Park itself is also both a local space of environmental education and protection, as well as located in a global network of ecologically significant sites.  - In a few instances, ENGO and tourism web content also invokes the Paris COP agreement and the need to respond to climate change as another instance of the vertical dimension of ecological governance.  - Less prevalently across data, the vertical dimension comes up also around oil prospectivity in Greenland and the relationship between Greenland and the Danish government. | - With regard to tourism, much of the tourism sector is provincial/regional in focus. National Parks and UNESCO sites, typified by Gros Morne, are the most visible spaces of vertical multi-level governance, involving international (UNESCO), national (Parks Canada), provincial and local actors and interests. Generally, there are not many tensions or points of conflict in managing the vertical dimension here.  - With regard to oil, there does seem to be more tension or conflict within the vertical dimension, particularly around things like climate change policy and performance. Environmental Assessment regulations and oil governance involves more tensions and potential conflicts between the provincial and federal governments (with the provincial government more explicitly aligned with the interests of the oil sector). The Paris agreement also comes up at some points as an international critical event that poses political challenges for the NL oil sector. | - A common theme is that oil governance tends to be more national/international, whereas tourism governance is more regional/local in scale. This perhaps helps explain part of the lack of a connective dimension of governance.  - Tourism governance is generally diffuse and localized, but also involves trying to manage extra-local flows and issues. There is often a need to further strengthen the vertical dimension to improve connectivity between local operators and host communities with provincial, national government. There are also international actors present, such as UNESCO, or links between tourism development and the UN (SDGs) or EU Blue Flag program.  - Oil governance tends to operate more on the national level and generally appears to receive more attention and be better developed. The oil sector is an international economic network, and several companies operate across multiple case study sites and appear as key actors, including Equinor, Maersk, Shell.  - The Arctic Council also comes up as a key international agency, particularly around Arctic-related issues that touch on both tourism and oil development, as well as climate change.  - Climate change is another place the vertical dimension of governance becomes visible, with invocations of the Paris Agreement as a critical event that potentially impacts environmental governance. |
| **Governance**  **“horizontal” dimension –range of actors involved** | - The collaboration network questions further illustrate the presence of a relatively strong government/oil alignment.  - It also looks like all sectors have antagonistic ties with government - likely a reflection of the role of government in managing oil governance processes and decision-making. | - In relation to oil governance, a range of national government ministries and offices and oil sector organizations are particularly central. Equinor/Statoil comes up repeatedly as a key oil sector actor. The government-oil sector partnerships and relationship are seen as part of the reason for the success of the Norwegian model of oil development.  - ENGOs also come up as key actors, though often in conflict (but also collaboration) with government and the oil sector. This includes a mix of international, national, and localized environmental actors. A key idea here is that the Norwegian political sphere is particularly open to NGO actors.  - By contrast, there is less on tourism governance, which appears to be more localized/regionalized in terms of governance, less of a political priority, and more diffuse and fragmented as a field. | - The need to better develop tourism governance in order to address the emerging “challenges of success” and public/media narrative of “tourism fatigue” is particularly notable.  - Among all forms of tourism governance, government-tourism sector collaboration is most visible around tourism marketing & promotion, with Promote Iceland as a key actor.  - There is also collaboration within the tourism sector, and between tourism and ENGOs around things like environmental sustainability, industry self-regulation (i.e. VAKINN certification program in particular), boat tours, whales and whaling, as well as mobilizing to ensure the protection/integrity of natural areas.  - The tourism sector is dominated by a relatively small number of “big actors”, which have more interest and capacity to engage in tourism governance and collaboration.  - Oil sector actors are generally not central in terms of the horizontal dimension. Where oil governance does come up, we see engagement by opposition parties and ENGOs. | - While there is not a lot of contact across the oil and tourism sectors, there appears to be high levels of government-private sector collaboration in each of the oil sector and tourism sector.  - Government-oil collaboration includes stuff on policy/fiscal regimes, risk mitigation, supporting research and development, as well as renewable energy transitions and decommissioning.  -There also appears to be a high level of government-tourism collaboration around marketing and promotion and developing tourism governance.  - Likewise, there appears to be a high level of collaboration within the tourism sector around marketing and promotion.  - Social movements are not highly visible, but it is notable that the Greenpeace Brent Spar campaign comes up as a critical event shaping oil governance around decommissioning issues. | - Oil-government collaboration comes up, with the Danish government, Ørsted (formerly DONG energy) and Maersk appearing as key actors (as well as Shell and Chevron). Talk about collaboration focuses on oil fiscal regimes, but also renewable energy transitions. The importance of state engagement in the energy sector also comes up in terms of driving the sector towards environmental/social responsibility and taking an early leadership role in wind power transitions.  -Tourism-government collaboration is also prevalent, especially in data on the Wadden Sea, which works as a site of governance that connects both horizontal and vertical dimensions.  - Tourism-government tensions come up around ensuring protection of Danish coasts and avoiding opening up for over-development.  - There are also indicators of ENGO-government conflict, around issues of environmental assessment, negative impacts of renewables, and protecting Danish coasts from over-development and agricultural impacts. By contrast, ENGO-oil conflict focuses more on the extension of Arctic oil frontiers and climate change. | - There is quite a lot of material on oil-government collaboration. Key actors include government agencies (i.e. CNLOPB, Natural Resources) and key oil companies (Equinor, etc.). This links with positive views of the oil sector and notions of the oil sector as a field of technological innovation. There is generally a positive view of oil governance, as well as the discourse that government regulations can’t be too complex or onerous. There is material on public engagement, though generally not a lot of evidence of the tourism sector’s engagement in environmental governance.  - There is also quite a bit of material on tourism-government collaboration for tourism development, with “network weaving” often done by provincial and national government organizations (i.e. Parks Canada, TCII) and tourism groups (i.e. Hospitality NL). In contrast to oil, there appears to be more engagement of Indigenous communities in tourism governance, particularly around co-management of national parks in Labrador (Torngats, Mealey Mountains) and increasing Indigenous interest/involvement in tourism development.  - Just as there is not a lot of involvement of the tourism sector in oil governance, the inverse is also true of oil sector involvement in tourism governance.  - In general, non-state actors seem more engaged and important to oil governance than tourism governance, where there seem to be a smaller number of key influential non-government actors (i.e. Hospitality NL, Gros Morne Cooperating Association). | - There are a range of models of tourism governance along the horizontal dimension. Often, tourism governance is relatively underdeveloped and something that needs to be strengthened. Tourism collaboration between government and non-governmental actors is more often oriented around marketing and promotion. The need for governance focused on tourism management and addressing the problems and negative impacts unfolds in a largely reactive manner in response once problems emerge (largely as “costs of success”) as in the Icelandic case, or in Lofoten.  - There appears to be higher levels of horizontal collaboration between government and the tourism sector in Scotland than in the other cases.  - The Wadden Sea National Park also stands out as a specific example as a collaboration node. Likewise, the new Labrador national parks with moves to Indigenous co-management are also particularly interesting examples of the horizontal dimension of tourism governance.  - There are also signs of tourism-government tension, particularly in the Danish case around issues of coastal zone development and competing visions for the types of tourism that are appropriate for coastal environments.  - Horizontal collaboration related to oil development generally seems much more developed (with the exception of Iceland), with a great deal of oil-government collaboration across cases, and specific energy companies appearing as particularly visible and influential actors in political networks. The Danish case is particularly interesting here, where we also see collaboration for renewable energy transitions, as well as for the ongoing management/regulation of the oil sector.  - ENGOs are also prevalent as key actors (discussed in more detail below), often involved in conflict around oil development, but more around collaboration in tourism development. |
| **Social movements: when does intervention happen** | - n/a | - Mobilization and contention against the oil sector is triggered by the expansion of oil exploration into new regions, particularly Lofoten (LoVeSe) and the Arctic, framed primarily around risks to fisheries and Arctic ecologies, but also around climate change and tourism impacts. There is evidence here of ENGO-tourism alignments.  - There are also examples of tourism-ENGO collaboration around tourism sustainability projects. | - Movement interventions are more around tourism, taking a few forms: ensuring integrity/protections of parks and natural areas, around anti-whaling, and conversely environmental education around whale watching and boat tours.  - ENGOs have been engaged when oil prospectivity was more in the public and political sphere, but not recently as it has become more peripheral (although minimal exploratory work does continue, some exploration licenses have been dropped or abandoned).  - Where intervention around energy development comes up, this is also, interestingly, in relation to renewable energy projects and potential impacts on wilderness values (and by extension, the Icelandic tourism image and attractors). | - Overall, there is not much recent mobilization or engagement around oil issues within the data. The most significant is the historical event of the Greenpeace Brent Spar campaign, which comes up as a critical historical event that provoked a re-think around issues of decommissioning within the oil sector and government.  - Anti-fracking campaigns (in the UK in general) also come up in ENGO-produced content.  - By contrast, ENGO engagement in tourism is more oriented around collaboration and tourism as a site of environmental education.  *(PM: there are social movement cultures in Glasgow, Edinburgh, but mobilized around other (social) issues, so don’t equate this with a lack of activism per se.)* | - ENGOs are less explicitly engaged in oil or tourism-related issues, but rather have broader concerns around issues of coastal development, bird and wildlife protection, and the wellbeing of aquatic environments.  - Social movement intervention often focuses on negative impacts of renewable energy, more through localized conflict from communities, rather than through larger institutionalized ENGOs.  - The No Heliport campaign in the Wadden Sea region is another instance of localized conflict around oil infrastructure, more than a campaign from larger institutionalized ENGOs.  - Where oil comes up as an object of contention for ENGOs, it is more around the expansion of Arctic oil frontiers. | - Mobilization around oil is exceptional and sporadic. It is not geared at the oil sector in general, but rather when proposed oil development risks impinging on established and highly valued tourism (and fisheries) economies and relationships. This is most apparent with the Gros Morne fracking controversy, but also with the Old Harry controversy. Movements appear to be mobilized more by resistance to oil development (often in alliance or on behalf of more “sustainable” tourism economies), rather than intervening around tourism per se. In other words, tourism is positioned as a more sustainable alternative to oil development, and Gros Morne and its ecological and economic importance is used as a rationale for opposing new oil development. | - Contention comes up more often around oil development. It is generally episodic, and project specific, and is triggered when new oil development risks impinging on established social-ecological relationships that include tourism, as well as fisheries. During the project, this is most apparent in the Norway and NL cases. Where there isn’t an imminent threat of oil development impinging on highly valued environments/economies, there are less signs of mobilization or contention.  - There is likewise contention around oil frontier expansion into the Arctic, driven by less localized concerns but more by references to fragile Arctic ecologies, as well as climate change.  - By contrast, engagement in tourism development is often more collaborative around things like improving the sustainability of tourism practices, environmental education projects, or (in the Icelandic case) alignments around specific issues like anti-whaling. There are also ENGO-tourism alignments against new oil development, where tourism is positioned as a more sustainable development pathway, where the economic importance of tourism is leveraged to defend places against prospective oil development.  - The Scottish case is a bit different here, with more material on decommissioning and a historical memorialization of the Brent Spar conflict playing a key role in narratives about present and future needs for decommissioning. |
| **Social movements:**  **Key discourses used to intervene in oil-tourism interface** | - n/a | - There are multiple discourses used, including a focus on localized risks and impacts of any new oil development (i.e. Lofoten, Arctic) on fisheries and vulnerable Arctic ecologies.  - The focus on local impacts also links to tourism, positioning these as incompatible development paths. Tourism as a relatively more sustainable path is negatively impacted by new oil development.  - There is also a climate change-based critical discourse that points to the ironies of Norway’s ostensible climate commitments (invoking the Paris climate agreement) coupled with intentions to extend oil exploration and extraction frontiers. A climate justice variant asserts that given Norway’s history and benefits from oil wealth, it can afford to keep remaining reserves in the ground and take a leadership role in this regard. There is also a focus here on renewable energy transitions and decarbonisation.  - More peripheral, but there is some critique of negative ecological impacts of tourism, mostly focused on cruise ship tourism and its impacts re: climate change (i.e. carbon intensity) and on Arctic ecologies. | - This case highlights not just an oil-tourism interface, but broader energy-tourism interface where renewable energy projects are also subject to controversy, in terms of power development vs. wilderness values (which underlie the tourism destination image).  - Whales are invoked as objects of ENGO discourse around tourism issues, in aligning tourism & environmentalism. Wilderness values and wildlife (i.e. whales) are key elements of discourse. | - Oil development is a source of risk to seabirds and coastal environments, also is linked to climate impacts and biodiversity issues.  - There is also a lot of focus on bird and wildlife protection (whales, puffins, seabirds, seals). Though this is not generally framed through tourism, these are key nature-oriented tourism attractors. | - Not much here specifically on oil or tourism, but in ENGO web content there are recurring motifs of nature as fragile and vulnerable to human activity, and the need for bird and wildlife protection. | - The focus is on new oil development and the risks posed to the environmental wellbeing (and the related economic value via tourism) to Gros Morne, whales, seabirds, wilderness values, and fisheries. Tourism and fisheries are positioned as sustainable economies put at risk by potential new oil development. | - Mobilization around oil is grounded in localized risks impacts on ecological basis (& wilderness values) of established tourism and fishing economies.  - More prevalent in Norway is a focus on broader impacts of climate change, Arctic nature, and the carbon complex more generally, in addition to the localized impacts.  - There is some critique of carbon intensity of tourism, particularly cruise ships and the expansion of Arctic tourism (i.e. Norway).  - There is an ENGO/tourism alignment in Iceland around whales and anti-whaling, where whales are redefined from extractive resource to basis of tourism value as part of the wilderness and wildlife of Iceland.  - We also see mobilization around renewable energy development (especially Iceland) around potential negative impacts on wilderness values (and thus on tourism), which draws attention to a broader “energy-tourism interface.” |
| **Social movements: repertoire of action, tactics** | - n/a | - The main tactics that come up are using social media for reaching attentive audiences, requests for donations, issuing public statements or declarations, and holding rallies and protests. This is a mix of e-tactics and occupying offline space, as well as more moderate, in-system tactics (public declarations, donations) and more contentious tactics (protest rallies). The range of tactics seems consistent with the notion of Norway as a diverse social movement field that bridges larger-scale, more institutionalized movement groups and smaller-scale organizations. | - Not a lot here. Some netnography data refers to the use of protest camps, marches, rallies, in relation to protecting wilderness values from industrial development more broadly, as well as contention around offshore oil, HFO-free Arctic.  *- (KB: There were some regular marches in Reykjavík organised by activists when the exploration licences had been issued… starting at a small shop named “Drekinn” – a humorous reference to the “Drekasvæðið” as the oil exploration region is called.)*  - Tourism-ENGO alignment is mostly based on public outreach & education/tourism as a site of environmental education (as noted above). | - Not too much here. There is some material on protest rallies and marches related to fracking protest (UK in general, Greenpeace); environmental education initiatives from RSPB (which is a key ENGO actor that engages in tourism development); and calls for volunteering. | - The main tactics seem to be participation in environmental assessment processes, lobbying the government, public environmental education campaigns and initiatives, and requests for donations and memberships.  *- (JU: There is the notion that in the wake of the 2009 COP meetings, ENGO action shifted away from grassroots and media-oriented activism more towards policy-makers and the political sphere. This interpretation fits with the tactics that are most visible across different modes of data.*) | - Not a lot here. Mostly in-system tactics are used in conflicts over oil development: public meetings and events, lobbying, using web 2.0 applications, letter-writing campaigns, court/legal actions. | - Overall, this feels a bit underdeveloped and we are doing further work to help fill gaps here.  - Tactics that come up are largely “in-system” oriented: using social media to reach audiences, seeking donations, petitions or public declarations, lobbying, letter writing, environmental education initiatives, calls for volunteers, legal actions.  - There are also examples of using more contentious tactics like protest marches and rallies across the cases. We see mixes of in-system and more contentious tactics across most cases (NL and Denmark seem more in-system oriented rather than the mix that we see in other cases).  - Denmark is notable here, as there has been a shift in social movement repertoires and in the make-up of the field in the wake of the 2009 COP meetings, with activism shifting from grassroots to more policy-oriented and to more in-system tactis. |
| **Social movements:**  **structure of field** | - n/a | - The Norwegian case is particularly interesting in having a diverse and complex “social movement ecology” that includes national chapters of international organizations (Greenpeace, WWF, Friends of the Earth as core orgs), national organizations (Bellona, Nature & Youth as core orgs), and more localized, less institutionalized or professionalized organizations (Oil Free Lofoten), which also adopt a range of orientations to conflict and collaboration around oil and tourism development issues, from more moderate to more critical. | - IceWhale comes up across data sources as a key organization that serves as a “bridging tie” between environmentalism and tourism. It focuses on issues of whales, whaling, tourism as site of public education & outreach, etc.  - Other key organizations that come up at different points include the Icelandic Nature Conservation Society, Saving Iceland, Greenpeace, WWF. The ENGO field mostly seems oriented around a small cluster of national organizations, with occasional involvement of international groups.  - That said, the response to the 2008 crisis does come up as an exemplar of the tradition and potential for grassroots mobilization and Icelandic political culture, though this is less evident in the project data oriented around the oil-tourism interface. | - The main organizations that come up are 1) the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, which is Scottish/UK-based and is more engaged in tourism-related issues, including tourism-ENGO collaboration around tourism as a site of environmental education; 2) Greenpeace, which is the national office of the international major ENGO, and comes up more in conflict around oil and gas development.  *(PM: Lots of larger ENGOs headquartered in London, flows of activist capital & resources focus more on the capital, don’t flow north. Other than focus on local issues.)* | - Key ENGO actors include the WWF, Greenpeace, Danish Nature Conservation Association, and Danish Ornithological Society. The field is structured around key national and international organizations. Note, though, that there are episodes of localized contention around renewable energy and oil infrastructure that are driven more by local communities than by these larger and more institutionalized organizations, which tend to focus on coastal environments more broadly.  *- (JU: Note also the COP 15 meetings as a critical event that shifted the structure of the field towards more institutionalized, professionalized ENGOs that orient more towards the policy sphere.)* | - CPAWS NL comes up as a particularly important actor, as does East Coast Trail Association (which is primarily a hiking/outdoor rec NGO). A range of other national groups, regional alliances (Save our Seas and Shores, St. Lawrence Coalition) and local groups also come up. Overall, however, there are few highly visible ENGOs and the field generally seems fragmented and relatively underdeveloped compared with some other cases? | - Using the idea of a “social movement ecology” may be useful to understanding the differences here.  - The Norwegian case suggests a strong multilevel social movement ecology of international, national, and local organizations, engaging in different forms of conflictual collaboration.  - The Danish field also seems to have a fairly strong core of key national and international organizations, with somewhat less visibility of local organizations.  - The Icelandic ENGO field seems dominated by a relatively small core of national organizations with some engagement with international groups. Though there is a history there of active grassroots mobilization and protest.  - Fewer core organizations come up in the Scottish case, and include the RSPB and Greenpeace. An explanation is that many national/international groups are headquartered in London and attention and resources often don’t flow north.  - The NL case seems to have a less visible ENGO field in general, with a few key chapters of national organizations (CPAWS) and local/provincial organizations, as well as a couple broader interprovincial alliances that are engaged in specific issues.  -Greenpeace (and its national chapters) and WWF appear as key actors across multiple cases, and have a role as international actors and bridging ties between national/local politics and controversies. |
| **Social movements:**  **Collaboration & conflict networks** | - The conflict network questions further emphasize that tourism development isn't particularly controversial, but appears to have high consensus. By contrast, oil is more likely a site of conflict, with tourism/ENGO alignments vs. oil/government alignments | - Regarding oil development, movements are mostly involved in conflict and contention with the oil sector and government, particularly around the extension of oil frontiers. Though, there are also instances of collaboration across ENGOs and oil around renewable energy transition projects or risk mitigation. This is a good illustration of the notion of “conflictual collaboration” between movements and other players in the political field, particularly with government. This links back to the notion of Norway as an “open society” where movements have access to engage with government.  - There are signs of ENGO-tourism collaboration and alignment, mostly around specific tourism sustainability projects, such as innovation to lower the environmental footprint of tourism and positioning tourism as a relatively sustainable development pathway. | - Across data sources, there is a sense of ENGO-tourism alignment and collaboration, with IceWhale as a particularly important bridging tie. Tourism works as a space of environmental education, sustainability discourse, developing sustainable tourism models & business practices, and space for anti-whaling discourse.  - Oil development is peripheral (future-oriented, hypothetical, focused on exploration and prospectivity), but where it does emerge, there is more ENGO-oil conflict and opposition.  - There are also examples of ENGO-government conflict linked to protecting the integrity of natural and protected areas (linked, by extension, to the Icelandic tourism destination image), anti-whaling, and opposition around oil development. | - ENGO-oil conflict comes up more as a historical critical event around the Greenpeace Brent Spar campaign, which shifted practice and policy around decommissioning.  - Oil-ENGO conflict also comes up in some of the web data, with ENGOs (aka Greenpeace in particular) positioned as oppositional to the oil sector.  - ENGO-government collaboration comes up around parks and protected areas. Similarly, ENGO-tourism collaboration comes up around tourism as a site of environmental education. | - ENGO collaboration around tourism come up a few times, mostly around tourism as a site of environmental education and the ENGO involvement in Wadden Sea National park.  - Here we see conflict networks mostly between ENGOs and government around issues like renewable energy (mostly localized and community groups, rather than larger ENGOs), environmental assessment processes, protecting coastal environments from overdevelopment and negative agricultural impacts.  - There are also instances of ENGO-oil conflict networks, but more around the extension of Arctic oil frontiers and climate change. | - Social movement collaboration networks are within movement and also with tourism sector actors, as well as with fishers, mostly in relation to oil-related conflict at Gros Morne and the Gulf of St. Lawrence.  - Conversely, ENGO conflict networks focus on government and the oil sector, with proposed oil development positioned as a risk to established national park landscapes, tourism and fisheries economies.  - The field notes also highlight interesting examples of anti-environmentalism around oil development and also around anti-sealing campaigns, though these are not dominant themes in the project overall. | - Overall, relationships with the oil sector are predominantly conflictual and focus on particular points of controversy. A notable exception is Norway, where there is also signs of collaboration around renewable energy development.  - By contrast, relationships between ENGOs and tourism tend to have more signs of collaboration and alignment. This is around opposition to oil development in places with established, valued tourism economies. This is also around projects for improving tourism sustainability practices, lowering carbon footprints, environmental education, etc…  - The Norway case is most characterized by a logic of “conflictual collaboration” between movements and other players (government, oil), whereas in other places relationships tend to be conflictual or collaborative. This ties back to notions of Norway as an “open society” and relatively good access between civil society and the policy sphere.  - We also see some instances of conflict around renewable energy issues, again pointing to the importance of a broader focus on energy systems beyond oil in thinking about energy futures, etc… |
| **OUTCOMES:**  **Lessons from cases for moving towards more socially-environmentally sustainable futures** | - Given response rate, results are very suggestive, however, the suggestion of different epistemic communities re: oil-tourism interface is interesting. i.e. oil & government perspective of oil & tourism as complementary development paths vs. ENGO (and tourism, a certain extent) perspective that sees these as more incompatible and antagonistic development paths. This highlights value of better developing the “connective” dimension of environmental governance to bridge these perspectives.  - Also, these results tease out differences in political scale of oil governance (national-regional) vs. tourism governance (local-regional). Again, this speaks to need to better develop connective environmental governance, but doing so with attention to multi-scalar nature of environmental governance. | - While the “Norwegian fairytale” can be critiqued, there are valuable lessons in terms of the potential for governments to negotiate significant benefits for host societies from engagement with the oil sector, and to use public ownership and a strong culture of collaboration to maximize social benefits and engage in *relatively* more sustainable oil economies, as well as to build on this to shift energy systems towards renewables. However, remaining committed to the oil project means that there is an interest in extending new oil frontiers, which is raising opposition on the basis of local concerns (fisheries, tourism) as well as broader concerns (climate change, Arctic ecologies).  - The other major lesson that seems to come from this case is the value of a well-developed multi-scalar “social movement ecology” of international, national, and local movements that engage in a mix of in-system and more contentious tactics, and that adopt varying strategies of conflictual collaboration with government and the oil sector. We also see quite a bit of environmental reflexivity here around both the negative multi-scalar impacts of oil and tourism. | - Iceland most typifies the need to grapple with developing tourism governance in parallel with tourism marketing promotion, rather than as an afterthought or engaging in tourism governance reactively only when the “challenges of success” start to appear in terms of overcrowding, impacts on natural areas, etc… This case, more than the others, shows that tourism is not a wholly positive, benevolent alternative to resource extraction.  - The Icelandic case also seems to show more environmental reflexivity than others regarding environmental drawbacks of tourism, both on local environments as well as the carbon footprints linked to broader issues of climate change. There are also examples of tourism-environmentalism alignment, and ENGO intervention in protecting the integrity of natural areas and wilderness values that underlie the tourism destination image. This goes beyond just assuming tourism is a sustainable alternative to demonstrating greater reflexivity and engaging in projects that attempt to make tourism economies better in terms of social-ecological wellbeing. This isn’t “anti-turismo” (as per the Spanish anti-tourism movements and sentiment), but trying to envision and build tourism economies that fit community interests and environmental sustainability. | - Re: the oil sector, a few things stand out: 1) the way in which social movement conflict (the Brent Spar) has generated lasting impacts on the collective thinking around issues of decommissioning and sustainability; 2) the acknowledgement that the Scottish North Sea is largely in a “post-peak” state and discussions about decommissioning are necessary – including discussions about the distribution of costs of decommissioning; 3) while oil has been largely beneficial to Scotland as a whole, there is some sense that Aberdeen, as a host community, has failed to take advantage of this to the same degree as other comparable oil host cities. This points to the importance of the conscious distribution of the benefits of oil along the vertical dimension of oil governance.  - Like the Icelandic case, there is also a notable degree of environmental reflexivity about the costs and negative impacts (social and environmental) of tourism, as well as the emergence of specific projects that are attempting to build more sustainable, lower-footprint tourism economies. | - While on the national scale oil is now often viewed as a sunset industry and tourism occupies more space in the public imaginary, the landscape of Wadden Sea National Park/Esbjerg appears to be a particularly unique example of co-existence between oil/energy sector and tourism, where both are part of the landscape and self-image of place.  - Similar to Norway, one of the key lessons related to the oil economy is the importance of strong state involvement in the sector in terms of public ownership, collaboration, and pushing corporate social, environmental responsibility. Like Norway, this seems to contribute towards maximizing social wellbeing for host societies, but even more so than Norway is helping with decarbonisation and transitions to renewable energy systems.  - Somewhat similar to Iceland, we also see points of tension or contestation around renewable energy development (mostly localized, rather than linked to the major ENGO field), but which also highlights the importance of a broader focus on energy systems in thinking about oil, climate change, renewable transitions, etc…  - Tourism is generally seen in a positive light as a sustainable development pathway. Yet, similar to Iceland and Scotland, we also see environmental reflexivity re: tourism’s carbon footprint, as well as tensions around issues of coastal development and envisioning the types of tourism that are most appropriate to coastal environments. There is also active engagement in tourism sustainability projects using and using tourism as an environmental education forum.  - The 2009 Copenhagen COP meetings had a profound effect on re-shaping environmental movements/civil society more towards larger, institutionalized organizations and in-system tactics. | - This case perhaps best illustrates a state-oil alignment, with the province largely taking on an oil sector-centric perspective on social and economic wellbeing, and relatively little reflection on things like renewable energy transitions. When critique and local/regional mobilization occur it is related to specific episodes of proposed oil development that create risks/negative impacts for existing tourism (and fisheries) economies, essentially in Gros Morne/Gulf of St. Lawrence.  - This case also shows a very strong positive view of tourism, but other than specific episodes of conflict, this is often siloed out from oil development. There is less of the environmental reflexivity around tourism than we see with Iceland, Scotland or Denmark, and tourism governance beyond destination promotion and management is relatively underdeveloped. Like Iceland and Norway, we might expect tourism governance to emerge in a reactive way when/if problems become visible.  - Gros Morne embodies how parks and protected areas, as tourism anchors and economic drivers, can become focal points for opposition to new fossil fuel development. | - Both oil and tourism are highly valued as economic drivers across the case studies. While oil is primarily valued in terms of economic wellbeing (royalties, employment) tourism benefits are often seen as more multidimensional (economic, social, cultural, and also contributing to rural communities more than oil). There is generally a broad, cross-sectoral consensus about the positive impacts of tourism as a relatively sustainable development pathway. By contrast, interpretations of oil are more heterogenous and sometimes conflictual. Where there is disagreement, this often breaks into oil-government alignments versus ENGO-tourism alignments.  - Ongoing oil extraction in established regions is often not problematized. Conflict between oil and tourism (as well as fisheries) is more episodic and erupts when new oil exploration/extraction activity is proposed, or oil frontiers are extended, that create risks and negative impacts for established social-ecological relationships grounded in tourism (or fisheries).  - Strong state involvement in the energy sector helps ensure social benefits and minimize environmental risks, but can also be leveraged to help with renewable energy transitions and decarbonisation. However, as tensions around renewables highlight (including around impacts on tourism), there is no innocent energy and the social dimensions of renewable transitions are also important to consider as we think about energy systems and climate change more broadly.  - Parks and protected areas (i.e. Gros Morne) can be particularly important leverage points against expanded oil development. In these cases, nature gains political standing and voice from ENGOs/tourism sector interests as it is translated into economic value for tourism host communities.  - Tourism governance is generally underdeveloped. Government-tourism collaboration is mostly focused on promotion and marketing of the tourism destination image and increasing flows of tourists. Other dimensions of governance tend to emerge reactively only after social and ecological problems become apparent. There is space for more preventative approaches to tourism governance – to envisioning the types of tourism that are appropriate for host communities and ensuring that tourism management evolves in synch with tourism marketing and promotion. |
| **OUTCOMES**  **How do societies in the North Atlantic best navigate offshore oil & tourism as development pathways in ways that build social-ecological wellbeing?** | - Build on consensus around tourism as relatively sustainable development pathway. But, tourism networks tend to be more localized/regionalized. Emphasis on building more active tourism governance with attention to improving vertical connectivity & dialogue?  - Oil is more contentious, less consensual, more concern re: environmental risks and impacts. More reflection, need for engagement, FPIC about where & when oil extraction and prospectivity are taking place?  - Oil & tourism are often viewed as compatible development paths but do come into conflict when oil development poses risks to other established and valued economies (tourism fisheries). Community engagement and consent needs to include possibility of saying no and prioritizing preferred social-ecological relationships and development pathways?  - Importance of developing the connective dimensions of environmental governance, more landscape/seascape level thinking, dialogue, planning. Not just connecting sectors *after* controversy and conflict erupt. | - While Norway demonstrates a valuable model for engaging with oil in ways that maximize social wellbeing, over-dependence on oil is leading to extensions of oil frontiers into new areas that are much more controversial and conflictual. How to translate the critical discourse that is coming from Norwegian social movements and provoke broader discussion about whether/where the expansion of oil development is and is not appropriate in the context of climate change and a carbon constrained world?  - Tourism governance in Norway appears fragmented and underdeveloped, and the tourism field is more localized and regionalized, and is quite peripheral compared to the political economic importance of oil. When the ecological and social “problems of success” or growing tourism in specific regions appears, the need for better tourism governance becomes visible and reactive, and largely peripheral to the national political imaginary. There is a need for evolving tourism governance to fit the forms of tourism that are appropriate to host communities and mitigate the negative impacts. If tourism is to be a “sustainable alternative” to oil extraction, it needs to be actively managed and envisioned to fit the needs and values of host communities. | - The Icelandic tourism boom shows the importance of taking a more proactive approach to tourism governance, as well as the value of ENGO-tourism collaboration for building more sustainable forms of tourism that better contribute to social-ecological wellbeing and fit community interests.  - The oil conversation has largely fallen out of the public sphere. Drawing from other cases, this is potentially problematic as it leaves a “sleeping dragon” that can be reawakened when/if oil prices rebound and draw oil sector attention back to Arctic oil exploration in a serious way again. Is it better to more actively engage the oil question in relation to whether this fits the image of Iceland as a “green nation” that is also part of the tourism destination image, not to wait for circumstances to change?  - Tensions around renewable energy projects also point to the complexities of navigating the oil-tourism interface, in terms of envisioning and enacting the pathways that are adopted towards decarbonisation or lower-carbon futures and how this might negatively impact other values (i.e. wilderness values that are linked with the tourism destination image). This highlights the importance of thinking about energy systems more broadly than simply offshore oil, and building the connective dimensions of environmental governance around energy systems and renewable energy transitions as well. | - Both oil and tourism are highly valued for their social and economic contributions, and generally seen as complementary, though there is little direct connectivity in terms of governance or the political sphere. There are significant signs of collaboration around both the oil sector and tourism sector, and both have weight in the political economy and political imaginary. Where there is less of a stark asymmetry between the sectors, this may be more conducive to building the connective dimension of environmental governance and thinking about oil and tourism development through more of a landscape/seascape level lens?  - The “energy trilemma” framework is an interesting one for making sense of human development goals, climate action, and economic wellbeing in an oil-dependent region. The ways this is incorporated into the oil-as-tourism sites (e.g. science centres) is also helpful in terms of the potential to use tourism to provoke reflection on energy futures.  - As the decommissioning discussion highlights, disruptive episodes of social movements can provoke lasting change in extractive sectors that appear very beneficial with hindsight in terms of pushing corporate practices to change. The discussion around decommissioning is more evident and proactive here – asking the questions about how to manage the end of the oil lifecycle and debates over who should be responsible. | - The Wadden Sea National Park/Esbjerg model is interesting and may provide valuable lessons for other regions where oil and tourism co-inhabit the landscape. Even here, though, the connective dimension of governance is underdeveloped and could be further developed.  - This case presents a good example of state involvement in the oil sector in pushing towards the ecological modernization of the energy sector. At the same time, tensions around renewable energy illustrate that decarbonisation is not free from its own points of tension that need to be addressed and managed.  - The Copenhagen/rest of country social/cultural divide appears as a challenge for envisioning and building towards social-ecological wellbeing beyond the capital region. | - Tourism is really in the shadow of oil, from a political economic perspective, though both are valued in the public imaginary/self-image of place. The eruption of episodic conflict between oil and tourism development suggests the need for greater development of the connective dimension of environmental governance.  - The focus on collaboration for tourism promotion and marketing should be coupled with greater attention to other dimensions of tourism governance and collaboration, and more weight for the sector in the political sphere.  - In general, the ENGO field is relatively weakly developed in this case, and there is relatively less environmental reflexivity about tourism-energy-climate change interfaces. A stronger social movement ecology may help provoke environmental reflexivity and these necessary conversations?  - The emergence of the newer Labrador national parks, which emphasize Indigenous co-management and consciously leverage tourism and environmental protection for community wellbeing are a positive example worth highlighting. | - In the cultural dimension, both tourism and oil are valued by host communities. However, in the political sphere there is often an asymmetry that privileges oil over tourism (Norway, NL), or where tourism is more visible than discussions around oil (Iceland, Denmark). Even where there is more symmetry (Scotland), the connective dimensions of governance are underdeveloped. Governance emerges reactively only when conflict points erupt. One of the main take-aways of the book, then, may be a call for more connected forms of environmental governance, thinking about relationships among multiple development paths at the landscape/seascape level and thinking about the kinds of social-ecological futures that host communities want and how to enact these.  - Strong state intervention and involvement in the energy sector appears to be beneficial in terms of maximizing social benefits for host communities, ensuring (relatively) greater environmental responsibility, but also leveraging to envision and implement new energy futures and grappling with the main social-ecological challenges of the 21st century (i.e. climate change, which is a core part of the context of where tourism and energy economies are headed). That said, renewable transitions are not themselves free of tension and conflict. Renewable transitions aren’t simply technological/economic issues, but also involve other important social-ecological dynamics and considerations.  - Tourism is not simply a benevolent, sustainable alternative to oil extraction. Tourism governance also needs to be strengthened. While nature-based tourism is highly valued in the cultural sphere, it often needs to be taken more seriously in the political sphere, and governance should focus on co-evolving around promotion & marketing and implement policy that shapes the direction and form of tourism development, not just being reactive once the social and ecological “challenges of success” become apparent.  - There are multiple and important roles for environmental organizations and civil society in the oil-tourism interface, including:   * Giving voice to non-human nature, aligning with tourism (& fisheries) where oil development creates risks to community and ecological wellbeing. * Conflictual collaboration with oil-government interests to create tension around the expansion of fossil fuel development, but also engagement in renewable transitions. * Collaboration to ensure that tourism can fulfill its potential as a site of environmental education. At present, this orients mostly around ecological literacy. Is there potential to use tourism to also engage in more reflexivity about environmental problems and conflicts? (i.e. the energy trilemma?) * Pushing the tourism sector to engage in greater environmental reflexivity and adoption of more pro-environmental practices around both local ecological impacts and the broader carbon-intensity and fossil fuel dependence of the sector. |